

1 Logan Municipal Council Logan, Utah September 2, 2025

Logan, Utah

September 2, 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, September 2, 2025, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 5:30 pm. Logan Municipal Council Meetings are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and the City of Logan YouTube channel at: bit.ly/LoganCouncilMeetings

Councilmembers present at the beginning of the meeting: Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds, Vice Chair Mike Johnson, Councilmember Ernesto López, Councilmember Mark A. Anderson and Councilmember Amy Z. Anderson. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines, City Attorney Craig Carlston, Finance Director Richard Anderson, and City Recorder Teresa Harris.

Chair Simmonds welcomed those present. There were approximately 58 in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

OPENING CEREMONY:

Councilmember Ernesto López provided the opening ceremony and led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

Councilmember López stated that from the 15th of September to October 15th is filled with celebration and appreciation for the Hispanic/Latino community. The community is invited to attend the Latino Festival on September 13th on Center Street. In Utah, the Latino population is half a million, with 8,000 of the population residing in Logan. Hispanic refers to individuals who have a connection to the Spanish language. Latino refers to individuals with ancestral ties to Latin America or the Caribbean regardless of native or predominant language. Celebrating Latino heritage is celebrating a part of American history. They are a crucial part of the workforce, strengthening the economy, creating businesses, and creating jobs and innovation. In 2023, their economic impact reached \$4.1 trillion.

However, this year's festivals will be downsized, and the truth is uncomfortable. Of the 70 million Latinos in the United States, more than 20 million are immigrants. We, our families, circumstances, and life callings made us part of this great nation. We contribute in every way possible. Many millions are not fortunate enough to be documented. Undocumented immigrants are essential workers. The federal administration believes otherwise. The truth is that there are not enough criminals to sanction the number of deportations. These individuals are someone's loved ones, their fathers, mothers, and children. They can be neighbors, friends, or heroes like Officer Eric Estrada, who gave his life in the line of duty. Organizers and attendees are concerned about the safety of the community, lest customs and immigration officers consider raiding the event. Many out of safety and concern are electing not to participate. So, please show up to the event and participate in the community celebration. Reach out to elected officials and beseech them to stop supporting the terrorizing of the Latino community in the country.

42 Chair Simmonds expressed gratitude and appreciation for being able to work with
43 Councilmember López.

44 **Meeting Minutes.** Minutes of the Council meeting held on August 19, 2025 were
45 reviewed. Also reviewed with minor corrections made were minutes of the Truth In
46 Taxation meeting held on August 7, 2025.

47
48 **Meeting Agenda.** Chair Simmonds announced there are four public hearings scheduled
49 for tonight's Council meeting.

50
51 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember M.**
52 **Anderson to approve tonight's agenda, minutes from August 19, 2025 and minutes**
53 **from August 7, 2025 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote.**

54 **A. Anderson: Aye**

55 **M. Anderson: Aye**

56 **Johnson: Aye**

57 **López: Aye**

58 **Simmonds: Aye**

59

60 **Meeting Schedule.** Chair Simmonds announced that regular Council meetings are held
61 on the first and third Tuesdays of the month at 5:30 p.m. The next regular Council
62 meeting is Tuesday, September 16, 2025.

63

64 **QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL:**

65

66 **Chair Simmonds explained that any person wishing to comment on any item not**
67 **otherwise on the agenda may address the City Council at this point by stepping to the**
68 **microphone and giving his or her name and address for the record. Comments should**
69 **be limited to not more than three (3) minutes unless additional time is authorized by**
70 **the Council Chair. Citizen groups will be asked to appoint a spokesperson. This is the**
71 **time and place for any person who wishes to comment on non-agenda items and items**
72 **that are germane or relevant to the authority of the City Council. Items brought**
73 **forward to the attention of the City Council will be turned over to staff to respond to**
74 **outside of the City Council meeting.**

75 Gail Hanson, a resident of Logan expressed concerns about the changes in federal funding
76 for first-time home buyers. She also asked if the Council and audience are aware of the
77 italicized portion of the agenda. She read from the agenda and emphasized the importance
78 of treating each other with courtesy and respect.

79 Chair Simmonds asked if the City is still participating in the "Welcome Home, Own in
80 Logan" program.

81

82 Mayor Daines responded that the City did not fund the program through the RDA.
83 Unfortunately, the program was taken advantage of and with market changes, it is no longer
84 part of the budget.

85 Richard Anderson, Finance Director added that roughly \$10,000 in funds is still being
86 carried forward. The funds are a repayment made by a homebuyer who sold their home
87 prior to the required 5 years of residency.

88 Patrick Belmont, a resident of Logan shared a positive story about a city changing to solely
89 renewable energy. He advocated that trust can be built with the community. He expressed
90 his continued disappointment regarding the prior decision made by the Council to add
91 baseload power from natural gas to the city's energy portfolio.

92 There were no further comments or questions for the Mayor or Council.

93 **MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:**

94 **Presentation of Canyon Road Surface Improvement Update and proposed timetable**
95 **– Zan Murray, JUB Engineering (17:03)**

96 Zan Murray with JUB Engineering addressed the Council regarding the First Dam Tank
97 Pipeline Project – Canyon Road Improvements. Canyon road will be improved from
98 approximately 600 East to 1500 East just past Herm's Inn.

99 Canyon Road Improvement Project Purpose as recommended in the Transportation
100 Master Plan, Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan, and Wilson Neighborhood Plan:

- 101 1. Provide a vehicle corridor along Canyon Road to meet future needs.
- 102 2. Improve bicycle mobility along Canyon Road.
- 103 3. Provide safe pedestrian movement along Canyon Road to park and recreation
104 destinations.
- 105 4. Create a uniform streetscape that matches the neighborhood plan goals.

106 Canyon Road should be deemed a bicycle boulevard that is part of the city's biking and
107 walking trail system. A bicycle boulevard is an area that is improved to permit bicycles to
108 be used as commuting as a means of transportation.

109 Wilson Neighborhood Plan Recommendations:

- 110 • Neighborhood street design should favor local safety and neighborhood character
111 over suburban commuter speed and volume.
- 112 • Street widening should only be done on critical transportation corridors.
- 113 • Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure should be expanded because it's a healthier
114 and less impactful mode of transportation to the neighborhood.
- 115 • Large public infrastructure projects should involve neighborhood residents for
116 better collaboration, analysis and alternatives when necessary.

117 Canyon Road Improvement Project Benefits:

118 1. A vehicle corridor along Canyon Road to meet future needs.
119 2. Bicycle mobility along Canyon Road.
120 3. Safe pedestrian movement for residents and the community along Canyon Road
121 to park and recreation destinations.
122 4. A uniform streetscape that matches the neighborhood plan goals.

123 Chair Simmonds requested clarification on the difference between 10% & 30% design
124 and their meaning.

125 Mr. Murray explained that 10% of the designs are a preliminary design of what a design
126 may look like. A 30% design is a horizontal layout. How does the design fit in the right-
127 of-way, and so forth.

128 Chair Simmonds referred to the slide show of the bike boulevard with a wide park strip.
129 She indicated that much of the south corridor has a canal, which would be the park strip
130 area. She inquired whether there are anticipated changes in this location.

131 Mr. Murray answered that the canal/ditch will be enclosed, and the trees will be in
132 appropriate spots to grow.

133 Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that the imposed 66 feet is from one edge of the
134 sidewalk to the other edge.

135 Mr. Murray replied that it is approximately a foot behind the edge of the sidewalk on the
136 right-hand side as a buffer.

137 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if any is part of the City's easement.

138 Mr. Murray responded that the City has a 99-foot right-of-way for Canyon Road. The
139 City has the ability to use that right of way, but it extends onto private property.

140 Councilmember A. Andreson referred to the retaining wall slide. She inquired how high
141 the retaining wall is, and ADA requirements.

142 Mr. Murray answered that the retaining wall is about 5 feet tall, but there are areas where
143 the retaining wall is higher when closer to the road. The City standard for ADA
144 requirement is 5 feet at its narrowest.

145 Chair Simmonds commented that the Boulevard Trail is 8-feet for comparison.

146 Councilmember M. Anderson remarked that the pump house on the north side was
147 upgraded, and if it would be possible for the retaining wall to match the outside of the
148 pump house.

149 Mr. Murray replied that the intent is to create a streetscape with a consistent use of trees,
150 grass, or rock as zero-scape.

151 Councilmember López inquired if concerns regarding seismic activity will be addressed.

152 Mr. Murray explained that currently, the soil is being checked by geoengineers to review
153 the strength of the soil. Then the retention walls are built to withstand potential seismic
154 activity.

155 Councilmember M. Anderson asked as part of the research for the project if the trees on
156 Canyon Road were counted.

157 Mr. Murray stated that the number of trees was not counted.

158 Councilmember M. Anderson estimated a total of 30 trees.

159 Chair Simmonds clarified that technically there is not a park strip for trees to be counted
160 from.

161 Mayor Daines requested a brief explanation on the free right turn.

162 Mr. Murray explained that the free right turn does not allow cars to merge onto the short
163 dugway. The proposal shows the removal of the free right turn and a wider radius. This
164 will create a four-way stop and allow traffic to move. Currently, still in the works is
165 additional traffic counts from the Public Works Department.

166 Councilmember López inquired what number of vehicles/traffic would determine if the
167 free right turn was needed or not.

168 Mr. Murray responded that the primary indicators are how many vehicles turn westbound
169 turning north bound. Then the numbers would be placed into a model to determine if a
170 free right turn lane would work or not.

171 Councilmember López requested an exact number needed for the determination.

172 Sam Powell, Lead Project Designer, answered that based on projections from July, there
173 will be a delay due to not having the numbers of the influx of USU students. The worst
174 traffic movements were left or right or north bound.

175 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the dugway gates would still be available to close
176 in case of heavy snow.

177 Mr. Murray confirmed that this is the case, and there are concerns as it is a very steep
178 slope.

179 Chair Simmonds commented that the only way to plow the road is for the snowplow to
180 go downhill.

181 Chair Simmonds referred to the 730 East slide and requested confirmation that the dotted
182 line did not represent the retaining wall.

183 Mr. Murray confirmed that the blue dotted line did not represent the retaining wall on the
184 slide. The blue dotted line is the approximate location of the edge of the 99-foot right-of-
185 way.

186 Councilmember A. Anderson indicated that the retaining wall is represented by the black
187 line, but the actual depiction of the retaining wall is down below by the sidewalk.

188 Mr. Murray confirmed that is correct. The black line merely shows the length/extension
189 of the retaining wall. The actual retaining wall is down below by the sidewalk.

190 Vice Chair Johnson referred to the Crockett Avenue slide and clarified for the benefit of
191 the public that the current phase is the 30% design (just lines on the map). Each
192 individual property owner shown on the slide will be reached out to in order to receive
193 input.

194 Mayor Daines remarked that if the sidewalk is adjacent to the parking it is easier for
195 ADA accessibility and stroller accessibility.

196 Mr. Murray requested public feedback on the number of stalls proposed. The proposal is
197 ten stalls, but if there is a preference for more, there is a possibility of additional stalls
198 being added.

199 Councilmember López inquired if there will be any crosswalk beacons installed at this
200 location.

201 Mr. Murray stated that it is an option.

202 Chair Simmonds referenced the 1420 East slide and asked what would occur to the right-
203 of-way afterward.

204 Mr. Murray answered that once the right-of-way design of the street is completed, the
205 right-of-way will be vacated and returned to the citizens.

206 Vice Chair Johnson requested clarification on where the right-of-way will go .

207 Mr. Murray clarified that the right-of-way would go down to 66 feet, but there may be
208 areas where the right-of-way would be a bit wider due to the retaining wall, ADA
209 requirements, and so forth.

210 Chair Simmonds for the benefit of the public stated that a master plan involves
211 neighborhood input, city-wide input, a committee of residents, public hearings, and
212 countless opportunities for residents to voice their opinions.

213 Councilmember A. Anderson clarified for the benefit of the public that the City owns a
214 99-foot right-of-way, and there may be structures that need to be removed on City
215 property.

216 Mr. Murray stated that collector streets have a need for sidewalks. A smaller residential
217 street may be able to get by without sidewalk. An advantage of continuity is the trail from
218 First Dam to Merlin Olsen Park, which will be of tremendous value once completed.
219 Currently, the north side is not utilized because there is no sidewalk nor facility there.

220 Mayor Daines added that the goal is to create a trail from the dugway to Merlin Olsen
221 Park.

222 Councilmember A. Anderson remarked that putting in sidewalks actually increases the
223 value of residential homes; it does not devalue them.

224 Mr. Murray stated that the value of an amenity is about perception.

225 Vice Chair Johnson asked if the trees on the North or South side would be watered, what
226 would be the maintenance for them, and how can we ensure the trees will grow and
227 flourish.

228 Mr. Murray said, unfortunately, at this time, there is no clear answer. It would depend on
229 the design and on what the City would like to invest in or create with the project.

230 Mayor Daines explained that when putting trees in park strips, a sleeve is put under the
231 sidewalk. The hope is that residents would be interested in helping with irrigation and
232 watering of the trees. Alternatively, there are discussions about the neighborhood caring
233 for the trees for the first 10 years until the trees are firmly established.

234 Vice Chair Johnson inquired if the City would maintain the 8-foot sidewalk and shovel
235 snow if needed during the winter months.

236 Mayor Daines replied that if the sidewalk is part of the City's trail system, the City will
237 maintain the sidewalk. However, if the sidewalk goes down to 5 feet that would be the
238 responsibility of the property owners.

239 Vice Chair Johnson asked if a sidewalk would affect slope stability, especially on the
240 northern slopes.

241 Mr. Murray responded that geotechnical designs, ground boring, different types of
242 retention walls, the type of soil strengths are reviewed, and they are designed accordingly
243 to mitigate any instability issues. Regarding the northern slopes, the retention walls will
244 be larger and deeper to ensure they stabilize the slope.

245 Councilmember López inquired if JUB has ever built multiple retaining walls and do they
246 have sufficient experience to address slope instability and appease public concerns.

247 Mr. Murray answered that the current geoscope engineering firm is reviewing the soil,
248 and they are a nationwide firm. They have done countless walls, and their team in
249 particular has worked on multiple projects in the past. This project is by no means an
250 abnormality.

251 Councilmember M. Anderson recommended that neighborhood members verify their
252 property lines to determine what the impact will be. He requested that staff meet with
253 neighbors as well to inform them of the impact.

254 Mr. Murray invited the community to review the aerial image available on the website,
255 https://www.loganutah.gov/government/departments/public_works/capital_projects.php.
256 Residents are welcome to email questions and comments to logantank@jub.com,
257 especially homeowners who will be impacted by the project. The community is also
258 invited to participate in the ongoing survey available at the City website.

259 Councilmember A. Anderson shared a personal story of losing property trees and privacy
260 when the canal pipe project occurred in the Hillcrest neighborhood. Their neighborhood
261 was very upset at that time. However, the project resulted in the canal trail. She
262 personally uses the canal trail at least four times per week. The entire neighborhood uses
263 the trail, which was only possible when the construction project occurred. The trail has
264 become an essential part of the neighborhood. She shared that change is hard, and she
265 understands what the neighborhood is currently experiencing and implores them to be
266 part of the change.

267 Councilmember López expressed concerns about losing the free right turn to go up the
268 dugway and potential negative traffic impacts. He and his wife walk the neighborhood
269 and note that it is difficult to walk side by side on the narrow strips of sidewalk.

270 Vice Chair Johnson asked what the cost of the sidewalk would be.

271 Mr. Murray estimated that the cost for the sidewalk will be \$1.5 million, which also
272 includes the cost of the retaining walls on the north side.

273 Chair Simmonds requested clarification on whether the estimated cost for the sidewalk is
274 already part of the project or if it will be an additional cost.

275 Paul Lindhardt, Public Works Director, came to the podium to address the question and
276 responded that the proposed budget for the project includes improvements to the sidewalk
277 and the retaining wall.

278 Mayor Daines invited the public to contact the Council regarding concerns and to also
279 contact JUB Engineers for further information and questions.

280

281 **Explanation of survey to receive feedback from City residents on Canyon Road**
282 **improvements – Matt Vance, Wilson Neighborhood Chairperson (1:20:19)**

283 Matt Vance, Wilson Neighborhood Chairperson addressed the Council. Mr. Vance stated
284 that he has experience in feedback and survey design. The survey is a product of City
285 Staff, Engineers, Neighborhood Plans, Committees, and is a good example of a
286 collaborative effort. The integrity of the survey will go through an AI model. The data
287 results will be presented to the general public. More detailed data will be available to
288 those who desire it. The survey can be anonymous, and to please make comments that do
289 not reveal personal information if that is the desire.

290 Mr. Vance addressed the concerns regarding comments being pushed out by a survey. In
291 his professional opinion, that is not the purpose of a survey. The purpose of the survey is
292 to narrow the scope of opinions. The strategic use of a survey to aggregate to the ongoing
293 project which is much more effective. The survey will be available to the public for 3
294 weeks. The survey will be available on Facebook, email, and on the City's website.
295 Everyone is invited to participate. Community participation is crucial as more responses
296 create better data sets.

297 Councilmember A. Anderson said the trail system is used by the community and those
298 living in and out of the City. She asked if the survey is designated only for residents
299 and/or other residents of Cache Valley be able to participate in the survey.

300 Mr. Vance answered that the header of the survey states that the survey is designated for
301 Logan City residents. There is an option on the survey for a resident outside of Logan to
302 participate as well.

303 Mayor Daines reminded everyone that the City website has further details.

304 Vice Chair Johnson asked if the data collected will have any impact on the final decision
305 of the Council, and if the City will have prior access to the data before the public does.

306 Mr. Vance replied that the City will receive access to the data at the same time as the
307 public. Professional analysis will occur, and the survey will be objective as a third party
308 to minimize bias.

309 Mayor Daines stated that the survey is one of the many data points available and part of
310 the decision.

311 Councilmember López inquired if there would be a Spanish survey option.

312 Mr. Vance responded that there is no readily available survey, but they can translate and
313 make a Spanish version available.

314 Mayor Daines clarified for the benefit of the public that even if a sidewalk is not put in,
315 the trees will be removed for the installation of the waterline.

316 No further Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

317 **COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

318

319 **Planning Commission Update – Chair Simmonds (1:30:46)**

320

321 Chair Simmonds reported that the Planning Commission meeting was cancelled.

322

323 **Board and Committee Reports – Councilmember A. Anderson, Vice Chair Johnson**
324 and Councilmember López

325

326 Councilmember A. Anderson reported that he attended the USU Aspire event held by the
327 USU Electric Vehicle & Roadway (EVR) research facility. A future possibility for
328 electric vehicles is that they can charge as they drive. The Public Art Committee just
329 finished a call for artists. On Monday, the committee will be meeting to review the
330 submissions to determine finalists. The Fine Arts Committee met and the grant cycle was
331 completed yesterday.

332

333 The Local Homeless Council met to discuss homelessness in the city and the tri-county
334 area. The Cache County School District reported that this time last year, they had 40
335 students who were homeless. This year, there are 55 students (K-12). It is important to
336 remember that homelessness does not just affect those with mental health illnesses, but it
337 also affects children and families.

338

339 Councilmember A. Anderson also attended the Balance of State of Continuum Care
340 quarterly meeting, the Shelter Advisory Meeting, and the Utah League of Cities and
341 Towns meeting. The Library Board met and encouraged the community to review the
342 statistics of the library. Last year, the library had over 458,266 physical items checked
343 out, 170,423 estimated library visits, 5,721 hours of meeting room, 886 public meetings
344 held, and 28,980 library grants.

345

346 Vice Chair Johnson reported that RESAB (Renewable Energy & Sustainability Advisory
347 Board) met to discuss energy efficiency outlines. BPAC (Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory
348 Committee) is planning bike week for the Health Department on September 8th through
349 the 13th. He attended the Utah League of Cities & Towns meeting for their housing
350 advisory subgroup.

351

352 He and Councilmember M. Anderson attended the UAMPS annual conference where
353 Steve Wright discussed aligning leadership in public service. Mick Dominguez discussed
354 the difficulty in California of having to curtail excess solar energy in the day, and issues
355 with baseload power in the evening. They are trying to add 15 GW of power as they are
356 expecting a shortfall of 12 GW next year.

357

358 He attended RUSH week at Logan High School to help students sign up for the Logan
359 City Youth Council. As well as the Wilson Neighborhood meeting that was last week.
360 Multiple meetings with the Wilson Neighborhood and the Canyon Road team. Lastly,
361 meetings with staff, and another energy meeting in Brigham City.
362
363 Councilmember López reported that he attended the Canvass of the primary election, the
364 Truth In Taxation meeting and the Wilson Neighborhood Council meeting. The Logan
365 High Youth Council will be creating a T-shirt to identify their organization. The Public
366 Arts Committee met with artists and will meet to select finalists for the art project at the
367 Softball Complex. He attended the kickoff meeting for the centennial celebration
368 committee. The Fine Arts Committee met and decided on the cultural grants recipients;
369 he also attended a meeting with the Cache Arts Committee.
370

371 No further Council Business items were presented.
372
373 **ACTION ITEMS:**

374
375 **PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration of a proposed resolution adopting the
376 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Consolidated Annual Performance
377 and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for Program Year 2024 for the City of Logan –
378 Resolution 25-34 – Amanda Pearce, CDBG Coordinator ([1:44:36](#))**
379

380 At the August 19, 2025 Council meeting, CDBG Coordinator Amanda Pearce addressed
381 the Council regarding the proposed resolution. She explained that the 2024 Consolidated
382 Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) provides an analysis of the first
383 project year (July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025) of the City's 5-year Consolidated Plan
384 completed in 2024.
385

386 The CAPER is prepared annually to report accomplishments of the funded activities and
387 to measure the success in achieving the vision, goals, and objectives identified in the
388 Consolidated Plan and the Annual Action Plan.
389

390 During Project Year 2024 there were two completed public facility projects, the Merlin
391 Olsen Wildlife Mural and the Sunshine Terrace Commercial Oven.
392

393 The Project Year 2023 BRAG Emergency Home Repair Program was completed in Project
394 year 2024, providing 11 Low-Moderate Income households up to \$5,100 to complete minor
395 home repairs.
396

397 Ms. Pearce reviewed the list of current neighborhood improvements projects and their
398 status at the close of Project Year 2024.
399

400 During the Project Year a total of \$711,107.44 was spent in CDBG funds and \$5,507.91 in
401 CDBG-COVID funds. A total of \$103,677.47 was spent on administrative expenses.
402 Chair Simmonds and Council expressed their appreciation for the 100 W 200 S
403 Pedestrian crossing as it was needed by the community.

404 Chair Simmonds asked who does the work for the BRAG emergency repairs.

405 Mayor Daines responded that BRAG has a team that does home emergency repairs.

406 Chair Simmonds said for the benefit of the public that the CDBG board meets on an
407 annual basis. Projects are submitted to the board and reviewed, before allocating funds to
408 projects.

409 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

410 Gail Hanson, a resident of Logan, stated that she is grateful for the scope and compassion
411 the City continually shows.

412 There were no further comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.

413 **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson
to approve Resolution 25-34 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**

414 **A. Anderson: Aye**

415 **M. Anderson: Aye**

416 **Johnson: Aye**

417 **López: Aye**

418 **Simmonds: Aye**

419 **Consideration of a proposed ordinance enacting Section 12.24.050 of the Logan
Municipal Code “Camping on Public Property” – Ordinance 25-13 – Craig Carlston,
City Attorney (1:50:44)**

420 At the August 19, 2025 Council meeting, City Attorney Craig Carlston addressed the
421 Council regarding the proposed ordinance.

422 He said the State legislature has granted general welfare power to the City Council,
423 independent, apart from, and in addition to, its specific grants of legislative authority,
424 which enables the City of Logan to pass ordinances as are necessary and proper to provide
425 for the safety and preserve the health, promote the prosperity, improve the peace and good
426 order, comfort, and convenience of the City and its inhabitants, and for the protection of
427 property and the City.

428 Mr. Carlston reviewed the proposed ordinance:

441 **SECTION 1.** Section 12.24.050, “PROHIBITED CAMPING ON PUBLIC PROPERTY”
442 is hereby proposed as follows:

443

444 A. It is unlawful for any person to camp, lodge, or pitch a tent, fly, lean to, tarpaulin,
445 or any other type of camping equipment or personal belongings on public grounds, as
446 defined in subsection B of this section, upon any portion of a street, road or right of way,
447 or in any park, playground or publicly owned property. It is unlawful for any person using
448 or benefiting from any of the foregoing items of camping equipment or personal belongings
449 to fail to remove the same for more than thirty (30) minutes after being requested to do so
450 by any City official, officer or employee.

451

452 B. For the purpose of this section, the term “public grounds” means any real property
453 owned in whole or in part by the United States of America and its agencies, the State of
454 Utah, or any of its political subdivisions, including the City of Logan, upon which no
455 camping has been authorized by that entity.

456

457 C. The mayor, in his/her discretion, may issue a temporary permit authorizing
458 camping in connection with an approved special event that is in the public interest and does
459 not constitute a public nuisance or threat to the public health, safety or welfare.

460

461 D. Unless otherwise stated, any person violating any provision of this section shall be
462 guilty of a class B misdemeanor and shall be punished within the confines of that class as
463 prescribed by laws. Each day a violation continues shall constitute as a separate offense.

464

Mayor Daines stated that the ordinance is essentially required by the State.

465

Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that if the ordinance is not put into effect, the
funding that comes to the City for homelessness will be sent elsewhere.

466

Craig Carlston, City Attorney, confirmed that is correct.

467

Councilmember A. Anderson added that funding is utilized by CAPSA and BRAG.
Otherwise, the funding will be lost without the ordinance, but by approving the ordinance
funding will continue.

468

Councilmember López inquired if this is a new State requirement as of this year.

469

Mr. Carlston referred to Councilmember A. Anderson, who answered that the law was
enacted in the 2023 legislative session. Entities across the State had until 2025 to put the
law into effect.

470

471

472

473

474

478 **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember M.**
479 **Anderson to adopt Ordinance 25-13 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote**
480 **(5-0).**
481 **A. Anderson: Aye**
482 **M. Anderson: Aye**
483 **Johnson: Aye**
484 **López: Aye**
485 **Simmonds: Aye**
486
487 **PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$19,620**
488 **reserve funds toward Water and Wastewater Impact Fee Study; \$10,170 reserve**
489 **funds toward Electric Impact Fee Study; \$18,360 reserve funds toward**
490 **Transportation and Parks & Recreation Impact Fee Study; \$3,200,000 funds the**
491 **Public Works Department was awarded by the Cache County Council of**
492 **Governments (COG) for improvements on the 1000 North and 600 West**
493 **intersection; \$301,370 Parks & Recreation Impact Fee Reserves toward the 800 East**
494 **Culvert Trail Extension; \$126,624 a grant the Parks & Recreation Afterschool**
495 **Program was awarded to support After School Programs at Adams, Bridger, Ellis,**
496 **Woodruff, and Logan City Schools – Resolution 25-35 – Richard Anderson**
497 **(1:53:00)**

498
499 At the August 19, 2025 Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed
500 the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments resolution.

501 Chair Simmonds asked if the light will be located at 1000 North & 600 West.

502 Mr. Anderson confirmed that there would be a light at this intersection.

503 Vice Chair Johnson requested clarification that the funds are being pulled from reserves
504 and not a grant for the 800 East Culvert Trail extension, and the Impact Study.

505 Mr. Anderson confirmed that the funds are from reserves and not a grant.

506 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

507
508 There were no comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.

509
510 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember López seconded by Councilmember A.**
511 **Anderson to approve Resolution 25-35 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote**
512 **(5-0).**

513 **A. Anderson: Aye**
514 **M. Anderson: Aye**
515 **Johnson: Aye**
516 **López: Aye**
517 **Simmonds: Aye**
518

519 **PUBLIC HEARING - *Unspent Appropriations FY 2025 – Carry Forwards:***
520 **ADMINISTRATION - \$70,000 for Election expenses**
521
522 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - \$76,876** Community Development funds for the
523 General Plan; **\$30,000 for Elements Software Implementation; \$12,000 for the**
524 **Library Mural; \$23,000 for Community Art**
525
526 **FIRE DEPARTMENT - \$12,624** for Fire Station Cabinetry; **\$21,416 for Paging**
527 **System Phase 3**
528
529 **POLICE DEPARTMENT - \$14,882** for Police Department Vehicles.
530
531 **PUBLIC WORKS - \$152,130** for Elements Software Implementation; **\$25,185 for 400**
532 **North 600 West Intersection; \$57,407 for Public Works Equipment; \$10,226 for part**
533 **time Inspector (Google Fiber); \$783 for benefits; \$304,523 for Google Fiber Blue**
534 **Staker; \$576,043 for Capital Projects**
535
536 **PARKS & RECREATION - \$145,922** for various Parks & Recreation Capital;
537 **\$50,000 for various Parks & Recreation Capital**
538
539 **CEMETERY - \$30,000** for Cemetery Water Switching Station
540
541 **WATER & SEWER - \$61,587** for Water Rights Report & Software Implementation;
542 **\$1,752,234 for Water Capital Improvements; \$27,465,870 for Water Tank and**
543 **Waterline; \$107,755 for Water Rolling Stock; \$52,093 for Water and Wastewater**
544 **Masterplans; \$4,126,397 for Wastewater Capital Improvements; \$201,483 for**
545 **Wastewater Rolling Stock**
546
547 **SEWER TREATMENT – \$3,297,774** for Bioreactor 4; **\$7,441 for Rolling Stock**
548
549 **ELECTRIC - \$557,861** for SOCC Battery Project; **\$66,731 for various Electric**
550 **Capital Projects; \$600,000 for UDOT relocation project; \$359,538 for various Electric**
551 **Capital Projects; \$4,366,939 for Natural Gas Generation Project; \$136,463 for**
552 **Sediment Removal Project; \$266,968 for Sediment Removal Project; \$73,061 for**
553 **Sediment Removal Project**
554
555 **ENVIRONMENTAL - \$6,255,928** for Environmental Capital Projects; **\$158,305 for**
556 **Rolling Stock; \$73,640 for Landfill Permits**
557
558 **STORM WATER - \$710,725** for Master Plan Updates; **\$16,571 for Rolling Stock;**
559 **\$2,592,997 for Capital Projects**
560
561 **EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES - \$353,142** for new Ambulance and remount

562
563 **Carry Forward of Capital Projects:** \$2,965,113 General Capital Improvement Projects;
564 \$4,166,907 for curb, gutter and street Improvement Projects; \$462,809 other Capital
565 Projects; \$2,292,410 for Public Works Facility; \$378,285 for 200 South Park
566
567 **Capital Equipment:** \$28,323 for Community Development Vehicles; \$7,712 for Police
568 Vehicles; \$1,926,974 for Fire Vehicles; \$96,505 for Public Work Vehicles; \$27,103 for
569 Parks & Recreation Vehicles
570
571 **Restricted Revenue and Grants** - \$73,579 for Police Alcohol Enforcement; \$62,179 for
572 Class C Street Projects; \$2,077,661 for Class C Street Projects; \$2,954,835 for
573 Transportation Tax Projects
574
575 **FEDERAL GRANTS** - \$934,672 CDBG Grant; \$12,247 Bullet Proof Vest Grant;
576 \$11,961 JAG Grant; \$877,799 Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security
577 Grant; \$5,000,000 Wastewater Treatment Facility BIOMAG Expansion Grant;
578 \$117,590 EECBG Electric Charging Station Grant; \$3,440,276 Green Waste Facility
579 Grant
580
581 **STATE GRANTS** - \$50,000 General Plan Update Grant; \$20,560 First Responders
582 Mental Health Grant; \$78,750 House Bill 23 Police Mental Health Grant; \$107,864
583 House Bill 23 Fire Mental Health Grant; \$338,548 Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant;
584 \$5,794 UCA Proportionate Share of Remaining Funds; \$90,000 Water Quality
585 Trapper Park River Stabilization
586
587 **MISC GRANTS** - \$32,918 Utah League of Cities and Towns; \$31,250 Deed Battery
588 Storage Grant; \$16,900 UCAIRS Electric Equipment Rebate
589
590 **Carry Forward of Reimbursement Grants:**
591 **RAPZ GRANTS** - \$644,195 RAPZ Reimbursement Grants; \$152,971 RAPZ
592 Population Split Grant; \$62,698 RAPZ Population Split Grant – Resolution 25-36 –
593 Richard Anderson ([1:55:30](#))
594
595 At the August 19, 2025 Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed
596 the Council regarding the proposed carry forwards.
597
598 Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that most of the funds will be expended this year
599 since the projects were already initiated in the last fiscal year.
600
601 Mr. Anderson confirmed that most of the funds will be expended this year.
602
603 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.
604

605 There were no comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.
606

607 **ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember López to**
608 **approve Resolution 25-36 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**

609 **A. Anderson: Aye**

610 **M. Anderson: Aye**

611 **Johnson: Aye**

612 **López: Aye**

613 **Simmonds: Aye**

614

615 **WORKSHOP ITEMS:**

616

617 **Consideration of a proposed resolution updating the Commercial and Residential**
618 **Lighting Incentive Program – Resolution 25-38 – Emily Malik, Sustainability**
619 **Program Coordinator. (1:57:33)**

620

621 Sustainability Program Coordinator Emily Malik addressed the Council regarding the
622 proposed resolution. She explained that the City of Logan supports demand, side
623 management programs, and efforts that encourage residents and businesses to use less
624 energy. The City of Logan recognizes that the cheapest energy is energy not used and the
625 City has previously established a commercial lighting retrofit incentive program in October
626 2014 and revised the program in 2017, 2019, 2022. The energy market and technology are
627 ever-changing, as should be our incentive programs to reflect these changes. She requested
628 that the Council adopt the proposed revised Commercial Lighting Retrofit Incentive
629 Program incentive amounts as presented, with an effective date of October 1, 2025.

630

631 Vice Chair Johnson inquired where the funds come from to pay for these incentives.
632

633 Ms. Malik responded that the Light & Power Department has a fund that collects 1% of
634 the rates to pay for these incentives.

635

636 Mr. Anderson added that for the most part, the funding comes from all electric rates.
637

638

639 Ms. Malik clarified that the funding is split into three portions for other incentives and
improvements. The estimated amount collected is approximately \$50,000.
640

641 Vice Chair Johnson asked how many residents took advantage of the energy incentives.
642

643 Ms. Malik replied that she has the information, but she does not recall the exact amount at
644 this time. A rough estimate for residential is \$30,000.

645

646 Councilmember M. Anderson requested confirmation that the commercial users are the
647 biggest power users.

648
649 Ms. Malik responded that commercial users definitely are a higher power consumer.
650
651 Councilmember A. Anderson requested clarification if there is an energy incentive for lawn
652 mowers.
653

654 Ms. Malik clarified that the lawn mowers are part of a different energy incentive and there
655 is still availability for residents to apply for an energy rebate.
656

657 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the September 16,
658 2025 Council meeting.
659

660 **REZONE – Consideration of a proposed rezone. Blaine Hamblin/J&C Properties**
661 **Group LLC (Sierra Meadows), authorized agent/owner is requesting a zone change**
662 **of 20.06 acres located at approximately 1300 West 450 South from Suburban**
663 **Neighborhood Residential (NR-4) to Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-6)**
664 **(Woodruff Neighborhood) – Ordinance 25-14 – Aimee Egbert, Planner (2:02:35)**
665

666 Planner Aimee Egbert addressed the Council regarding the proposed rezone.
667

668 **RECOMMENDATION**

669 Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of
670 **Approval** to the Municipal Council for a rezone of approximately 20.06 acres of property
671 located at 1300 West 450 South (TIN# 02-066-0026) from Suburban Neighborhood
672 Residential (NR-4) to Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-6).
673

674 *Land use adjoining the subject property*

<i>North:</i>	NR-4: Residential Uses	<i>East:</i>	NR-4: Residential Uses
<i>South:</i>	MR-9: Residential Uses	<i>West:</i>	Outside City Boundary

675 **PROJECT**

676 The proponent is requesting to rezone a 20.06 acre vacant parcel from NR-4 to NR-6 for
677 the purpose of constructing new single family residential dwelling units. The site is located
678 north of 600 South and adjacent to the Visionary Homes development. The rezone request
679 does not include any formal development plans. The NR-4 zone would permit 80 new
680 SFR's while the proposed NR-6 zone would permit up to 120 new SFR's on the 20.06-acre
681 site.
682

683 **GENERAL PLAN**

684 The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP), adopted in 2008, identifies this property as Detached
685 Residential. The Logan City General Plan states that in areas designated Detached
686 Residential (DR), all new development, whether infill between existing homes,
687

688 replacement of existing homes or new development on vacant land, will be detached
689 single family structures. The site is surrounded by DR.

690

691 **LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE**

692 The Land Development Code (LDC) regulates land use and establishes specific
693 development entitlements for properties. The existing NR-4 zoning district permits single-
694 family residential development with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet and a
695 maximum gross density of four (4) units per acre. Under the current NR-4 zoning, the
696 subject property could accommodate approximately 80 single-family residences. The
697 proposed rezoning to NR-6 would allow for up to 120 units, with a reduced minimum lot
698 size of 6,000 square feet.

699

700 Immediately south of the subject property is the MR-9 zoning district, which permits higher
701 residential densities of up to 180 units and allows a minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet.
702 This area is the Sugar Creek Subdivision, a similarly sized parcel that served as the catalyst
703 for the creation of the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) within the LDC. The PDO
704 was established in response to the developer's desire to incorporate a variety of housing
705 types and lot sizes while maintaining an overall density of 5.3 dwelling units per acre.

706

707 Adjacent parcels to the north and east are zoned NR-4 and generally feature lot sizes over
708 10,000 square feet. However, properties located just one block further east range between
709 6,000 and 14,000 square feet, with a significant number falling below the 10,000 square
710 foot benchmark. This pattern indicates that, despite the NR-4 zoning designation, the
711 broader area is not uniformly developed with large-lot residential character, and instead
712 reflects a more varied lot size composition.

713

714 Given the existing lot patterns in the broader area and the proximity of the recently rezoned
715 MR- 9 Sugar Creek Subdivision to the south, the proposed NR-6 zoning would be
716 compatible with the evolving development context and not out of character for the
717 neighborhood.

718

719 **STAFF SUMMARY**

720 The subject property is a vacant parcel located north of the Sugar Creek Subdivision. The
721 surrounding area is primarily composed of single-family residential uses, with some
722 scattered multi-family developments. The Rivergate Subdivision includes conditions
723 that require road stubs connecting to this parcel. The nearest multi-family zoning (MR-9)
724 is directly south of the property. Based on staff's analysis, the proposed NR-6 zoning serves
725 as an appropriate transitional zone between the higher-density MR-9 to the south and the
726 lower-density NR-4 to the north.

727

728 **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

729 No comments have been received.

730

731 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

732 As of the time of this report, no comments have been received.

733 **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

734 Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 8/2/25, posted on the City's website
735 and the Utah Public Meeting website on 8/4/25, and noticed in a quarter page ad on 7/28/25.

736 **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS**

737 The Planning Commission bases its decision on the following findings supported in the
738 administrative record for this project:

739 1. The Logan City FLUP identifies the area as Detached Residential (DR).
740 2. The surrounding zoning is NR-4 to the north and east and MR-9 to the south with
741 NR-6 approximately 650' away.
742 3. The predominate land use pattern in the area is detached single family residential
743 uses.
744 4. Adjacent development will provide street and utility stubs to the parcel.

745 On August 14, 2025, the Planning Commission **recommended denial** to the Municipal
746 Council for the Sierra Meadows Rezone Amendment as proposed by the applicant.

747 **Planning Commissioners vote (4-0) to deny. FINDINGS FOR DENIAL. The
748 proposed zone is not consistent with the Woodruff Neighborhood Plan.**

749 Ms. Egbert stated there were two public comments made at the Planning Commission
750 meeting. The first comment was a concern about the consequences of
751 development/infrastructure, and the other about the impact of water consumption.

752 Councilmember A. Anderson remarked that staff from the Community Development
753 department recommended approval.

754 Ms. Egbert confirmed that the staff recommended approval of the project.

755 Councilmember M. Anderson asked the reason for staff approval.

756 Ms. Egbert answered because of the lack of housing availability. NR-4 to NR-6 is not a
757 large jump as it would be multi-family housing. These would simply be smaller lots,
758 detached homes.

759 Vice Chair Johnson interjected that the section is not entirely NR-4 and there are NR-6 lots
760 mixed in the NR-4 area.

761 Ms. Egbert said that because of the existing mix, staff recommended approval of the
762 project.

774
775 Chair Simmonds inquired if there were public comments made against the rezone.
776
777 Ms. Egbert responded the only two comments made were the two she previously
778 mentioned.
779
780 Councilmember A. Anderson referenced the rendering of zones and requested clarification
781 of the yellow line indicated.
782
783 Ms. Egbert explained that the yellow line is a property divide; however, the property is
784 zoned MR-9 along with adjacent residential.
785
786 Chair Simmonds observed that there are wetlands at the location of the proposed rezone.
787
788 Vice Chair Johnson stated that the consensus among the neighborhood is that there is no
789 plan yet available, and that the neighborhood plan requested NR-4.
790
791
792 Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that the difference between zones is
793 80 to 120 homes.
794
795 Ms. Egbert clarified that the maximum number of homes built is 120, if there are no roads
796 or wetland impact.
797
798 The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the September 16,
799 2025 Council meeting.
800
801 **REZONE – Consideration of a proposed rezone. George Honey, property owner, is**
802 **requesting a zone change of a .21 acre parcel located at 165 North 200 East from**
803 **Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) to Town Center Two (TC-2) (Adams**
804 **Neighborhood) - Ordinance 25-15 – Aimee Egbert, Planner (2:12:22)**
805
806 Planner Aimee Egbert addressed the Council regarding the proposed rezone.
807
808 **RECOMMENDATION**
809 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval
810 to the Municipal Council for a rezone of approximately 0.21 acres of property located at
811 165 North 200 East (TIN# 06-066-0024) from Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-
812 6) to Town Center 2 (TC-2).
813
814 **PROJECT**
815 The proponent is requesting to rezone the 0.21-acre property at 165 North 200 East from
816 NR-6 to TC-2. The property currently contains a single-family dwelling in the front and

817 one (1) apartment above the detached garage in the rear. The house was built in 1909, while
818 the current detached garage in the rear yard was built in 1979. An open-ditch irrigation
819 canal traverses the property flowing northward and essentially bisects the parcel with the
820 home on the front section and the garage/apartment on the rear section.

821
822 In 2009, a previous owner applied to grandfather the property as a three-unit configuration,
823 consisting of one residential unit in the front and a duplex in the rear structure. That request
824 was denied due to lack of evidence of legal establishment for the third unit, and with proper
825 evidence for the establishment of the second unit, the property was officially recognized as
826 a legal nonconforming two-unit property.

827
828 The applicant is requesting to rezone the property from NR-6 to TC-2 to allow the legal
829 reestablishment of a third residential unit in the detached garage. The TC-2 zone permits
830 higher residential density (30 du/ac) and would allow for three units on the site provided
831 the applicant obtain a building permit and meet minimum building code requirements.

832
833 **GENERAL PLAN**
834 The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP), adopted in 2008, identifies this property as Town
835 Center (TC). The General Plan describes TC areas as being a hub of Logan City and reflects
836 a vibrant downtown, with a variety of commercial, mixed-use, and institutional uses and
837 activities. The TC designation ranges from 200 South to 500 North and weaves between
838 100 East and 200 East along the eastern side of Downtown Logan.

839
840 **Town Center 2 Zone**
841 The intent of the TC-2 zone is to encourage dense, walkable commercial and residential
842 development in the downtown area with unique and interesting building designs. This zone
843 allows a density of up to 30 units per acre along with a mixture of commercial uses. The
844 City went through a deliberate and robust process in 2018 to redefine the Town Center
845 zoning districts which culminated in the adoption of Ordinance Number 18-07. This year-
846 long zoning process established TC-2 in the outer-ring areas of downtown as a way to
847 buffer or transition the residential neighborhoods further east and west of Downtown. The
848 goal of the zoning strategy adopted in 2018 was to further implement the visions expressed
849 in the General Plan through a methodical transition of uses and structure.

850
851 **SUMMARY**
852 The current land uses on the block are a mixture of commercial and residential uses. The
853 site immediately north was rezoned to TC-2 on March 5, 2024. Because the property is
854 planned in the FLUP as Town Center, and due to the current commercial land uses on the
855 block, the request to up-zone this parcel to TC-2 would be a predictable and expected
856 zoning change. With the LOS Temple located to the east of the block with extensive
857 setbacks, TC-2 development and land uses on the subject property and the remaining 200
858 East block face, would be compatible and pose minimal impacts to the residential areas
859 further east. As the applicant has indicated in their application, the purpose of the rezone

860 is to facilitate the legal establishment of a third residential unit within the detached garage.
861 The site has adequate room to meet minimum parking requirements while the provision of
862 additional housing is important to the downtown area.

863

864 **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

865 No comments have been received

866

867 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

868 As of the time of this report no comments have been received.

869

870 **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

871 Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 8/2/25 and the Utah Public Meeting
872 website on 8/4/25. Public notices were mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the
873 project site on 7/28/25.

874

875 **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF APPROVAL FOR REZONE**

876 The Planning Commission bases its decision on the following findings supported in the
877 administrative record for this project:

- 878 1. The surrounding zoning to the west is TC-2 and a rezone of this property will result in
879 a contiguous zoning pattern on the block.
- 880 2. The TC-2 zone is appropriate because it aligns with the adopted FLUP and fits into the
881 existing land use patterns of the block.
- 882 3. TC-2 zoning, and land uses are in close proximity to transportation choices, downtown
883 commercial goods and services, and employment centers.
- 884 4. The majority of the surrounding existing land uses to the west are commercial in nature.
- 885 5. The LDC development standards will ensure a quality project that will be compatible
886 with the surrounding neighborhood.

887

888 On August 14, 2025, the Planning Commission **recommended approval** to the
889 Municipal Council for the Honey Rezone as proposed by the applicant.

890 **Planning Commissioners vote (4-0).**

891

892 Chair Simmonds remarked that the request is to make the three units legal.

893

894 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if there were any issues related to parking.

895

896 Ms. Egbert responded that there is a garage that fits two vehicles, a carport that fits two
897 vehicles, and in the back area, two to three vehicles. Each unit has two parking spaces.

898

899 Councilmember A. Anderson inquired how many units can there be if the rezone is
900 approved.

901

902 Ms. Egbert answered that if rezoned, the zone permits up to 6 units.

903
904 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if a commercial or residential mix is required for TC-
905 2.

906
907 Russ Holley, City Planner answered that TC-2 can be a residential mix, commercial mix,
908 or residential/commercial mix.

909
910 Chair Simmonds asked how high TC-2 can go.

911
912 Mr. Holley replied that TC-2 can go up to a maximum of three stories high.

913
914 Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that the Planning Commission did
915 not have any concerns and approved the change.

916
917 Ms. Egbert confirmed that the Planning Commission did not have any concerns and
918 recommended approval.

919
920 The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the September 16,
921 2025 Council meeting.

922
923 **PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONE – Consideration of a proposed**
924 **Planned Development Overlay.** Brett Jensen/Willow Lakes Holdings LLC,
925 **authorized agent/owner is requesting a Planned Development Overlay Zone for the**
926 **12 acre Phase Five area of the Willow Lakes development to include a 40,000 square**
927 **foot Fitness/Boat Club commercial building, five beachfront short term rental homes,**
928 **eleven single family lots, five multi-family mansion style homes, and a 60-bed assisted**
929 **living facility located at approximately 1100 South 1400 West in the Traditional**
930 **Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) zone (Woodruff Neighborhood) – Ordinance 25-16**
931 **– Russ Holley, Planner (2:19:39)**

932
933 Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council regarding the proposed Planned Development
934 Overlay.

935
936 **OVERVIEW**

937 The PDO request is for the 12-acre phase 5 area of the Willow Lake project in the Woodruff
938 Neighborhood. The PDO request includes new commercial, short-term-rental assisted
939 living, and multi-family land uses. As part of the Planned Development Overlay (PDO)
940 process, the initial concept plan review was conducted at the Commission, Council, and
941 Neighborhood level. That applicant has made changes to the condominium portion of the
942 original PDO concept review.

943
944 North: Outside of Logan City Boundary East: NR-6: Residential Uses
945 South: NR-6: Residential Uses West: NR-6: Residential Uses

946

947 **Current Zoning and FLUP Designation**

948 The site is currently zoned NR-6 and designated on the Future Land Use Plan Map as
949 Detached Residential (DR). The recently completed Woodruff neighborhood plan
950 designates this area as single family residential.

951

952 **Project Proposal**

953 This proposal is for the 12-acre phase 5 of the Willow Lakes project. Phases 1-4 have
954 already been approved and platted. Construction is underway on the two artificial lakes,
955 public infrastructure, and single-family homes. This PDO proposal is for a new 40,000 SF
956 Fitness/Boat Club Commercial Building, 5 Beachfront Homes intended for short-term
957 rental, 11 single family home building lots, 5 mansion style multi-family structures, and a
958 60-bed Assisted Living two-story building located near the 1000 West frontage.

959

960 **Boat Club & Fitness Commercial Building**

961 The concept plan shows a large commercial building near the far west edge of phase 5. The
962 three-story, 40,000 SF building with upper floor observation decks, is located along the
963 north shore of the Big Wake and Tube Lake. Access to the commercial building is via the
964 new 1000 South public street. Parking areas are shown north of the building and a series
965 of beach amenities are shown along the lake edge. This commercial building is planned
966 with Clubhouse/Events area, Fitness/Gym area, and associated office space.

967

968 **Beach Homes**

969 East of the Fitness Center building, the proposal shows 5 beach front single family homes
970 along the Big Wake and Tube Lake north beach. The home design shows vehicular access
971 from the north via the fitness center parking lot and the south yards of the homes have
972 direct access to the beach. These 5 homes are being proposed as short-term rentals.

973

974 **Additional Residential**

975 Farther east along the north shore of the Slalom Lake, the proposed plan shows 11 single
976 family building lots and five mansion style multi-family building footprints. The proposal
977 suggests that the mansion-style homes would be between 2-4 units each and within
978 character of the MR-9 zoning district. No architectural designs or elevations have been
979 submitted with this portion of the proposed PDO.

980

981 **Assisted Living**

982 Shown at the far east side of phase 5, and along the 1000 West Street frontage, the plan
983 proposes a two-story 60-bed assisted living building. Access to the assisted living building
984 is via the new 1100 South Street. The assisted living building is shown at lower heights
985 and is somewhat separate from the other areas of phase 5 being located across the street
986 and having no associated lake frontage.

987

988 **Planned Development Code Amendment**

989 PDO's are intended for unique and specific projects that would not otherwise fit into regular
990 zoning districts and are designed to provide flexibility and discretion to all parties involved
991 in the process. Chapter 17.27 is the PDQ Land Development Code (LDC) chapter, and if
992 approved, new language specific to the proposed project will be adopted as part of the
993 Council Ordinance for rezone and code amendment. The specific language adopted as part
994 of the PDO and within LDC 17.27 will specify density, setbacks , heights, land use, open
995 space, and parking. Also, similar to a development agreement, if any additional amenities
996 or improvements are required as per the PDO process, they would be specified in the code
997 amendment ordinance. Design Review of the proposed architectural will also be part of the
998 ordinance adoption or it can be required subsequently based on underlining zone
999 requirements.

1000
1001 The applicant has requested delayed design review for some portions of this project as they
1002 are still in the preparation phase. If any future changes to the project are proposed, an
1003 applicant would have to go back through the PDQ process seeking an amendment to the
1004 approved PDQ language.

1005
1006 **Density, Site, and Building Design**

1007 The PDQ is exclusive to the 12-acre phase 5 remainder parcels. Phase 1-4 are not included
1008 in the PDQ application unless decision makers require amenities in those areas in exchange
1009 for PDO concessions in phase 5. The application is requesting up to 36 residential units (5
1010 beach homes, 11 single family and up to 5 four-plex's). The fitness center and assisted
1011 living center is not calculated in the residential unit per acre density count, but rather is
1012 viewed as a structure and/or use similar to group treatment homes or hotels.

1013
1014 The proposal shows building heights capped at 43 feet tall. The fitness and assisted living
1015 building are shown at 43 feet tall and the homes and 4-plexs would sit at lower heights.
1016 Typical height restrictions in the LDC are based on the mid-gable points in the roofline.
1017 The current height limitation in the NR-6 zone is 35'.

1018
1019 Building design is focused on what the applicant calls Lakehouse Style, Mountain
1020 Craftsman, and Mountain Modern. For the commercial and assisted living areas,
1021 architectural style is not considered with LDC requirements, rather a minimum amount of
1022 articulations, fenestrations and materials.

1023
1024 **Parking Requirements**

1025 The LDC requires parking ratios for the following land uses. Assisted living at 1 stall per
1026 every 4 beds, fitness centers at 1 stall per every 500 SF, residential units at 2 stalls per one
1027 dwelling unit and short-term rentals at 1 stall per every two bedrooms. Based on the above
1028 categories, the fitness center would be required to provide 80 parking spaces, the assisted
1029 living would be required to provide 15 stalls, the multi-family residential units would be
1030 required to provide 40 parking spaces. Each new single-family home requires 2 parking
1031 stalls.

1032
1033 **Pedestrian Circulation & Open Space**
1034 The proposed site layout shows standard sidewalks along public streets within phase 5
1035 areas. There are no crosswalk enhancements or safe delineated sidewalks through the
1036 parking lot areas. The proposal does not show any trails or pathways that would allow
1037 people to use alternative transportation.

1038
1039 The proposed project narrative explains the overall Willow Lakes open space and
1040 conservation easement areas totaling 75 acres of easement area and 36 acres of open space
1041 in phase 1-4 (primarily the lake surfaces). The beachfront areas near the fitness center have
1042 been detailed in this proposal, but the remaining areas of phase 5 show little open space
1043 detail or trail connectivity to the bigger overall Willow Lakes open space areas.

1044
1045 **Staff Summary**
1046 The PDO process allows for negotiations prior to ordinance adoption. Some of the desired
1047 improvements discussed are 1400 West Street extensions to 600 South and additional trail
1048 connections to areas along the river. The Planning Commission will need to determine
1049 whether the proposed architectural design descriptions in the CC&R's are enough to satisfy
1050 design review or require subsequent design review approvals by the Planning Commission
1051 for certain areas of the site.

1052
1053 **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**
1054 Comments were solicited from the following departments or agencies:
1055
1056 • Environmental, Light and Power, Water and Engineering

1057
1058 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
1059 Notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. As of the
1060 time of this report, no comments have been received.

1061
1062 **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**
1063 Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 8/16/25, posted on the City's website
1064 and the Utah Public Meeting website on 8/18/25, and mailed to property owners within
1065 300 feet on 8/11/25.

1066
1067 **RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**
1068 This project is subject to the proponent or property owner agreeing to comply with the
1069 following conditions as written, or as may be amended by the Planning Commission.
1070
1071 1. All standard conditions of approval will be recorded with the Design Review and are
1072 available in the Community Development Department.

1073

1074 2. This PDQ Code Amendment will include a new 40,000 SF club house and fitness center
1075 building shown on the west side of phase 5. The building will be 43 feet tall maximum
1076 and contain minimum commercial building articulations and ground floor transparency
1077 of 30% of the facade and upper floor transparency of 20%. Open space and landscaping
1078 in this area shall total 20% of the site with a minimum of 20 trees per acre. Parking lot
1079 setbacks will default to COM zoning at 10 feet along the street frontages and 5 feet
1080 along the sides and rear. Pedestrian connections from the street to the fitness center
1081 building and throughout the parking lot are required for safe and easy walking access.
1082 80 parking stalls shall be provided on-site for this building.

1083

1084 3. The 5 beach homes will be in the same location as shown on the site plan and capped
1085 at 6,000 SF total per home. Short Term Rental regulations shall for Logan City's STR
1086 requirements for terms, business licensing, occupancy, parking, and inspections. 1
1087 parking stall shall be provided per every two bedrooms.

1088

1089 4. The 11 single family home sites shall follow standard NR-6 setbacks, heights, driveway
1090 and parking requirements.

1091

1092 5. The Mansion Style building shall be four units maximum per building with a total of 5
1093 buildings. A Design Review Permit will be required for these buildings and based on
1094 the MR-9 zone (or closest similar) for compliance with parking, open space, setbacks,
1095 and heights when the applicant is ready to develop this section. 2 parking stalls per each
1096 dwelling unit shall be provided on-site.

1097

1098 6. The assisted living building can be up to 43 feet tall and contain up to 60 beds. The
1099 building shall provide at least 15 parking spaces, and building design shall be compliant
1100 with MR-12 zoning. Pedestrian circulation shall be provided into and around this
1101 section of the project.

1102

1103 7. Phase 5 areas shall have trail connections made to area trail networks along the river to
1104 the south and points beyond.

1105

1106 8. 1400 West Street shall be developed as per city specifications and extended north to
1107 intersect with 600 South with a cross section matching the city's neighborhood street
1108 classification.

1109

1110 9. Street trees and park strip landscaping shall be provided every 30 linear feet along all
1111 city streets within phase 5 and along 1400 West.

1112

1113 10. No open pit storm-water detention basins shall be placed in the yard between the
1114 building and the adjoining streets. If designed as landscaping with maximum 4-to-1
1115 cross slopes, undulating shapes, and ground cover containing 75% grass and a

1116 combination of trees and shrubbery so that it does not appear to be a storm water
1117 collection area, then it may be located in the front yard area.

1118

1119 11. All dumpsters shall be visually screened or buffered from public streets by using
1120 fencing, walls and landscaping if placed near street edge.

1121

1122 12. Rooftop mechanical and/or building wall mechanical equipment shall be placed out of
1123 view from the street or screen from view from the street.

1124

1125 13. Exterior lighting, including gas canopy lighting, shall be concealed source, down-cast
1126 and shall not illuminate or cast light onto adjacent properties.

1127

1128 14. No signs are approved with this Design Review Permit. All signage shall be approved
1129 and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.

1130

1131 15. No fences are approved with this Design Review Permit. All fences shall be approved
1132 and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.

1133

1134 16. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, the Director of Community Development shall
1135 receive a written memorandum from each of the following departments or agencies
1136 indicating that their requirements have been satisfied:

1137 a. Environmental-contact 716-9760

1138 • Minimum 60 ft. straight on clear access required. The approach must be level, no down
1139 or uphill slopes and no parking spaces or curb blocking 60 ft. access.

1140 • Any collection point further than 150 feet from the public right of way must provide an
1141 on-site turn around. A minimum of 20-foot overhead clearance from building eves, parking
1142 awnings, trees, poles, overhead power, or cable wires, etc. is required.

1143 • Minimum inside measurement for a double enclosure is 24 ft. wide by 10 ft. deep.
1144 Minimum inside measurement for a single enclosure is 12 ft. wide by 10 ft. deep.

1145 • Place bollards in the back of the enclosure to protect walls.

1146 • Gates are not required, however if desired, they must be designed to stay open during the
1147 collection process.

1148 • Barrel hinges are suggested for the gates. We need a full 12 ft. clearance so the gates
1149 must be designed to open completely.

1150 • The buildings water service line/s needs to have a RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested
1151 on the water service line/s after the water meter, as it/they enter the building before any
1152 branch offs or possible connections inside or outside of building. [For best individual
1153 business's protection, the following is suggested- Each unit's water main would have its
1154 own RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested on the water main as it enters each unit/ building
1155 before any branch offs or possible connections inside or outside of building. So, each unit
1156 is independently controlled and protected.] Properly sized drain required to serve dump
1157 port of the RP's backflow assemblies. All backflow assemblies must be tested within 10
1158 days of turning water into them and annually thereafter. Refer to current IPC Utah State

1159 Amendment# 608.1.1,608.1.2,608.1.2.1 for installation criteria. No open-ended water lines
1160 allowed, all future lines must be plugged or capped watertight.

- 1161 • All landscape irrigation system's fed from Logan City water must have a high hazard
1162 rated backflow assembly installed and tested within 10 days of turning in water to it.
- 1163 • Fire suppression systems that connect to Logan City water (with no added unapproved
1164 chemicals) must have a minimum DC (ASSE1015) installed and tested. Fire risers and all
1165 8/F assemblies must be installed and tested as per Logan City standards.
- 1166 • Project shall comply with all currently adopted plumbing codes and their amendments
1167 and Utah Admin. code R 309-105-12-(1) rules and regulations including, but not limited
1168 to, those pertaining to backflow prevention and cross connection protection, during and
1169 after construction, for the safety of the water source and its consumption.
- 1170 • There is an additional 1" waterline stubbed to this property. If the line is not used it needs
1171 to be plugged at the main. Water Division recommends utilizing it as an irrigation meter to
1172 avoid having to dig in 1000 N and to reduce sewer collection and treatment costs on
1173 metered water.

1174

1175 **GENERAL**

- 1176 • Water shares or in-lieu fee for indoor and outdoor increased water demands shall be
1177 provided to the City in accordance with City Code 17.29.210 and Utah Administrative Rule
1178 R309-510-7.
- 1179 • All adjacent and internal rights of way and easements shall be shown on the final plat and
1180 construction plans. Improvements of this project shall not infringe upon the rights of an
1181 existing easement / right of way / property owned by others without their written
1182 permission.
- 1183 • Documentation of existing and/or new easements or agreements for the proposed shared
1184 access condition and any other conditions such as shared access, parking, utilities,
1185 stormwater facilities (inside or outside of the project boundary) shall be provided with the
1186 construction plan / final plat submittal.
- 1187 • A Public Works Development Agreement and Financial Surety of at least 110% of the
1188 cost to construct all improvements in the City right-of-way and for all new storm water
1189 improvements shall be executed prior to approval of construction plans.
- 1190 • Provide a Geotechnical Report that includes but is not limited to: 1) Historical high
1191 ground water elevation, and 2) Percolation rate of soils at bottom of all unlined storm
1192 water holding facilities. Groundwater has been a problem for adjacent development and
1193 has caused significant delays. Making sure this is correct will ensure a smooth development
1194 process.
- 1195 • A "Preconstruction meeting¹¹ shall be held with the City's Engineering Division prior
1196 to starting construction activities and a "Work in the Right of Way¹¹ permit shall be
1197 obtained for all work in the City's right-of-way and PUE or for any tie-in to City utilities.
- 1198 • City right-of-way shall not be used for storage of construction materials or parking of
1199 construction equipment or related vehicles during construction.

1200

1201 **UTILITIES**

- All utilities outside of the public right-of-way way shall be private lines and shall be owned, maintained, repaired/replaced by the property owner. All infrastructure shall be installed, maintained, and repaired/replaced in accordance with Logan City Standards.
- A private Water Utility agreement shall be provided for all private water and sewer lines (including fire lines) not located within a Public Right of Way. The agreement shall be executed prior to approval of construction plans and shall be recorded with the County Recorder.
- Each individual building shall have separate water service and sewer service connection to the City's water and sewer systems.
- Fire hydrants locations shall meet the Fire Code requirements as determined by the City's Fire Marshall.
- All existing water and sewer service lines extending to the site that are not proposed to be used with the new development shall be capped at the City main line. Currently the plan shows one water service not being used. If it is not used it will need to be abandoned at the main.

STORMWATER / IRRIGATION

- Storm water detention/retention shall be designed and constructed according to Logan City standards. This includes the retention of stormwater from any adjacent street that currently discharges to the property. Retention of the 90% storm event is required and shall be provided using Low Impact design methods.
- Stormwater can be discharged to the City's stormwater system after the 90th percentile storm has been collected for infiltration onsite and the remainder released at design rates. If development encounters ground water and intends to install a footing/structural drainage system, this system will not be permitted to discharge to the City's stormwater system and will need to be managed separately. Canal permission will be required to discharge this flow into a canal.
- An executed Public Works Stormwater Maintenance Agreement shall be provided to the City prior to construction plan approval. The agreement shall be recorded at the Cache County Recorder's Office.
- Property is greater than 1 acre so compliance with the State Storm Water Permit is required. Development shall also provide a sediment and erosion control plan for all construction activities.
- This development is located in an area of moderate water table elevation (25 to 48 inches) and classified as having moderate liquefaction potential; given the potential groundwater elevation in the area, more than normal stormwater pond area may be required to maintain the pond elevation sufficiently above the historic high groundwater elevation.
- Above ground and below ground stormwater facilities shall be designed to be a minimum 1 foot above the historic high groundwater elevation as determined by the geotechnical engineer. Regardless of the design, stormwater facilities that are found to be constantly wet by groundwater will be required to complete a design revision that revises the facility to meet the City's standard.
- A Digital Site Plan in AutoCAD {DWG} Format

1245 • PUE's Public Utility: 10' Easement on all property lines that face a roadway and 5'
1246 Easement on all other property lines.

1247

1248 **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL FOR THE PLANNED**
1249 **DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY**

1250 The Planning Commission bases its decisions on the following findings supported in the
1251 administrative record for this project:

- 1252 1. The proposed project is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere
1253 with the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties because of the setbacks, building
1254 design, site layout, materials, landscaping, and open space.
- 1255 2. The Code Amendment and Rezone conform to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan
1256 Municipal Code.
- 1257 3. The proposed project provides adequate open space and useable outdoor space in
1259 conformance with Title 17.
- 1260 4. The proposed project provides code compliant off-street parking.
- 1261 5. The project meets the goals and objectives of the Logan General Plan by providing high-
1264 quality developments designed in way for easy circulation of both pedestrian and
1265 vehicles.
- 1266 6. The proposed project complies with maximum height, density and building design
1268 standards and is in conformance with Title 17.
- 1269 7. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development
1271 Code and the Municipal Code.
- 1272 8. 1000 West and 1400 West provides access and are adequate in size and design to
1274 sufficiently handle all traffic modes and infrastructure related to the land use.

1273
1274
1275
1276
1277 On August 14, 2025, the Planning Commission **recommended approval** to the
1278 Municipal Council for the Willow Lakes Phase 5 Planned Development Overlay Zone as
1279 proposed. **Planning Commissioners vote (4-0).**

1280
1281 Chair Simmonds expressed concerns about the Planning Commission permitting the
1282 applicant to make the PUD zone change first, rather than a design review being first.

1283
1284 Russ Holley, Planner replied that the code has not changed, but the process was altered.

1285
1286 Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that on the far west, there is still a
1287 clubhouse.

1288
1289 Mr. Holley indicated that this is correct.
1290
1291 Chair Simmonds referenced the beach homes. The initial proposal was for Airbnb's where
1292 the beach homes are located at to ensure that the properties remain as a short-term rentals
1293 rather than being sold.
1294
1295 Mr. Holley replied that the property could be reverted down to a single-family home and
1296 be resold. However, these properties are purpose-built, it would not make sense to revert
1297 down.
1298
1299 Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that these designated short-term
1300 rental properties will be the only short-term rentals allowed anywhere on the property. The
1301 rest of the residences will be owned.
1302
1303 Mr. Holley confirmed that the only short-term rentals allowed on the property will be these
1304 designated properties on the beachfront. However, technically, this could apply to other
1305 properties with similar footage and distance to the beach.
1306
1307 Vice Chair Johnson remarked that if other short-term rentals did appear it would be on the
1308 west side of the plat, which would have a similar condition to meet the short-term rentals.
1309
1310 Vice Chair Johnson asked if the proposed setback is similar or close to the NR-6 setback.
1311
1312 Mr. Holley responded that 5,000 sf. is the standard front, and they would like 20,000 sq.,
1313 another setback is 8,000 sf. and they would like 5,000 sf., with the 10,000 sf. remaining
1314 the same.
1315
1316 Vice Chair Johnson requested clarification on whether the 5,000 sf. for a setback was to
1317 the lot or to the next building.
1318
1319 Mr. Holley clarified that the 5,000 sf. is for the lot, not the adjacent building.
1320
1321 Chair Simmonds asked if they could specify setbacks to match those of single-family
1322 housing.
1323
1324 Mr. Holley answered that with a PUD overlay, the Council can request that the setbacks
1325 match those of single-family homes.
1326
1327 Chair Simmonds preferred single-family properties to match existing single-family home
1328 setbacks.
1329

1330 Mr. Holley replied that the changes would be from 25 single-family homes to only 15
1331 single-family homes.

1332

1333 Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that the MR-12 overlay is only for the assisted
1334 living center.

1335

1336 Mr. Holley explained that with the PUD overlay, the Council can declare what can and
1337 cannot be done in that zone. For example, if the proponent desires to change the site to a
1338 gas station instead. This would require a code amendment and, therefore, be brought before
1339 the Council.

1340

1341 Councilmember A. Anderson asked what the setback for the assisted living center would
1342 be.

1343

1344 Mr. Holley responded that the setback is about 15 feet from the easement.

1345

1346 Mayor Daines inquired if in preparation for the arterial road, there is a need for a right-of-
1347 way dedication.

1348

1349 Mr. Holley answered that there is a dedication already in place. The portion of the road that
1350 is not dedicated is the portion that is in the County.

1351

1352 Vice Chair Johnson commented on behalf of the adjacent neighborhood that many are not
1353 opposed to the development, but have expressed concerns about the increase in traffic from
1354 the creation of a gym/development.

1355

1356 Mr. Holley would be willing to receive directives from the Council on the meaning of
1357 traffic-stopping measures.

1358

1359 Vice Chair Johnson would like to include the trail as part of phase 5.

1360

1361 Mr. Holley explained though the trail is outside of phase 5, it does tie into the impact.

1362

1363 Councilmember A. Anderson is aware that the Planning Commission approved the design
1364 and asked if there were any other expressed concerns.

1365

1366 Mr. Holley responded that the Planning Commission was disappointed to see that the
1367 condominiums were removed from the design. Their discussion focused on 1400 West
1368 and how to calm/control the traffic, supporting a trail system, and reviewed setback. They
1369 desire to see the design reviews for the mansion homes, fitness center, and assisted living.

1370

1371 Chair Simmonds inquired about the reason why the short-term rentals will not be reviewed.

1372

1373 Mr. Holley answered that short-term rentals will be permitted as a single-family home, and
1374 design reviews are not required for a single-family home.

1375
1376 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the assisted living center would have different
1377 requirements for parking.
1378

1379 Mr. Holley replied that parking is based on use and not on the zone. An assisted living
1380 center has a low parking standard. However, the assisted living center will have sufficient
1381 parking for staff and visitors.

1382
1383 The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the September 16,
1384 2025 Council meeting.

1385
1386 **Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$8,147 funds the Library**
1387 **received from the State of Utah to support the Interlibrary Loan Program; \$7,123 a**
1388 **grant the Fire Department received from the State of Utah (project 796); \$6,780**
1389 **police forfeitures toward police equipment purchases – Resolution 25-39 – Richard**
1390 **Anderson (2:49:08)**

1391
1392 Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget
1393 adjustments resolution.

1394
1395 Councilmember A. Anderson asked what the plan is for the police equipment being sold.

1396
1397 Police Chief Jeff Simmons responded that the proceeds will be used for drone carriers and
1398 drone pilots.

1399
1400 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the September 16,
1401 2025 Council meeting.

1402
1403 No further workshop items were presented.

1404
1405 **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

1406
1407 Councilmember M. Anderson expressed his appreciation and gratitude to the City's
1408 Animal Control officers, who removed a skunk from his residence.

1409
1410 Councilmember A. Anderson expressed gratitude on behalf of the community. She
1411 thanked the City police officers on how they handled the funeral processions of Officer
1412 Eric Estrada and Sgt. Lee Sorensen.

1413
1414 Mayor Daines thanked USU President Smith for their support as well and the overall
1415 community partnerships.

1416
1417 The remainder of the Council also expressed their gratitude.
1418
1419 No further considerations were discussed.
1420
1421 **ADJOURNED TO A MEETING OF THE LOGAN REDEVELOPMENT**
1422 **AGENCY AT 8:20 p.m.**
1423
1424 Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Redevelopment Agency convened in regular session
1425 on Tuesday, September 2, 2025, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at
1426 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 8:21 pm. Logan Municipal Council Meetings
1427 are televised live as a public service on Channel 17 and the City of Logan YouTube
1428 channel at: bit.ly/LoganCouncilMeetings
1429
1430 Councilmembers present at the beginning of the meeting: Chair Jeannie F. Simmonds,
1431 Vice Chair Mike Johnson, Councilmember M. Anderson, Councilmember Ernesto López
1432 and Councilmember Amy Z. Anderson. Administration present: Mayor Holly H. Daines,
1433 City Attorney Craig Carlston, Finance Director Richard Anderson, and City Recorder
1434 Teresa Harris.
1435 Chair Simmonds welcomed those present. There were approximately 20 in attendance at
1436 the beginning of the meeting.
1437 **ACTION ITEM:**
1438
1439 **PUBLIC HEARING - Unspent Appropriations FY 2025 – Carry Forwards:**
1440 **REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY - \$10,856 for the Northern Neighborhood**
1441 **Improvement Program; \$150,000 for Development Agreement for Demolition at 25**
1442 **West 300 North; \$150,000 for Demolition at 315 North Main; \$115,000 for**
1443 **Development Agreement – Resolution 25-37 RDA – Kirk Jensen, Economic**
1444 **Development Director (2:53:07)**
1445
1446 At the August 19, 2025 Council meeting, Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen
1447 addressed the Council regarding the proposed RDA carry forward resolution.
1448
1449 Chair Simmonds asked how much of the incentive is tied to housing.
1450
1451 Mr. Jensen explained that the original incentive was for \$2.5 million including
1452 commercial and residential. There was a time limit set, the objective was not met, and the
1453 incentive was reduced by \$150,000. These are annual payments that will be made for the
1454 duration of the project. The funding is being held until certain trail requirements are met.
1455
1456 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.
1457

1458 There were no comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.
1459
1460 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Vice Chair Johnson**
1461 **to approve Resolution 25-37 RDA as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-**
1462 **0).**
1463 **A. Anderson: Aye**
1464 **M. Anderson: Aye**
1465 **Johnson: Aye**
1466 **López: Aye**
1467 **Simmonds: Aye**
1468
1469 **WORKSHOP ITEM:**
1470
1471 **Budget Adjustment FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$500,000 RDA reserves toward**
1472 **the 1250 North 200 east intersection project – Resolution 25-40 RDA – Kirk Jensen,**
1473 **Economic Development Director ([2:26:50](#))**
1474
1475 Economic Development Director Kirk Jensen addressed the Council regarding the
1476 proposed budget adjustment. The funding will go toward building a new light signal at
1477 1250 N 200 E. A portion of the light signal will also be paid by the public works
1478 department.
1479
1480 Chair Simmonds said that sell and trade in regard to this intersection had been discussed
1481 and questioned the trade as she was under the impression it was not a sole proprietor
1482 rather multiple proprietor(s).
1483
1484 Mayor Daines responded that the sell and trade did occur as the owner had use for the
1485 parking lot.
1486
1487 The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the September 16,
1488 2025 Council meeting.
1489
1490 **ADJOURNED:**
1491
1492 There being no further business, the Logan Redevelopment Agency adjourned at 8:30
1493 p.m.
1494
1495
1496
1497 Teresa Harris, City Recorder