

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, October 7, 2025, in the Logan Municipal Council Chambers located at 290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah 84321 at 5:30 p.m. 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](https://bit.ly/LoganCouncilMeetings)

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

Participating via Phone: Councilmember Mark A. Anderson

Excused: Councilmember Ernesto López.

Chair Simmonds welcomed those present. There were approximately 52 in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

#### **OPENING CEREMONY:**

Mayoral Candidate Mark A. Anderson provided the opening ceremony and showed a recorded video with his campaign message.

Chair Simmonds led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

**Meeting Minutes.** Minutes of the Council meeting held on September 16, 2025 were reviewed.

**Meeting Agenda.** Chair Simmonds announced there are three public hearings scheduled for tonight's Council meeting.

Chair Simmonds requested a minor amendment to the agenda to read a statement.

**ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Vice Chair Johnson to approve tonight's agenda and minutes from the September 16, 2025 Council meeting as amended.** Motion carried by roll call vote.

**A. Anderson: Aye**

**M. Anderson: Aye**

**Johnson: Aye**

**López: Excused**

**Simmonds: Aye**

**Meeting Schedule.** Chair Simmonds announced that regular Council meetings are held on the first and third Tuesdays of the month at 5:30 p.m. The next regular Council meeting is Tuesday, October 21, 2025.

Chair Simmonds recognized Mayor Holly Daines, who received the Mayor Brent and Jennie Taylor Service Award for the State of Utah during the ULCT Conference held last week. She read the following:

***Mayor Brent and Jennie Taylor Service Award***

*The late Mayor Brent Taylor of North Ogden gave a life of service to his community before he was tragically killed in November 2018 while serving a second tour in Afghanistan with the Utah Army National Guard. Major Taylor had just been re-elected to a second term as mayor when he accepted his deployment.*

*Brent Taylor practiced what he preached: service above self. Whether as Mayor of North Ogden, or Major in the Utah National Guard, he dedicated his life to serving his community and his country. His wife, Jennie, and their seven children continue his legacy through activity in civic, faith, and community groups. Brent served on the ULCT Board of Directors prior to his final deployment to Afghanistan. He helped modernize the organization's structure and set the League on a new path to more thoroughly address the needs of Utah's municipalities with transparency, accountability, and focus.*

*ULCT created this award to honor the Taylors' tremendous sacrifice and dedication to service. Jennie was the final President of the ULCT Auxiliary and a frequent attendee at ULCT conferences. She works tirelessly continuing a legacy established with her husband to honor country and community through service.*

***Mayor Holly H. Daines***

*Mayor Holly Daines has gone above and beyond as the Mayor of Logan City. Her dedication to our community has been evident in numerous initiatives, particularly her support and vision for the Center Street and Plaza projects, which have significantly revitalized our downtown.*

*Her forward-thinking approach and willingness to embrace new ideas have greatly improved our community and enhanced the services we provide for our citizens. Beyond her commitment to the community, she genuinely cares for city employees, and it has not gone unnoticed.*

*Her frequent acknowledgement that "the City's greatest assets are its employees" has fostered a positive working environment and earned immense respect and trust among staff.*

*Under her leadership, there is a sense of pride among citizens and accomplishment among employees. Mayor Daines, thank you for your support and dedication to Logan City. You are very deserving of this award.*

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

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

Gail Hanson, a resident of Logan is grateful for the use of technology, though it can also be a curse. She believes that participation should always be fostered. She reminded the audience of the need for decorum.

Patrick Belmont, a resident of Logan discussed the importance in the reduction of fossil fuels and what was discussed at the latest United Nations meeting. He said there are 100 countries who are committed to decrease methane emissions.

Mayor Daines invited Mr. Belmont to stay for Item A. on tonight's agenda regarding solar.

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

## **MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:**

### **Board Appointment (Golf Course Advisory) – Mayor Daines (21:28)**

Mayor Daines requested the ratification of Dan Johnson to serve on the Golf Course Advisory Board which is a new appointment.

**ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember M. Anderson to approve the ratification of Dan Johnson as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

**A. Anderson: Aye**

**M. Anderson: Aye**

**Johnson: Aye**

**López: Excused**

**Simmonds: Aye**

### **Recognition of USU Engineering Students – Mayor Daines (22:30)**

Mayor Daines introduced Dan O'Crowley for Utah State University.

Mr. O'Crowley talked about a program that helped the Logan Aquatic Center Pool provide adaptive technology to allow those with disabilities to be able to enter the deeper

end of the pool. Unfortunately, at the start of the project, they weren't able to make a piece of equipment work.

The State of Utah has the Utah Assisted Technology Program, whose purpose is to help and be aware of upcoming technologies. The solution provided allowed the existing equipment to integrate the pool gutter system that was already there. Through custom solutions, there can be more future projects helping those with disabilities. In addition to creating cost-effective savings for the city. He thanked the Mayor and Council for their time in learning about the equipment and for allowing the opportunity to serve.

Mayor Daines thanked Mr. Crowley.

#### **Report on Canyon Road Survey – Matt Vance, Wilson Neighborhood Chairman (24:05)**

Mayor Daines introduced Dan O'Crowley for Utah State University.

Mr. O'Crowley talked about a program that helped the Logan Aquatic Center Pool provide some adaptive technology that allowed those with disabilities to get in the deep area of the pool. His group couldn't make a piece of equipment work that they had ordered. He said that every State has an assisted technology program. The Utah Assisted Technology Program is for the State of Utah. They happen to have an office here in Logan, which is a great blessing. The solution they provided was one where they were able to integrate the existing equipment that was purchased with the pool gutter system that was already there. They do custom solutions and can help with any future projects for those with a disability. They can also create cost savings to the city. Their job is to be aware of all sorts of technologies coming up on the marketplace for those with disabilities. He thanked the Mayor and Council for their time hearing about this equipment.

#### **Report on Canyon Road Survey – Matt Vance, Wilson Neighborhood Chairman**

Matt Vance, Wilson Neighborhood Chair addressed the Council. He stated that he has lived in Logan for about 15 years. He went to school in Logan and lives also lives here with his wife and five children. He is the co-founder of a software company and they do feedback management, surveys and manage online reviews. Doing this survey for the City was a great opportunity for him to share his professional skill set for something that was a civic project. He noted that the survey was done independently. It was done as a donation and public service to the City and the residents. There was no transaction involved. There were a few comments about the survey itself that he shared and laid the foundation of how he approached the analysis.

There were comments around the timing of why residents were being asked for feedback at this specific time. There were comments saying the survey was not satisfactory or wasn't complete or was leading. He stated that crafting a survey is a professional skill and there are certain elements to minimize bias and to ensure that leading questions are

not being asked. But he stated it's also about not giving options that are not possible. We live in America; a free country and he is very grateful that we're able to say the pledge of allegiance. He said the Mayor and Council are the decision makers and they are public servants and the residents have been provided an opportunity to share feedback to help them make a decision. The survey itself isn't a vote. It's not a popular vote but a data point to help the Mayor and Council in the decision making process which is a big responsibility that they shoulder.

As far as the survey goes, he can attest that it was built professionally and only with the options that made sense to include which were based on the objectives and constraints of the project. There were three elements that Mr. Vance presented. He reviewed participation, scored questions and comments.

Participation was open for three weeks. There were a total of 821 survey submissions. There were 750 completed surveys of the English version, 70 that were partially completed. There was one partial submission of the Spanish version of the survey. Access to the survey was posted on Facebook, signs were placed around the community with QR codes and it went out on several different email lists. The largest demographic was the Wilson Neighborhood which is where the project is located. There were also those who participated that have lived here previously and are not current residents and some who have never lived here. Between those two it was about 10% of the total responses and then the rest were split between different neighborhoods. There were 46% of the respondents who have lived in Logan 20 plus years.

The first survey question was to select up to three elements that they felt should be prioritized. This included trees, shared use path for trail connectivity, traffic calming, pedestrian safety, sidewalks, separate bike facilities, consistent streetscape, crosswalks, and parking. Color coding was done from the most mentioned to the least mentioned. There was a slight variance, but the trend was definitely that trees are the number one most important element to respondents.

The next survey question was regarding shared parking, which was not a priority.

The next survey question was regarding road completeness as it fits within the definition. The question is that Logan City's code and neighborhood plans reference complete streets and include pedestrian connections which include sidewalks on both sides of the street. The question asked was, do you feel Canyon Road is a place where sidewalks on both sides of the street would benefit the community?

The response was 60% said no. There were 28% that said yes and 12 said indifferent.

Mr. Vance read several open comments that were made at the end of the survey both for and against sidewalks.

The next question was which pedestrian path do you feel is best for the community on the north side of Canyon Road?

Mr. Vance stated that from his experience in doing a lot of surveys, when you have comment questions or comment boxes on every single question, it puts an immense burden for the team that's doing the analysis and you typically see repeated themes. The more efficient method is to have an open text at the end and that's where you get the ability to share and capture different sentiments.

In regard to the pedestrian path question, a large majority that voted or made a selection said they preferred the 5 ft and path and there was a split between 8 ft asphalt and 8 ft concrete. It was about 50/50 response on the width of the path. There were some comments that said they would like to have an even wider sidewalk or no sidewalk at all. There was a variance in the open comments that went more extreme on both sides.

The next question was, at the Canyon Road Park, which is on the north side of Canyon Road at approximately 970 East. Which sidewalk design do you prefer? A winding sidewalk through the park or a standard straight sidewalk along the road?

Mr. Vance said there were a lot of passionate comments about this topic which he feels was a smaller element to the overall project.

The next question is about the park area at Canyon Road Park on the North side of Canyon Road at approximately 960 East. Which parking option do you think would best serve the community?

There were 82% that said they would like to have 10 parallel parking spots as the lesser option. There were 18 that voted or suggested they would like 20 parking stalls. There were a lot of comments on this topic. The survey showed that the respondents don't want parking at the park at all or they want less than 10 stalls.

The next question was in addition to trees in the park strip, the space between the road and sidewalk, what type of landscaping would you most like to see?

The responses were 43% indicated native plants as the preferred landscape. Xeriscaping was next and then grass.

The next question was about the types of trees which had over 600 comments. The highest priority were shade trees and low water consumption. Those were the two elements that mattered most to the respondents.

Vice Chair Johnson stated that as someone who has Bradford pear trees in his park strip that the city planted years ago, he said they are messy trees and he feels they are not a good option to plant.

The last question on the survey is, do you have any additional comments you'd like to share?

Mr. Vance said there were several comments made, with the number one being the opposition to a sidewalk on the north side of Canyon Road and saving the existing trees.

This was 50%, which is around 200 comments. Pedestrian and bike safety was the second most comment, traffic calming and cost of the project followed.

Mr. Vance stated that the entire survey including all of the comments will be publicly available for everyone to read. He appreciated some of the very detailed comments that were made. In his personal opinion, he feels that comments have more influence when they are organized and there is a thoughtful argument. Responding in all caps is aggressive language and, in his opinion, gets discredited as a professional going through the analysis. As far as the numbers, this was fully inclusive of all the voices that were shared in the survey. It was also fully anonymous other than some put their name and address in the comment section and requested a follow-up conversation about their property.

The Council thanked Mr. Vance for time and effort he took to prepare and conduct the survey.

Chair Simmonds referred to the slide showcasing the importance of trees in the survey. She asked if the survey specified all trees or just some.

Mr. Vance responded that the response was for any tree(s) along Canyon Road project area.

No further Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

### **COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

#### **Planning Commission Update – Chair Simmonds ([44:35](#))**

Chair Simmonds reported that the Planning Commission reviewed a proposed amendment to the Planned Development Overlay for the Cache Valley Marketplace and will come to Council later on the agenda.

#### **Board and Committee Reports – Councilmember A. Anderson and Vice Chair Johnson**

Councilmember A. Anderson reported that the Public Arts Committee met and will meet next Tuesday to review the final design proposals for the Willow Park Softball Complex. The Library Board is planning to have the Christmas Train display again this year which is sponsored by the Friends of the Library. She reminded the public that the makerspace is open and available to the public at the Library and new software to make a room reservation at the Library is available for use.

Preliminary information was presented at the Parks & Recreation meeting regarding a proposed recreation center. Trapper Park is closed due to the bridge installation. The trail on the east side of the park is almost complete and there is an updated trail map available

on the website. The trail connection at 800 East 1250 North is closed and under construction.

The Bear River Homeless Council is observing the suggested changes to the State Action Plan. When temperatures drop below 18 degrees, Code Blue will commence from the 15<sup>th</sup> of October until the end of April. The State Homeless Conference was held last week. Homelessness for seniors is now at 42%. Last year, the Cache County School District identified 51 students who were homeless, this year, the number is 85.

Several from the Logan Council met with the Logan Youth Council and were invited to attend the USU Homecoming Parade on Saturday, October 18. The Youth Council has plenty of ideas regarding civic education and civic action. Lastly, she attended the Utah League of Cities and Towns and heard a diversity of topics from housing to water issues.

Vice Chair Johnson reported that Renewable Energy & Sustainability Advisory Board (RESAB) discussed contracting with an outside firm to conduct custom energy efficiency for corporations. The Audit Committee is meeting next week. The Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) has been dissolved. He virtually attended the Utah League of Cities & Towns Housing Advisory Committee. He plans to attend the weekly meetings of United Today, Stronger Tomorrow, who have scheduled a listening session on October 15 from 6 to 8 p.m. at the Logan Library.

No further Council Business items were presented.

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

*(Continued from the September 16, 2025 Council Meeting)* - PUBLIC HEARING - PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONE – Consideration of a proposed Planned Development Overlay. Brett Jensen/Willow Lakes Holdings LLC, authorized agent/owner is requesting a Planned Development Overlay Zone for the 12 acre Phase Five area of the Willow Lakes development to include a 40,000 square foot Fitness/Boat Club commercial building, five beachfront short term rental homes, eleven single family lots, five multi-family mansion style homes, and a 60-bed assisted living facility located at approximately 1100 South 1400 West in the Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) zone (Woodruff Neighborhood) – Ordinance 25-16 – Russ Holley, Planner (55:15)

At the September 2, 2025 and the September 16, 2025 Council meeting, Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council regarding the proposed Planned Development Overlay.

Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that the remainder of the project is already approved, and several portions of the project have already been completed, only Phase 5 is requesting an amendment.

Russ Holley, Planner confirmed that is correct. Phases 1 through 4 have already been approved.

Chair Simmonds asked if the presented overlay is the agreed-upon or partially agreed-upon proposal.

Mr. Holley responded that the City would participate in the construction of Sections 1 & 2 and pay half the cost of the trail, which should not exceed \$600,000. The trail will be built prior to the certificate of occupancy of the fitness center planned for Phase 5.

Chair Simmonds and Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that the trail for Sections 1 & 2 will be built by the developer to match City specifications.

Mr. Holley confirmed that the developer will build the trail to city specifications.

Councilmember M. Anderson requested confirmation that the developer is aware of the requirements.

Councilmember A. Anderson stated for the benefit of the public that at least two public meetings have been held regarding the Willow Lakes Overlay. This process has been ongoing for some time.

Mr. Holley stated that there was a public meeting at Woodruff Elementary, and another a few years prior regarding the initial overlay.

Chair Simmonds requested the developers be permitted to speak first.

Brett Nelson, Developer, indicated that a portion of the land was returned to the City to continue to maintain an easement along the Logan River. There is an ongoing restoration project for that section of the river. There is some grant funding available for restoration, but the majority of the costs are incurred by the developer. The original cost estimate was \$600,000, but the change order is for \$675,000. There are also other mitigating costs not included. The request was to make facilities like the fitness center available to the public. In order to accommodate the traffic, the City requested the construction/expansion of 1400 West. In addition, it was determined that a priority for trail construction would be completed in Sections 1 & 2. The developers' primary concern is the construction of 1400 West. The proposal was to modify some of the trail specifications in order to accommodate the developer's needs.

Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Joshua Molitor, a resident of Logan, is concerned regarding the location of the assisted living center and it being placed on the edge of the property. He feels it will make it difficult for residents to take advantage of the available facilities such as the fitness

center, clubhouse, lake, and so forth. He also expressed concerns about the density and the negative impact on residents.

Dr. Gail B. Yost, a resident of Logan, is also concerned about how the assisted living center is being funded. Will the assisted living center be for those who can afford to live there or will it also accept lower-income residents. How will the space be utilized for the residents, and will there be outreach/interaction with the community.

Chair Simmonds clarified that what is being approved today are merely concepts. The developer has identified an assisted living center in that location. The developer still needs to come before the Planning Commission for a design review and approval. A member of the team is aware of the needs and legalities of such a facility.

Mary Da Silva, a resident of Logan echoed concerns about the assisted living center. She gave an educated guess that more than likely the facility will be private.

Linda Johnson, a resident of Logan likes the additions made by the developer especially the public access to the trails, clubhouse and lakes. She is in favor of the proposal and hopes the Council is too.

Patrick Belmont, a resident of Logan, appreciated the different types of housing and trails. He is concerned about the difficulty in managing the lakes and the cost thereafter. He would also like to know if the lake will be filled with culinary water or if it has access to change the water. Furthermore, corners will be cut, when the lake and other amenities can't be maintained.

Chair Simmonds clarified that the developer has water rights, which is culinary water. The lake is not being filled with culinary water. They have access if they need it. And the development will be under an HOA.

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

Councilmember A. Anderson referred to the mansions on the east side of the project and inquired about their size, and whether the setbacks will align with the single-family homes to the west.

Mr. Holley answered that there are 5 mansions with 4 units each, a total of 20 units. The mansion(s) setbacks will align with the single-family homes.

Chair Simmonds stated the developer proposed reducing the requirement of the trail by 10 percent and asked if the Council was in favor or not.

Vice Chair Johnson said in discussions with the developer, the area of reduction would be in the tail/end of the northwest corner. The trail would end at a connection, which would reduce the cost by \$60,000.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the northwest area was unincorporated property.

Vice Chair Johnson confirmed that to the northwest, it is unincorporated property.

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired if the 4,400 sq. in reduction is temporary, is an entire reduction, or just to an area.

Mr. Holley replied that it is simply a cost estimate for the concrete.

Chair Simmonds requested that she would like to know a number in linear feet to determine how much trail will actually be built.

Councilmember M. Anderson reminded the Council of the purpose of an overlay which is for the Council to have flexibility in situations like these.

Councilmember A. Anderson said she is in favor of the proposed housing and the suggested changes. Regarding the trails, the key is to make sure all the access points are included. The determination should be for funding rather than trail feet of up to \$1.2 million.

Mr. Holley did a quick estimate; if 3,000 ft. of linear trail are built, the estimated cost is \$1.1 million. Roughly 86% of trail would pay for Section 1 & 2 to be built.

Vice Chair Johnson highlighted some of the concerns from the neighborhood which are an increase in traffic. The developer has been willing to mitigate traffic by extending the road. He asked if the language needs to be specific to the code.

Mr. Holley responded that outlining the goals and objectives will suffice; the development agreement will be more specific.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested that she would like to see in writing the necessity to have at least one trail connection to Trapper Park.

Chair Simmonds requested the developer return to the podium.

Mr. Nelson stated that the wording needs to be clear from a legal standpoint.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the language needs to be changed from a 50/50 split to the City increasing their portion of the project cost.

Mr. Holley said the language does not need to change, but the Council can add language stating that the applicant's cost will not exceed \$500,000.

Chair Simmonds stated that an access point is required for Trapper Park.

Vice Chair Johnson suggested that the last portion for Phases 3 & 4 could be gravel.

Chair Simmonds would like both access points to be concrete even if the rest of the path is gravel.

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired who is responsible for trail maintenance, and if it would be a burden on the City for the trail to be maintained.

Chair Simmonds requested that Russ Akina, Parks & Recreation Director address the question.

Russ Akina recommended that the trail be built right the first time. It will be twice as costly to correct and redo at a later time. The preference is for concrete.

Chair Simmonds asked if having the trail end at Section 1 & 2 is the best option.

Mr. Akina replied that the intent is to create a trail from Trapper Park and from his staff's perspective, the best option/priority is to connect Trapper Park from the northwest area. The recommendation is that the connection be along 600 South rather than 1400 West.

Chair Simmonds inquired about the length of that portion of the trail.

Mr. Holley estimated that the trail portion is 3,000 feet. Based on his estimate of the budget, the total trail that can be built is 3,800 ft.

Vice Chair Johnson asked if there are any concerns that the only access point is not ADA accessible.

Mr. Akina responded that the concerns would have to be dealt with, including a boardwalk.

Chair Simmonds said that the priority will be the northwest trail and asked if the details should be added to the agreement or in the ordinance.

Mr. Holley requested that the finer details be managed in the development agreement, but it should be stated in the ordinance what the priority should be.

Item A was paused and will be continued until after the remaining action items are completed.

**ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember M. Anderson to continue Ordinance 25-16 until the end of the action items.**

The Council discussed the changes and amended the ordinance with the language below.

Item A was resumed at [3:20:07](#).

Mr. Holley presented the changes to the Council and stated that the developers are content with the changes made.

Vice Chair Johnson requested clarification on the definition of linear feet and why the trail end was kept.

Mr. Holley clarified the linear feet is the total trail length that goes east. The trail end was kept because Mr. Akina felt it was needed.

Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that Section B. applies to everything, including the trail.

Mr. Holley confirmed that the requirements in Section B. also apply to the trail.

**ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to amend Ordinance 25-16 as presented with the following:**

**§17.27B.080 Development Standards – Additional Requirements**

**This Planned Development Overlay requires improvements outside of the Phase 5 project boundaries based on additional commercial land use permissions and associated impacts.**

- A. Public Trail Improvements. A ten-foot-wide concrete multi-use trail, built to city specifications, shall be constructed from the new Trapper Park pedestrian bridge running east for approximately 790 linear feet and running west for approximately 3,010 linear feet and terminating at the northwest corner of the project site, for a total trail length of 3,800 linear feet (listed as section #1 and #2 on applicant exhibit). This new trail shall have minimum of one tie-back section to Willow Lakes Drive between the building lots for additional public access.**
- B. Public Trail Completion Requirements. The Public Trails shall be completed at the time of Certificate of Occupancy for the fitness center building in phase 5 or three (3) years from September 2025, whichever is sooner.**

C. Public Trail Cost Share Requirements. The City of Logan will split the cost of the above trail sections with the applicant paying 45.45% and City paying 54.55%. The City's total obligation shall not exceed \$600,000.00 to be paid by the City at the completion of both trail sections. If the source of the city's funding is RAPZ or other grant funding, the applicant shall provide proof of payment for work completed to satisfy participating grant criteria. Prior to construction, the applicant and the city shall enter into a development agreement that specifies contracts, materials, and schedules.

**Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

**A. Anderson:** Aye

**M. Anderson:** Aye

**Johnson:** Aye

**López:** Excused

**Simmonds:** Aye

*(Continued from the August 19, 2025 Council meeting)* - PUBLIC HEARING - CODE AMENDMENT – Consideration of a proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 17.24 “Critical Lands Overlay Zone” to modify the Riparian and Wetland Setback Standards and update the range of uses and activities permitted within setback areas – Ordinance 25-11 – Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director ([2:02:45](#))

At the August 5, 2025 and the August 19, 2025 Council meeting, Community Development Director Mike DeSimone addressed the Council regarding the proposed code amendment.

**Critical Lands Elements/Rule Making Framework:**

- Riparian / Wetlands / Floodplains
- Related but Different (rules/regulations/purpose not always interchangeable)
- Regulated Independent of each w/different Standards
- No changes to Floodplain Regulation

**Updates to Riparian Regulations:**

Proposed 17.24.010 B – list regulated Riparian Areas:

- Logan River
- Blacksmith Fork
- Spring Creek
- No. Branch of Logan River (Little Logan) from Willow Park downstream to confluence with Logan River

- Lands within 100 feet as measured from the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of a stream, river, or manmade water course regulated by the Utah State Engineer's Office, Division of Water Rights, or the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, and can support a riparian habitat (08/19/25).
- Lands within 150 feet as measured from the Annual High Water Line (AHWL) of a stream or river draining a basin size greater than one square mile, and the land within 25 feet of the centerline of a stream draining an area less than one square mile (current).

Updates to Riparian Regulations:

Proposed 17.24.060 A revises the minimum riparian setbacks as follows:

- Residential – Greater of 25' or average of 2 nearest structures
- Other structures/development (commercial parking) 40'
- Road Construction – 25'
- Unincorporated lands to be annexed – 100; from all Riparian Areas for all development.
- Unincorporated lands to be annexed – 100' public conservation and trail easement (Logan River & Little Logan)
- General 25' setback (including roads) & 100' for unincorporated lands along Logan River (08/17/25)
- Current – 3-Tiered System 50'/100'/150'

Proposed Changes – Wetland Stetbacks/Buffers:

- (New) Structures, Uses, Developments – 25' from a Delineated wetland (change from 50' to 25')
- (New) Residential Property Lines – 15' from a Delineated Wetland
- (New) Road Construction – 20' from a Delineated Wetland measured from back of curb
- (Unchanged) Structures, Ueses, Developments – 20' from a Delineated Wetland defined as a Ditch/Canal
- (New) Minimum 25' from off-site wetlands

Proposed Changes – Wetland:

- Clarifies the expansion of Non-Conformities (CUP)
- Stormwater Facilities may be permitted in Wetland Buffer/Setback area if approved by City engineer
- Wetlands/wetland Buffer owned/managed by HOA vs. private lot owner
- Parks/Rec Facilities, Underground utilities, Bridges permitted in a wetland Buffer/setback area

## Proposed Changes – Wetlands:

### Applicability & Process

- Applicable to Jurisdictional Wetlands (USACE)
- Delineation required if project <100' of a potential wetland
- Wetland Delineation required with CUP/DR Application
- Project with Wetland Disturbance/USACE Permit
  - a. USACE Permit Application required with CUP/DR Application
  - b. USACE Permit required with Building Permit Application

Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that if the selection is less than 100 feet, what will occur with the empty lots. In addition, every structure that is already built will be non-conforming. She also asked what it means to reside in a non-conforming structure.

Mike DeSimone, Community Development Director, stated the lots/structures will be non-conforming and there will be an impact. An example is if the resident wants to add on, or if there is a fire/flood, but the resident only has a set time to rebuild.

Councilmember A. Anderson referred to the slide indicating current setbacks of already built homes, specifically the lot with a 47-foot setback. She asked if that lot could still be developed or not.

Mr. DeSimone answered that with the current standard it would not be possible to build. With the proposed standard, the building footprint would be tight. The purpose of a setback does not take into account characteristics onsite.

Chair Simmonds stated that one of the reasons for riparian areas is to provide shade and temperature control for the river itself. She expressed concerns about the impact on riparian areas.

Mr. DeSimone agreed, but clarified that in this specific area, there are no clear riparian areas such as the USU Water Lab.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that the proposed changes would not impact the Willow Lakes project.

Mr. DeSimone confirmed there will be no negative impacts as the conservation and trail easement are already in place.

Vice Chair Johnson gave an example of properties becoming non-conforming when there is a zone change. Is it an actual concern if the referenced properties become non-conforming.

Mr. DeSimone stated that the general policy is to try not to create additional non-conforming properties.

Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation on the property line setback.

Mr. DeSimone confirmed that the property line will be 15 feet away.

Chair Simmonds asked why the delineated wetland is from 50 to 25'.

Mr. DeSimone explained that the Corp of Engineers measures from the edge of the wetlands, but the City measures outward.

Chair Simmonds inquired what value is placed on wetlands.

Mr. DeSimone answered that the federal government regulates the boundary, and we still want to protect the riparian areas within reason.

Chair Simmonds requested an explanation on the difference between road construction and development.

Mr. DeSimone explained that a right-of-way is typically linear permitting wider entry.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested clarification on how a curb and gutter would impact the setback.

Mr. DeSimone replied that the setback would be to the curb, the sidewalk would be in the wetland. Trails are set up that way, and we allow them next to bodies of water.

Chair Simmonds inquired how an HOA would be able to manage mitigations.

Mr. DeSimone responded that the City can require it and help them with the process, but it is up to the HOA to manage it.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if it would be possible to make that a requirement as part of a development agreement with an HOA.

Mr. DeSimone said it would be possible via an agreement.

Chair Simmonds inquired if additional use permits would be required for a deck. If so, why allow it. And if so, what is the point as conditional use permits are typically not denied.

Mr. DeSimone confirmed that a permit would be required if a deck were to be built toward the river. This would be an exception and would match the non-conforming existing language. A criterion has to be met for a conditional use permit to be issued. A permit can

and will be denied if the criteria is not met. However, criteria should be established based on needs. The standards set are for larger waters, but in these areas the setbacks do not always make sense.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested clarification on the recommendation made by the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Johnson clarified that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the ordinance.

Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing. ([2:39:18](#))

Shauna Hart, Chairman of the Utah Wildlife Federation and also a Logan resident addressed the Council. She read a statement that was also emailed to the City Council.

*On behalf of the Utah Wildlife Federation, we are writing regarding Ordinance 25-11 and the proposed reduction of wetland setbacks to 25 ft as well as the change to a single 25 ft riparian setback within city limits with 100 ft setbacks only for proposed annexations. We appreciate the City's efforts to balance property owner needs, infrastructure requirements, and regulatory clarity, as well as the practical challenges Logan faces in its development. We are, however, concerned that the proposed 25 ft buffers are scientifically inadequate to protect the ecological, hydrological, and wildlife functions of wetlands and riparian zones. We respectfully urge the City to retain substantially wider buffers, citing evidence-based standards that preserve water quality, habitat, and ecological connectivity. Setbacks are not arbitrary. They are a critical planning tool. Scientific evidence shows that buffers of 25 ft are insufficient to maintain the functions of riparian areas. Properly designed buffers filter sediment and nutrients, stabilize banks, moderate stream temperatures, support invertebrate and vertebrate food webs, and provide critical habitat and movement corridors for birds, amphibians, and mammals. Mammals research consistently shows that effectiveness increases with width and that very narrow buffers provide minimal protection except under limited sight conditions. The US Environmental Protection Agency reviewed the scientific literature and found that riparian buffers generally require at least 50 to 100 ft to provide reliable nitrogen removal with narrow widths rarely sufficient and there is citations in this letter which you all can review. The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service highlights the importance of multizone riparian buffers that include one streamside zone critical for bank stabilization, shade and stream integrity. Two, middle zones providing habitat and pollutant removal and three outer zone filtering runoff and sediment in the inner mountain west riparian buffer design guidelines from 2008.*

Ms. Hart continued and said that she has lived in the City for eight years. She has seen tremendous changes, some good, some not so good from her point of view. No man is an island, and this issue has been publicized statewide. Her hope is that the City Council and

other officials associated with this decision will truly consider what kind of legacy they want to leave for their children and grandchildren. There is nothing like having a grandchild come visit this beautiful area and take them out to the ponds and the rivers to see the wildlife. Are we going to protect what's there and leave that legacy in the future?

Gail Hanson, a resident of Logan emphasized that 25 feet is not much. She also reminded the audience of the importance of maintaining decorum.

Stevie Koller, a resident of Logan addressed the Council. She does not believe that the ordinance specified this was only for 1000 West. The ordinance affects the entire city of Logan. When it has wording like every stream, every wetland, anything that's considered riparian, that is very concerning to her. She emailed a petition to the Mayor and City Council regarding the proposed changes to Ordinance 25-11 and she verified that it was received. The petition has over 600 signatures to date and is still growing. She knows the Mayor and Council have a difficult job balancing growth and what residents value most, but ecology and development are not opposites. People choose to live and invest in Logan because of its natural beauty, the rivers, the trees and wildlife that make this valley feel like home. And reducing the setback from 100 ft or 150 ft would move the risk closer to our water, increase flood potential, raise insurance costs, and erode the character that supports both our economy and our well-being.

Ms. Koller read the following petition:

*The Logan River is the heart of our valley. For decades, the 100-foot setback has protected clean water, wildlife, and safe floodplains throughout Logan's riparian corridors.*

**Now, proposed changes to Ordinance 25-11 seek to shrink that buffer to just 25 feet. This change would allow development right up to riverbanks and stream edges across the city—destroying habitat, polluting our water, and increasing flood risk for our community.**

*Our waterways are more than scenery. They are home to fish, birds, and pollinators. They are classrooms for our kids, places of healing for families, and safeguards for the valley's future.*

*We cannot let short-term development erase protections that generations before us had the wisdom to keep. Once these riparian zones are gone, we can't get them back. Join us in calling on the Logan City Council and Planning Commission to **reject the redlined changes in Ordinance 25-11 and KEEP the 100-foot setback**. Together, we can protect our rivers, streams, wildlife, and community for generations to come.*

#### **Why Cities Use a 100-Foot River Setback**

*A setback is basically a buffer zone between development and a riverbank. It isn't just an arbitrary number — 100 feet is based on science, safety, and long-term planning.*

### ***Flood Safety***

*Rivers rise and fall with snowmelt, storms, and seasonal changes.*

*A 100-foot buffer gives the river room to swell without homes/businesses flooding.*

*Without it, developers build too close, and then taxpayers often end up footing the bill for flood damage.*

### ***Water Quality***

*The strip of land between development and the river is called a riparian zone.*

*Plants and soils in that zone filter out fertilizers, pesticides, and pollutants before they reach the water. 100 feet is wide enough to actually work as a filter. A 25-foot strip is usually too narrow.*

### ***Wildlife Habitat***

*Birds, fish, insects, pollinators, and mammals use river corridors as habitat and migration routes. A 100-foot setback helps keep that habitat intact, which is especially important for threatened species.*

### ***Erosion Control***

*Natural banks need deep-rooted vegetation to stay stable.*

*Development too close (like concrete or lawns right up to the edge) causes banks to collapse and erode, leading to costly fixes.*

### ***Community Value***

*A 100-foot setback protects the “green ribbon” that makes river corridors and wetlands beautiful and accessible, while protecting their ecosystem functions.*

*It’s part of what makes Logan a thriving ecological hotspot and a community treasure — a place of belonging, renewal, and eco-tourism value, not just leftover space between developments.*

Ms. Koller thanked the Council for their time and for the incredible job they do. She appreciates the trails and the people here in Logan, and nature is what keeps her here.

Griffin Gallagher, a resident of Logan, is a student at USU. He has resided in Logan for several years and appreciates the importance of the river. As part of a class exercise, they recorded how many species they could spot in a certain length of time, which was at least 15 species. He expressed concerns about the detrimental impact not just on the environment but also on the impact of the surrounding wildlife/species. He requested the Council reconsider.

Joshua Molitor, a resident of Logan, is against the ordinance and requested the Council vote to deny.

Susan Janecke , a resident of Logan is a geology professor and gave a small presentation showcasing the difference between the flooding in different areas of Logan. She requested that the ordinance be revised to separate locations of land with infilling (where the presented setbacks would be acceptable) vs. flood zones (the present setbacks should remain as they are detrimental).

Patrick Belmont, a resident of Logan expressed concerns about changes to the setbacks and negative consequences such as flooding.

Kent Hoggan, a resident of Logan, thanked the Council and staff in trying to compromise between developing and protecting natural resources. Logan City is the only City requiring further setbacks than those already presented. He stated as a result of the setbacks, twenty potential lots were lost to his development. The City is a protector of wetlands and doing everything they can to protect river and streams.

Dr. Gail B. Yost, a resident of Logan, expressed concerns about making it easy for development. It is okay for the City to say, this is the limit set.

Vice Chair Johnson read a statement from Logan resident Hilary Shughart.

*If the Logan City Council is going to bypass the proposed Planning Commission review of substantial changes to the proposed amendments to Ordinance 25-11, I respectfully request that you please consider the NRCS recommended minimum riparian buffer of 35 feet. Additionally, please include the entire North Branch of the Logan River, which was included in the proposed amendments recommended for approval by the Planning Commission, as it is a natural river regulated by the Utah State Engineer's Office Division of Waters Rights, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, and can support a riparian habitat. Thank you.*

There were no further comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.  
[\(3:01:46\)](#)

Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that the flood plains are governed by FEMA & the Corp of Engineers. She gave an example of a 10 ft. setback and FEMA said no 15 ft. are needed for flood plains. This is a different discussion than the riparian area.

Mr. DeSimone confirmed that these two governmental entities who oversee flood plains. The flood plains and our riparian area are different but may overlap.

Chair Simmonds stated that the proposal was changed to compromise and was only a reasonable manner to permit potential future applicants and lots (shown on the slides) to permit them an opportunity without being too restrictive nor lenient. She is 100% percent in favor of having a 100-foot setback for any new properties annexed especially those to the west. She is torn about changes to the setback of existing properties.

Councilmember M. Anderson recommended this item be continued as he does not believe the public is aware of the changes made to the ordinance.

Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that historically the setback was 25 ft. up until 2023, which then went up to 100 ft. He asked how long the setback was in place at 25 ft.

Mr. DeSimone replied that the setback was at 25 ft. for at least 15 years.

Vice Chair Johnson remarked that an average recommendation for a wildlife riparian online is that of 33 ft.

Mr. DeSimone clarified that the rules that are being applied should be applied but not to a space that is already developed.

Councilmember A. Anderson is comfortable with the presented infield riparian.

Vice Chair Johnson presented hypothetical scenarios about what would occur if the properties in question were ever redeveloped.

Mr. DeSimone stated that although the area can be redeveloped, it will not be densified beyond what already exists. Trees would have to be removed, roads, and homes. What will occur is that a home may be redeveloped but it will not exceed the footprint of what already exists.

Chair Simmonds reminded the public that they can still make comments regarding this amendment and can send them to the City Council.

**ACTION. Motion by Councilmember M. Anderson seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to continue Ordinance 25-11 to the October 21, 2025 Council meeting without a public hearing. Motion carried by roll call vote (3-1).**

**A. Anderson: Aye**

**M. Anderson: Aye**

**Johnson: Nay**

**López: Excused**

**Simmonds: Aye**

**PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$8,722 funds the Parks & Recreation Department received from the State of Utah for the Recreation Center Complex; \$52,000 a grant the Fire Department received from the State of Utah; \$25,000 insurance proceeds toward Police rolling stock – Resolution 25-41 – Richard Anderson (3:18:38)**

At the September 16, 2025 Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments.

Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Gail Yost, a resident of Logan, said that she trusts the finance director.

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

**ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to approve Resolution 25-41 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).**

**A. Anderson: Aye**

**M. Anderson: Aye**

**Johnson: Aye**

**López: Excused**

**Simmonds: Aye**

### **WORKSHOP ITEMS:**

**Consideration of a proposed resolution authorizing the Fremont Solar Purchase Power Agreement Project Transaction Schedule under the Master Firm Power Supply Agreement with Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems; and related matters – Resolution 25-42 – Mark Montgomery, Light & Power Director (3:26:20)**

Light & Power Director Mark Montgomery addressed the Council regarding the proposed resolution.

Chair Simmonds asked how the 64MW compared to other solar power the City utilizes.

Mark Montgomery, Light & Power Director explained that currently the City does not have a battery for storage. There is a cap, and tariffs as the battery is coming from China.

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired about the location of the project.

Mr. Montgomery responded that the solar project is located in Iron County. Notably, the transmission study has found that the project needs to be doubled in size. The loan company is willing to take the risk, and the project will continue as planned. There are caps in place if the project reaches the set funding limit.

Chair Simmonds asked if the project was in queue.

Mr. Montgomery answered that the project had already gone through the queue.

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired how many other members of UAMPS and others are participating in the project.

Mr. Montgomery replied that the facility will produce 100MW and it is all being taken by UAMPS members.

Chair Simmonds asked if there were any updates available on geothermal power.

Mr. Montgomery responded that the small project of 2MW of geothermal is still moving forward.

The proposed resolution will be an action item at the October 21, 2025 Council meeting.

**CODE AMENDMENTS – Consideration of proposed amendments to the Land Development Code.** Mike DeSimone/Logan City is requesting a code amendment to the Land Development Code Chapters 17.08 Neighborhood Residential Zone Uses, 17.10 Specific Development Standards: District and Corridors, 17.37 Additional Development Standards, 17.40 Subdivisions, 17.51 Expirations and Extensions of Time, and 17.62 Definitions to (1) Modify permitting process for short term rentals from conditional use permit to permitted use, (2) Update beekeeping standards to make consistent with State Code, (3) Adjust minor subdivisions from 3 to 10 lots, and (4) Adjust permit & subdivision expiration deadlines from 12 to 24 months - Ordinance 25-17 – Mike DeSimone (3:31:50)

Community Development Director Mike DeSimone addressed the Council regarding the proposed ordinance.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Municipal Council of the proposed amendments to Chapters 17.08, 17.10, 17.37, 17.40, 17.51 and 17.62 of the Land Development Code.

### **REQUEST**

This is a proposal to amend several different sections within the Land Development Code that are relatively minor and could be lumped together under one application and one eventual adoption Ordinance.

### **SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

The proposed amendments will not necessarily be discussed in numerical LDC order but will be reviewed by subject matter with specific code references.

#### **Short Term Rentals - Remove CUP Requirement**

The proposed changes in LDC 17.08.040 and 17.37.130 removes the Conditional use Permit requirement for establishing an STR and shifts the review entirely to the

administrative process (business licensing) for permitting & licensing. Since the last code updates for STR's, our practice with permitting short term rentals has demonstrated that most STR's are being approved under the consent agenda and are relatively easy to permit administratively. The most consistently heard issue is that people are generally unaware of the original rules establishing STR's throughout Logan, and while the Planning Commission's public hearing gives people a forum to voice their opinions, the CUP process is not the process to legislate a change in rules. This procedural change does not alter any of the other STR requirements, i.e., notification of surrounding residents, parking, safety upgrades, etc., and would save time and money for both a STR proponent and the City.

### **Beekeeping - Update to Match State Law Updates**

The proposed changes in LDC 17.37.110 updates the City's beekeeping standards to make them consistent with recent changes made to the Utah Bee Inspection Act in Title 4 of Utah Code (March 17, 2025). Generally, the rule change the minimum land area per two hives (6,000 sf to 5,445 sf) and includes a 10' setback from property lines.

### **Subdivisions - Increase Minor Subdivisions**

The proposed changes in LDC 17.40 & 17.62 would increase the minimum threshold of Minor Subdivisions from three lots to ten lots and moves the review of subdivisions containing up to ten lots into the administrative process. Since 2013, the Commission has reviewed an average of ten subdivisions per year while staff reviews an average of six minor subdivisions per year.

This change will probably have a minimal impact on the actual distribution of subdivision review (staff vs Commission), it just provides additional flexibility and some cost savings for smaller projects.

### **Permit Expiration and Extensions**

The proposed changes in LDC 17.51 would increase the length of time a permit (Design Review, Conditional Use, or Subdivision) is valid from 12 months to 24 months, reduce the number of permit extensions to one, and require a project or subdivision reapply after 36 months.

The language in LDC 17.51.010.A should also include increasing the recording requirements for the first phase of a subdivision from 12 to 24 months, while still retaining the 12 month increment for subsequent phases.

### **Town Center 1 (TC-1) Development Standards**

- Frontage, Bid. Stories, Drive-thru Lane The proposed changes in LDC 17.10.060 adds some differences to the frontage requirements based on location in the TC-1 zone, eliminates the requirement for a second floor within a building without eliminating the minimum building height and includes an allowance for limited drive-thru lanes in the TC-1 zone. These proposed changes would provide

additional flexibility for new development in the TC-1 zone without compromising the characteristics unique to the historic downtown. These proposed changes are the result of the recent bank project proposal at the corner of Main Street and Fourth North.

The TC-1 zone runs from 200 South to 500 North, and within those seven blocks, the architectural & historical character along Main Street and elsewhere varies. The inner blocks around the historic core are generally lined with a mixture of historic one, two & three story buildings built out to the sidewalk while in the outlying blocks, the development pattern is a mixture of less historic development in a variety of shapes & sizes. The latest new projects along Main, including the City Library and the hotel, are both built out to the sidewalk on Main Street. The hotel wraps the corner with building mass along both Main Street and Second North while the library is oriented towards Main Street.

A primary design goal of the TC-1 zone is to have the bulk of a new building located along the street frontage, whether it is Main Street or one of the cross streets, which is consistent with the historic development pattern common in downtown.

The first proposed change to TC-1 modifies the amount of building mass required at the front setback based on location in or near historic downtown. The closer to the historic core, the greater the percentage of building mass is required to be located on the street frontage while further away, the amount of minimum building mass located at the street frontage is reduced.

The proposed building frontage requirements are based on location in the TC-1 zone:

Min. % of Building Frontage at Front Setback: Main Street (200 North - 200 South) - 90%  
Center Street - 80%  
Main Street - 70%  
100 North & 100 South - 70%  
Fourth North - 60%  
Other Streets - 50%

The second proposed change is to permit a reduction in the second street frontage for projects on a corner lot. This proposed modification provides some design flexibility on a corner property to account for limitations on street access, internal circulation and parking.

The streets are listed in priority order, so the project would be required to meet the frontage requirement for the higher priority street with the ability to reduce the secondary street by 50%.

The third proposed change is to require ground floor commercial on all buildings on Center Street. The current language only requires ground floor commercial on Main Street and Fourth North.

The fourth proposed change is to eliminate the requirement for an internal second floor while requiring that a proposed building be designed to look like a two story building on the exterior.

This offers a designer the flexibility to design and build a building based on their functional needs and the limitations of the site, whether it is size, access, or parking, but still gets to a taller building mass located adjacent to the street.

The fifth proposed change is to permit a small, detached drive-thru that is subordinate to the primary structure and on the site. The goal is not to permit a wrap-around drive-thru in the TC-1 zone, but permit a small, freestanding type of drive-thru similar to what is currently used at Zion's Bank located approximately one block north.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY**

The purpose of these changes is to simplify a number of different areas of the Land Development Code. Most of these are relatively minor and are more procedural in nature. Moving STR's out of the CUP process makes their review simpler, quicker and cheaper. Increasing the review threshold of a minor Subdivision from three to ten lots shortens the review timeline for approximately 10% of the total subdivisions the City reviews annually. The changes to the permit expiration dates and numbers of extensions should reduce the number of permit extensions the City grants annually. The proposed TC-1 changes are a little more in depth and need some broader discussion; however, the proposed changes don't diminish the overall intent and applicability of the TC-1 zone, it just tries to recognize the balance between protecting the character of historic downtown with the need to accommodate new development near downtown. The last project proposal at Main & Fourth is what triggered these changes and discussion.

Procedurally, all of the proposed LDC amendments included in PC 25-046 are bundled together under a single application and would need to be acted upon as a single item.

### **GENERAL PLAN**

The Land Development Code was prepared and adopted to implement the vision expressed in the General Plan. The purpose of most of these code changes are generally procedural in nature and clarify provisions in the Land Development Code involving the review processes for STR's and certain sizes of subdivisions, the design standards in the TC-1 Zoning District, permit expiration and extensions, and beekeeping standards. The proposed updates are consistent with the General Plan.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

As of the time the staff report was prepared, no comments were received.

## **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 8/30/25 and posted on the City's website and the Utah Public Meeting website on 9/01/25.

## **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**

The Planning Commission bases its decisions on the following findings:

1. Utah State Law authorizes local Planning Commissions to recommend ordinance changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).
2. The Code Amendments are made in conformance with the requirements of Title 17.51 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The proposed Code Amendments are consistent with the Logan City General Plan.
4. The proposed Code Amendments are consistent with UCA Title 10, Chapter 9a, Part 5 & Part 6.
5. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendments.

On September 11, 2025, the Planning Commission recommended **approval** to the Municipal Council of the following Land Development Code (LDC) Amendments:

Amend LDC Chapters 17.08 "Neighborhood Residential Zone Uses" and 17.37 "Additional Development Standards" to eliminate the Conditional Use Permit process for Short Term Rentals;

Amend LDC Chapters 17.37 "Additional Development Standards" to update the City's beekeeping requirements to make consistent with changes to the Utah Bee Inspection Act;

Amend LDC Chapters 17.40 "Subdivisions" and 17.62 "Definitions" to adjust minor subdivisions from three (3) to six (6) lots.

Amend LDC Chapters 17.51 "Expirations and Extensions of Time" to adjust permit & subdivision expiration deadlines from 12 to 24 months and reduce the number of permit/approval extensions to one.

**Deny** amendments to LDC 17.10 "Specific Development Standards: District and Corridors" modifying the Town Center (TC-1) Development Standards.

Regarding the proposed amendments to the TC-1 Development Standards, the Planning Commission recommended deferring this specific review until the new General Plan was adopted and any changes to the TC development standards should be evaluated during the subsequent zoning update process. As a result, we have withdrawn the proposed changes to LDC 17.10 from this package of amendments. **Planning Commissioners votes (5-0).**

Chair Simmonds requested clarification on the recording time for the plat being 12 to 24 months.

Mr. DeSimone responded if there were exceptions, yes. This is mainstreaming of the policy.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked what the reason for the increase in minor subdivisions from 3 to 6 lots would be.

Mr. DeSimone answered that occasionally commercial projects need to be subdivided.

Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that the reference is for commercial not residential.

Mr. DeSimone replied that the City does not do many subdivisions per year. The application will be to both residential and commercial. It is primary to hasten the process. The existing requirements have not been changed.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked what the Planning Commission's recommendation was on this item.

Mr. DeSimone responded that the Planning Commission recommended the item move forward.

Vice Chair Johnson requested clarification on the length of the permit extension.

Mr. DeSimone answered the permit extension is only for 12 months, before a new application is required.

The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the October 21, 2025 Council meeting.

**ZONE CHANGE – Consideration of a proposed zone change. The recently completed Historic Preservation Reconnaissance Level Survey recommends expanding the Historic District Overlay Zone Boundary – Ordinance 25-18 – Russ Holley ([3:40:30](#))**

Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council regarding the proposed ordinance.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Historic Preservation Committee forwards a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission and Municipal Council for an overlay zone amendment expanding the Historic District.

## **PROJECT**

The Community Development Department received a matching grant from the Utah State Preservation Office (SHPO) to complete a new Reconnaissance Level Survey (RLS) for the Logan City Center Street Historic District (CSHD). After awarding the project to 10 Landarch (Consultant) and determining the project budget and scope, it was recommended to also survey select adjacent properties outside of the current CSHD boundary to determine eligibility for historic preservation.

The new 2025 RLS itself is simply a new tool used by city staff as a reference in historic preservation projects and does not require public hearings or formal adoption. An RLS is also a required step if a property wishes to be listed on the National Registry. After completing the RLS for the existing district and adjacent properties, it was recommended by the consultant that the Center Street Historic District boundary be expanded. This boundary change would require a zoning map amendment by the Land Use Authority. There are three expansion options proposed. The Historic Preservation Committee recommended the full expansion.

## **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

**No agency or department comments have been received.**

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. As of the time of this report, over a dozen comments, phone calls, written, and HPC public statements, have been received. The majority of the comments are in opposition to the expansion. They are attached for review and consideration.

## **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 8/30/25 and the Utah Public Meeting website on 9/1/25. Public notices were mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the project site on 8/25/25.

## **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF APPROVAL**

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

1. The report recommended the expansion of the overlay zone based on the quality of historic structures.
2. The Historic Preservation Committee recommended the full expansion of the district overlay zone.
3. The Logan City General Plan and Land Development Code recognize and support historic preservation in the City.
4. The Center Street Historic District Design Standards ensure quality and compatible development and building additions that enhance the character of the district.

On September 11, 2025, the Planning Commission recommended **denial** for the full expansion and approval of only the cleanup map proposal to the Municipal Council for the Overlay Zone Amendment. Planning Commissioners vote (3-2).

Councilmember A. Anderson requested clarification on the notices that were sent out.

Russ Holley, Planner replied that the survey was sent to the property owners. Many of the property owners did not want to expand the HPC area. Their primary concern was affordability.

Vice Chair Johnson referred to the slide with the data survey and requested confirmation that section A had been removed.

Mr. Holley confirmed that section A was removed.

Chair Simmonds asked if the data not only included the old district but the new district as well.

Mr. Holley confirmed that the data includes both the old and new district.

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired if the tax credit is only available if the property is designated historic.

Mr. Holley confirmed that it is one of the requirements and must be graded B or higher and be registered as part of the national registry.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested clarification on the green box on the boundary slide.

Mr. Holley clarified that the location was Chuck-o-Rama.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked what recommendations were made by the Planning Commission as their motion failed.

Mr. Holley said the Planning Commission was inclined to add the boulevard area, but not the rest of the area.

Chair Simmonds remarked that the Planning Commission discussed that 85% of the property owners qualify to be under the historic district.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked what the cost for an individual property owner would be to apply for their own historic registration at the national historic level.

Mr. Holley said the cost is \$3,000.

Councilmember A. Anderson suggested a grant or application for aid to help home owners interested in registering and applying for the tax credits.

The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the October 21, 2025 Council meeting.

**CODE AMENDMENT- Cache Valley Marketplace Planned Development Overlay.**  
**Brady Morris/Woodsonia Cache Valley LLC, authorized agent/owner, is requesting a proposed amendment to change Commercial property layout and final design of multi-family structures, located at 115 and 155 East Cache Valley Boulevard and 1295 North 200 East in the Commercial Zone (Adams Neighborhood) - Ordinance 25-19 – Russ Holley (3:58:29)**

Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council regarding the proposed ordinance.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conditionally approve a Design Review & Code Amendment for Project #25-050 Cache Valley Marketplace PDO Amendment and recommend approval of the Code Amendment to the Municipal Council, in the Commercial (COM) zone located at approximately 1300 North Main Street, TIN# 05-014-0078

#### **Original 2023 Project Proposal**

This project was approved in 2023 as The Cache Valley Marketplace Planned Development Overlay and consisted of a new 150,000 SF Target big-box store, 156 room hotel/retail building, and 346 multi-family residential units in four separate buildings. Associated parking, open space, and landscaping were approved throughout the site. This site, which was the prior home of Cache Valley Mall and nearly 40-acres in size, was subdivided with several pad-site buildings along the outer perimeter.

#### **New Proposal**

This proposal eliminates the 156-room hotel and replaces it with 62,000 SF of retail space. The new "mid-box" retail space, a single-story building with two storefronts, aligns with the storefront of the Target building to the north. The parking areas west of the retail remains essentially the same. The two multi-family residential buildings directly east of the new retail building change in footprint and overall dwelling unit counts. The smaller building near the southeast corner is now 41 dwelling units, four (4) stories tall, and clad in brick, stucco, and fiber cement board siding. The larger building is now 74 dwelling units, four stories tall, with a similar material palette. Both multi-family buildings have rear-entry ground-floor garage parking proposed. Overall site access and cross access between the different buildings remains the same as the 2023 approvals.

## **Design Review Permit**

The LDC 17.43 requires a Design Review Permit for new commercial and multi-family residential developments. The Design Review Permit assures compliance with adopted code standards and design specifications applicable to the project proposal. The Planning Commission is the Land Use Authority on Design Review Permits. For this project, a Design Review Permit will be required for the new retail and multi-family buildings.

## **Density & Land Use**

The LDC allows a density of 30 units per gross acre in the COM zone. At a total of 25.5 acres, and a proposed 312 overall residential units, the overall density is 12.2 units per acre. The multi- family buildings are shown as stand-alone (freestanding) residential buildings positioned near 200 East and 1250 North. The COM zone requires all buildings to contain commercial land use, but the original approved PD Overlay waived this requirement. The proposed "big box" and "mid-box" retail land uses and structure types are both permitted in the COM zone. As proposed, the project complies with density and land use regulations and the original PDO approved.

## **Setbacks**

The Land Development Code (LDC) requirements for setbacks in the COM zone are as follows (as measured from property lines):

Front (0-40' tall bldg.):	10'
Front (41-55' tall bldg.)	40'
Side:	8'
Rear:	10'
Parking (front):	10'
Parking (side/rear):	5'

This proposed project complies with setbacks. The previously approved north multi-family building, taller than 40 feet, received a unique setback approval through the PD Overlay process in 2023.

## **Building Heights**

The LDC 17.10.080 limits building heights to a maximum of 55' in the COM zone with enhanced setbacks. Ground floor commercial space is required to be at least 12 feet tall. The tallest building in the proposal is the four-story multi-family apartment building shown at 50 feet.

## **Building Frontage**

The LDC requires a minimum 50% building frontage in the COM zone to help frame streets with architecture. This requirement also results in surface parking lots being less visually prominent and more subordinate (rear) to primary buildings. The proposed project has multiple street frontages. On average the project shows a building frontage of 52% and is in compliance with this code requirement. As proposed, the project complies with the LDC.

## **Lot Coverage**

The LDC 17.10.100 establishes a maximum lot coverage of 60% (building(s) footprint) in the COM zone. Collectively, the proposed building footprint(s) are at approximately 27% lot coverage and below the maximum code regulations. As submitted, the project complies with the lot coverage maximums in the LDC.

## **Parking Requirements**

The LDC requires 1.5 to 2.0 stalls per multi-family dwelling units (1.5 stalls/studio and one- bedroom units and 2.0 stalls/2 bedroom or larger units), 1.0 stalls for every 250 SF of mid-box stores. Based on the new proposal, 1172 parking stalls are required as per the LDC. The project provides a total of 1265 parking stalls, including 88 garages stalls for multi-family residents. The amended two multi-family buildings and the new mid-box retail store would require 422 parking stalls. Those three areas are shown with a total of 423 stalls and in compliance. The LDC 17.31.40 requires bike racks/parking areas for commercial and residential developments. As conditioned with minimum parking counts, the project complies with the LDC parking requirements.

## **Site Layout & Pedestrian Circulation**

The LDC 17.30 requires projects to provide pedestrian and street connectivity. The proposed site layout shows pedestrian circulation through the site and around the perimeter. As conditioned with sidewalk connections and walkability throughout the site, including to adjacent bus stop locations, the project meets the requirements in the LDC.

## **Building Design**

The LDC requires commercial and multi-family projects to have four-sided architecture and a mix of materials. Acceptable building materials are masonry, stucco, fiber-cement board, wood, and metal. Material mixes shall wrap all four sides of buildings and blank walls exceeding 40 linear feet are prohibited. All buildings are shown with a mix of brick, stucco (EFIS), fiber-cement siding and trim. All multi-family building elevations comply with the LDC design standards as submitted. The side elevations of the mid-box retail building have areas of blank walls. The south wall is directly adjacent to a public street. As conditioned with additional design elements on the side facade of the mid-box building, the project complies with building design requirements in the LDC.

## **Useable Outdoor Space and Landscaping**

The LDC 17.10.080 requires 10% landscaping and an additional 10% useable outdoor space in the COM zone, while LDC 17.32.050 requires 10% useable outdoor space and 20% landscaping for residential developments. The LDC 17.32 generally describes useable outdoor space as outdoor areas that are designed and used in conjunction with a primary use for the benefit and enjoyment of the residents and their guests of the development. Useable outdoor space may include public gathering areas, patios, decks, walkways, plaza's, active recreational areas, and natural open space areas but do not include parking lots, driveways, and other similar vehicular oriented areas. Landscaping

is defined as planted and natural areas containing trees, shrubs, grasses, mulches, and other similar materials.

The LDC requires a minimum of 20 trees and a combination of 50 shrubs, flowers and ornamental grass per acre of land for multi-family residential projects. The LDC also requires minimum perimeter and interior parking lot landscaping to reduce the visual and environmental impacts of asphalt parking lots. At 25.5 acres, 510 trees and 1,275 shrubs/flowers/grasses are required.

The 25.5-acre property (1,110,780 SF) is broken up into four areas, two commercial and two multi-family. The commercial areas total 722,225 SF and would require 144,444 SF (20%) of both outdoor space and landscaping. The multifamily areas total 388,555 SF and would require 116,566 SF (30%) of both outdoor space and landscaping. Based on the two standards and two development type areas, the project would require a total of 261,010 SF of landscaping and outdoor space. As conditioned with compliant landscaping and outdoor space, the project meets the requirements of the LDC.

### **Lighting**

The LDC 17.37.090 requires adequate lighting that adds aesthetic quality and improves safety while mitigating unnecessary glare, sky glow and light trespass. The LDC limits freestanding pole height to 32 feet and luminaire fixtures on buildings and canopies to be concealed source, down-cast and shielded from neighboring properties. Light measurements are required to range between 0.5 - 4.0-foot candles, so areas are sufficiently safe, but not excessively bright. As submitted, no exterior lighting has been shown. As conditioned, the project meets the requirements of the LDC.

### **Code Amendment**

If approved as proposed, the LDC 17.27A PD-1 Cache Valley Marketplace code section will be amended to remove the hotel, dwelling units, and parking counts and replace them with new building types and densities. All other sections pertaining to the Cache Valley Marketplace Planned Development Overlay will remain as approved in 2023. Proposed code amendments are attached at the end of the staff report.

### **AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

Comments were solicited from the following departments or agencies: Environmental, Water, Light & Power and Engineering.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. As of the time of this report, staff have received one written comment.

## **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION**

Legal notices were published in the Herald Journal on 9/13/25, posted on the City's website and the Utah Public Meeting website on 9/15/25 and mailed out to adjacent property owners within 300' on 9/8/25.

## **RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

This project is subject to the proponent or property owner agreeing to comply with the following conditions as written, or as may be amended by the Planning Commission.

1. All standard conditions of approval will be recorded with the Design Review and are available in the Community Development Department.
2. This permit and code amendment authorizes a new 62,000 SF "mid-box" retail building and reconfigured multi-family buildings totaling 312 dwelling units in four-story buildings.
3. The southern facade on the "mid-box" retail building shall have additional architectural features or a combination of features and a trellis planted with climbing vines to break up the blank wall areas of that facade.
4. The overall project, including Target and all other multi-family buildings, shall provide a minimum of 1,172 parking stalls.
5. The amended areas of the site that include new "mid-box" retail and two southern multi-family buildings totaling 115 dwelling units (mix of studio and multi-bedroom units), shall provide a minimum of 422 parking spaces and bike racks near each building.
6. The project shall provide a bus stop amenity along Main Street (Green and Blue Line) and a continuous pedestrian way with sidewalks and painted raised crossings to both the big box and retail buildings and the 200 East bus stops.
7. A raised painted crossing shall be installed between the west side of the big box and the west side of the retail building. Additional sidewalks shall be installed so that all multi-family units can walk on either a sidewalk or painted crossing to the big-box and hotel/retail building.
8. A performance landscaping plan, prepared in accordance with §17.39 of the LDC, shall be submitted for approval to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of the building permit. The plan shall include the following:
  - a) Landscaping and Useable Outdoor areas shall total a minimum of 261,010 SF .
  - b) Landscaping and Outdoor Space shall be provided in a relative proportionate manner per lot or per phase.
  - c) 510 trees and 1,275 shrubs/perennials/grasses shall be provided for this project.
  - d) 18 SF of interior parking lot landscaping shall be provided per parking stall contained within the surface parking area as per LDC.
  - e) A landscape buffers shall be used in parking lot perimeter areas.
9. All dumpsters shall be visually screened or buffered from public streets by using fencing, walls and landscaping.
10. Rooftop mechanical and/or building wall mechanical equipment shall be placed out of view from the street or screen from view from the street.
11. Exterior lighting shall be concealed source, down-cast and shall not illuminate or cast light onto adjacent properties.

12. Surface storm-water retention and detention facilities shall be located away from public streets and buffered from view with landscaping.
13. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, the Director of Community Development shall receive a written memorandum from each of the following departments or agencies indicating that their requirements have been satisfied:
  - a. Environmental-contact 716-9761
    - Minimum 60 ft. straight on clear access required. Approach must be level, no down or uphill slopes and no parking spaces or curb blocking access.
    - Minimum inside measurement for a double enclosure is 24 ft. wide by 10 ft. deep. Minimum inside measurement for a single enclosure is 12 ft. wide by 10 ft. deep.
    - Place bollards in the back of the enclosure to protect walls.
    - Gates are not required, however if desired, they must be designed to stay open during the collection process.
    - Barrel hinges are suggested for the gates. We need the full 12 ft. clearance so gates must be designed to open completely.
  - b. Engineering- contact 716-9160
    - Per LDC §17.41.050 Existing public utility easements dedicated with the most recent plat or previous dedications, will need to go through the City's vacation process for Council Approval prior to relocation or removal. Application and information on going through this process can be found on the City's Engineering Webpage.
    - Work with GIS to confirm addressing for lots 3A and 38.
    - A PUE shall be dedicated between Lots 3A and 38.
    - The dedication language will need to dedicate the new PUE's to the City.
    - Include a basis of bearing on the plat.
    - The Plat Notes are not the same notes that were on the 2024 Plat. Please replace the applicable notes from the original 2024 plat. Also, many of the notes refer to Cache County. Please adjust as follows:
      - O Note 1 conflicts with what is shown on the plat. To remove confusion, it was recommended sticking to the PUEs being shown on the plat.
      - O City is good to keep Notes 2 and 3 as is.
      - O Notes 4 & 5, Remove as this is not in Cache County.
  - c. Water-contact 716-9627
    - Project shall comply with all currently adopted plumbing codes and their amendments and Utah Admin. code R 309-105-12-(1) rules and regulations including, but not limited to, those pertaining to backflow prevention and cross connection protection, during and after construction, for the safety of the water source and its consumption.
    - Obtain an updated fire flow analysis by sending the proposed utility (water) locations to joseph.hawkes@loganutah.gov or derek.holmstead@loganutah.gov.
  - d. Fire and Light and Power - contact 716-9515, 716-9722
    - Fire apparatus access, Fire hydrants required, Required fire flow compared to available fire flow, Fire sprinklers, Fire Alarms, etc will be evaluated and reviewed with the building permit.

- A 1-Line Diagram required with building permit.
- Complete a Logan City Load Data Sheet found on Logan Light & Power Website and email to [angie.pacheco@loganutah.gov](mailto:angie.pacheco@loganutah.gov)
- A Digital Site Plan in AutoCAD (DWG) Format is required with the building permit.
- PUE's Public Utility: 10' Easement on all property lines that face a roadway and 5' Easement on all other property lines are required.

## **RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT**

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

1. The conditioned project will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties because of the building design, site layout, height transitions, landscaping, and setbacks.
2. The Design Review Permit conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The conditioned project provides required off-street parking.
4. The project meets the goals and objectives of the COM designation within the Logan General Plan by providing services near high-capacity roadways and is designed in a way for easy circulation of both pedestrian and vehicles.
5. The conditioned project complies with density and building design, open space standards and is in conformance with Title 17.
6. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.
7. Main Street, 1250 North, 1400 East, 200 East are adequate in size and design to sufficiently handle infrastructure related to the proposed land uses.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked if parking stays the same.

Mr. Holley confirmed that parking does not change.

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired how many housing units will be lost with the proposed change.

Mr. Holley responded that 38 units will be lost, but the size of the units will increase. The apartment complex will still look the same.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked which side of the building would need to have architectural features.

Mr. Holley answered that the south side of the building would need to have architectural features.

Chair Simmonds inquired if any green space would be added.

Mr. Holley replied that their green space will be overall acreage, and the acreage did not change.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked how parking would be accommodated as some parking was lost.

Mr. Holley responded that there will be garage parking available as well.

Chair Simmonds stated that the Planning Commission recommended three tenants instead of two.

Councilmember A. Anderson suggested that the middle section be designed as a storefront even if it is not.

The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the October 21, 2025 Council meeting.

**Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$18,000 a grant the Police Department was awarded from the Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force of Utah; \$103,000 funds the State Task Force was awarded by the State of Utah to reduce, prevent, and investigate drug usage; \$3,200 insurance reimbursement proceeds toward repair costs; \$41,200 funds Parks & Recreation received from the State of Utah to be used for a feasibility study of the Logan River Trail improvements through the Logan River Golf Course; \$10,000 funds for Library electronic book subscriptions - Resolution 25-43 – Richard Anderson (4:04:09)**

Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments.

Councilmember A. Anderson asked what abbreviation ICAC stood for.

Chair Simmonds replied that the abbreviation stands for Internet Crimes Against Children.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the October 21, 2025 Council meeting.

No further workshop items were presented.

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

No further considerations were discussed.

**ADJOURNED:**

There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Teresa Harris, City Recorder