

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, November 18, 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

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

Councilmember Mark A. Anderson announced his resignation from the Council on November 17, 2025 so he can prepare to take office as Mayor in January 2026.

Chair Simmonds welcomed those present. There were approximately 34 in attendance at the beginning of the meeting.

OPENING CEREMONY:

City Attorney Craig Carlston led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

Meeting Minutes. Minutes of the Council meeting held on November 4, 2025 were reviewed and approved.

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember López to approve tonight's agenda and minutes from the November 4, 2025 Council meeting as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).

A. Anderson: Aye

Johnson: Aye

López: Aye

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, December 2, 2025.

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 emphasized the importance of civility and respect during council meeting. She invited the community to believe in government, much like Tinkerbell from Peter Pan. There must be responsibility from local government, school districts, water boards, and so forth up to State & Federal government. She said that we need to be united and not be divided to triumph over contention.

Joshua Molitor, a resident of Logan expressed appreciation for the energy shut-off notices sent via text.

Susan Janecke, a resident of North Logan is a retired geoscientist professor. She distributed information to the Mayor and City Council and indicated as to the reason why there are landslides in certain areas of the City of Logan, and where they are on the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP). In her opinion the primary location is the Logan Bluff, because of the angle of repose. There was a catastrophic landslide in 1916 in the area of 500 East after a rainstorm. Because of the angle of repose, any extra moisture can cause landslides in this area. Landslides are also likely to occur in an area if there is clay.

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

MAYOR/STAFF REPORTS:

Canyon Road Update – Mayor Daines ([10:30](#))

Mayor Daines read an update regarding Canyon Road.

The City has spent considerable time studying how to rebuild and improve Canyon Road following the installation of a new 10-million-gallon water tank and a 42-inch transmission line. This major water infrastructure project—driven by state requirements and our 2025 Drinking Water Master Plan—will support long-term community water needs throughout the city. Construction of the tank and parts of the water line is already underway, and tree removal on Canyon Road has begun so trenching can start in spring 2026.

As we considered how to rebuild the roadway afterward, we gathered extensive public feedback—through individual comments, a citywide survey, neighborhood plans, and our new General Plan, which emphasizes connected trails as a top community priority. Other guiding documents included the Wilson Neighborhood Plan, the Transportation Master

78 *Plan, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. We also worked closely with staff and*
79 *design experts.*

80
81 *While some residents oppose changes on Canyon Road, many others are supportive. As*
82 *an example, I received the following email from a resident after our public meeting this*
83 *fall:*

84
85 *“I have been in favor of the project from the beginning, and now even more so. I also*
86 *want to thank you for taking the hard steps to greatly improve the island area. I have*
87 *lived on XXXX Street for 42 years. One of my greatest concerns has been the lack of a*
88 *sidewalk and the speed on Canyon Road. My kids were never allowed off our little street*
89 *because of it. I have either run or walked on Canyon Road or the trail behind my house*
90 *nearly every day during that time.”*

91
92 *Parents in the area have repeatedly told us their children have not been able to safely*
93 *walk or bike along the corridor for decades. This project creates a rare opportunity—the*
94 *city already owns the needed right-of-way—allowing us to build pedestrian and cycling*
95 *infrastructure that will serve the next 50–100 years.*

96
97 *Some survey respondents questioned why “no sidewalk or trail” wasn’t an option. That*
98 *was intentional: City code requires a pedestrian facility, and the survey focused on*
99 *design elements that could be adapted. Regardless of the final layout, the ash trees and*
100 *others along the corridor must be removed for the water line installation.*

101
102 *Based on community input, we have made several compromises. Even though Canyon*
103 *Road is designated in the Transportation Master Plan as an 80-foot-wide right-of-way,*
104 *three-lane collector road, we are reducing it to a 66-foot right-of-way, two-lane*
105 *configuration to address neighborhood concerns about traffic speed and volume. This*
106 *design—curb and gutter, defined striping, and pedestrian facilities—will help calm*
107 *traffic. The pavement will remain at approximately the same width.*

108
109 *Survey results showed the top priorities are: trees, trail connectivity through a shared-*
110 *use path, traffic calming, and pedestrian safety. Because trees ranked highest, the City is*
111 *committing to planting larger-caliper trees that will grow quickly. Without a park strip*
112 *and pedestrian facility on the north side, new trees could not be planted there. We also*
113 *plan to reduce planned parking at the park based on survey feedback. After construction,*
114 *any unused right-of-way is planned to be deeded back to adjacent property owners.*

115
116 *After weighing all viewpoints, planning documents, technical requirements, and staff*
117 *recommendations—and coordinating with the Wilson Neighborhood Council—I am*
118 *proposing that the City build an 8-foot-wide shared-use path along the north side of*
119 *Canyon Road from Herm’s Inn to the Dugway. This will include curb and gutter and a*
120 *park strip with large trees. Shared-use paths are part of the City’s trail system and will*

121 *be maintained year-round by the Parks Department, including snow removal. In a few*
122 *tight areas, the width may narrow, but the path will remain ADA accessible.*

123
124 *Canyon Road is uniquely positioned to connect existing and future trail networks,*
125 *offering a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists, direct access to Logan Canyon, and—*
126 *when the next phase is funded—a connection to Merlin Olsen Park with minimal street*
127 *crossings. No other route can provide this type of safe, continuous link.*

128
129 *While individual preferences matter, our responsibility is to consider the long-term good*
130 *reflected in multiple community-driven plans. Trail development is a major citywide*
131 *priority, and projects like the new pedestrian underpass at 600 South Main show our*
132 *commitment to active transportation and outdoor access for people of all ages and*
133 *abilities.*

134
135 *As we move forward, we will work closely with residents to maintain the character of*
136 *Canyon Road through thoughtful landscaping, tree placement, and careful design of*
137 *retaining walls to minimize visual impact.*

138
139 *The recent survey highlighted both real neighborhood concerns and a broader desire for*
140 *connected, safe, walkable communities. Balancing these goals requires difficult choices,*
141 *but we must keep our long-term vision in mind.*

142
143 *In conclusion, I am recommending the 8-foot shared-use path design and asking for a*
144 *head nod from City Council to proceed. I believe this approach benefits the entire*
145 *community for the long term.*

146
147 Councilmember A. Anderson expressed her appreciation for the update and made a
148 head nod in the affirmative.

149
150 Vice Chair Johnson recognized the countless hours and discussions regarding Canyon
151 Road and he believes the project will improve neighborhood connectivity. He also gave
152 a head nod in the affirmative.

153
154 Chair Simmonds recognized that the Council has tried to weigh all the different aspects
155 and comments regarding Canyon Road. She agreed that a 8-foot sidewalk will be a
156 benefit to the neighborhood as it will be maintained by the City. She gave a head nod in
157 the affirmative.

158
159 Councilmember López thanked everyone who has been engaged and involved in the
160 discussion/decision-making process. He recognized that there would be an impact on
161 individuals in the community; however, he feels that an 8-foot path would benefit the
162 community. He also gave a head nod in the affirmative.

163

FY 2025 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report – Richard Anderson, Finance Director ([21:36](#))

Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council and stated that the 2025 Annual Comprehensive Report is ready and available on the City website at www.loganutah.gov under the Finance Department.,

The report has been audited, and the report is clear. There are 4 compliances from budgetary to State & Federal compliance. In all material respects, the finances tell a good story. It shows the City has accomplished a lot from infrastructure projects to investments. There is a statement made in the report that the City has not exceeded the budget for the past several years.

Lastly, the City has sufficient reserves in almost every budget. Occasionally, reserves will drop to accomplish/complete a significant project. There are several such projects in the water, sewer treatment, and electric funds.

Chair Simmonds asked if the City reserves are dictated by a State percentage.

Mr. Anderson responded that many of the funds require a minimum and a maximum of accumulated funds. The City tends to have more than the minimum and is closer to the maximum of funds. That being said, the maximum funds would barely, if at all, cover a large infrastructure project.

Councilmember A. Anderson said that Mr. Anderson is being modest, the report speaks to the excellence of the state of finances, especially the ‘Certificate of Achievement for Excellence,’ which is reflective of the finance staff.

Mayor Daines echoed her appreciation for Mr. Anderson, who is most excellent at his job.

Mr. Anderson added that all City staff are appropriately trained from Department Heads to managers, and how the finance process is divided to ensure checks and balances

Vice Chair Johnson stated that he has served on the Audit Committee for two years and speaks to the character of Mr. Anderson and the finance staff. The auditors of the report have nothing but praise.

Mayor Daines commented that the audit services are changed every two years to ensure different auditors are reviewing the City’s finances.

No further Mayor/Staff Reports were presented.

202 **COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

203
204 **Planning Commission Update – Chair Simmonds ([28:04](#))**

205
206 Chair Simmonds reported that there was a request to rezone a property at 920 North 200
207 West from MR-12 to Commercial, but the request was denied. The request will come to
208 the Council for final determination. There were 9 townhomes at 675 North 500 West in
209 the Bridger Neighborhood that were approved. A new Dutch Brothers Coffee was
210 approved on the South end. An amendment was approved for storm water fees, which
211 will also be reviewed by Council in an upcoming meeting.

212
213 **Board and Committee Reports – Chair Simmonds**

214
215 Chair Simmonds stated that Councilmember Mark Anderson resigned from the City
216 Council as of November 17, 2025 to be Mayor starting January 2026. In accordance with
217 State code his resignation creates a vacancy and the necessity to fill the position for his
218 remaining two year term. It is an open application process and applicants are welcome to
219 apply. More information will be provided on the Logan City website. All applicants will
220 be interviewed by the current Councilmembers on Tuesday, December 16, 2025 at which
221 time a new City Councilmember will be selected and appointed.

222
223 Councilmember A. Anderson noted that the deadline for applicants is Friday, December
224 05, 2025 at 5:00 p.m. There are several forms that need to be filled out including a
225 financial statement.

226
227 Vice Chair Johnson said if there are questions, please reach out to Teresa Harris, City
228 Recorder.

229
230 No further Council Business items were presented.

231
232 **ACTION ITEMS:**

233
234 **PUBLIC HEARING - CODE AMENDMENTS – Consideration of proposed**
235 **amendments to Section 17.30.180 of the Land Development Code to clarify road**
236 **standards and access specifications for multi-family infill and flag lot development –**
237 **Ordinance 25-20 – Russ Holley, Planner ([31:10](#))**

238
239 At the November 4, 2025 Council meeting, Planner Russ Holley addressed the Council
240 regarding the proposed code amendments.

245 **RECOMMENDATION**

246 Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend **approval** to the
247 Municipal Council of the proposed amendments to Chapters 17.29 and 17.30 of the Land
248 Development Code.

249
250 **SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

251 This is a proposal to amend two sections within the Land Development Code that
252 regulate driveways, connectivity standards, and residential infill development standards.
253 Slight modifications are proposed to the driveway and connectivity standards, while the
254 infill section is proposed with significant amendments. Two categories, one for single-
255 family and one for multi-family, are proposed with different access and setback standards
256 for each. This proposed amendment takes the general term of infill as defined in LDC
257 17.62 and creates two further refined categories of either flag lot or middle of the block
258 infill depending on the number of units, surrounding context, access widths and overall
259 project size. This proposal is a result of prior projects and neighborhood concerns about
260 compatibility and access limitations to infill development.

261
262 The proposed changes include flag lots being defined as one additional home behind an
263 existing home or up to a two (2) lot subdivision with one building lot not having public
264 street frontage. For multi-family zones, a flag lot is defined in the same fashion but can
265 be created for up to one new duplex (two units) and must comply with base zoning
266 density. Flag lots may be accessed via a 20-foot-wide shared driveway. Flag lots are
267 required to have larger setbacks and lot size minimums to ensure better compatibility and
268 spacing with the existing surrounding homes.

269
270 ***Middle of the Block Infill***

271 The proposed changes include a new category of infill, “Middle of the Block Infill,” that
272 caps the total number of new units for single-family at six (6) and new multi-family at
273 twenty (20) units. These types of projects are required to build a new private access road
274 with sidewalk and on-street parking. Private access roads are not required to be as wide
275 as a public street. Slight increases in setbacks ensure better compatibility but still allow
276 for efficient project layout. Parking, building height, density and other similar
277 development standards default to base zone standards. For larger infill projects containing
278 more than six (6) single family homes and twenty (20) multi-family units, standard
279 public streets, setbacks, and density are required.

280
281 **STAFF SUMMARY**

282 The purpose of these changes is to continue to encourage and accommodate infill
283 development projects to better utilize existing public infrastructure, minimize outward
284 suburban sprawl patterns, and reduce vehicle miles traveled daily. But middle of the
285 block infill is typically harder to access, has tricky project sites, and existing conditions,
286 so unique regulations are required in these circumstances to ensure they are done in the
287 manner that minimizes impacts to existing homes and residents on the block. The

additional setbacks and lot size requirements will help to accomplish compatibility and maintain privacy. Access should be sized for the anticipated additional residential traffic associated with new dwelling units and emergency vehicles.

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 10/11/2025 and posted on the City's and Utah Public Meeting website on 10/13/2025.

AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

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 August 14, 2025, the Planning Commission **recommended approval** to the Municipal Council for the Infill and Flag Lot Code Amendment as amended by the Planning Commission. Staff added the clarification that on-street parking on private access roads may be parallel or angled parking stalls if space permits. **Planning Commissioners vote (4-1).**

Chair Simmonds requested clarification on whether the driveway would be part of the second lot?

Mr. Holley explained that there are two options to create a driveway, one as an easement and the other as a latch.

Councilmember A. Anderson said he understands that the changes being made are to allow further housing and address the current housing crisis. She asked if this was a fair statement to make and requested confirmation that the Fire Department will review the flag lots and ensure their vehicles can enter and exit.

Mr. Holley confirmed that the statement was accurate and that is the intent and purpose of the code amendment. The Fire Marshal reviews every subdivision plat submitted to ensure that emergency access points are sufficiently wide enough to permit emergency vehicles.

Councilmember López asked if the easement for the driveway is perpetual or is there a risk for the easement being revoked.

Mr. Holley replied that one of the conditions is that the driveway is a perpetual easement. There may be a scenario in which access can be granted from a different direction. This perpetual easement can be revoked to permit a new perpetual easement with the same requirements.

Councilmember A. Anderson inquired if a flag lot can have an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) as well.

Mr. Holley responded that it would require a NR-6 building lot of sufficient size to permit an ADU.

Chair Simmonds expressed concerns about not creating connectivity in a block. She asked if it would be possible to still accomplish a mini-block with a smaller street width or a stub.

Mr. Holley answered that it would be possible, but it would require adopting new code for cross sections and it would be a longer process. One of the reasons for a cap of 3 to 6 lots is to ensure that if a mini-block is possible it can be done through the review authority (Planning Commission).

Chair Simmonds said she would prefer a mini-block, and that a cul-de-sac be a last resort.

Mr. Holley gave an example and referred to the slide showing 'reason for code amendment'. In the example shown, it would not make sense to tear out a home to make a mini-block. It would make more sense to create a cul-de-sac.

Councilmember López inquired about the benefits of a cul-de-sac vs. a stubbed street.

Mr. Holley replied that a cul-de-sac would permit the creation of an extra home vs. a stub would be placed as an open/closed street. An alternative option is a hammerhead option, which takes up less land and acts like a stub.

Vice Chair Johnson concluded that the reasoning for a cul-de-sac is so that emergency vehicles can turn where a stub may not permit them to.

373 Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.
374
375 There were no comments and Chair Simmonds closed the public hearing.
376
377 Chair Simmonds said her only reservation is a cul-de-sac.
378
379 Vice Chair Simmonds asked if a developer could request a stub or cul-de-sac.
380
381 Mr. Holley said the language reads “it can terminate with a cul-de-sac, loop, or a hammer
382 head approved turnaround,” including a stub. A cul-de-sac takes space and tends to be the
383 least chosen option.
384
385 Vice Chair requested confirmation that Chair Simmonds would like to remove the cul-de-
386 sac option.
387
388 Chair Simmonds confirmed that it is her preference.
389
390 Councilmember A. Anderson asked if the Planning Commission had discussed the cul-
391 de-sac option.
392
393 Chair Simmonds responded that the Planning Commission did not discuss the cul-de-sac
394 option.
395
396 Vice Chair Johnson did not understand why the removal of the cul-de-sac and not the
397 loop with green space in the middle. A loop is similar to a cul-de-sac with green space in
398 the middle.
399
400 Councilmember López inquired if there would be a home in the middle of a loop.
401
402 Mr. Holley answered that it is possible but is highly unlikely. He gave an example in the
403 Island area of the infield called "Apple Island."
404
405 Chair Simmonds wanted to ensure that the site map is more responsive to the traditional
406 neighborhood character.
407
408 Vice Chair Johnson did not disagree with Chair Simmonds but acknowledged that the
409 projects will be unique as they will be constructed in infield lots already surrounded by
410 property. The site itself may make creating a mini-block difficult. Flexibility in the code
411 is beneficial to allowing more housing.
412
413 Chair Simmonds was in favor of narrowing the inner roads for these projects to allow
414 mini-blocks.
415

Vice Chair Johnson asked how wide a street needs to be to permit an emergency vehicle, and whether it would be required or not.

Mr. Holley replied that any home that is 150 feet away from a street requires a turnaround. However, if the street connects all the way through, then no turnaround is needed.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that the code does not preclude a mini-block but rather allows alternative options where that is not a feasible option.

Mr. Holley confirmed that options do not preclude a mini-block but rather permit alternative options such as the cul-de-sac.

Councilmember López asked if Chair Simmonds would like the cul-de-sac option removed.

Chair Simmonds reiterated that she would prefer the cul-de-sac and loop options to be removed.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember López to adopt Ordinance 25-20 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (3-1).

A. Anderson: Aye

Johnson: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Nay

PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2025-2026 appropriating: \$5,889 funds received from the US Treasury Department for the Police Department to be used to purchase specialized equipment for the collection and documentation of evidence in criminal investigations; \$9,374 funds received from the US Treasury Department for the Police Department to purchase specialized equipment for the collection and documentation of evidence in criminal investigations - Resolution 25-45 – Richard Anderson ([53:40](#))

At the November 4, 2025 Council meeting, Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments.

Chair Simmonds opened the meeting to a public hearing.

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

ACTION. Motion by Vice Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember A. Anderson to approve Resolution 25-45 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).

A. Anderson: Aye

Johnson: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

WORKSHOP ITEMS:

Consideration of a proposed ordinance amending Section 8.04.019 of the Logan Municipal Code regarding the Wildland Urban Interface Code – Ordinance 25-21 – Robert LaCroix, Assistant Chief of Operations, Logan City Fire Department ([54:55](#))

Robert LaCroix, Assistant Chief of Operations with the Logan City Fire Department, addressed the Council regarding the proposed ordinance.

Assistant Chief LaCroix explained that the State legislature has granted general welfare power to the City Council, independent, apart from, and in addition to, its specific grants of legislative authority, which enables the City of Logan to pass ordinances as are necessary and proper to provide for the safety, promote the prosperity, improve the peace and good order, comfort, and convenience of the city and its inhabitants, and for the protection of property in the city. In the 2025 Utah General Session, the Utah state legislature passed House Bill 48 requiring municipalities to adopt the 2006 Utah Wildland-Urban Interface Code which states:

SECTION 1:

8.04.019: 2006 UTAH WILDLAND–URBAN INTERFACE CODE ADOPTED:

For the purpose of prescribing regulations governing conditions hazardous to life and property from impacts related to development in wildlands, the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban Interface Code, as adopted by Utah Code Section 15A-2-103, or its successor, is hereby adopted. A copy of the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban Interface Code shall be placed on file in the office of the Logan City Recorder for the use and examination of the public.

Chair Simmonds asked if there was anything East of the proposed zone.

Assistant Chief LaCroix responded that currently, there was nothing proposed, but in the future, that could be new construction/development.

Chair Simmonds inquired about what CWS stands for.

Assistant Chief LaCroix answered that it stands for the Cooperative Agreement/Wildfire System between the City and State.

Mayor Daines added that there are certain requirements/qualifications that need to be met and it is beneficial to be part of the system. She gave an example of the wildfire that occurred on state lands in Green Canyon . If not for being part of the agreement, North Logan City would have been liable for \$1 million.

Councilmember López inquired about the level of risk for this area.

Assistant Chief LaCroix replied that the State of Utah has the Utah Wildfire Risk Assessment Portal, and it shows the location of residents and the level of risk. The area shown is considered a level risk of 7. However, the official map has yet to be presented; that number may change.

Councilmember López asked what would occur if the number changed to 6.

Assistant Chief LaCroix said it would impact the fee, but if there are no homes, there is no fee until development occurs since it is considered a high-risk area.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that the land East of the green line shown on the map is not private land, and if there is private land can that be developed.

Assistant Chief LaCroix responded that it is part of Logan up to the State land. The red line shown on the map is State land. If private, it may be possible to develop, but he is uncertain.

Craig Carlston, City Attorney, interjected that the current resolution does not adopt the map. The map will be adopted later. The proposed code is being adopted at this time.

The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the December 2, 2025 Council meeting.

CODE AMENDMENT – Consideration of a proposed amendment to Chapter 5.10 of the Logan Municipal Code “Alcoholic Beverages” – Ordinance 25-22 – Aaron Smith, Neighborhood Improvement Manager (1:04:10)

Neighborhood Improvement Manager Aaron Smith addressed the Council regarding the proposed code amendment.

Summary of Amendment

Logan City Business Licensing is proposing an amendment to LMC Section 5.10: Alcohol Beverages to make additional bar licenses available by consolidating bar and tavern licenses into a single category of licensing, and to establish a proximity restriction

between existing bar and tavern licenses, and any new bar and tavern license. This amendment is prompted by the Business Licensing Division receiving an application for a bar license at an existing alcohol manufacturing location in the Industrial Park zone.

Currently, Logan City limits the total available bar and tavern licenses by population. The licensing standard is one (1) bar license per 10,000 population and one (1) tavern license per 10,000 population. This restriction allow for a total of five bars and five (5) tavern licenses available to be issued. All available bar licenses have been issued and only one (1) available tavern license has been issued. This amendment proposes to create new available bar licenses by combining the available bar and tavern licenses into a single license pool. The combined license pool population restriction would also be adjusted to one (1) license per 6,000 population, which creates a pool of nine (9) total bar and/or tavern licenses. With 6 bar or tavern licenses currently issued, 3 new licenses would become available for either a new bar or tavern.

Staff considered several potential population limits for the proposed amendment ranging from 1:5,000 to 1:10,000. Staff considered how many licenses the options would make available and how often new licenses would become available based on population growth. The Bar and Tavern License Combination Study provides a further explanation of these considerations and is attached to this memo. A 1:5,000 population limit would combine the current 5 bar and 5 tavern licenses into a pool of 10 licenses; however, staff is concerned that creating four available licenses could lead to faster than anticipated growth of bars in Logan if all licenses are utilized (assuming bar licenses are available through DABS). It would also create a scenario where new licenses would become available more often based on population growth. In order to limit the creation of new licenses and temper the rate of new licenses becoming available through population growth, staff is recommending a population limit of 1:6,000 for the new combined bar and tavern license pool. As previously stated, this limit will create a pool of nine (9) licenses available for either a bar or tavern. With six (6) bar or tavern licenses currently issued, three (3) new licenses would become available for either a new bar or tavern. Regarding new licenses relative to population growth, with a current population of approximately 54 ,000 and a 1% growth rate, the license pool will increase to 10 around 2034.

The amendment also proposes a proximity restriction that would not permit a new bar or tavern within 350' of an existing bar or tavern establishment. This proposal is based on similar codes found in other Utah municipalities, namely Ogden and Salt Lake City. Salt Lake uses a straight-line proximity restriction in neighborhood commercial zones, and Ogden uses a total amount of licenses along a particular street to limit alcohol establishments in an area. The proximity restriction is being proposed to reduce the concentration of bars or taverns along any single street in Logan. For reference, the 350' proximity requirement is a little more than half a typical downtown block in Logan. The proposed proximity restriction would be in addition to current State community location

proximity restrictions, which are a 200' straight line buffer and a 600' ordinary pedestrian travel restriction from the nearest boundary of the community location to the closest pedestrian entrance to the alcohol establishment. Community locations include churches, schools, parks, playgrounds, and libraries. The attached Proximity Restriction Maps show the impact of the proposed 350' license buffer and an approximation of the State proximity restrictions. The zones where bars and taverns are permitted are also shown (TC-1, TC-2, MU, CS and IP). While large areas of downtown Logan would not be eligible for a license, there remain areas, particularly on the north and south ends of downtown, that would be eligible for a license.

Bar and Tavern Zoning Use and Previous Alcohol Amendment

Ordinance #24-03 revised the zoning categories for most alcohol uses in Logan, including bars and taverns. The Ordinance permits bars and taverns in the Town Center and Mixed-Use zones. The Ordinance also established standalone manufacturing as a permitted use in the Commercial Services and Industrial Park and created an allowance for bars and taverns to be established at manufacturing locations in those zones.

License Information and Definitions

Bar

- Logan Municipal Code: Bar establishment license means one of the following types of licenses as defined by the UABC: a dining club license, equity license, fraternal license or bar license.
- 21 and over age restriction
- Beer, heavy beer (ABV greater than 5%), wine, and liquor
- Must have food available, but no percentage of food sales requirement
- Current local license limits-1:10,000 population
- 5 licenses available / 5 licenses issued
- Current licenses
 - o The Cache bar and Grill - 119 S Main
 - o Fraternal Order of Eagles - 170 W 900 N
 - o Barrell & Stave - 33 Federal Ave
 - o Home Range Brewing - 186 N Main
 - o Logan Country Club - 710 N 1500 E

Tavern

- DABS: Taverns are defined as beer bars, parlors, lounges, cabarets, and nightclubs.
- 21 and over age restriction
- 5% ABV Beer or less
- No food requirement
- Current local license limits-1:10,000 population
- 5 licenses available / 1 license issued

- Current licenses
 - o The White Owl - 36 W Center

Manufacturing

- Logan Municipal Code: Includes several scales of manufacturing
 - o Brewery, distillery, or winery- Permitted in the IP zone
 - o Small Brewery, Distillery, Winery- Permitted in the CS and IP zones
 - o Taproom - Permitted in conjunction with a bar or tavern in TC-1, TC-2, and MU zones
 - o Brew Restaurant - Permitted in conjunction with a restaurant
- Bars and taverns are permitted in conjunction with a manufacturing location
- Standalone manufacturing establishments that do not have a bar, tavern, or restaurant license are only permitted to serve a 5 oz sample to the public.

State License Information (July 2025)

- 369 bar licenses issued by DABS
- 8 tavern licenses issued by DABS
- County Data
 - o Cache (145,000) - 5 bar licenses
 - o Box Elder (64,000) - 5 bar licenses
 - o Tooele (84,000)-9 bar licenses
 - o Washington (207,000)-11 bar licenses
 - o Weber (276,000)- 32 bar licenses

Amendment Goals:

- Create additional available bar licenses – All available bar licenses have been issued
 - Consolidation of bar and tavern licenses into one license pool
 - Application received from licensed alcohol manufacturing location in Logan for a bar license.
- Create buffers around bars and taverns to reduce the risk of potential geographic concentrations of either license type

Amendment Proposal:

- Genesis of the Amendment - Interest from licensed manufacturing location to acquire a bar license
- Combine the pool of available bar and tavern licenses into a single pool
 - 1 license per 6,000 population
- Current pool (both 1:10,000 population)
 - Bar - 5 licenses available / 5 licenses issued
 - Tavern - 5 licenses available / 1 license issued

- Proposed pool
- 1:6,000 population
- Bar or tavern – 9 licenses available / 6 licenses issued / 1 application
- 2 licenses for either a bar or tavern available

Amendment Proposal - Number of Licenses:

- 1 license per 6,000 population proposal
 - Currently 10 licenses are available for bars and tavern
 - Proposal creates combined license pool of 9 total licenses
 - Likely to see interest in remaining available licenses for bars
 - dependent upon availability of licenses from the DABS
 - Other population ratios considered
 - 1:5,000 population - creates 10 licenses, but would create a scenario where new licenses become available considerably faster than the current 1:10,000 for both bars and taverns
 - 1:7,000 population – fewer total licenses (7) and slow growth of new licenses
 - 1:10,000 population – Inadequate number of licenses

Amendment Proposal – Bar & Tavern Proximity:

- Goal of Proximity Regulation
 - Create buffers around bars and taverns to reduce the risk of geographic concentrations of either license type
- Precedent from Ogden and SLC
 - Ogden – Number of licenses along a single street
 - SLC – Distance buffer in community/neighborhood commercial zones
- Proposal
 - No new bar or tavern establishment within 350' of an existing bar or tavern
 - Does not affect license for existing bar or tavern establishments (grandfathered)
- 350' Proximity Buffer
 - Roughly half a city block
 - Allows for walking distance between establishments but prohibits an entire street or corner from becoming a series of bars or taverns
 - 350' buffer is in addition to the existing State proximity requirements

Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that the locations/zones where a bar or tavern will not be changed and what is the difference between a bar and a tavern.

Mr. Smith clarified that the location/zones of a bar or tavern are not being changed. A bar can sell heavy beer or other liquor and must have food available. Taverns sell 5% Alcohol by Volume (ABV) beer or less and have no food requirement. There are 5 licenses available, but only 1 tavern is licensed.

Vice Chair Johnson referenced the bar overview slide and asked if it mirrored the State population for license limits.

Mr. Smith responded that the current local license limit is 1 for every 10,000 population, and the State has their own limit. There are State bar licenses, which are unusual, but there are only about 4 in existence. The State has no State or regional focus.

Councilmember A. Anderson added that some communities have much lower license limits, such as Park City. It varies by municipality as the municipality determines the local license limit.

Chair Simmonds requested confirmation that the bottle license is issued by the State.

Mr. Smith confirmed that the bottle license is issued by the State. The City issues alcohol licenses. The City has a limit on the number of licenses that can be issued for a certain type. The City can only issue 5 bar licenses. This is a City statute, not a State statute.

Chair Simmonds asked if the 5 bar licenses issued count as part of the pool of the State.

Mr. Smith explained that 5 of the licenses are part of that pool, but the State has hundreds of licenses that can be and are permitted. If that pool is ever depleted, then the City would not issue a license as there are none available to issue, since the State cannot issue a bottle license.

Councilmember A. Anderson requested confirmation that St. George had abolished their license limit per population.

Mr. Smith confirmed that St. George has removed the limit in its entirety.

Vice Chair Johnson inquired about the reason why there are only 8 tavern licenses issued for the entire State.

Mr. Smith suggested that it was due to restrictions on tavern licenses and the products sold are restricted.

Vice Chair Johnson asked if the State issues a certain number of licenses.

Mr. Smith answered that a certain number of bar or tavern licenses can be issued. The licenses that are often fully issued and not available at State level are bars and full-service restaurants.

Chair Simmonds inquired if the Council could define what constitutes as a bar or tavern.

Mr. Smith replied that a bar or tavern is defined by the City and State code.

Chair Simmonds expressed bewilderment as to the reason for the change to permit more bar licenses.

Vice Chair Johnson explained that the 5 bar licenses are taken and not available for use.

Councilmember A. Anderson clarified that rather than having 10 distinct licenses, there will instead be a pool of 9 licenses that can be used for a bar or tavern.

Chair Simmonds asked if the existing single tavern would turn into a bar.

Mr. Smith responded that the tavern would remain as it is unless the applicant reapplied for a bar license. However, the tavern may not be eligible to apply for a change due to the change use with the State. The tavern is grandfathered, but if the applicant reapplied, the tavern would not be eligible under current State standards.

Vice Chair Johnson referenced the bar & tavern proximity slide and inquired if the two properties in proximity to each other are grandfathered.

Mr. Smith confirmed that the two properties referenced are grandfathered properties provided their license is always up to date.

Vice Chair Johnson inquired if the reason for the change is that there have been inquiries and there are some who have expressed interest in acquiring a bar license.

Mr. Smith answered that there is interest and there is a pending license for a bar. Staff does not have any objections to increasing the number of bars rather to ensure there is sufficient proximity between new bars that may be established.

The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the December 2, 2025 Council meeting.

Budget Adjustment FY 2025-2026 appropriating \$31,528 funds received for police overtime shifts - Resolution 25-47 – Richard Anderson ([1:22:28](#))

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

Vice Chair Johnson requested confirmation that the funds are reimbursements for overtime.

Mr. Anderson confirmed that the funds received are reimbursement for police officer overtime.

The proposed resolution will be an action item and public hearing at the December 2, 2025 Council meeting.

No further workshop items were presented.

The meeting adjourned to a Closed Session at 6:50 p.m.

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember A. Anderson seconded by Councilmember López to move to a Closed Session to discuss potential litigation. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).

A. Anderson: Aye

Johnson: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember López seconded by Vice Chair Johnson to reconvene the meeting at 7:35 p.m. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-0).

A. Anderson: Aye

Johnson: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS: ([2:08:33](#))

Councilmember A. Anderson stated for the benefit of the public that the Warming Center will open November 30, 2025. Volunteers are actively being sought and the community is encouraged to apply.

No further considerations were discussed.

842 **ADJOURNED:**

843

844 There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

845

846

847

848 Teresa Harris, City Recorder

DRAFT