



---

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

### Meeting of February 12, 2015

---

City Hall Council Chambers \* 290 North 100 West Logan, UT 84321 \* [www.loganutah.org](http://www.loganutah.org)

Minutes of the meeting for the Logan City Planning Commission convened in regular session Thursday, February 12, 2015. Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Planning Commissioners Present: David Adams, Amanda Davis, Tom Jensen, Russ Price, Sara Sinclair

Planning Commissioners Absent: David Butterfield, Maybell Romero

Staff Present: Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley, Amber Reeder, Kymber Housley, Bill Young, Paul Taylor, Debbie Zilles

Minutes as written and recorded from the January 22, 2015 meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Sinclair moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Commissioner Price seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**PC 15-012 Bridge Plumbing** [Design Review Permit] Doug Bird/Vrugg Holdings LLC, authorized agent/owner, request a 9,600 SF plumbing shop at the northeast corner of 1200 West 130 South in the Commercial Services (CS) zone; TIN 05-064-0027.

**STAFF:** Ms. Reeder reviewed the project. The property is within the Westfields Subdivision Phase II, which is in the process of being platted. The property is on the corner of 130 South 1200 West. The lot is 1.46 acres and includes a drainage easement for water detention for the subdivision and for wetland mitigation. There are existing utilities within the adjacent rights-of-way. Staff feels this is a reasonable request for the site. There are environmental constraints that limit the amount of the site than can be developed and the nature of this commercial services business may require the additional area for vehicular access. A plumbing shop is an allowed use in the zone. The building is adjacent to the frontage of 1200 West and landscaping is provided as a buffer to the building and paved areas.

**PROPONENT:** Garth Woolsey, the project architect, explained that the east elevation has been modified to add windows. There will be a canopy over the door and the stone on the base will be extended. The parking drive in the front is 52' to allow for more convenience when pulling out of the overhead doors. He answered for Commissioner Jensen that there would be enough room to turn around on the northeast corner.

**PUBLIC:** None

**COMMISSION:** Commissioner Jensen asked about the driving approach on 130 South, which seemed to be excessively wide. Ms. Reeder said it was within the required allowance. Commissioner Jensen questioned the turning radius on the northeast corner. Ms. Reeder indicated that the distance between the building and the property line is 25'.

Commissioner Adams asked for clarification on the parking. Ms. Reeder explained that this proposal requires 13 parking spaces. There are 8 spaces indicated on the site plan, however there is parking available within the building. Staff has asked for an alternative parking plan to be developed that includes information on employee numbers and business operation that would indicate that parking is adequate on site (Condition of Approval #3). Mr. DeSimone, the Community Development Director, advised that any change of use would be subject to review, including parking. Commissioner Adams wanted to ensure that the minimum parking requirement is met.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Adams moved to **conditionally approve** PC 15-012 for a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 15-012. Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion.

#### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. A Performance Landscaping Plan, prepared in accordance with LDC §17.39, 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. A total number of at least 29 trees and 73 shrubs, perennials and grasses shall be provided. A minimum of three (3) different tree species required.
  - b. Varieties and sizes of all plant material shall be specified on the plan and plant quantities shall be per LDC §17.39.050 and include a minimum of 25% evergreen varieties for year-round visual interest.
  - c. Plant material shall be placed around the perimeter of the building footprint in a 3' minimum planting strip to screen foundations and grade changes - with the exception of vehicle and pedestrian entrances, full glass facades, patios and utilities.
  - d. The landscaping area along 130 South shall meet the guidelines of LDC §17.39.070 *Parking Lot Landscaping for Type "B" Standards*, which require shrubs to be planted at an average of 3' on center and trees on an average of 15' on center.
3. A minimum of 13 spaces shall be provided or an alternative parking plan be developed that includes information on employee numbers and business operations that would indicate parking is adequate on site. Information addressing how bike parking would be accommodated on the site is also required.
4. The east building elevation requires the addition of an acceptable break, such as windows, horizontal building modulation - like a recess, and/or changes in color or material.
5. The south building elevation will provide transparency of a minimum of 20% of the wall for the extent of the office area.
6. Exterior lighting shall be concealed source, down-cast and reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of a building permit and shall comply with current LDC regulations.
7. No signs are approved. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
8. No fences are approved. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
9. 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. Fire Department
    - i. Existing fire hydrant locations appear to be within the required distance around the exterior of the building. If a fire sprinkler system is installed, a hydrant is required within 100' of the fire department connection.
  - b. Environmental Department
    - i. Minimum inside measurement on enclosure is 12' wide x 10' deep. A second enclosure will be required if a recycling dumpster is also located.
    - ii. Concrete pad required in front of enclosure(s) to protect pavement.

- c. Engineering Department
  - i. No building permit to be issued until the plat for Westfields Phase II subdivision has been recorded.
  - ii. No certificate of occupancy will be issued until all required infrastructure for Westfield Phase II subdivision has been completed and accepted by Public Works.
  - iii. Subdivision designed to provide stormwater detention/retention for a 10-year/1-hour storm. Site shall be designed to meet current stormwater design criteria and provide all additional required storage and treatment.
  - iv. Access widths to comply with Land Development Code standards.
- d. Water (Cross Connection) Department
  - i. Building water main must have an R/P (ASSE-1013) as it enters the building before any branch offs.
  - ii. Landscaping irrigation must have a backflow assembly rated for high-hazard, such as an R/P (ASSE-1013) or PVB (ASSE- 1056).
  - iii. If building requires a fire sprinkler system it will need an approved backflow assembly, such as a DCDA (ASSE-1048) or RPDA (ASSE-1047).

#### FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The project is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties.
2. The project conforms to the requirements of Title 17.47 concerning hearings, procedures, and application requirements.
3. The project meets the goals and objectives of the Commercial Services designation within the Logan General Plan by providing commercial service-based business opportunities in areas with existing services and infrastructure in the vicinity.
4. The location of the building and parking areas are appropriate to the nature of the site and allowances of the Land Development Code.
5. The project provides adequate open and useable outdoor space in conformance with Title 17.
6. Allowing a transparency minimum standard of 20% would not negatively impact the building or surrounding area as materials, other architectural features, and landscaping are provided to the building.
7. The project would provide for a use permitted in the Commercial Services zoning district.
8. The project provides adequate off-street parking in conformance with Title 17 with an approved Alternative Parking Plan.
9. Adjacent public roadways, planned and developed, in the vicinity provide adequate access and services to the subdivision.
10. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.

[Moved: Commissioner Adams    Seconded: Commissioner Jensen    **Passed: 5-0**]

Yea: D. Adams, A. Davis, T. Jensen, R. Price, S. Sinclair    Nay:    Abstain:

**PC 15-013 Mortensen Apartments Zone Change** Steven Taylor/Pro-Time Services LLC, authorized agent/owner(s), request to rezone 1.85 acres from Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) to Mixed Residential (MR-12) at 875 West 530 South; TIN 02-0008;-0009;-0036.

**STAFF:** Mr. Holley reviewed the project. The request is to rezone three (3) parcels totaling 1.85 acres located at approximately 875 West 530 South, from Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) to Mixed Residential Low (MR-12).

With a total of 1.85 acres proposed to be rezoned from NR-6 to MR-12, this property could be developed with 22 new multi-family dwelling units. The submitted site plan, which is not being considered for approval, shows 20 new dwelling units arranged and oriented around a new and expanded apartment complex parking lot.

The General Plan and several current and previous elected officials have emphasized the importance of being committed to single-family neighborhoods, especially the neighborhoods on the west side of town that have had, in some cases, unbalanced amounts of high-density multi-family zoning. This particular area is awkwardly shaped and difficult to access, but Staff considers this rezone proposal a short-term answer that could have lasting negative impacts on the surrounding single-family neighborhood. Many of the immediate properties surrounding this site are vacant or under-utilized could be a great opportunity for someone to create a collaborative and innovative single-family development similar to what is described in the General Plan. Staff is recommending that the City remain committed to single-family neighborhoods and the General Plan and recommend denial for this rezone request.

**PROPONENT:** Steven Taylor explained that the first four multi-family units in the area were built in 1985 and have been well maintained, the single-family homes were built afterward. He provided some history of the area. The owner would like to develop and utilize this property. They have looked at many alternatives. The main access to the property is off of 530 South. The area was zoned single-family in 2000. There are 72 multi-family units in the area (duplexes, 4-plexes and 8-plexes). Mr. Taylor said he was on the City Council when the west side was rezoned (from approximately 2100 North to 230 South) and eliminated the multi-family area. He said many individuals were not appropriately notified; an ad was published in the newspaper but there were no letters sent to property owners. He agrees with the concept of having multi-family units throughout the City and more of a clarified plan. He believes this is one of the areas that should be considered for the MR-12 zone, which would allow for the best use of this property. This proposal makes sense, will be well maintained and can be designed to meet the guidelines.

**PUBLIC:** Several email comments in opposition to the proposal were received and distributed to the Commission for review prior to the meeting (copies included in project file).

LaDonna Connors, 166 West 400 South, a member of the Woodruff Neighborhood Council, explained that this area seems to be a depot for high-density building. Most of the residents she has spoken to would like the area to remain single-family. There are multi-family complexes that are not well maintained. She is also concerned with growth related to the school and would like to see it better controlled.

Val Christensen, 494 Southwest Street, said the area is a mess, it is hard to access and he agrees with Ms. Connors. It is not the fault of local residents that the landowner cannot figure out what to do with the property. He encouraged the Commission to uphold the recommendation for denial.

Marilyn Griffin, 630 West 200 East, does not want to see multi-family put in the middle of a single-family area. She can understand the frustration of the residents. The development behind Sam's Club is a source of great contention and many families moved out of the area because of it. She believes that this may cause more families to relocate and agreed with the recommendation for denial of the rezone.

Miles Wandersee, 320 Three Point Ave., said most renters tend to not have as much pride in, or take care of, their property as well as homeowners. This project would be a detriment to the neighborhood. He would like to see the area remain single-family.

**COMMISSION:** Commissioner Jensen asked about the multi-family properties to the southwest and what happened to "break that development pattern". Mr. Holley explained that they were built in the early 1990's under the R-3 zone. He pointed out one grandfathered duplex located on Southwest Street; however, the majority of the area is comprised of single-family homes. Commissioner Jensen asked about the open area on the southwest section. Mr. Holley advised that the current zone is single-family.

Commissioner Adams asked about access to the property. Mr. Holley explained that the current Code requires multiple accesses for subdivisions with 9 or more homes. A second access would most likely need to be developed – at the very least a fire-approved turnaround would need to be added. Access, layout and the shape of the property make this area unique and challenging.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the issue regarding access points. Mr. DeSimone explained that private roads developed under a PUD and maintained by an HOA do not have to allow or grant access.

Commissioner Jensen asked if it would be possible to develop single-family homes on the property because it is so constricted. Mr. DeSimone said that single-family homes could be put in; access would be an issue and challenge regardless of the zone or density.

Commissioner Price said he is an advocate of densification, however, he agrees that there are access issues with this particular property, although it is not the fault of the property owner, it is the result of poor planning 30 years ago. In 2000 a decision was made that this area should be established as single-family and people have purchased and built in the area with that expectation. The precedent follows the General Plan and the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP), and while he would like to find places appropriate for increased density, he does not think this is the right location.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Sinclair moved to **recommend denial** to the Municipal Council for a zone change of 1.85 acres from Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) to Mixed Residential (MR-12) at 875 West 530 South as outlined in PC 15-013. Commissioner Price seconded the motion.

#### FINDINGS FOR DENIAL

1. The proposed re-zone is not consistent with the adopted Logan City Future Land Use Plan.
2. The proposed rezone is not consistent with the Logan City General Plan.
3. The proposed rezone would likely result in the area not being developed as owner-occupied homes. The General Plan specifically desires owner-occupied homes in existing single-family neighborhoods.
4. By not changing the zoning this site will have a better likelihood of being combined and developed in a collaborative method that may enhance design, layout and access becoming more appealing to potential single-family home buyers.

[Moved: Commissioner Sinclair Seconded: Commissioner Price **Passed: 5-0]  
Yea: D. Adams, A. Davis, T. Jensen, R. Price, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:**

**PC 15-002 LDC Amendment – 17.19 Town Center Development Standards** [Code Amendment]  
– *continued from 1/22/15* - Logan City requests to clarify Town Center building standards in Land Development Code §17.19.

**STAFF:** Mr. DeSimone reviewed the project. The amendment includes modifying the minimum building height in the Town Center zone from 3 stories/38' to 2 stories/24', increasing the maximum building height on side streets from 40' to 42', eliminating the requirement to have one entrance per 40' of frontage and adding clarifying language regarding building placement and orientation.

The direction from the Commission was to research other jurisdictions to see how Logan's proposal compared. Mr. DeSimone provided a comparison of the proposed changes with 15 other jurisdictions in Utah.

The Town Center (TC) zone runs from 200 South to 500 North - generally from 100 West to 100-200 East and comprises the commercial core of Logan. The TC zone includes a wide range of commercial areas through the historic core of Logan.

The building heights are generally varied within the TC zone. The predominant building pattern is primarily single-story or two-story buildings, with a limited number of taller structures on Main Street. Even in the historic commercial core, with the exception of the west side of Main Street between 100 East and Center, the predominate building pattern is two-story on the west side and single-story on the east side. Outside of this core, there are generally single-story buildings with a variety of building heights. What is consistent, at least in the historic core, is the massing, scale and proportionality of the buildings regardless of building height or number of stories.

Compared to other jurisdictions (other than Salt Lake City and portions of Murray) Logan is more restrictive from a building story and building height requirement. The original intent behind the minimum building height in the TC zone was to build large, tall buildings downtown. The challenge in this approach is how to define “downtown”. The Town Center zone was created as a downtown zone; however, it also covers an area much broader and diverse than just the historic core.

The original proposal was to reduce the overall minimum building stories from three stories to two stories, and the building height from 38’ to 24’ in the Town Center zone to allow for a wider range of commercial opportunities.

Mr. DeSimone recommended that the Commission consider the proposed amendment as originally presented to reduce the minimum building stories and height, but consider including the following language (or some variation) as listed on the Town Center spec sheet (17.19.060) to afford some level of flexibility for projects where necessary. The Commission shall review proposed projects to ensure new commercial and infill development are appropriate in terms of scale, mass and proportion with significant adjacent structures, and which may provide for a deviation in the minimum height either below or above the base building height of 24’.

**COMMISSION:** Commissioner Price questioned Lehi City’s language (noted in the Staff Report) *“Infill development must not be significantly shorter or taller than adjacent existing structures. New commercial development should be appropriate with scale, mass and proportion, and be in character with the architectural theme and color palate of significant adjacent structures.”* He is concerned with the “context in which we are building buildings”. The Town Center (TC) zone covers a very wide range of building types, ages and historicity. Some are considered to be “filler/background buildings” while others are significant. He would like the significant buildings to be preserved and stand out. When new buildings are built outside the historic core, they should “comport with desire of what we want the entry of our City to look like”. He would like to see the ability to recognize significant buildings within the historical area and that building material, cornice lines and fenestration all contribute to what is in the area. It is important to maintain and there are ways to write enforceable code around those concepts. He would like to think, encourage and enforce the use of materials, building rhythms and heights that are in context with the environment around them. He provided an example from Fullerton, California, which has a land use plan and design standards that allow for and enforce architectural detailing, massing and fenestration. Other cities have chosen much more constricted geographical areas (blocks vs. miles). Orange and Huntington Beach, California have requirements for minimum heights in restricted areas.

Mr. DeSimone agreed that there are some good examples; however, areas in Southern California have enough market influence to drive economic investment and density into particular areas. Logan is competing with outside areas and there is a need to protect downtown. There are current design standards, as well as a designated Historic District that address those issues.

Commissioner Jensen agreed with Commissioner Price. It is more important to have some of the characteristics such as fronting on the lot line and roofline/cornices than an absolute number for height. Mr. DeSimone advised that current design standards require massing along Main Street.

Commissioner Jensen said the many vacancies downtown is a serious problem and the City should be able to have some creative thought on how to bring in economic vitality. He suggested possible incentives to entice development in the downtown area.

Mr. DeSimone advised that the City is currently meeting with developers regarding a couple of potential projects (in the conceptual stage) in the downtown area.

Mr. DeSimone cited the example of Chuck-A-Rama (1-story) building – it may not work in other locations, but it fits in nicely in the area it is located. Nice development can be obtained through the design standards that are in place. If a block is developed, there is a wide range of opinions regarding what would work. The City encourages mixed use, if limited to a tightly defined box, it could limit development. There are also Historic District Design Standards (HDDS) for the historic area which provides a dual overlay. The Commission can review design standards as necessary.

Commissioner Price is concerned about relying on what is adjacent to a building rather than the larger context. An adjacent building might be insignificant or inappropriate. He suggested one option of looking at designations of landmark buildings which are exemplary of the type of buildings that the City supports in that particular area. The large area of the Town Center (TC) is problematic. The idea of mixed-use development (having retail with office/residential) seems to be a long way off. Mr. DeSimone advised that the City has met with potential developers expressing interest in some mixed-use projects, they are a challenge to finance, which is one reason there are few of them. He pointed out that Riverwoods is a good example of a mixed-use project that is horizontal rather than vertical.

Mr. DeSimone agreed that insignificant buildings should not be used to define new development. The blocks from 100 South to 200 North contain both good and inconsequential structures, however, in totality it is a quaint street frontage which the City would like to preserve. He suggested eliminating the minimum height requirement and applying design standards to ensure good development.

Commissioner Price said he is not convinced that the current Code is strong enough to be enforceable. There are many developments that meet the design standards but do not have great architecture. The beauty that built downtown Logan included community and unity. Mr. DeSimone agreed but also encouraged the Commission to recognize that downtown Logan was built at a completely different time, where it was the center of life; today's society is much different. Commissioner Price rejected that argument and said there are many cities that seem to be able to carry on economic activities in historical buildings and historical context.

Chairman Davis noted that there have been many non-specific broad terms used and she is inclined to continue this discussion to work out the concerns and issues. Commissioner Price agreed.

Mr. Housley pointed out that incremental improvements can be made. Commissioner Jensen agreed that this is a work in progress and can be constantly improved; however, there are economic issues that also need to be addressed.

Chairman Davis is concerned that the current wording seems to be too “squishy” and questioned who decides if an adjacent building is significant or not – everyone's perception is different.

Mr. DeSimone suggested putting together a work group to focus on specific issues.

Commissioner Sinclair suggested continuing the discussion; Commissioner Jensen agreed that it would be advisable to have further discussion.

Chairman Davis recommended some type of scaling mechanism, by either providing a radius or outlining a specific area. She also noted that the Commission needs to have some latitude and discretion for deviation as appropriate.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Jensen moved to **continue** PC 15-002 to the February 26, 2015 meeting. Commissioner Price seconded the motion.

[Moved: Commissioner Jensen Seconded: Commissioner Price **Passed: 5-0**  
Yea: D. Adams, A. Davis, T. Jensen, R. Price, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:

**PC 15-003 LDC Amendment – 17.38 Parking** [Code Amendment] – *continued from 1/22/15*  
Logan City requests to include compact parking stall standards, clarify structured parking requirements in the Campus Residential zone and refine other language outlined in the Land Development Code §17.38.

**STAFF:** Mr. DeSimone reviewed the proposal. Originally, the proposed amendments to Section 17.38 of the Land Development Code included eliminating the covered parking requirement and increasing the unit count threshold where structured parking becomes a requirement from 10 units to 20 units.

The direction from the January 22, 2015 PC meeting was to research other jurisdictions to see how Logan's proposal compared. The proposed changes were compared with 15 other jurisdictions in Utah (outlined in the updated Staff Report which was distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting).

The average mid-sized car is 197" (length) x 73" (width) or 16' x 6'. Logan's "normal size" stall of 9' x 18' is similar to most other jurisdictions. Of the 15 cities researched, 9 allow for compact stalls while 4 provide for a reduction in length with landscaping. The proposed percentage of 25% is higher than all but 2 of the other jurisdictions. A compact parking percentage of 25% applied to the minimum number of 50 stalls, represent 12 stalls designed as compact stalls.

The maximum length of a row of parking stalls is 15 stalls, which with the normal stall dimension of 9' x 18', equates to a length of approximately 135'. The same 15 stalls with the proposed compact stall dimension of 8' x 16' equates to a length of approximately 120' of stall area, or a difference of 15'. The provision of compact stalls provides for flexibility in laying out a parking lot and does not lead to additional units being constructed nor eliminate the minimum parking requirements for specified uses.

Mr. DeSimone suggested leaving in the proposed language for compact stalls; however, because this is a citywide standard and not just a student housing/parking consideration, reduce the overall percentage of compact stalls from 25% of a lot greater than 50 parking stalls to 10% of a lot greater than 50 parking stalls may be designed as compact parking stalls.

Logan City currently requires structured parking in the CR zone for projects exceeding 10 dwelling units and for 50% of all required parking in the TC zone.

The Campus Residential zone covers an area from 400 North to 1200 North and from 6<sup>00</sup> East up to USU. The maximum density is 40 units per acre, which may equate to a total of 240 occupants per acre. The current parking requirement is 1 parking stall per occupant with surface parking permitted for up to 10 units or 60 total occupants. Over 10 units, structured parking is required. 60 stalls of surface parking requires approximately 0.5 -0.7 acres to accommodate stalls, driveways and landscaping.

The Town Center zone runs from 200 South to 500 North, generally from 100 West to 200 East and comprises the commercial core of Logan. Current parking requirements are determined by the underlying use, with retail averaging 1 stall per 250 square feet and general office space averaging 1 stall per 300 square feet. The current Code language requires that, regardless of the size of the project, at least 50% of the proposed parking shall be structured parking. A project containing 2,500 square feet of retail space would require 10 stalls, five of which are to be structured parking.

Based on available 2013 cost data, the average cost for a parking structure is \$50.00 - \$70.00 per foot square foot, or approximately \$15,000 - \$30,000 per stall. The cost of surface parking is approximately \$1,500 per stall. To construct 11 units with 66 occupants in the CR zone would require almost \$1,000,000 for structured parking whereas 10 units with 60 occupants in the CR zone would require approximately \$90,000 for surface parking. Parking for the retail example above in the TC zone would cost that business an additional \$75,000 for five structured stalls.

Mr. DeSimone recommended eliminating the structured parking language in the TC zone (17.38.090.B.3) and replacing it with *“In the Town Center (TC) zone, projects choosing to utilize structured parking to meet their minimum parking requirements, per Table 17.38.070, may reduce the minimum number of required parking stalls by 30%”*.

The purpose for requiring structured parking is partially due to a belief that surface parking lots are overly consumptive of available land and partially aesthetic. The problems with this approach are that the economies of scale drive the affordability of parking structures. Potential projects are being penalized with a very expensive parking element that has more community benefits than private benefits. The approach should be to incentivize the construction of a desirable element rather than penalize them by forcing it to happen. Smaller projects in the TC zone are currently unable to proceed because they cannot provide structured parking under the current regulation.

Mr. DeSimone suggested changing the threshold for structured parking from 10 units to 40 units (or eliminating it all together).

Caution should be applied in incentivizing a parking structure in the CR zone due to the potential for “spillover” parking into the surrounding neighborhoods. But, the argument is still the same with imposing community values versus private investment in the form of an expensive parking requirement. Under the original code language, a parking structure for 11 units (66 spaces) probably does not pencil; however, a parking structure for 40 units (240 occupants) may come closer to reality. As a vacant parcel currently used for parking appreciates in value, it will eventually reach a tipping point that supports the conversion of that surface parking lot into something more valuable, whether it is additional dwelling units, structured parking or a combination of both. The current parking approach in the code for the CR zones may also be holding back smaller or mid-size projects as the costs associated with structured parking is prohibitive.

**PUBLIC:** Marilyn Griffin said she would not like to see any more parking lots like the Post Office. Compact stalls make it difficult to get in and out of cars. Parking in the CR zone is a very hot topic, the City Council approved a 1:1 parking ratio which has helped to minimize problems in the neighborhoods and she would like to make sure that is not affected. Mr. DeSimone advised that the proposed language would not change the 1:1 ratio. Ms. Griffin said in theory a lot of this sounds good but in reality students will continue to live and park in neighborhoods near the campus.

**COMMISSION:** Commissioner Price pointed out that compact spaces do not work well in parking lots that service businesses with a high customer turnover rate. They are better used in areas like a transit center where people park all day. He does not think this will be a large market in Logan.

Mr. DeSimone advised that the proposal is a limit of 10% of compact stalls for lots with more than 50 stalls, which would allow for some flexibility.

Commissioner Adams questioned the 8' dimension and thought 8'6" might be a little better. The other commissioners agreed. Mr. DeSimone said this only becomes a big issue in a parking lot as large as the mall. For 85% of projects, it may only affect a couple of stalls.

Commissioner Jensen agreed that the cost of parking in the Town Center (TC) zone is market driven.

Commissioner Price suggested incentivizing structured parking. It may not be so much an issue of how much or where the parking is, but how it is managed. Lawrence, KS (the home of a large university) had this exact issue when a project was being developed and whether the developer would get a break if structured parking was provided. One of the problems was people parking on the streets. The conclusion was an assessment district where permits would be issued. This idea would take a lot of work to incorporate. Commissioner Price is particularly sensitive in the Campus Residential (CR) zone because of the size of the housing developments. Parking problems are detrimental to property values. Eventually it will "all work itself out", but generally blighted areas have parking issues – it is not causal but it is contributory. Currently there is a surplus of parking downtown and there are some economic challenges. In neighborhoods adjacent to the CR zone it becomes problematic both on the street and perimeters around large parking lots. He is not sure that it is not workable to use the government as a tool for collective action and find a way (both downtown and in the CR zone) to either work with people who park their cars, or with developers, to find ways to identify areas where structures could be built. There are several examples of places, relatively the same size as Logan, that have made this choice and it seems to be working.

Mr. DeSimone said overflow from the University will always be a problem because it is cheaper to park in neighborhoods than it is to pay for a campus parking permit. From a structure standpoint in the downtown area it is a very expensive proposition and the project would have to be quite large in order to make the parking structure feasible. From the City's priority standpoint, it would be more important to have a structure in the downtown area than in the CR area. It can work in some projects; however, ultimately the market will drive it. From a regulatory standpoint it does not make sense to have it required in the Code. There are different state laws and existing redevelopment (RDA) areas where portions of a structure could be financed through taxes or bonds. Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) that could possibly offset some of the cost could be an option; however, these are not applicable in the CR zone.

Commissioner Price said confidence in the market is not an idea that he shares with Mr. DeSimone.

Mr. DeSimone pointed out that the goal of large student housing projects is to intensify density and bring students closer to campus in a managed way.

Commissioner Price asked how to incentive developers. Mr. DeSimone said that currently the Code is de-incentivizing developers who are building smaller complexes because it is cheaper, and recommended eliminating the structured parking requirement and letting the market drive the need. Commissioner Price disagreed.

Commissioner Adams said it does not seem feasible that a developer would buy an entire block for parking. Mr. DeSimone agreed that a large development has to provide parking, if they cannot do it with surface parking, they will have to build a parking structure to meet the requirement.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Adams moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for an amendment to the Land Development Code Section 17.38 (Parking) as outlined in PC 15-003. Commissioner Jensen seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Utah state law authorizes local planning commissions to recommend ordinance changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).
2. The amendment is in conformance with the requirements of Logan Municipal Code Title 17.51.
3. The amendment clarifies the minimum parking standards by eliminating a covered parking requirement in the Campus Residential (CR) zone and provides minimum standards for compact stalls applicable citywide.
4. The provisions for the amendment are consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the Logan General Plan.
5. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendment.

[Moved: Commissioner Adams    Seconded: Commissioner Jensen    **Passed: 3-2**  
Yea: D. Adams, T. Jensen, S. Sinclair    Nay: A. Davis, R. Price    Abstain:

**WORKSHOP ITEMS for February 26, 2015:**

- ✓ PC 15-014 Airport Industrial Park (Subdivision)
- ✓ PC 15-015 Child & Family Support Center (Design Review, Subdivision & Zone Change)
- ✓ PC 15-016 Dr. Doug Pediatric Dentist Office (Design Review)
- ✓ PC 15-017 Countryside Village Phase 6 (Subdivision)

Meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

---

Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded for the Logan City Planning Commission meeting of February 12, 2015.

---

Michael A. DeSimone  
Community Development Director

---

Amanda Davis  
2015 Planning Commission Chair

---

Russ Holley  
Senior Planner

---

Amber Reeder  
Planner II

---

Debbie Zilles  
Administrative Assistant