

**Minutes of the North Logan City
Planning Commission
Held on May 7, 2026
At the North Logan City Offices, North Logan, Utah**

(0:00:00 - Time stamps throughout the minutes below, indicate the time an item begins in the audio recording of the meeting.)

Opening Business

The meeting was called to order by Nan Isaacson at 6:30 p.m.

Commission members present were: Nan Isaacson, Gavin Payne, Teresa Theurer, Porter Wilkins, and Deidra Hartwell.

Others present were: Alan Luce, Scott Perkes, Aaron Thaxton, Mark, Hancey, Quila Buhler, Matt Cook, Craig Loosle, Russell Goodwin, Corey Wiley, Doug Norman, and Yvonne Norman.

An invocation was given by Deidra Hartwell
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Nan Isaacson

Adoption of Agenda

(0:01:40)

Motion

Teresa Theurer made a motion to adopt the agenda, as presented. Porter Wilkins seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously with Teresa Theurer, Porter Wilkins, and Deidra Hartwell voting in favor.

Approval of Minutes for April 9, 2026.

(0:02:00)

Motion

Teresa Theurer made a motion to approve the minutes for April 9th, as presented. Porter Wilkins seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously with Teresa Theurer, Porter Wilkins, and Deidra Hartwell voting in favor.

Follow-up on Issues from Previous Meetings

Scott Perkes provided an update regarding the previously approved Wolfpack Commons development located near 2500 North and Wolfpack Way, including:

- Planning Commission previously forwarded a positive recommendation for the project rezoning.
- The North Logan City Council approved the: Rezone, Preliminary plat. And Development agreement.
- Infrastructure installation and grading activities had already begun.
- A final plat was anticipated within approximately one month.
- Vertical construction of buildings was expected within the next two to three months.

Regular Items

Item #1: 6:35PM PUBLIC HEARING - ZMA-2026-03 - Oak Meadows Rezone.

Scott Perkes summarized the project, including:

- Rezone approximately 3.5 acres from Residential Estate (RE-1) to Residential R-1-15.
- Existing condition:
 - Undeveloped "greenfield" property.
 - Historically zoned RE-1 since original zoning adoption in the 1970s.
 - Currently in agricultural production.
- Surrounding neighborhoods have a mixture of R-1-10, R-1-12, and R-1-15.
 - Surrounding developments generally consist of quarter-acre to one-third-acre residential lots.

- To the east lies Utah State University agricultural research land, which staff anticipates will likely remain agricultural for the foreseeable future.
- Proposed Development Concept:
 - Under existing RE-1 zoning: the parcel could support approximately 2–3 homes after required right-of-way dedications.
 - Under proposed R-1-15 zoning: approximately 8 residential lots could be achieved.
 - While bonus density provisions might theoretically allow up to 11 lots, the parcel's dimensions limit practical development to approximately 8 lots.
- North Logan General Plan designation for the area is Residential Core 2 Future Land Use District, which:
 - Encourages moderate-density single-family residential development.
 - Does not envision apartments or townhomes.
 - Anticipates smaller single-family lots rather than large estate lots.
- Staff concluded the proposed rezoning aligned with:
 - Long-term growth expectations.
 - Existing neighborhood development patterns.
 - The city's adopted General Plan goals.
- Staff noted:
 - No planned city park dedication was anticipated on the site.
 - No major trail corridors crossed the parcel beyond standard sidewalk connectivity.
 - Rezoning requests are legislative decisions
 - The Planning Commission has broad discretion to evaluate: neighborhood compatibility, public welfare, and character and fit.
 - If approved, subsequent subdivision review would become administrative and technical in nature.
 - Written public comments had been submitted to staff and were provided to the Commission for review.

Applicant Matt Cook introduced himself and stated that he had lived in the area for approximately 15 years. Mr. Cook expressed his belief that:

- The proposed homes would fit well within the surrounding neighborhood pattern.
- The development would continue the established character already present in the area.
- The project represented a reasonable continuation of nearby residential development.

Nan Isaacson read aloud the guidelines for speaking at a public hearing, and opened the public hearing at 6:44 p.m.

Quila Buhler (resident) comments included:

- She was not opposed to development itself, noting her background growing up around subdivision development through her father's homebuilding work.
- Primary concerns included:
 - Drainage and water flow impacts
 - Excavation practices
 - Sewer installation impacts
 - Potential damage to landscaping and neighboring property improvements
- She and neighboring property owners had invested significant resources into landscaping improvements
- Flooding and drainage problems had occurred in nearby Banbury developments
- She hoped the development would be completed thoughtfully and responsibly.

Yvonne Norman (resident) comments included:

- She lives west of the proposed development.
- Her concerns mirrored those previously expressed and included:
 - Stormwater drainage
 - Potential detention pond placement
 - Sewer line installation impacts

- Future grading and elevation changes affecting neighboring properties
- She referenced prior flooding and drainage issues experienced in nearby Banbury subdivisions and expressed concern that:
 - Increased density could worsen runoff impacts
 - Improper grading could create future drainage problems
 - Utility installation could create costly property damage.
- She emphasized her desire for:
 - Honest and thoughtful development practices
 - Good communication between the developer and neighbors
 - Careful attention to surrounding homeowners' concerns

Corey Wiley comments included:

- He was representing adjoining agricultural property to the north and discussed several concerns:
 - Sewer Access: regarding sewer installation through agricultural land currently under Greenbelt status.
 - Drainage: stormwater impacts on surrounding properties.
 - Road and Emergency Access:
 - Road width
 - Fire truck accessibility
 - Turning radius requirements
 - Placement of fire hydrants
 - Large emergency vehicles require approximately 50 feet for turnaround operations
 - Fire apparatus cannot rely on private driveways for maneuvering
 - Emergency access standards would need to be carefully evaluated
- He acknowledged the city's need for growth while encouraging careful planning and infrastructure design.

At 6:52 p.m. Nan Isaacson closed the public hearing and opened up dialogue to the Planning Commission.

Applicant Matt Cook addressed concerns raised during public comment:

- Existing public utility easements would be utilized
- Sewer lines were anticipated to be bored underground rather than trench-cut where possible
- The intent was to minimize disturbance to landscaping and neighboring properties.
- Stormwater Management: A civil engineer would design the stormwater system. Current city standards favor "low impact" drainage systems using swales rather than traditional curb-and-gutter systems.
- Mr. Cook acknowledged that roadway design and turnaround standards would need to meet all applicable codes.

Alan Luce presented information, including:

- Effectiveness of low-impact stormwater swales.
- Importance of proper installation and inspection.
- Existing successful examples within North Logan subdivisions.
- The city now applies much stricter stormwater standards based on lessons learned from past developments.
- City inspections ensure compliance with drainage design requirements.

Commission discussions with staff included:

- Fire Access Discussion
 - Need for compliant emergency vehicle turnaround areas
 - Hammerhead turnaround requirements
 - Future subdivision design review responsibilities
- Compatibility of the proposed zoning with surrounding neighborhoods
- Existing surrounding R-1-10, R-1-12, and R-1-15 developments
- Long-term development expectations for the area

- Potential future coordination with adjacent church-owned property
- Possibility of improving zoning boundary consistency in the area
- Future roadway connectivity opportunities.
- Commission members generally expressed that:
 - The proposal aligned with the General Plan
 - Moderate-density single-family development was appropriate in this location
 - Growth should be managed thoughtfully and responsibly.

Commissioners also thanked residents who submitted written comments and acknowledged concerns regarding previous flooding experiences in nearby developments.

(0:35:10)

Motion

Gavin Payne made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for ZMA2026-03 Oak Meadows rezone, based on the facts and finding contained in the body of the staff report. Deidra Hartwell seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously with Gavin Payne, Teresa Theurer, Porter Wilkins, and Deidra Hartwell voting in favor.

Staff Business

Scott Perkes reviewed items, including:

- Potential future joint work session on May 21st between the Planning Commission and the City Council regarding owner-occupied deed restrictions and related housing policy implementation.
 - Topic originates from goals contained within the General Plan
 - Additional policy guidance and implementation details are needed
 - Staff hopes to receive feedback from both bodies regarding future development standards

Adjourn to Work Session

This work session will be held in the main conference room adjacent to the Council Chambers. The session is open for public attendance, but is not open for public comment. No action will be taken by the Planning Commission following discussion.

Item #2: Work Session - Review and discussion regarding draft text amendments to the West 2500 North Gateway Corridor zoning classification.

Scott Perkes explained the purpose of the meeting was to continue discussion regarding proposed amendments to the Gateway Commercial West zoning district and related development standards. The discussion was intended to refine concepts before bringing formal zoning text amendments to a future public hearing.

1. Review of Gateway Commercial West Zoning Adjustments

Staff reviewed previous discussions involving possible zoning tools and approaches for the 2500 North Gateway corridor, including overlays, rezonings, incentives, disincentives, and amendments to the manufactured commercial zone. Staff stated the overlay concept had become overly complicated and that attention had shifted back toward modifying the existing Gateway Commercial West zoning tool.

A consolidated land-use table comparing residential, commercial, manufacturing, and mixed-use zones was presented. Residential categories were temporarily removed from the display to focus discussion on commercial and gateway-related uses. Commissioners discussed uses previously identified as permitted versus conditional uses and reviewed several categories that may need to be revised.

Topics discussed included:

- Transportation and distribution systems
- Parking lots and parking structures
- Hospitality-related uses

- RV and boat parking
- Animal-related uses
- Accessory buildings and lot coverage standards

2. Outdoor Storage and Commercial Use Standards

Commissioners discussed whether outdoor storage should be permitted in portions of the corridor and what limitations should apply. Discussion included:

- Equipment rental businesses
- Vehicle and trailer storage
- Delivery vehicle storage
- Bakery or service vehicle parking
- Storage associated with commercial operations

Staff clarified distinctions between temporary operational parking and long-term outdoor storage. Commissioners expressed concern about maintaining an attractive corridor appearance while still allowing transitional commercial uses.

Discussion also addressed whether car lots and RV sales should be permitted, prohibited, or conditionally approved within the corridor. Commissioners noted the need for flexibility while still preserving long-term redevelopment potential.

3. Building Materials and Architectural Standards

A substantial portion of the meeting focused on exterior building materials and façade requirements. Staff presented existing draft language requiring a percentage of masonry materials on commercial buildings. Commissioners discussed whether the current wording clearly reflected the Commission's intent.

Major Topics Discussed:

- Whether "brick" should specifically be required
- Differences between true masonry, veneer systems, and faux materials
- Use of real stone versus manufactured stone
- Longevity and durability of materials
- Aesthetic consistency along the corridor
- Avoidance of materials perceived as low quality or temporary

Several commissioners expressed concern about stucco and synthetic materials due to cracking, fading, and maintenance issues over time. Others emphasized allowing flexibility for architects while still establishing minimum quality standards.

Examples of recently constructed commercial buildings were discussed as reference points, including restaurants, hotels, banks, and retail developments. Commissioners generally supported:

- Requiring high-quality masonry materials
- Avoiding large blank walls
- Maintaining long-term visual quality
- Allowing some design flexibility

Preliminary Direction Discussed:

- Approximately 50% masonry requirement on non-glass façades
- Allowing brick, stone, or similar high-quality masonry materials
- Potential prohibition of stucco or faux masonry materials
- Clarifying language to better define acceptable materials

Staff noted that any revisions made to this corridor would likely need to be carried through to other commercial zones where similar language currently exists.

4. Window and Glass Requirements

Commissioners discussed whether minimum window requirements should be included for commercial buildings in the corridor. Discussion centered on:

- Creating visually welcoming buildings
- Avoiding long blank walls
- Allowing future adaptability of structures
- Balancing aesthetics with practical industrial or commercial operations

Commissioners discussed percentages ranging from 25% to 30% window coverage on façades. Concerns were raised regarding engineering limitations for all-glass buildings, though commissioners generally agreed some minimum level of glazing would improve appearance and pedestrian experience.

Consensus generally favored:

- A minimum façade window requirement
- Approximately 25% minimum glazing
- Continued flexibility for commercial and manufacturing uses

5. Fencing and Screening Standards

The Commission reviewed fencing regulations within the first 330 feet of the corridor frontage. Staff explained:

- No chain-link fencing would be permitted in front-facing areas
- Limited fencing could occur behind structures
- Parking and circulation areas would require screening and landscaping

Commissioners discussed outdoor patio fencing for restaurants and whether attractive decorative fencing should be allowed. Staff emphasized the difficulty of drafting code that anticipates every possible design scenario while still maintaining enforceable standards.

6. Landscaping, Sidewalks, and Setbacks

Staff presented landscape and sidewalk concepts associated with the corridor standards. Discussion focused on:

- Meandering versus straight sidewalks
- Green space percentages
- Compatibility with adjacent residential areas
- Pedestrian comfort along high-speed roadways
- Frontage landscaping requirements

Commissioners discussed:

- Maintaining approximately 20-foot landscaped setbacks
- Ensuring attractive frontage landscaping
- Creating visually appealing commercial development without excessive unused green space

7. Rental Services, Heavy Sales, and Outdoor Storage Regulations

Staff reviewed proposed language for:

- Rental service businesses
- Heavy sales and service
- Outdoor storage regulations
- Equipment rental operations
- Trade shops and contractor

Discussion included whether these uses should be:

- Permitted outright
- Subject to conditional use permits
- Limited through operational standards

Commissioners expressed concern regarding:

- Outdoor storage visibility
- Noise, vibration, and odors
- Storage of tools and equipment
- Transitional land uses within the corridor
- Long-term redevelopment flexibility

Examples discussed included:

- Equipment rental businesses
- RV dealerships
- Irrigation equipment sales
- Contractor yards
- Trade shops
- Light manufacturing operations

Staff explained the distinction between light manufacturing and heavier commercial or industrial uses, noting that most light manufacturing was expected to occur entirely indoors.

Several commissioners suggested that trade shops and similar uses may warrant conditional use review in order to provide additional oversight and ensure compliance with operational standards. Staff cautioned against creating an excessive number of conditional uses because of administrative burdens, but acknowledged that conditional approvals can provide stronger enforcement tools when operational concerns arise.

The Commission generally agreed:

- Transitional uses may be appropriate in the corridor
- Outdoor storage should be carefully regulated
- Standards should ensure attractive development during transition periods
- Conditional use permits may provide useful oversight for higher-impact uses

8. Future Meetings and Next Steps

Staff indicated the next meeting in May would likely involve a joint work session to continue discussion on the corridor standards and zoning amendments. Commissioners requested additional refinement of language related to:

- Masonry and façade materials
- Outdoor storage
- Trade shops and light manufacturing
- Conditional use standards
- Screening and landscaping

Nan Isaacson adjourned the meeting at 8:44 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission:

July 16, 2026

Transcribed by: Scott Bennett

Recorded by:



Scott Bennett/City Recorder