

**Logan Municipal Council
Meeting Minutes for August 4, 2026**

Minutes of the meeting of the Logan Municipal Council convened in regular session on Tuesday, August 4, 2026, 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 streamed live on the [City of Logan YouTube channel](https://www.cityofloganutah.gov/CouncilMeetings) at: [go.loganutah.gov/CouncilMeetings](https://www.cityofloganutah.gov/CouncilMeetings)

Meeting Attendance

Approximately 18 individuals were in attendance at the start of the meeting. Chair Mike Johnson called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

Council members present:

- Chair Mike Johnson
- Vice Chair Ernesto López
- Councilmember Jeannie F. Simmonds
- Councilmember Melissa Dahle
- Councilmember Katie Lee-Koven

Administration present:

- Mayor Mark A. Anderson
- City Attorney Craig Carlston
- Finance Director Richard Anderson
- City Recorder Teresa Harris

Opening Ceremony

The opening ceremony was provided by Councilmember Lee-Koven who led the audience in the pledge of allegiance.

Meeting Minutes and Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve minutes from July 21, 2026, Regular Council Meeting and the August 4, 2026, agenda as presented.

ACTION: Motion by Councilmember Dahle, seconded by Councilmember Lee-Koven, to approve minutes from July 21, 2026, Regular Council Meeting and August 4, 2026, meeting agenda, as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0)

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

35 Chair Johnson announced that regular Council meetings are held on the first and third Tuesdays of the
36 month at 5:30 p.m. The next regular Council meeting is Tuesday, August 18, 2026. A Data Center
37 Open House will be held tonight immediately following council meeting at approximately 7:00 p.m.
38 He also announced a Truth in Taxation public meeting on Tuesday, August 11, 2026, beginning at
39 6:00 p.m.

40 **Questions and Comments for the Mayor and Council**

41 **[Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp \(5:40\)](#)**

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

50 Logan resident Susanne Janecke addressed the Council. Ms. Janecke, an environmental geoscientist,
51 river scientist, and community activist, requested that Logan City pause its sponsorship of the Logan
52 River Watershed Project. She expressed concerns regarding project costs, operating expenses, water
53 use, drought conditions, impacts to the Logan River, and the overall scope and affordability of the
54 project. She also questioned information being submitted to the federal government and asked the
55 Council to further review the project before proceeding.

56 Logan resident Danny Hammon addressed the Council. He represents the Young Automotive Group
57 and thanked the City for its public-private partnership and provided an overview of services now
58 available to municipal customers, including vehicle purchasing and pricing, in-house vehicle upfitting
59 for police and fire vehicles, collision repair services, towing and delivery, and fire apparatus sales and
60 service.

61 Logan resident Joshua Molitor addressed the Council. He commented on preservation and the historic
62 character of downtown Logan. He discussed the appearance of a Main Street property and expressed
63 concern about preserving historic architectural elements, including the iconic blue tile, and
64 maintaining the character and atmosphere of Main Street.

65 Logan resident Linda Johnson addressed the Council. She works for the Logan City School District
66 and mentioned the District's recent surplus technology sale. She encouraged greater public outreach so
67 that residents and families who could benefit from low-cost used computers and Chromebooks have an
68 opportunity to obtain them before equipment is recycled. She suggested additional neighborhood-level
69 outreach and collaboration between the City and School District.

70

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

72 **Mayor/Staff Reports**

73 [Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp \(18:10\)](#)

74 Mayor Anderson reported on the significant fire incident in Logan over the weekend and expressed
75 appreciation to Logan's fire, police, public works, light and power, parks, emergency management, and
76 other City crews, as well as mutual-aid agencies from throughout Cache County and the State. He
77 noted that the rapid response prevented loss of homes and lives, with no reported injuries and minimal
78 property damage.

79 Mayor Anderson specifically recognized Emergency Manager Ron Gonsalvez for coordinating
80 evacuation support, including shelter, food, water, and assistance for residents and pets. He also
81 thanked the Council for funding the emergency management position.

82 He stated that the incident demonstrated the importance of the City's 'Ready, Set, Go' emergency
83 preparedness program and that the City intends to promote the program over the coming months so
84 residents are prepared to evacuate quickly.

85 Mayor Anderson reported that the City's emergency communication system did not reach all residents
86 who had registered. Staff will meet with the provider to determine what occurred and identify
87 improved communication methods. The City is also evaluating utility-billing software that would
88 allow more geographically precise emergency notifications by phone, email, and text.

89 Mayor Anderson discussed the City's water tank and pipeline projects, noting that the fire consumed
90 more than 30 percent of the City's water reserves. He explained that the planned tank will
91 approximately double storage capacity and help equalize water pressure throughout the City,
92 strengthening emergency fire-fighting capacity.

93 He also discussed upcoming Truth in Taxation decisions, including funding for an additional fire
94 station and additional police and fire staffing. He stated that the weekend fire demonstrated the need
95 for additional resources.

96 Chair Johnson said on behalf of the City Council he also thanked all those that assisted with the recent
97 fire.

98 No further Mayor/Staff reports were provided.

99 **Council Business**

100 [Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp \(30:46\)](#)

101 **Planning Commission Update – Councilmember Simmonds**

102 Councilmember Simmonds reported that the Planning Commission's recent consideration of a
103 wetlands setback item would be addressed later in tonight's meeting.

104

105 **Council Announcements – Chair Johnson**

106 Chair Johnson noted the upcoming data center open house and the Truth in Taxation hearing
107 scheduled for August 11, 2026. He also announced that a Data Center Information Open House will be
108 held tonight immediately following the regular council meeting. The public is invited to attend and
109 provide input on potential ordinances regulating data center development.

110 Councilmember Simmonds stated that she received an email from a resident that was concerned about
111 the recent fire and access to the trail in that area on Canyon Road.

112 City Attorney Craig Carlston reported that negotiations are continuing and that two Salt Lake City law
113 firms have been retained to explore available options regarding the trail.

114 Councilmember Simmonds reported from a recent meeting of the Cache Metropolitan Planning
115 Commission (CMPO) regarding a new state planning concept referred to as 'Centers,' including
116 possible future funding opportunities.

117 No further Council Business items were presented.

118 **Action Items**

119 [Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp \(33:53\)](#)

120 **PUBLIC HEARING - Budget Adjustments FY 2026-2027 appropriating: \$50,000 funds Public**
121 **Works received from UDOT to improve the 400 North 600 West intersection and corridor;**
122 **\$18,000 a grant the Police Department received from the Internet Crimes Against Children**
123 **(ICAC) Task Force of Utah to investigate, protect and educate the community on child**
124 **exploitation; \$10,710 funds the Police Department received through the Bulletproof Vest**
125 **Partnership to purchase vests for police officers; \$40,000 funds the City will receive from Select**
126 **Health to promote wellness to employees through activities, newsletters, and other wellness**
127 **programs; \$2,500 donated funds toward Police Department supplies; \$22,000 funds toward**
128 **Visage Software Package for golf carts - Resolution 26-26 – Richard Anderson, Finance Director**

129 Finance Director Richard Anderson addressed the Council regarding the proposed budget adjustments.
130 The proposed adjustments included:

- 131 • A **\$50,000 appropriation** to Public Works for a Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)
132 grant related to improvements at **400 North and 600 West**.
- 133 • A **\$18,000 appropriation** for the Police Department's **Internet Crimes Against Children**
134 **(ICAC) Grant**.
- 135 • A **\$10,710 appropriation** for the Police Department's **Ballistic Vest Grant**.
- 136 • A **\$40,000 appropriation** from **Select Health** to support the City's employee wellness
137 program, replacing the previous wellness grant provided by Cigna.
- 138 • A **\$2,500 appropriation** of donated funds for Police Department supplies.
- 139 • A **\$22,000 appropriation** for the golf course's **Visage GPS software system** for golf carts.

140

141 The Council discussed the annual nature of the golf cart software agreement, the potential for
142 advertising revenue, maintenance and safety benefits, and data privacy requirements. The Council also
143 clarified the purpose of the UDOT funds.

144 Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

145 There were no comments, and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

146 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Dahle to approve**
147 **Resolution 26-26 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**

148 **Dahle: Aye**

149 **Johnson: Aye**

150 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

151 **López: Aye**

152 **Simmonds: Aye**

153 **PUBLIC HEARING - REZONE – Consideration of a proposed rezone. George Honey,**
154 **authorized agent/owner requesting the rezone of a .21-acre property located at 165 North 200**
155 **East from Traditional Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) to Town Center Two (TC-2) within the**
156 **Adams Neighborhood – Ordinance 26-13 - Aimee Egbert**

157 Planner Aimee Egbert presented Ordinance 26-13, a request to rezone approximately 0.21 acres
158 located at approximately 165 North 200 East from NR-6 to TC-2 (Town Center 2). The property is
159 located across from the temple. The property is currently surrounded primarily by TC-2 zoning to the
160 west and north, with NR-6 zoning remaining to the south. The Future Land Use Plan identifies the
161 entire block as “Downtown,” with the property across the street identified for public use.

162 She explained that the property contains a primary residence and a garage structure. The home was
163 constructed in 1909. An apartment was constructed above the garage in 1979, and a studio apartment
164 was constructed on the same floor as the garage in 1980. The two units were grandfathered as legal
165 units; however, the studio unit was not grandfathered because a permit had not been obtained. The
166 City became aware of the third unit following a complaint regarding meters, electricity, and high
167 utility bills. The current owner subsequently requested the rezone to allow the property to legally
168 contain three units. Staff noted that TC-2 zoning on the approximately 0.21-acre parcel would allow
169 up to six units, although the applicant is requesting approval for only three units.

170 The Planning Commission recommended approval of the request by a vote of 4-1. Staff stated that the
171 dissenting vote did not specify a particular reason but included concerns regarding future
172 development.

173 Council discussion centered on the property's existing nonconformities, particularly the canal setback.
174 Council questioned whether rezoning the property to allow an additional residential unit would
175 increase or otherwise affect the existing nonconformity.

176 Ms. Egbert explained that there are two types of nonconformities involved. The first is a structural
177 nonconformity, which relates to the existing structure's setback from the canal. Because the structure

178 was permitted in 1979, that setback is legally grandfathered. The existing structure may continue to be
179 used and reconfigured without creating an additional structural nonconformity. The second is a use
180 nonconformity, which relates to the use occurring within the structure. The requested rezoning would
181 address the use by allowing the property to contain the proposed three residential units. Any future
182 expansion or alteration of the existing structure would be required to comply with current setback
183 requirements and could not expand closer to the canal.

184 The Council also discussed the relationship between the Future Land Use Plan and the existing zoning
185 designation.

186 Ms. Egbert clarified that the Future Land Use Plan does not automatically change the zoning of
187 individual properties. The City's General Plan establishes the anticipated future land use, but the
188 corresponding zoning changes have not yet been adopted. Therefore, a property owner must still
189 request a rezone in order to change the property's zoning designation.

190 Council asked whether the property would have sufficient parking if the rezone were approved and the
191 property contained three units.

192 Ms. Egbert confirmed that the property meets the City's parking requirements and stated that staff did
193 not identify any other code issues that would prevent approval of the rezone.

194 Councilmember Simmonds discussed the City's previous denial of the rezone request.

195 Ms. Egbert explained that the request had previously been denied because the City was in the process
196 of developing the General Plan and there was concern that approving the request at that time could
197 result in isolated "spot zoning" and leave an island of NR-6 zoning.

198 The Council noted that circumstances have since changed, including the surrounding zone and the
199 City's adopted Future Land Use Plan.

200 Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

201 George Honey, owner and applicant of the proposed rezone, addressed the Council. He encouraged the
202 Council to approve the rezone for the reasons presented by staff. He stated that he believed the
203 property would comply with the City's requirements once the zoning was changed and offered to
204 answer any questions from the Council.

205 Logan resident Robert Sims addressed the Council. Mr. Sims stated that he lives in the studio
206 apartment on the property. He identified himself as a U.S. Air Force veteran who served for five years,
207 from 1955 to 1961, and stated that he is 88 years old. Mr. Sims said that he is comfortable living at the
208 property and asked the Council to approve the rezone so that he could continue living there. He stated
209 that, if the rezone were not approved, he would need to find another place to live.

210

211

212 Logan resident Joshua Molitor addressed the Council and said he had listened to the discussion and
213 believed that arguments had been presented on both sides of the issue. He acknowledged that rezoning
214 a property to accommodate one additional apartment can be a difficult decision but stated that Logan
215 needs housing and that he supported the request. He emphasized that approving the rezone would
216 allow an existing apartment to remain available to a veteran at a time when housing is difficult to find.
217 He stated that he was familiar with the property and believed the rezone would not substantially alter
218 the character of the neighborhood. He described the neighborhood as attractive and stated that the
219 proposal would essentially allow the property to continue in its existing condition and use.

220 Logan resident Linda Johnson addressed the Council. She understands the Council's reluctance
221 because of the concern that an unpermitted secondary apartment could potentially be legalized after
222 the fact. She also acknowledged the canal setback issue.

223 Ms. Johnson encouraged the Council to consider the long-term direction of the area and the City's
224 General Plan. She noted that the home is more than 100 years old and is increasingly surrounded by
225 medical-related development. She suggested that the area could potentially have a medical rather than
226 residential use in the future and noted that future Councils could make additional decisions concerning
227 the canal.

228 Ms. Johnson also noted that the property owner had paid the rezone application fee and had gone
229 through the process twice. She stated that any future changes to the property would still need to
230 comply with applicable building and zoning requirements.

231 Ms. Johnson concluded that she believed the rezone was consistent with the City's future plans and
232 would not create a significant negative impact. She acknowledged the concern about allowing illegal
233 construction to become grandfathered but noted that the current homeowner was not the person who
234 created the unpermitted unit. She therefore encouraged the Council to approve the request.

235 There were no further comments, and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

236 Councilmember Lee-Koven moved to approve the rezone request, stating that the Future Land Use
237 Plan indicates the direction in which the area is likely to develop and that the existing structures on the
238 property supported approval of the request. The motion was seconded.

239 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Lee-Koven seconded by Councilmember López to adopt**
240 **Ordinance 26-13 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-1).**
241 **Dahle: Aye**
242 **Johnson: Aye**
243 **Lee-Koven: Aye**
244 **López: Aye**
245 **Simmonds: Nay**

246 **PUBLIC HEARING - CODE AMENDMENT – Consideration of a proposed ordinance**
247 **amending the Land Development Code Chapter 17.24 “Development Standards for Wetlands” –**
248 **Ordinance 26-14 – Russ Holley, Community Development Director**

249 Mr. Holley presented the proposed amendments to the City's wetland setback regulations. He
250 explained that the item had been discussed by the Council at the previous meeting and that he had
251 subsequently met with Councilmember Melissa Dahle and received additional comments from the
252 Councilmembers regarding the proposed setback standards.

253 He explained that the primary issue under consideration was establishing different setback
254 requirements for different types of development. The Planning Commission had previously
255 recommended different standards for public and private development, with a reduced setback for
256 certain public improvements. At the previous Council meeting, however, the Council expressed a
257 preference for establishing setback requirements based on the type and size of the development or
258 structure, rather than simply distinguishing between public and private development.

259 Mr. Holley reported that he researched the typical size of pavilions and determined that approximately
260 1,200 square feet was a common size. Based on that research, staff created a category for structures
261 1,200 square feet or smaller, which could include pavilions, restrooms, pump houses, well houses, and
262 similar public works facilities. These smaller structures would have a different setback requirement
263 than larger structures.

264 He also reviewed the relationship between roads and wetlands. He explained that the areas shown on
265 the map as potential wetlands represented National Wetland Inventory areas and that actual wetlands
266 would be determined through a delineation process conducted through the U.S. Army Corps of
267 Engineers.

268 Mr. Holley noted that the City's adopted transportation master plan attempts to maintain a grid pattern
269 in the western areas of the City where wetlands are more prevalent. Some roads will inevitably
270 intersect areas containing wetlands, requiring mitigation in order for the roads to be constructed. Mr.
271 Holley explained that establishing different setbacks for different types of improvements would
272 provide some flexibility while still protecting wetlands.

273 Russ proposed three primary setback distances: 15 feet, 25 feet, and 50 feet.

274 • **15 feet** would apply to sidewalks, trails, landscaping, and stormwater facilities.
275 • **25 feet** would apply to streets.
276 • **50 feet** would apply to larger buildings and parking lots.

277 Mr. Holley explained that the 25-foot street setback would be measured from the edge of the asphalt or
278 curb. This would allow a park strip and sidewalk to be located within the overall street corridor while
279 maintaining the required wetland setback.

280 Council discussed the proposed treatment of stormwater facilities.

281 Mr. Holley explained that these facilities are generally landscaped depressions that temporarily collect
282 stormwater and allow it to percolate into the ground. They are generally dry except during storm
283 events and may consist of grass or other landscaping. Any pipes or tanks associated with the facilities
284 would typically be located underground.

285 Mr. Holley explained that smaller public structures, such as restrooms and pavilions, would be
286 permitted at a reduced setback when they fall within the smaller-structure category. Boardwalks would
287 also receive special treatment because the Army Corps of Engineers provides an exemption for certain
288 types of boardwalk construction within a limited disturbance area.

289 The residential subdivision setback had also been revised. The original proposal had included a 10-
290 foot setback from a wetland for subdivision lot lines. He proposed increasing the setback to provide
291 greater consistency with the other setback standards.

292 Mr. Holley explained that subdivision lot lines and building setbacks are separate requirements. A
293 subdivision lot line could be required to remain a certain distance from the wetland, with the residence
294 then required to meet an additional setback from the lot line under the City's zoning regulations.

295 Council questioned why residential subdivisions would receive a reduced setback rather than the 50-
296 foot setback proposed for larger structures. Discussion focused on the difference between an
297 individual homeowner developing a relatively small lot and a larger development where the developer
298 has greater flexibility to arrange buildings, open space, and landscaping around a wetland.

299 Councilmembers expressed differing views regarding whether a reduced residential setback would
300 adequately protect wetlands. One Councilmember expressed concern that applying a reduced setback
301 to subdivision lot lines could result in houses ultimately being constructed closer to wetlands than
302 intended, while staff explained that the additional building setbacks required by the zoning code would
303 create additional separation.

304 The Council also discussed the distinction between apartment or commercial development and
305 residential subdivisions. Staff explained that a larger multifamily or commercial parcel may contain a
306 wetland within the parcel and measure the required setback directly from the delineated wetland to the
307 building. A subdivision, by contrast, creates individual lots, resulting in additional setback
308 requirements between the lot line and the home.

309 Mr. Holley stated that the proposed residential setback represented an attempt to balance the
310 competing objectives of protecting wetlands while allowing reasonable development of properties that
311 contain wetlands. Staff noted that developers had indicated that the existing 50-foot standard made
312 certain types of development difficult or impractical, including sidewalks, sewer lines, and kayak
313 ramps. At the same time, staff acknowledged the importance of protecting wetlands.

314 The Council continued to discuss whether a 50-foot setback should remain for residential subdivisions.
315 Councilmembers noted that when a wetland has already been delineated within a subdivision, the
316 wetland itself remains protected, and a 50-foot setback would still apply to structures in many
317 circumstances.

318 The Council also discussed whether streets should have the same setback as lot lines. Staff explained
319 that many subdivision streets are dedicated as public streets because private streets must generally be
320 constructed to public standards.

321 The Council asked whether the proposed setback standards would encourage multifamily
322 development. Staff explained that the setback requirements themselves would not determine whether
323 an area develops with multifamily housing; that determination would be made through the City's
324 zoning regulations as the City establishes zoning districts in accordance with the General Plan.

325 Mr. Holley explained that a property owner who could demonstrate that a wetland setback deprived
326 the property of all development value could potentially pursue a **reasonable use exception**. Staff
327 clarified that this is not technically a variance and would require the applicant to meet a high standard
328 demonstrating that the regulation prevents reasonable development of the property.

329 Council discussed whether sidewalks and trails should be treated the same under the proposed 15-foot
330 setback. One Councilmember expressed concern that sidewalks located adjacent to heavily traveled
331 streets may have a different impact on wetlands than recreational trails.

332 The Council discussed whether the potential impacts associated with sidewalks were attributable to the
333 sidewalk itself or to the adjacent roadway. The Councilmember explained that the concern was
334 primarily related to the connection between sidewalks and roads, including potential impacts
335 associated with road chemicals and other runoff.

336 The Council also discussed the importance of maintaining sufficient space for future pedestrian access.
337 One Councilmember explained that if streets and sidewalks were required to have the same setback,
338 future roadway construction could potentially eliminate pedestrian access. Maintaining a smaller
339 setback for sidewalks would preserve space for pedestrian facilities even if a roadway were later
340 constructed or modified.

341 The Council generally agreed that sidewalks should have a smaller setback than roads because they
342 have a lesser impact on wetlands and because maintaining a separate setback could preserve future
343 pedestrian access.

344 The Council discussed a compromise that would increase the residential subdivision lot-line setback
345 while maintaining the additional zoning setback required between the lot line and the residence. After
346 discussion, the Council indicated support for moving the subdivision lot-line setback to **25 feet**, which
347 would result in a greater setback for the residence because of the additional zoning setback.

348 The Council also discussed the treatment of patios and decks within the setback. Staff explained that
349 patios and decks are generally treated as open space or landscaping under the City's code. The Council
350 discussed the potential environmental impacts of paved patios compared with lawns and landscaping,
351 including the potential for fertilizers and other materials to enter wetland areas.

352 The Council then discussed sidewalk setbacks and agreed that the proposed approach should provide a
353 smaller setback for sidewalks than for streets while maintaining sufficient separation to protect
354 wetlands and preserve pedestrian access.

355 Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

356

357 Logan resident Joshua Molitor addressed the Council. He expressed concern that the proposed wetland
358 setback ordinance could miss an opportunity to address potential impacts from future commercial
359 development, particularly data centers. He questioned the appropriateness of allowing commercial
360 development within 50 feet of wetlands and suggested that the Council delay consideration of the
361 ordinance for approximately one month to allow additional discussion and consideration of ways the
362 ordinance could provide greater protection for wetlands from potential data center development.

363 Logan resident Linda Johnson thanked the Council for balancing property development rights with
364 wetland preservation and emphasized the importance of protecting wetlands from environmental
365 impacts. She supported the proposed 25-foot road setback, noting it adequately accommodates a
366 sidewalk while maintaining the 15-foot sidewalk and trail setback, and suggested considering different
367 regulations for paved versus unpaved trails due to potential impact differences. Additionally, Ms.
368 Johnson expressed support for increasing subdivision lot-line setbacks to place homes farther from
369 wetlands without restricting land use and advocated for maintaining the 50-foot setback for
370 commercial and larger structures to strengthen wetland protection and mitigate concerns surrounding
371 potential data center development.

372 There were no further comments, and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

373 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Vice Chair López to continue**
374 **Ordinance 26-14 to the August 18, 2026, Council meeting as an action item and no public**
375 **hearing as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**

376 **Dahle: Aye**

377 **Johnson: Aye**

378 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

379 **López: Aye**

380 **Simmonds: Aye**

381

382 **PUBLIC HEARING – Consideration of a proposed resolution of the Logan Municipal Council**
383 **Repealing Resolution 25-46 which approved Logan City’s Withdrawal from the Logan-Cache**
384 **Airport Authority – Resolution 26-25 – Craig Carlston, City Attorney**

385 City Attorney Craig Carlston presented background on Resolution 26-25 regarding the city's
386 relationship with the Logan-Cache Airport Authority. Following the city's December 2025 passage of
387 Resolution 25-46 to withdraw from the authority and eliminate future financial liabilities, it was
388 determined that federal FAA grant eligibility required Logan City to remain a participating member.
389 To resolve this issue while still achieving the city's operational and financial goals, the proposed
390 resolution repeals Resolution 25-46 and authorizes an amendment to the 1992 Interlocal Agreement.

391 Under the key terms of the amended Interlocal Agreement, Logan City is relieved of all direct
392 financial contributions while gaining increased insulation from potential liabilities. Governance is
393 restructured under a dual-board model consisting of a seven-member Sponsor Board for general
394 oversight, budgeting, and long-term debt approval, and a seven-member Airport Authority Board
395 responsible for technical operations, maintenance, contracts, and regulations. Representation on the
396 Sponsor Board includes three Cache County Council members (with at least one Logan resident), two
397 Cache County elected officials, the Logan City Mayor or Designee, and one Logan City Council

398 member, while the Airport Authority Board comprises one countywide elected official and six public
399 members with domain expertise. In the event of future dissolution without continued operations,
400 airport assets will be split equally between the city and county; if the county continues operations for
401 at least 20 years post-dissolution, assets revert entirely to the county, whereas operations lasting fewer
402 than 20 years maintain the 50/50 split.

403 During Council discussion, Mr. Carlston clarified that internal rules and operational regulations will be
404 managed directly by the Airport Authority Board without requiring Council approval. He confirmed
405 that the FAA requires both entities to remain members to maintain grant certifications and noted that
406 the airport continues to pay for municipal services such as fire protection.

407 Council members noted that the restructuring achieves the city's original objectives of governance
408 oversight and liability insulation without ongoing financial contributions.

409 Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

410 There were no comments, and Chair Johnson closed the public hearing.

411 **ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Dahle to approve**
412 **Resolution 26-25 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**
413 **Dahle: Aye**
414 **Johnson: Aye**
415 **Lee-Koven: Aye**
416 **López: Aye**
417 **Simmonds: Aye**

418 **Workshop Items**

419 **[Link to video recording of meeting at time stamp \(1:35:49\)](#)**

420 **REZONE/CODE AMENDMENT - Consideration of a proposed ordinance approving the Maple**
421 **View Subdivision. Steward Land Company/Adams Family Trust, authorized agent/owner is**
422 **requesting approval of a Planned Development Overlay to allow development of a residential**
423 **subdivision on approximately 10-acres. The site is located at approximately 350 South 1400 West**
424 **(TIN 02-066-0013), within the Suburban Neighborhood Residential (NR-4) zone in the Woodruff**
425 **Neighborhood – Ordinance 26-15 - Aaron Smith, Planner**

426 Planner Aaron Smith addressed the Council regarding the proposed rezone and code amendment. He
427 introduced the workshop discussion for Ordinance 26-15, which involves a proposed rezone overlay
428 map and code amendment for the Maple View Subdivision Plan Development Overlay (PDO). The
429 underlying zoning for the site is Neighborhood Residential (NR4), where standard development
430 regulations apply unless explicitly modified by the proposed PDIO code amendment. Mr. Smith
431 explained that under the City's General Plan, the area is designated as low-density residential, which
432 primarily accommodates single-family detached homes but can allow small, attached housing at
433 densities ranging from 1 to 9 units per acre. He highlighted the surrounding site context and walked
434 through the adjustments requested during the Planning Commission's review. While the applicant
435 originally applied for a 51-lot subdivision, the Planning Commission recommended approval of a

436 reduced 46-lot plan by a 3–2 vote. The Planning Commission's condition restructured the site plan so
437 that roughly one-third of the total land area is dedicated to each of three lot categories: increasing the
438 required number of large lots (10,000+ square feet) from six to nine, requiring 15 medium lots (6,000+
439 square feet), and allowing the remaining balance as smaller lots.

440 Mr. Smith detailed the specific code modifications, road dedication requirements, and design standards
441 associated with the project. To accommodate smaller lots (5,000 square feet or less), the code
442 amendment reduces front building setbacks to 20 feet. He clarified that this 20-foot depth is measured
443 from the street to the structure, matching standards approved in nearby developments such as Sugar
444 Creek and ensuring driveways remain long enough, so parked vehicles do not overhang public
445 sidewalks. Regarding transportation infrastructure, the development team is required to dedicate a
446 minor arterial right-of-way width along 14th West and construct a collector-level road, as well as pave
447 a 24-foot-wide, two-lane asphalt travel surface extending north to connect the subdivision directly to
448 200 South. Aaron noted that while 14th West is identified as a major arterial on the Transportation
449 Master Plan, Public Works determined that full arterial construction is unnecessary in the immediate
450 future because the road terminates at a lake to the south. This collector construction standard preserves
451 extra right-of-way space for a required landscape buffer along 14th West, which will feature an 8-foot-
452 wide public sidewalk separated from lot boundary lines by a 25-foot landscaped strip. Additional
453 project requirements include eliminating three proposed lots served by a private drive, creating public
454 trail connections through open space to the adjacent park, providing safe trail crossings, and placing
455 open space management under an HOA. Aaron concluded by reviewing surrounding planning
456 documents, noting that the Woodruff Neighborhood Plan emphasizes single-family detached housing
457 west of 10th West, maintaining a balanced housing supply, and matching existing neighborhood
458 character, while the two dissenting Planning Commission votes stemmed from desires for either mixed
459 housing structure types or a higher proportion of larger lots.

460 Brad Brown, representing the proponent and development team, addressed the Council regarding the
461 evolution of the site plan and project feasibility. He expressed appreciation for the Council's time and
462 stated that the team's primary goal is to build a high-quality development that the community can be
463 proud of.

464 Mr. Brown explained that the developer has created multiple site plan iterations to incorporate
465 community feedback, including designs featuring a meandering path, internal trail connections
466 crossing 14th West, direct access to the adjacent city park, and a potential neighborhood pump track in
467 response to neighbor input. He noted that the unit mix mandated by the Planning Commission
468 represents a significant financial concession for the project team that pushes the project to its
469 economic limits.

470 Mr. Brown emphasized that including smaller and medium lot sizes is essential for housing
471 attainability and allows young families to move into a neighborhood and gradually transition into
472 larger homes as their space needs grow over time.

473 Addressing Council questions regarding site plan updates, Mr. Brown clarified that while 13
474 preliminary site plan variations had been drafted internally, he hesitated to formalize a final layout
475 until receiving clear directional targets from the Council to avoid continuously drawing moving

476 targets. He offered to complete and submit an updated site plan within a week if given specific
477 parameters.

478 During Council discussion, members evaluated the proposal's density, lot distribution, infrastructure
479 layout, and overall alignment with municipal planning goals. Council members expressed strong
480 reservations about the proposed 46-lot density, stating that the current draft continues to resemble an
481 ordinary, dense residential subdivision rather than a tailored Plan Development Overlay that justifies
482 density concessions. Members referenced extensive community outreach from the Woodruff
483 Neighborhood Plan and General Plan processes, noting that neighborhood guidance calls for density to
484 decrease as development moves further away from major arterial corridors. Council members also
485 cited input from the local school district superintendent, who attended prior public meetings to
486 emphasize the city's critical need for larger, long-term family housing to prevent growing families
487 from relocating out of Logan City to neighboring municipalities like Nibley or Smithfield. Discussing
488 lot geometry and site constraints, Council members criticized short 20-foot driveway configurations
489 spaced every 20 feet along internal streets and expressed skepticism over the proposed private HOA
490 pump track, noting that small HOA-maintained facilities often suffer from poor long-term
491 maintenance and that public park facilities are already situated immediately adjacent to the site.

492 To resolve the impasse and provide clear direction to the developer, the Council reviewed alternative
493 lot breakdown models presented by planning staff. Staff highlighted a balanced breakdown model
494 based on total land area that would yield 40 total lots, divided into 14 large lots (10,000+ square feet),
495 13 medium lots, and 13 small lots. Council members voiced strong preference for this 40-lot structure,
496 noting that concentrating larger lots along the eastern boundary creates an appropriate transition to
497 existing neighboring properties. The Council further directed the proponent to eliminate the private
498 pump track amenity and instead reconfigure lot boundaries so that individual backyards encompass the
499 landfill overlay area, allowing home buyers to enjoy larger private yard footprints while restricting
500 primary home structures outside the overlay zone.

501 Mr. Brown confirmed that he understood the Council's consensus and agreed to prepare and present a
502 revised 40-lot site plan reflecting 14 large lots, 13 medium lots, 13 small lots, and integrated overlay
503 lot lines for formal review at the Council meeting scheduled in two weeks.

504 The proposed ordinance will be an action item and public hearing at the August 18, 2026, Council
505 meeting.

506 **Consideration of a proposed resolution adopting Revised Logan Light and Power Residential,**
507 **Commercial and Industrial Electrical Rate Schedules and Adopting a Power Cost Adjustment**
508 **Rate Schedule – Resolution 26-27 - Mark Montgomery, Light & Power Director**

509

510

511

512

513 **ACTION. Motion by Chair Johnson seconded by Councilmember Dahle to continue Resolution**
514 **26-27 to the August 18, 2026, Council meeting as an action item with a public hearing as**
515 **presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).**

516 **Dahle: Aye**

517 **Johnson: Aye**

518 **Lee-Koven: Aye**

519 **López: Aye**

520 **Simmonds: Aye**

521 No further workshop items were presented.

522 **Other Considerations**

523 No further consideration were presented.

524 **Adjournment:**

525 There being no further business, the Logan Municipal Council adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

526

527

528 Teresa Harris, City Recorder