

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](#) at: go.loganutah.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

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

Questions and Comments for the Mayor and Council

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mayor/Staff Reports

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No further Mayor/Staff reports were provided.

Council Business

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

Planning Commission Update – Councilmember Simmonds

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

Council Announcements – Chair Johnson

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

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

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

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

No further Council Business items were presented.

Action Items

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

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

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

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Lee-Koven seconded by Councilmember López to adopt Ordinance 26-13 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (4-1).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Nay

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Council discussed the proposed treatment of stormwater facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

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

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

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

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

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Johnson opened the public hearing.

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

ACTION. Motion by Councilmember Simmonds seconded by Councilmember Dahle to approve Resolution 26-25 as presented. Motion carried by roll call vote (5-0).

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

Workshop Items

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dahle: Aye

Johnson: Aye

Lee-Koven: Aye

López: Aye

Simmonds: Aye

No further workshop items were presented.

Other Considerations

No further consideration were presented.

Adjournment:

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

Teresa Harris, City Recorder