



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting of October 13, 2016

City Hall Council Chambers * 290 North 100 West Logan, UT 84321 * www.loganutah.org

Minutes of the meeting for the Logan City Planning Commission convened in regular session on Thursday, October 13, 2016. Vice-Chairman Price called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Commissioners Present: David Butterfield, Dave Newman, Tony Nielson, Eduardo Ortiz, Russ Price, Sara Sinclair

Commissioners Excused: Amanda Davis

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

Minutes as written and recorded from the September 22, 2016 meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Sinclair moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Commissioner Nielson seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

PUBLIC HEARING

PC 16-040 Hampton Inn & Suites [Design Review Permit] MMR Investments LL/Weston Logan Inc./Logan City, authorized agent/owner, request construction of a 72,423 SF, 102-unit hotel on 1.63 acres located at 233 North Main in the Town Center (TC) zone; TIN 06-016-0001;-0002;-0023;-0024;-0023;-0027;-0028.

STAFF: Ms. Pollan reviewed the request for construction of a new 102-room hotel. The hotel will be 4-stories, 72,423 SF and will include a pool, patio, breakfast area, fitness facility, business center, laundry, and office facilities. The Land Development Code (LDC) table §17.17.030 permits hotel use within the Town Center (TC) zone. Town Center is described as an area designated to promote and compliment downtown Logan with a mix of retail, office, residential and civic uses in addition entertainment and cultural activities. The building, site, and uses provided for in this development meet the intent of the General Plan.

PROPONENT: Matt Weston advised that the brick will have articulation as submitted. A few other locations were considered but it was their desire to be downtown. He clarified for Commissioner Butterfield that no restaurant is proposed because the hotel franchise does not allow access from the hotel; it would have required separate exterior entrances which posed a challenge to the space, design, construction costs and parking, there is, however, a small breakfast area for hotel guests.

PUBLIC: An email in support for the project was received and distributed prior to the meeting from Gary Saxton, the Executive Director of the Logan Downtown Alliance.

Morgan Weeks asked how many proposals were submitted. Mr. Housley, the City Attorney, advised that the purpose of the meeting is to review the design of the project. He encouraged Mr. Weeks to contact the Economic Director, Kirk Jensen, for further background information.

Gary Saxton, representing the Logan Downtown Alliance, encouraged approval for this project.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Butterfield asked about the building materials listed in condition 7. Ms. Pollan explained that the materials listed in the condition are allowed in the zone, the requirement is for a mix of materials.

Ms. Pollan clarified that the intent of condition 8 is a recommendation for some brick to be used on the north and west facades (interior to parking lot and not street-facing). Commissioner Butterfield questioned how that condition would be applicable without a requirement for a certain percentage of specific material. Ms. Pollan advised that it is a suggestion to help maintain design consistency because brick is proposed on the street-facing facades.

Ms. Pollan clarified for Chairman Price that landscaping will be included on the streetscape; a plan will be submitted for approval. There has been some thought to adding a trellis to soften the large expanse of wall along the Main Street facade. Chairman Price liked the idea of brick detailing because it creates visual interest and would not rust as a trellis might.

Commissioner Nielson asked if library patrons would still have access to park. Mr. Weston said there will be a cross access agreement for parking. Hilton Hotel requires reserved parking for diamond members so there will be a couple of spots near the entrance reserved, other than that it will be open public parking.

Chairman Price said the Town Center area is meant to be a community gathering spot and asked about pedestrian access. Ms. Pollan said there will be sidewalk around the hotel for pedestrian circulation.

Commissioner Butterfield liked the design and thought this to be a good anchor project; he expressed kudos to the City and developer.

MOTION: Commissioner Butterfield moved to **conditionally approve** a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 16-040 with the conditions of approval as listed below. Commissioner Nielson seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. A 10' minimum parking setback provided with type "C" separation standards per LDC §17.039.070.
3. Parking to be provided at one stall per guest room. The Director may approve a reduction per LDC §17.38.090.E or an off-site parking agreement be provided per §17.38.050.
4. A performance landscaping plan, prepared in accordance with LDC §17.39, shall be submitted for approval to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of the building permit. The plan shall include the following:
 - a. Parking lot landscaping to be provided in accordance with LDC §17.39.070, including a minimum of 7 trees and plant coverage of 50% of the landscaped islands.
 - b. The streetscape on Main Street and 200 North to be coordinated with the staff to implement the Downtown Specific plan. Trees shall be maintained or installed at 30' on center along all adjacent streets.
5. Weather protection required for ground floor entrances.
6. Building elevations shall provide substantial conformance with the transparency and fenestration, and building wall length articulation requirements.
7. The proposed building materials include brick and painted stucco, with some metal railings and awning features. Stucco (EIFS) must be sufficiently detailed to provide interest and surface variation into areas of 64 SF or less.

8. If the north and west interior elevations are modified, brick shall be used first floor, as a minimum, or in vertical sections, alternating with building sections like the frontage elevations.
9. All dumpsters shall be visually screened or buffered from public streets by either the use of landscaping, fencing or walls.
10. Exterior lighting shall be concealed source, down-cast and reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of a building permit and shall comply with current LDC regulations.
11. No signs are approved with this permit. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
12. No fences are approved with this permit. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
13. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Director of Community Development shall receive a written memorandum from each of the following departments or agencies indicating that their requirements have been satisfied:
 - a. Fire
 - i. This project will require fire hydrants, fire sprinkler system, fire alarm system, standpipes, and aerial fire apparatus access.
 - ii. A fire pump may need a State permit.
 - b. Environmental/Waste Management
 - i. Minimum inside measurement of enclosure is 12' wide x 10' deep. Bollards or other design feature in the back to protect enclosure wall. Gates must have drop pins to hold the gates in the open position. No shed roof overhang allowed into lift space of enclosure.
 - c. Water
 - i. Water main must have an RP (ASSE1013) installed as it enters the building before any branch-offs or connections and be tested.
 - ii. The fire riser must have a minimum DC (ASSE1015) installed and tested. An RP will be required if there is also a pump system.
 - iii. Landscape irrigation must have a high-hazard rated backflow assembly installed and tested such as a RP (ASSE1013) or PVB (ASSE1015).
 - iv. All point of use backflow rules shall apply, according to the Utah 2015 IPC.
 - d. Engineering
 - i. Provide storm water detention/retention in compliance with City design and construction standards. This includes but is not limited to:
 - Onsite retention of the 90th percentile storm event
 - Implementation of Low Impact Development for storm water retention and detention
 - ii. Provide water shares per Land Development Code for increased water demand on existing City Water shares and system.
 - iii. Dedicate a 10' X10' corner cut at the intersection of US 89/91 and SR-30 for a 45' radius at the top back of curb, ADA sidewalk/ramps and relocation of signal pole. Coordinate radius corner and signal work with UDOT.
 - iv. Provide a cross access agreement with Logan City for access to all UDOT and City streets. This agreement shall include existing City buildings and parking lots and the possible future development of the north east corner of the block.
 - v. Access to US 89/91 and SR-30 shall be as approved and conditioned by UDOT and shall have CAMP approval.
 - vi. Provide a fixture count and flows per the plumbing code to ensure that the correct water meter size is provided and sewer lateral is sized correctly.
 - vii. Any current or previous utility connections not used by this development shall be capped at the City associated main, coordinate locations with Logan City.
 - viii. A Water utility agreement will be required for fire hydrant on interior of site.
 - e. Environmental (Waste Management)
 - i. Loop access is not large enough for collection truck and will cause excessive wear on the parking lot. Full grown trees will interfere with truck clearance. A better placement would be straight in on either of the access points so the collection

truck can pull straight in and then back out. Minimum inside measurement of a single enclosure is 10' deep x 12' wide.

f. City Forestry

- i. Street trees required in park strip every 30', to be installed or maintained by developer. Coordinate species and location with the Forester and provide information on landscaping plan submitted with building permit.

g. CVTD

- i. The CVTD bus stop is being proposed to be relocated to the north. Contact the Cache Valley Transit District to coordinate relocation options and construction.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The project is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties because of the building design, materials, landscaping, and setbacks to adjacent development.
2. The project substantially conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The project meets the goals and objectives in the General Plan by introducing an architecturally compatible building and use that will support the Logan downtown activity.
4. The project development utilizes existing utilities, infrastructure, and roadways.
5. The 6.73' setback is found to be acceptable as it allows additional wall plane variation and still has architectural elements that are within the setback range.
6. The project, as conditioned, complies with maximum height, density and building design standards and because the building is solely commercial in use that application of commercial standards in building design is appropriate and conforms to the intent of the LDC.
7. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.
8. Main Street and 200 North provide access and are adequate in size and design to sufficiently handle automobile traffic related to the land use. UDOT has reviewed the project and will have additional review to ensure any necessary mitigation occurs.

Moved: Commissioner Butterfield Seconded: Commissioner Nielson Passed: 6-0
Yea: D. Butterfield, D. Newman, T. Nielson, E. Ortiz, R. Price, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain:

PC 16-041 MR-9 Rezone [Zone Change] Logan City/Bernston LLC, authorized agent/owner, request a rezone of 3.42 acres, north of 1400 North and east of 1200 East, from Commercial (COM) to Mixed Residential (MR-9); TIN 05-011-0006.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request to rezone a 3.42 acre parcel from Commercial (COM) to Mixed Residential Transitional (MR-9) with the intent of developing lower-density (9 units per acre) residential townhomes. The developer feels the Commercial designation is inappropriate for the area given the proximity to single-family neighborhoods and large commercial shopping centers a few blocks west.

This area is a vacant site which slopes east to west, several stands of native trees and vegetation exist. A wetland delineation has not been completed at this time. The site is encircled by streets, including 1400 North, 1200 East and a small residential access road to the north that is located in North Logan City. The Logan City boundary runs along the northern property line.

The General Plan encourages neighborhood walkable commercial services and compact residential to give residents more transportation options and reduce the impacts of inefficient sprawling growth. With the proximity to USU and their student and faculty populations in need of quality and stable housing options, the Mixed Use designation seemed logical in 2008. With newer developments evolving in the last few years into bigger commercial and residential projects oriented towards vehicle use and regional populations, it is evident that these types of developments would negatively impact the established neighborhood character.

The current Commercial zone allowances and development patterns are very similar to that of Mixed Use, with large commercial buildings and higher-density multi-family housing above or behind. With a smaller existing convenience store, walkable commercial services can exist with some pedestrian improvements to the streetscape and intersections. Given the MR-9 zoning description in the LDC of being a transition area that provides quality housing options, the MR-9 zone would be more compatible than the current Commercial zone. The Commercial zone allows bigger structures and higher-density (30 units per acre) multi-family housing that could be built in an incompatible manner and negatively impact the neighborhood. Staff is recommending approval of the rezone request.

PUBLIC: James Huppi advised that the agreement with Cache-Highline will need to be modified. He is concerned about the setback on 1500 North and how high buildings could be. Chairman Price explained that those issues would be handed at the development/design stage.

Steve Dewey lives in North Logan and expressed concern with safety along 1500 North. There are currently four homes on that the dead-end lane. He asked if there would be a cost to North Logan if the street were developed. Mr. Holley said he does not anticipate any proposed access to the north, which would require crossing a jurisdictional boundary. Mr. Dewey said 1500 North used to be a through-street but was closed after a petition from the residents and he would not like to see it opened back up.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Sinclair asked if North Logan residents were noticed. Mr. Holley confirmed that property owners within 300' of the project site were sent notices.

Commissioner Newman asked about the standing water and whether wetland delineation will be required. Mr. Holley said that it will be required before any development and depending on the results there may be some mitigation necessary.

Mr. Holley clarified for Chairman Price that the requested zone would allow a developer up to 30 townhomes. Chairman Price questioned access; Mr. Holley said that would be addressed when a development is proposed. Chairman Price asked if there was a proposal pending. Mr. Holley anticipates there will be, however, there is nothing official at this point.

Chairman Price expressed concern with changing the Mixed Use designation indicated on the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) to Mixed Residential. This is an area where having mixed use would be appropriate and helpful and it seems as if the intent of the mixed use buffer is being lost. Mr. DeSimone, the Community Development Director, advised that the surrounding neighborhood did not want mixed use or commercial in this location. The fundamental question is whether the City envisions that this area would need to change to a commercial use, given the nature of the road system and the current commercial centers, there does not seem to be a supporting reason to keep it commercial. It does present a difficult quandary about what makes sense now versus what might be needed in the future.

Commissioner Butterfield said it is important to find areas for mixed use and higher-density housing that is healthy for the surrounding neighborhood(s).

Commissioner Newman thinks townhomes might be a good idea as residents begin to downsize and want to stay in the area.

Commissioner Ortiz advised that it is good to envision and plan for what might happen in 15-20 years. This is a small area and may not be right for mixed use; however, there are areas which would be good for mixed use development. Chairman Price agreed and pointed out that the tendency is to plan for long-term but make decisions based on "what is in front of us" which may be correct in most cases, however, there is a need to find ways to incentive mixed use type projects.

Commissioner Nielson said he is a proponent of mixed use and would like to see more small-scale commercial throughout the City. He also noted that there is a difference in townhomes for a retired community versus townhomes located near the University, which may serve a different population.

MOTION: Commissioner Newman moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for a zone change of 3.42 acres, north of 1400 North and east of 1200 East, from Commercial (COM) to Mixed Residential (MR-9) as outlined in PC 16-041 with the findings for approval as listed below. Commissioner Butterfield seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The rezone is consistent with the current neighborhood character.
2. The rezone will have less of a negative transportation impact than the current Commercial (COM) designation.
3. The proposed MR-9 zone is limited enough in density, height and bulk to ensure neighborhood compatibility with the current character of the area.
4. The streets and infrastructure services are sufficient in size and capacity to handle all allowed uses in the MR-9 zoning district.
5. The site, with proper preparation, is suitable to handle development associated with MR-9 zoning.

Moved: Commissioner Newman Seconded: Commissioner Butterfield Passed: 5-0
Yea: D. Butterfield, D. Newman, Ortiz, R. Price, S. Sinclair Nay: Abstain: T. Nielson

PC 16-039 LDC Amendment – CR Zone Refinement 17.14 & 17.15 – continued from Sept. 22

[Code Amendment] Logan City requests an amendment to the Land Development Code (LDC) Chapters 17.14 & 17.15 to refine the maximum height, maximum building lengths and minimum parking requirements in the Campus Residential (CR) zone.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone outlined the changes. The proposed amendments for building height and parking have been removed from this request. The Planning Commission has the latitude within the Land Development Code §17.50.090 to consider a deviation to the height standard by up to 10% when warranted (unique site considerations or unique building designs where the deviation will conform to the overall design). The Commission also has the latitude within Section 17.38.050 to consider deviations from the minimum parking requirements through the alternative parking plan process. This puts the burden of demonstrating the need for reduced parking and managing the impacts of a proposed parking stall reduction on a project proponent rather than the City.

The original purpose of the 120' maximum building length was to regulate the overall building mass along the street frontage to ensure that a building in the CR zone did not overwhelm the streetscape and still enable pedestrian movement through a project site.

The previous language stated:

Pedestrian Access

Buildings shall not exceed 120' in horizontal distance without minimum 20' breaks between buildings providing pedestrian access or common open space.

The proposed change to LDC §17.15.120 is:

Building Length and Mass

In order to contribute to a pedestrian-oriented environment and ensure compatibility with adjoining residential areas, larger projects with larger buildings need more substantial modulation features to break up the overall mass and add visual interest to the streetscape. The length of a building along a street frontage or a common property boundary adjacent to a Neighborhood Residential Zone shall not exceed 200' in length and shall include at least one significant break in the vertical wall plane with a minimum depth of at least 8', a minimum length of at least 20', and

running the full height of the building. The length of a building along the street frontage elsewhere in the CR Zone shall not exceed 300' in length and shall include at least two significant breaks in the vertical wall plane with a minimum depth of at least 8', a minimum length of at least 20' running the full height of the building.

Buildings located internal to a block or oriented away from the street or the Neighborhood Residential Zones, do not have a maximum building length. Interior buildings may be connected to those along the street frontage; however, the rear building shall be setback at least 75' from the façade of the primary building, while the open area shall be at least 30' in width and shall consist of useable plaza or courtyard space.

There shall be a minimum separation between buildings along the street frontage or adjacent to NR Zones of at least 20' to provide for common open space or pedestrian access.

The proposed language changes in LDC §17.15.120 accomplishes:

1. Clarifies that a building length limitation applies only to buildings located along a street frontage and/or adjacent to a NR zone. A building located within the interior of a property or oriented away from the street would not be subject to the maximum building length.
2. Increases the building length adjacent to a NR zone to 200', which is the equivalent of a 1/3 of a block, which lends to additional design flexibility while ensuring the project is in scale and character with the neighborhood.
3. Increases the building length adjacent to a street elsewhere in the CR to 300', which is the equivalent of 1/2 of a block.
4. Add additional significant articulation requirements for buildings in this zone.
5. Requires additional courtyard space for projects where interior structures are designed and constructed as extensions of those fronting the street.
6. Maintains the minimum separation of at least 20' between buildings along the street frontages or adjacent to the NR Zones.

The current design standards for multi-family residential projects are found in Section 17.14.040 as well as on the spec sheet in 17.15.120. The Land Development Code requires articulation, a mix of materials, variation in roof elevations, defined entry ways, variation in the building's fenestration, architectural styles, building height, and/or colors. The specific articulation standards require changes in wall planes every 500-1,000 SF based on building height. In the CR zone, generally there are articulated elements every 20' as the structures tend to be taller.

Some of the arguments against the current maximum building length are that it creates additional construction costs because with separate buildings, a variety of requirement elements such as building elevators, emergency accesses, exterior end construction, fire protection systems (sprinklers/alarms), building security systems, etc., are duplicated within each separate building. The end result is that the additional costs start rendering a project infeasible, or these costs get passed onto tenants, which can lead to higher rental costs that start pricing out a majority of the students and defeats the intent of the CR zone. A second issue or concern with limiting the building length is the challenge in developing a functional parking structure. Designing a structure with adequate internal access, parking areas, and ramps is potentially hindered by a limitation of length. A third set of issues revolve around controlled access. The original language expressed the standard in terms of pedestrian access and common open space. The last few student housing projects reviewed and approved have been designed to manage access through the project site, so the concept of creating open areas between buildings for pedestrian movement makes it more challenging to manage the overall site.

The existing limit on building length is arbitrary and does not support the intended movement towards a more modern and intensive built environment in this specific area. The CR zone is the only zone in the City to have a limitation on building length.

The prior Code language defining the 120' standard for pedestrian access was in place when the Independent Living Project was reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Clearly, the intent was to limit the amount of building frontage along the street in order to break up the mass of the building while providing visual interest, tenant access and open areas.

The proposed changes respond to a real need for site and building design flexibility in the Campus Residential Zone without compromising neighboring properties. The additional building lengths are appropriately scaled to overall block lengths based on location. The proposal helps control building mass along the streetscape while allowing for pedestrian movement into and through a project site. The proposed language clarifies building length internal to a project site.

Staff finds that the proposed amendments will enable Logan City, landowners and neighbors within, and adjacent to, the Campus Residential zone promote student housing projects compatible with the neighborhood, walkable in design, and reflect a long-term commitment to good, lasting construction and design.

PUBLIC: An email from Tom Jensen, supporting the proposed amendment, was received and distributed prior to the meeting.

Jan Nyman expressed appreciation for removing the height and parking elements of this proposal. She is concerned with the wording of LDC 17.50 and 17.38.050 allowing a deviation from the requirement. Mr. DeSimone explained that the Commission has the latitude to deviate up to 10% from the requirement during the design review process if additional criteria are met and/or if an alternative parking plan is submitted to help mitigate negative impacts. The Community Development Director is also authorized to review and act on alternative plans if the plan proposes a reduction or increase of more than 15% in off-street parking. Ms. Nyman said parking in the area around the University is a "chaotic mess" and she encouraged the Commission to hold to 100% parking on all projects.

Marilyn Griffin said she is amazed that this issue is being discussed again. There has been a lot of history and controversy regarding the Campus Residential (CR) zone. Consideration needs to be given to the impact these changes will have, especially for homes along 600 East. The Land Development Code was adopted after much discussion and debate and it seems as if developers always want more. She is perplexed that developers purchase property, knowing the regulations, and then try and change the rules without considering the long-term ramifications. Parking is a tremendous concern in the area and any deviation from 100% parking will cause problems. There is a need to find more ways to mitigate the problem. If building lengths are increased, there is a need for greater setbacks, especially for residents who live across the street from these large buildings. She encouraged going "no bigger, ever".

Craig Peterson said the City met with USU to discuss parking and the need for them to take more ownership in the problem and recommended the University allow overnight parking. The University seemed agreeable to consider the issue.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Newman questioned the wording in 17.15 Building Length and Mass "*Buildings located internal to a block or oriented away from the street or the Neighborhood Residential Zones; do not have a maximum building length*". The wording was refined by striking "*...or oriented away from the street or Neighborhood Residential Zones...*"

Mr. DeSimone clarified for Commissioner Newman that storm water control regulations are State required and any development will need to be in compliance.

Chairman Price asked about the actual projection of increase in students at USU. Mr. DeSimone said there is an upward trend with a growth rate of approximately 2.3% annually, anticipating about 12,000 more students in the next 15 years.

Commissioner Ortiz noted that 120' to 300' for building length is a big leap. He understands the economic aspect, however, questioned whether any quality of life factors would be impacted by this change (i.e. safety, health). Mr. DeSimone said it should not have any detrimental impacts and reminded the Commission that currently the CR zone is the only zone that has a building length maximum. The original intent of the restriction was to ensure there would be no massive buildings along the streetscape. Lengths internally are a technical and management issue. The desire is to increase density near the University and this change will help with that goal.

Commissioner Newman said he is familiar with areas where large structures are allowed and many single-family homes have been eliminated. Large student housing developments provide areas where "a lot of people sleep, but no one lives". It is a good concept to have concentrated high-density housing close to the University in a limited area.

Commissioner Butterfield feels this is a good change, especially considering future needs. Communities are impacted by all decisions. It would be detrimental to do nothing with the Campus Residential zone. Students will continue to come to USU and Logan wants it to be a successful University. If smart decisions are not made now, communities beyond the Campus Residential area will be detrimentally impacted in a way that may be difficult to control. This is an area where managed growth should be contained. Although this may not be a perfect solution, Logan is a college town and the City is doing their best to balance needs. He is supportive of this proposal.

Commissioner Nielson asked, by way of comparison, how long the Hampton Inn & Suites Hotel is proposed. Ms. Pollan said it is 166' along 200 North and 202' along Main Street. Commissioner Nielson asked if stairwells are regulated by fire codes. Craig Humphreys, the Fire Marshal explained stairwells are determined by a number of factors, including whether the building is sprinkled or unsprinkled. Mr. DeSimone pointed out that separate buildings are each required to have elevators, stairs and fire alarm systems, which could be quite costly.

Chairman Price noted that stairwells are generally for safety and elevators are for service. Long hallways with many students could be problematic with overcrowded elevators. Circulation is a primary driver and is important in understanding serviceability issues. He does not want to see large developments that do not have full occupancy because of poor design. The Parking Precedent Study, which was distributed to the Commission, contained helpful information. If parking structures should be integrated then there have to be ways to provide incentives.

Commissioner Nielson said it is difficult to compare a project like Riverwoods to this area because of the setbacks. More space between buildings (especially ones that border 600 East) may seem less intrusive. Mr. DeSimone explained that the length of buildings along 600 East will be limited to 200' (currently 120') with height transition requirements and breaks in the building.

Commissioner Butterfield said he drives along 600 East daily and there are a number of smaller structures that look quite ragged and could be replaced with larger developments that meet current design standards, which would be an upgrade. Size does not mean less quality and there are regulations in place to help ensure that design requirements are met.

Commissioner Nielson said he would like to see more open space for recreation opportunities. Mr. DeSimone said that the Campus Residential zone would need to be expanded if open space is increased. The goal of this area is to move students closer to campus and it is important to remember there is not a lot of land in this zone and there are some trade-offs that have to be made. The area has evolved over time and the decision to urbanize and densify this area was made when the Campus Residential zone was adopted. Chairman Price said he expects this to be a trend; as long as there is a bed count shortfall there will be a demand for more housing. He would like to see the City incorporate service changes that will help accommodate this expansion over time and allow this idea to work better.

Chairman Price noted that accommodating a large University is a challenge and Logan is not used to having an urban landscape. There are no easy answers; however, this seems to be a good step toward balance.

Commissioner Ortiz pointed out that as the City plans ahead he would like to see more promotion of pedestrian-friendly areas, with more bike spaces and larger sidewalks. He thanked staff for thinking ahead and encouraged continued proactive ideas.

Commissioner Newman said keeping the parking ratio at 1-1 will not help problems from the past, but will certainly help mitigate any future impact.

Chairman Price said he would like to eventually get to a point where 50% parking would be enough.

Commissioner Sinclair asked if there could be a possibility for a public/private partnership for parking. Mr. DeSimone said that is certainly possible, however, it would take owners and developers willing to work together with some capital investment and participation from the City and USU.

MOTION: Commissioner Butterfield moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for an amendment to the Land Development Code as outlined in PC 16-039 with the findings for approval as listed below. Commissioner Sinclair seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Utah state law authorizes local Planning Commission to recommend ordinance changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).
2. The amendment is in conformance with the requirements of Logan Municipal Code Title 17.51.
3. The amendment is consistent with the Logan City General Plan and the overall intent of the Campus Residential (CR) designation.
4. The amendment continues to improve new development proposals within the Campus Residential zone without negatively impacting the neighboring residential areas.
5. Public comment was received at the September 22, 2016 public hearing.

Moved: Commissioner Butterfield Seconded: Commissioner Sinclair **Passed:** 5-1
Yea: D. Butterfield, D. Newman, E. Ortiz, R. Price, S. Sinclair Nay: T. Nielson Abstain:

WORKSHOP ITEMS for October 27, 2016

- ✓ PC 16-042 Alma Huppi Family Trust Rezone [Zone Change]
- ✓ PC 16-043 Little Blossoms Preschool [Conditional Use Permit]
- ✓ PC 16-044 Milk Money Trucking Inc. [Design Review Permit]
- ✓ PC 16-045 Little Wonders – West [Conditional Use Permit]
- ✓ PC 16-046 Neighborhood NR-4 Rezone Project [Zone Change]

Meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded for the Logan City Planning Commission meeting of October 13, 2016.

Michael A. DeSimone
Community Development Director

Amanda Davis
Planning Commission Chairman

Russ Holley
Senior Planner

Amber Pollan
Senior Planner

Debbie Zilles
Administrative Assistant