



---

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

### Meeting of April 25, 2019

---

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

Minutes of the meeting for the Logan City Planning Commission convened in regular session on Thursday, April 25, 2019. Chairman Butterfield called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**Commissioners Present:** David Butterfield, Roylan Croshaw, Regina Dickinson, Sandi Goodlander, Dave Newman, Tony Nielson

**Commissioners Excused:** Eduardo Ortiz

**Staff Present:** Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley, Aaron Smith, Debbie Zilles, Kymber Housley, Bill Young, Paul Taylor, Craig Humphreys, Jeannie Simmonds (Council liaison)

Minutes from the April 11, 2019 meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Goodlander moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Motion seconded by Commissioner Nielson. Approved unanimously.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**PC 19-012 L59** [Design Review & Zone Change] Beth Larchar/Trent Cragun, authorized agent/owner, request to construct one (1) 120-unit apartment building with ground floor commercial fronting Main Street, and ten (10) town-homes in two (2) buildings fronting 100 East. The project is located at 150 South 100 East. Total project boundary is 2.89 acres, is currently zoned TC-1, Recreation, and NR-6 and includes the following parcels, or portions thereof, 02-047-0017, 02-047-0023, 02-047-0019, 02-047-0020, 02-047-0021, 02-047-0005, 02-047-0025 & 02-047-0014. The proposed rezone request includes the following: rezone approximately 0.50 acres of REC to TC-1 on a portion of 02-047-0014 (southern portion of Garff Gardens Park), rezone approximately 0.57 acres of NR-6 to MR-20 on the easterly 80' of 02-047-0017, 02-047-0023, 02-047-0019, 02-047-0020, & 02-047-0021 (100 East frontage), and rezone approximately .88 acres of NR-6 to TC-1 on the westerly portions (west of the proposed 80' boundary for MR-20) of 02-047-0017, 02-047-0023, 02-047-0019, 02-047-0020, & 02-047-0021. The rezone request also includes rezoning 02-047-0022 (LDS Church) from NR-6 to MR-20; however, this parcel is not included in the proposed project boundaries. (Wilson Neighborhood)

**STAFF:** Mr. Holley reviewed the request for a rezone that includes additional TC-1 area, replacement of the NR-6 zone with MR-20, and a reduction in the REC zone area. The request would result in the block being divided into three (3) zoning districts of TC-1, REC and MR-20. The REC area would be approximately 2.21 acres (0.60-acre decrease), the TC-1 area would be approximately 6.32 acres (1.50-acre increase) and the MR-20 area would be approximately 1.81 acres (church and townhome sites). The Logan City Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) designates the block as TC and REC. The FLUP does not demarcate between TC-1 and TC-2. The MR land use is not identified on this block in the FLUP. Given last year's lengthy TC-1 and TC-2 downtown rezone debate about redevelopment and land-use regulation, the anticipation was that this area would be rezoned TC-2 and not TC-1 and MR-20. The TC-2 zone was created as a transitional zone from the higher intensity of TC-1. This proposal, with the 0.54 acres of MR-20 along 100 East and adjacent to the NR areas, accomplishes this goal with lower density uses along 100 East and higher densities on the interior of the project site

Based on last year's extensive debate and specifically-crafted Code language, staff would question why TC-2 is not the best option for this project. Ultimately, the City Council will determine if this rezone proposal is appropriate. Once a rezone is decided, it is anticipated the Garff Garden property boundary adjustment will be completed to reflect the proposed project boundary.

**PROPONENT:** Beth Larchar, from Obodo Development, is working with Trent Cragun on this project. She explained that this will be the first project of its kind in downtown Logan. They have received quite a bit of feedback and have tried to be very receptive. The project has improved since the original proposal over a year ago. They went door-to-door and spoke with some of the neighbors, of which 60% were renters who had little-to-no interest in the project; 13 were homeowners and 92% of them were pleased with the changes that have been made. The reason for the rezone request is to create a buffer and provide a pleasing streetscape along 100 East. One of the neighbors, Richard Steele, recommended making each townhome unique; which has been incorporated in the proposal.

Chairman Butterfield asked if this project could be done without a rezone. Ms. Larchar said it could not, the current TC-1 area is too small and any type of infill would be too limited to work. Chairman Butterfield asked about the piece that is currently zoned Recreation (REC). Ms. Larchar said without that parcel, there would not be enough room to meet the parking requirement.

**PUBLIC:** A resolution of support endorsing the project, signed by 42 downtown business owners, was received and distributed prior to the meeting. Several emails were received and distributed prior to the meeting and are included in the project file.

Keith Schnare, a member of the Wilson Neighborhood Council, is representing a group of Wilson residents who have opposed this project and rezone. He conceded that this proposal is much better than the original one, however, there are still reservations. He requested that the church not be included in the rezone and is concerned with the request to rezone the Recreation piece. The main reason for objection to this development and rezone is about trust with the developer and the City. This will be the first densified housing project in the newly-created TC-1 zone and will set a standard for future development. The developer has no experience with a project of this size and the City has allowed major changes to recent development against public comment. He requested that a development agreement, as suggested by Councilmember Tom Jensen, be reached between the City and the developer which would take care of the trust concern. Preservation of trees is a major issue, Logan is a "Tree City" and this proposal would remove many of the older trees that provide shade at the park. The townhomes should have varied exteriors and not be a "cookie cutter" design. Traffic should not be allowed to pass from Main Street to 100 East through the development. Year-round site management is needed. These concerns may move the construction schedule back, however, a binding agreement will be worth the wait to ensure a quality development. He requested the rezone be denied at this time.

Lynn Hobbs, the area Stake President, said he knows of no other church property that is zoned anything other than NR and he does not understand why the church would have to be rezoned to MR-20. He has been following this process since the original request and is opposed to the change to MR-20, especially the church property. Mr. DeSimone pointed out that there are churches near the University that are in the Campus Residential (CR) zone. A church is considered an ancillary use to the uses around it.

Dr. Gail Yost lives two blocks south of this project site; she challenged the 92% figure that Ms. Larchar indicated. Of the 13 homes that were visited, at least three were opposed to the proposal, including herself, which would be 77%. She does not understand why the project cannot fit the zoning that already exists. A lot of work went into the TC-2 zone.

Janice Bird said the proposal is much different than residents were led to believe and they were not told that there would be a request for a zone change. This proposal would be recreating the old Garff Garden Apartments project that was rejected by the public. The lack of transparency seems like a misrepresentation and neighbors feel this is a “back door approach” to the same situation.

Mike Young is the Director of the Small Business Development Center at USU and long-time Logan resident. His office has done a lot of research on housing density and how that impacts economic growth and development. There is currently a housing crisis and every roadblock that is put in the way of developers increases the costs for development, making projects less profitable, which, in turn, makes it difficult to attract investors. For the community to continue to move forward and see sustainable economic growth and development, these types of projects are needed. Housing affordability is a huge issue and many have the “not in my backyard” mentality, however, not allowing projects such as this to move forward, or making it not financially viable or feasible, impacts the entire community.

Chairman Butterfield pointed out that the Commission spent a lot of time coming up with a good plan for zoning that would be conducive to these types of projects. He takes exception to the insinuation that this Commission is holding back projects. The Commission considers many different interests when making decisions.

Mary Ellen Robertson has had a family-owned home on 100 East for over 100 years. Her concern is the demand to reduce precious recreation space. Once that is gone, it does not come back. Garff Gardens has already become smaller than its original footprint. She is opposed to any loss of open space. The developer needs to come up with a project that fits into the area they currently have. There was a lot of work that went into the TC-2 zone and this block is one of the areas that it was planned for. She would like to see development work around established neighborhoods, rather than compromise them.

Gene Needham, a downtown Logan resident and business owner, is in favor of this proposal and any projects that bring housing closer to downtown. As a unified voice of downtown, and as the Chairman of the Design Committee, he said it is critical for the future of downtown to have densified housing. He appreciates the concerns that have been voiced, however, there are ways to make this work

Roger Yost said there is no space in the proposed MR-20 zone for parking and the townhome parking should not be mixed with the apartment building parking. Mr. Schnare pointed out that the parking is proposed to be under the townhomes.

Erika Blomdahl understands that Logan is growing and there is a demand for housing, however, she would like to see downtown remain charming. A large housing project might increase the vitality of downtown and she would be more supportive if the project did not reduce recreational space and remove a block of century-old homes. There are rundown, vacant and blighted structures downtown that could be used for housing. She is opposed to the rezone, however, if the development moves forward, she would like it to be high-quality and have a historic appearance. She encouraged the Commission to exert control over the quality and aesthetics of structures and locations to the extent that they can.

David Soderberg said this proposal is better than the original one and he appreciates the work of the Commission. He generally supports high-density housing and understands the need and value of affordable housing. He is concerned with removing green space from the park, and that trust with the developer has eroded, especially given the lack of concern on the developer's part to address the neighbors' concerns about parking. The past response from Mr. Cragun seemed ingenuine. He would like to see the character of Logan preserved.

Kendall Becker is a new homeowner in this neighborhood and lives on the corner of 100 East and 100 South. She expressed her desire for the recreational part to be retained and appreciates the Commission's work to accommodate concerns despite the pressure for development.

Randy Penrod does not want to see the recreational area reduced. He is surprised by the request for a rezone as he thought the zoning had been decided. He does not understand why the developer wants to change the zone just to make more money, the applicant knew what the zone was when the property was purchased.

Gary Saxton, Logan Downtown Alliance (LDA) Manager, has spent years working on how to preserve the personality, character and heritage of the City and incorporate new uses into old buildings. Downtowns need economic vibrancy to survive and there is not enough of a population base to create that vibrancy. He believes this new zoning, as formulated, protects the neighborhood and creates a good transition between high-density and residential. He is in favor of the rezone so it can bring a quality project close to downtown.

Commissioner Goodlander asked if any of the downtown business owners who submitted letters had any financial interest in this project. Mr. Saxton said he is not aware of any.

Keith Shaw questioned why the church would have to be rezoned and why the developer purchased the property if the zone was not appropriate for the project he had in mind.

Carole Johnson echoed the concerns that have been expressed. She is worried that if this project goes bad, it will be an element that will destroy the City; she does not want Logan to become like the "old downtown Ogden". There are areas downtown where nothing is being done to enhance the beauty of the City (abandoned and blighted buildings). Her concern is that business owners are expecting developers to come in and save downtown instead of working with what we have and preserving parks.

**COMMISSION:** Chairman Butterfield pointed out that the Commission went through a lengthy and exhaustive process to consider this area for rezone to TC-2; he questioned why that is not being considered and why staff is recommending approval for the request. Mr. Holley said the rezone is the request from the applicant and staff is recommending approval because the introduction of the MR-20 zone fulfills the same goals as the TC-2 zone would.

Commissioner Dickinson thanked the staff for the time put into the presentation and the different overlays that have been presented.

Commissioner Newman asked why the church property is included in the proposal, as it will not be changing use. Mr. DeSimone said staff asked that it be included to provide a more uniform and contiguous area of zoning. The NR zone has height and transition setbacks and a church does not have the same effect as a single-family dwelling. This proposal provides consistency with the rest of the block.

Commissioner Goodlander asked why there is not a "church" zone. Mr. DeSimone explained that a church is a permitted use in any zone and is an ancillary use, therefore, a separate zone is not necessary.

Mr. DeSimone noted that the City Council recognized that the TC-2 zone was not perfect and decided to wait to make the change based on a project with the right elements. The applicant has the right to request a change. The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) calls for more intensive uses in this area; TC-2 was designed to serve as a transition to TC-1, the MR-20 that has been requested is an appropriate transition zone.

Mr. Housley, the City Attorney, explained that a development agreement has a basic element of consideration. If a project meets all the ordinances, the City cannot extract anything more than what is required. The City uses development agreements all the time, primarily in RDA areas, which this project is in, to offer an incentive (like tax incentives); in this case it would be the small parcel of park property. Because the City is giving up something, concessions can be extracted. This is a function of the Mayor's office. In speaking with the Mayor, one of the things that would be required is that the townhomes be built concurrently with the apartment complex; if there is phasing, townhomes would be the first phase. This is not something the Commission would be tasked with negotiating.

Mr. Housley noted that a lot of the comments expressed concern about not using the TC-2 zone. He explained that MR-20 accomplishes the same thing that a TC-2 zone would.

Commissioner Goodlander pointed out that the entire park property was recommended to remain REC during the TC-2 discussions.

Commissioner Dickinson is not in favor of three different zones being changed in one area as that does not make sense. It does not seem like the developer has made any attempt to make a project work in the area and one of the reasons for the change is to allow for more units. She is not in favor of reducing the recreation property and is opposed to widening the TC-1 zone.

Commissioner Newman said removing six homes and yards and replacing them with townhomes does not net any green space. The proposal to replace the 30 parking stalls in the park area takes away public parking for the developer's use. To take every square inch possible with total disregard to the public is unacceptable. He would like to have the developer come up with a plan that fits on his property which would allow the church to remain in the NR zone and the project would be less dense.

Commissioner Goodlander likes the look of the proposed townhomes. She noted that TC-2 allows more density than MR-20.

Commissioner Croshaw likes the idea of TC-2 rather than MR-20 and leaving the church property in the NR zone. He is a proponent of green space and recreational area and would be opposed to reducing the park space.

Commissioner Nielson said it is not the Commission's job to redesign the project. The City needs this type of housing; however, he appreciates the resident's concerns and other public comment. Because the project "will not pencil" is the developer's problem. A boundary line adjustment and/or a reconfiguration of the park parcel might be worth considering. He agrees with Commissioner Dickinson that the request for three zone changes is a stretch.

Mr. DeSimone pointed out that this neighborhood has the highest amount of park acreage in the entire city. No one wants to lose green space, however, there is a large park within walking district. The City bases decisions on the sale of land with an eye toward a city-wide benefit.

Chairman Butterfield agreed that there is quite a bit of green space in this area, however, people have connections to spaces and places, and this went through a significant process that should be respected. There is a need for these types of projects and he commends any developer and/or investor willing to invest time and capital in bringing projects to the City. The Commission tries to balance the rights of investors and property owners with the needs and concerns of the residents.

Commissioner Newman pointed out the differences between MR-20 and TC-2. MR-20 allows for up to 20 units/acre and TC-2 allows for 30 up to units/acre; lot coverage in MR-20 is up to 60% and TC-2 is 80% maximum; setbacks are close, particularly as it relates to the proximity to single-family properties; both MR-20 and TC-2 allow up to 45' in height. TC-2 and MR-20 are quite similar. Mr. DeSimone pointed out that TC-2 allows for commercial. Commissioner Newman said erring on the conservative side would be allowing MR-20.

Chairman Butterfield voiced frustration that the Council did not implement the Commission's original recommendation to rezone the NR-6 area to TC-2 after all the work and debate put into the matter; instead they decided to leave it NR-6 until a project was submitted.

Commissioner Goodlander said her initial thought was to not allow a change to the Recreation property, however, after carefully listening to the discussion, she acknowledges the fact that this area has quite a bit of green space. There needs to be a good project put in and she likes the look of the townhomes. MR-20 allows for less density than TC-2, which placates the neighbor's concerns about a transition. She would encourage green space. Mr. Holley asked for clarification as to whether she is referring to public green space, or green space/amenity areas within the development itself. Commissioner Goodlander said she was referring to private green space. Chairman Butterfield and Commissioner Newman said they would prefer public open space. Commissioner Nielson said that although there is a large park nearby, having a park closer is nice.

Mr. Schnare pointed out that a development agreement would determine what the zoning should be. Chairman Butterfield agreed. Mr. Holley said that there was a purchase/development agreement under the previous administration which has since expired. Mr. Housley reminded the Commission that this is ultimately a Council decision.

Trent Cragun noted that as a property owner, he has rights and has carefully considered what options are available. One of the concerns with the original proposal was that it would be low-income housing. He said this project will be the highest rate market project in all of downtown. If this cannot be done as proposed, one of the options would be to turn it into affordable housing where it could be sold for tax credits. He said he wanted to be "clear and on the record that this is not a type of project he would be willing to put his name on", so he would more than likely sell the property. Commissioner Dickinson said it seemed as if the Commission was just threatened with low-income housing, which does not seem right.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Goodlander moved to **forward a recommendation** to the City Council for a zone change as proposed, with the exception that the church property remain zoned NR and the Recreation property remain as is until there is a development agreement in place. Commissioner Croshaw seconded the motion.

**Moved:** S. Goodlander **Seconded:** R. Croshaw **Approved:** 4-2  
**Yea:** Butterfield, Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander **Nay:** Newman, Nielson **Abstain:**

Mr. Holley said the Council will have a public meeting for the rezone on May 21, 2019. Chairman Butterfield said the decision related to the rezone will impact the design review portion of the request and suggested continuing the discussion related to the design.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Croshaw moved to **continue** Design Review Permit portion of PC 19-012 to the meeting of May 23, 2019. Commissioner Goodlander seconded the motion.

**Moved:** R. Croshaw **Seconded:** S. Goodlander **Approved:** 6-0  
**Yea:** Butterfield, Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman, Nielson **Nay:** **Abstain:**

**PC 19-013 8<sup>th</sup> & Main Car Lot** – **Project Withdrawn**

**PC 19-014 Municipal Pool Truck Rental** [Conditional Use Permit] R. Lowell Huber, authorized agent/owner, requests a permit for a truck rental on 1.47 acres located 114 East 1000 North in the Commercial (COM) zone; TIN 05-024-0019. (Adams Neighborhood)

**STAFF:** Mr. Smith reviewed the request for truck rental and vehicle storage (impound) in the Commercial zone. The site is approximately 1.47 acres and has an approximately 14,000 SF indoor swimming pool facility and an 18,000 SF parking lot. The truck rental is proposed to take place within the existing parking area, and will use 30 of the 60 existing parking stalls, which is approximately 9,000 SF. The vehicle storage is proposed to take place within the fenced area south of the primary building, and is approximately 12,000 SF. The new use impacts an approximate 21,000 SF area.

A new driveway along the western edge of the property is also proposed. The drive would be limited in use, as it is intended to allow for pull-through access to the impound area. The driveway is required to be at least 2' off the property line. This driveway will require approval from the Public Works Department through a right-of-way permit.

**PROPONENT:** Lowell Huber, the property owner, has struggled to find a use for the property. He has worked with the School District on the adjusted property lines and new sidewalk; fences will be installed.

Commissioner Newman asked how many cars would be in the impound lot. Mr. Huber said he was not planning on having an actual impound yard there, however, that is the category the rental trucks fall under.

Mr. Huber answered for Commissioner Croshaw that the actual building is not being used; the pool has been drained and shut down and nothing is planned. Commissioner Croshaw asked about the current signage on the building. Mr. Huber said he is not planning on removing it or adding to it. He owns, and has registered, the name "Municipool".

Commissioner Dickinson asked about the opaque fencing. Mr. Huber said it is chain link with soft vinyl slats. Commissioner Dickinson noted that the State requires an impound lot to have barbed wire on the top of the fence and asked if he was concerned about that with a school next door. Mr. Huber said he is not concerned.

**PUBLIC:** A letter from Frank Schofield, the Logan City School District Superintendent, opposing the requested permit was received and distributed prior to the meeting.

Mark Stewart is surprised that an impound lot could be approved next to a school. Most lots tend to look like a junk yard. Mr. Smith confirmed for Mr. Stewart that fencing will be 6' on the south and 4' on the front to the street, with landscaping on the north side. Mr. Stewart asked about the impact to 1000 North. Mr. Smith said there is not an anticipated impact related to the proposed use. Mr. Stewart is concerned what it will look like.

**COMMISSION:** Commissioner Newman asked for clarification on the south boundary line. Mr. Holley said a boundary line adjustment of 10' from the building was completed and they are currently working on a realignment of the sidewalk.

Mr. Housley reminded the Commission a Conditional Use Permit can mitigate any possible negative impacts, however, if the use is permitted within the zone, it must be allowed. There is nothing requiring a buffer for these types of uses when they are adjacent to a school.

Commissioner Goodlander asked if a truck rental could be approved without an impound lot. Mr. Housley said the permitted use is truck storage. Mr. Smith said this is classified as vehicle storage. He explained that the application lists two uses; one for vehicle rental (for the U-Haul trucks) and one for vehicle storage. Mr. Housley said impound lots are treated as vehicle storage. Chairman Butterfield said an impound lot is inherently different than a vehicle storage area. Mr. Housley said the challenge is to list every possible use within a general category.

Chairman Butterfield asked if a legitimate finding could be that an impound lot has inherent negative impacts when located next to a school. Mr. Housley said the problem is that distinction is not made in the Code, it is a permitted use in the zone. The Commission can mitigate the impacts; however, the use cannot be prohibited. If there is any ambiguity in the decision, the Court will generally rule in favor of the landowner.

Commissioner Newman asked how a vehicle is defined and if it would include farm equipment, tractors, construction vehicles, semi-trucks, boats etc. Mr. Housley said limiting the size of the vehicles that can be stored could be considered a mitigating condition.

Mr. Huber pointed out that there is an impound yard directly next door (Miller's Auto Body). Chairman Butterfield pointed out that this discussion is not related to that property.

Commissioner Croshaw asked if there is a proposed drive curb cut on the approach. Mr. Smith said a right-of-way permit will need to be applied for.

Mr. Smith clarified for Commissioner Nielson that the applicant will have to figure out where to put the required trees and landscaping. In answer to a question posed by Chairman Butterfield, Mr. Housley said the City has a property maintenance code that will be used to ensure that landscaping is maintained.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Goodlander moved to **add a condition** that the 15 required trees shall be planted along the eastern edge of the property between the parking lot and the ball field at 20' intervals. The trees shall be planted at 2' caliper, be deciduous, and have a mature height of at least 25' and a width of at least 20'. Commissioner Newman seconded the motion.

**Moved:** S. Goodlander    **Seconded:** D. Newman    **Approved:** 5-1  
**Yea:** Butterfield, Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman    **Nay:** Nielson    **Abstain:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Newman moved to **add a condition** that no vehicle in the impound area shall exceed 7' in height. Commissioner Goodlander seconded the motion.

**Moved:** D. Newman    **Seconded:** S. Goodlander    **Approved:** 4-2  
**Yea:** Butterfield, Croshaw, Goodlander, Newman    **Nay:** Dickinson, Nielson    **Abstain:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Newman moved to **conditionally approve** a Conditional Use Permit as outlined in PC 19-014 with the amended conditions of approval as listed below. Commissioner Dickinson seconded the motion.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. A maximum of thirty (30) parking stalls may be used for the truck rental.
3. The impound area is limited to the rear of the primary structure.
4. No parking is allowed within the 10' front parking setback or the 5' side/rear parking setback.
5. The two parking stalls adjacent to the sidewalk along 1000 North shall be deconstructed.

6. A landscaping plan, prepared in accordance with LDC 17.32, addressing the conditions of this permit shall be submitted for approval to the Community Development Department prior to landscape construction.
7. A landscape buffer shall be constructed separating parking from 1000 North and shall be a minimum of 10' wide and conform with type "C" separation as prescribed in LDC 17.32.070
8. A total number of 15 trees and 25 shrubs, perennials or grasses shall be provided.
9. The 15 trees shall be planted along the eastern edge of the property between the parking lot and the ball field at 20' intervals. The trees shall be planted at 2' caliper, be deciduous, and have a mature height of at least 25' and width of at least 20'
10. Street trees are required to be planted in the park strip along 1000 North every 30'. Species and location shall be coordinated with the City Forester.
11. A 6' opaque fence is required around all sides of the impound yard and along the perimeter of the parking area adjacent to neighboring properties. The fence may not exceed 4' in the front yard of the property.
12. No vehicle in the impound area shall exceed 7' in height.
13. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the LDC.
14. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the LDC.
15. Prior to issuance of a building permit or business license, 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. Maintain existing access, hydrants and water supply.
  - b. Engineering
    - i. Provide City with Standard Operating Procedure and/or a plan showing the site improvements that will prevent the discharge of any contaminants from stored or impounded vehicles to City storm drainage system.
    - ii. A right-of-way permit shall be obtained prior to construction of the new access/driveway.
  - c. Environmental
    - i. Dumpsters are available if needed. Cart will need to be placed at the curb on 1000 North for Tuesday morning collection.
  - d. Water/Cross Connection
    - i. If water is to be used the water main will require a RP (ASSE1013) to be installed and tested as it enters the building before any branch offs or connections, then point of use will need protection as per rules of the 2015 IPC and Utah State Amendments.
    - ii. Landscape irrigation if connected to Logan City water must meet current City standards and have high-hazard backflow protection. Cannot have City water feed and any other water source connected.
  - e. Business License
    - i. Business license required for impound and truck rental use.

#### FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The use conforms to the requirements of Logan Municipal Code Title 17 and is listed as a conditional use in the Use Table.
2. As conditioned, the use is compatible with the surrounding land uses and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjoining or area properties.
3. The streets providing access and other infrastructure to the subject property have adequate capacities and levels of service for the conditional use.
4. As conditioned, the proposed use provides adequate off-street parking in conformance with Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.

**Moved:** D. Newman    **Seconded:** R. Dickinson    **Approved:** 5-1

**Yea:** Butterfield, Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman    **Nay:** Nielson    **Abstain:**

**PC 19-015 LDC Amendment (Various Minor Changes)** Logan City requests to amend the Land Development Code (LDC) 17.08.040 Residential Use Table; 17.09.030 Residential Driveway Length; 17.11.030 District & Corridors Use Table; 17.12.050 Building Height; 17.30.100 Temporary Fencing; 17.30.200 Outdoor Storage & Display; 17.31.040 Parking Requirements; 17.37.060 Small Auto Dealerships; 17.62. Definitions.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Nielson moved to **continue** PC 19-015 to the meeting of May 9, 2019. Commissioner Goodlander seconded the motion.

**Moved:** T. Nielson    **Seconded:** S. Goodlander    **Approved:** 6-0

**Yea:** Butterfield, Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman, Nielson    **Nay:**    **Abstain:**

**PC 19-009 Logan City 2019 Moderate Income Housing Plan – continued from Apr. 11, 2019** - Amend the Logan General Plan to comply with Utah State Statute 10-9A-401 adopting the Logan City 2019 Moderate Income Housing Plan as an element of the Logan General Plan.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Newman moved to **continue** discussion to the meeting of May 9, 2019. Commissioner Dickinson seconded the motion.

**Moved:** D. Newman    **Seconded:** R. Dickinson    **Approved:** 6-0

**Yea:** Butterfield, Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman, Nielson    **Nay:**    **Abstain:**

**WORKSHOP ITEMS for May 9, 2019**

- ✓ PC 19-016 UT1-Larry Verizon Wireless Communications Tower

**MEETING ADJOURNED:** 8:24 p.m.