



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting of July 9, 2020

Logan City Council Chambers (290 N 100 W Logan, UT 84321) www.loganutah.org

Minutes of the meeting for the Logan City Planning Commission convened in regular session on Thursday, July 9, 2020. Chairman Nielson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Roylan Croshaw, Regina Dickinson, Sandi Goodlander, Jessica Lucero, Tony Nielson, Eduardo Ortiz

Commissioners Absent: Dave Newman

Staff Present: Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley, Tanya Rice, Debbie Zilles, Kymber Housley, Bill Young, Mayor Daines, Mark Montgomery, Jess Bradfield (Council Liaison), Jeannie Simmonds (City Council)

Commissioner Goodlander moved to approve the minutes from the June 25, 2020 meeting as submitted. Motion seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. The motion was approved unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

PC 20-032 Deer Pen Substation [Design Review & Conditional Use Permit] – *continued from June 25, 2020*. Logan City requests to install a substation at approximately 1880 East 1500 North in the Recreation (REC) zone.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone reviewed the request from Logan City Light & Power for a new power substation within an approximate 100' x 100' footprint (10,000 SF) on the City's Deer Pen property. The proposed substation will serve new residential growth in the Hillcrest area as well as additional growth and demand at the USU Innovation Campus. The current demand for power is exceeding the City's capacity for power provision in this section of Logan, and the anticipated demand will severely tax the existing system. The proposed substation consists of a small building and electrical equipment contained within a walled and landscaped enclosure.

The placement of a substation is limited by several considerations, with proximity to an existing high voltage transmission line and adjacency to service delivery area as the most important factors.

Light & Power evaluated other sites in the northeast part of Logan with no success. Staff from several different City departments looked at other alternatives on the Deer Pen site and determined the most viable with the least amount of impact. Staff considered placing the substation further east, but those options have more negative impacts on the viewshed, require additional grading, slopes, etc. Staff evaluated placing it to the north or the south on the Deer Pen acreage, but those options would require the construction of access roads, additional poles, and transmission lines to tie back into the system and would be closer to existing residential areas.

The preferred site has the least amount of visual and physical impact on both the Deer Pen property and adjoining residential uses. This site is immediately adjacent to the high voltage transmission lines and poles that the substation needs to tie into with a minimal extension of new infrastructure. The substation is located on publicly owned property minimizing the cost of land purchase for the consumer. And, this substation is located within the northeast part of town that is

demanding the power. Conditions of approval requiring enhanced landscaping and screening will ensure compatibility with adjoining uses.

Mark Montgomery, Light & Power Department Director, said several different sites have been considered. The site to the east, next to the pole, seems to offer the least visual impact and would be the easiest because it is close to the pole. The Parks Board considered a site to the south by a row of Russian olive trees, however, the downside to this location would be that another pole would have to be put in. The proposed 100'x100' site will help keep the equipment lower and less visible. An 80'x80' space would require an additional 30' high structure. He outlined the existing and proposed substations in the City. The demand has grown significantly and there is not enough capacity in this area. A substation needs to be located within the service area. The current station that feeds this area is located by Herm's Inn; voltage is being pushed quite a way into this service area. Originally the desire was to locate the substation near the USU station, however, they did not approve the request (five different sites were requested). A location further east (up the hill) would be closer to homes and quite steep (more expensive). He has had quite a few questions about why USU does not have to take care of more of the load. He explained that there is transmission voltage (high voltage) that runs through a substation, which turns it into distribution voltage. USU takes electricity from the transmission voltage into their substations which serves their service areas. They do not impact any distribution.

PUBLIC: Several emails were received and distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting and are included in the project file.

Christopher Warren said it feels like bad public relations for USU to force Light & Power to use recreation property for this substation. He would like to see a community campaign to put some pressure on USU. There are several good options on USU-owned property. He questioned whether private land was offered a fair price. He would like some assurance for safety if it is located in the area. This is a great place for people to walk.

Debbi Spendlove has lived in the area for 25 years. She has watched the land be disturbed over and over through the years with promises that it would be restored. They were told a dog park would be put in but that has not happened. It has become a dumping site and has never been taken care of. In the past, she was told by former Mayor Petersen that no development would go in this area. She has researched what is needed for a substation. She understands the need for development. Of the three sites considered, the proposed site is the better option, but she would like assurances that it will be aesthetically pleasing. This area is well used year-round and she feels like no one in the City cares.

Sherm Conger has been a resident of Logan for 36 years and moved into the Deer Crest subdivision in 2008. At the time he moved in there were guidelines in place to maintain the visual aesthetics of the area. The natural beauty of the area and the underground power lines were important in their choice to live here. All these things were in place to preserve the character of the neighborhood and the mountain and valley views. In recent years, the City has made efforts to preserve the area. The trails in the area are exceptional and residents recognize the great care given as well as the need for a substation. When he purchased his home, Deer Pen was designated to become a cemetery. In recent years, the plan was changed, and the land was zoned as Recreation with a plan for a park and NR-4 lots. He is puzzled with the current recommendation to locate a power substation on this property, which seems to be in direct opposition to previous efforts for this area. A substation will be difficult and/or impossible to camouflage, even with mature landscaping. The added wires and hardware will be visible and could become of a focal point in the area. Layout, setbacks, and landscaping will not be able to offset the negative impact or make it compatible with the existing character of the neighborhood.

Rebecca Conger said in the report, the Green Canyon site was prohibited due to cost, however, Mr. Montgomery mentioned that it was due to space. Mr. Montgomery said there is not enough space and it is too far away to push the needed voltage to the service area. Ms. Conger questioned whether a bond or an assessment has been considered. She suggested considering a location at the Ray Hugie Hydro Park. The proposed area is used a lot and she would hate to see curious children try and access the substation. She recommended considering other sites.

Jane Monson suggested the option of the southwest corner (shown on the map) or moving it further up the mountain. She said many people did not know about this issue and feels like it has not been transparent; "it's been a raw deal". Residents in the area have been let down many times. She encouraged taking time to see if there are other viable options.

Wendy Hurd is concerned with the associated health risk. She agrees with Ms. Monson's remarks. The area has been a wasteland for years. She questioned if development can be limited. Hillcrest School is not taking as much power. The land has been destroyed and nothing has been done. She does not think Logan City keeps its promises.

Fred Rigby received an email from Michael Timmons a few hours ago (the Commission received the letter). He questioned the forethinking of the City when the subdivisions were approved (i.e. Foothill Lofts, Hidden Cove, Sugar Plum) and why there was no thought to ensure that there would be enough power. He said residents were promised that this area would remain untouched.

Ben Gunsberg said he was told that there would be a hotel put in behind Old Chicago Pizza. He questioned the negotiating power with USU. He suggested finding leverage and ways that Logan can negotiate. The idea of trust is hard for residents in this area. He questioned whether a substation could be located behind Old Chicago Pizza, which is a more appropriate area. Locating a substation near homes not only creates problems with the views and vista but is also a potential health hazard. He thinks this is a "bad idea" and is hoping to find another solution.

Jess Jewett purchased his lot four years ago and has planned to build their dream home. They bought in this area specifically because of the parks and recreation available. This will ruin his dream. He would like to see this area preserved. He recommended putting this plan on hold for more research and other alternatives. He suggested options about decreasing visibly and possible burying lines.

Joel Pederson asked for clarification about the Design Review & Conditional Use Permit, as most of the discussion has centered around the location. He would like more information about the process moving forward. This is one of Logan's many nice neighborhoods and in an area where an increasing number of homes would look down onto this. He believes in landscape architecture and design and urged the Commission to explore the conditions and the way it can be designed, including improvements to the areas around it.

Andrea Melnick said there are so few green spaces in the City left. Residents enjoy the beauty and the ability of recreation in the area. She questioned how carefully all the options have been considered. If this is put in, it will be there forever. She would like to see the City do what is best and not what is easiest.

Christine Wingar thanked the Commission for accepting comments and reading the emails that were sent in. She moved to the area five years ago; one of the biggest reasons was due to the trail, parks, and dog park opportunity. She walks this area every day, it is part of the community and it would be a shame to put in a substation. There are few areas for children to explore. She is concerned about safety, aesthetics, and home values. The City should work with USU and take responsibility for more negotiation.

Belle Priebe has been using this area with her siblings for years and does not think this is a good place for a substation, it would spoil the view. She would like to see more thought put into this.

Brandon Priebe verified that Mr. Timmons letter will be recognized (Chairman Nielson said it has been). He agreed with the comments expressed. He hopes this will be an open dialogue and understanding of the concerns for the people who live here. This area is not only for the residents, but others from around the Valley who use it. To see the denigration of this area to go from a proposed cemetery to a dog park and now to a possible substation – it seems like “pulling the rug out from the citizens who are committed to this”. USU should not be the ones playing the heavy hand and dictate where the City needs to locate a substation.

COMMISSION: Mr. DeSimone clarified for Commissioner Goodlander that the City owns the property. The preliminary plat was drafted but not recorded. The lots could be sold individually or sold as a package to a developer.

Commissioner Goodlander asked about other possible locations. Mr. DeSimone said City staff walked the site to figure out alternatives. The station must be near existing power poles and within the service area. In looking at the site, the proposed location seemed to be the best option.

Chairman Nielson asked if any thought was given to the location at 1200 East, by the Shell Station. Mr. Montgomery said that was looked at, however, no one was willing to sell or lease any private property. Chairman Nielson said there is a natural gas station by Research Park; Mr. Montgomery said that location was considered but the inquiry was turned down.

Commissioner Goodlander asked about adding to the substation in Green Canyon. Mr. Montgomery said that is a combination substation between Rocky Mountain Power and Logan and there is not enough room. It is also as far away as the substation currently feeding the area and needs to be located closer to the service area.

Commissioner Croshaw asked if the property by Herm’s (the current station) could be expanded. Mr. Montgomery said there is not enough room for expansion and the substation needs to be located closer to the service area, so the power does not have to be pushed as far.

Mr. Montgomery explained, concerning comments about pressuring USU, that when he began working with the Light & Power Department 8 years ago, the relationship between USU and Logan Power was rancorous, over the years it has become a good working relationship. He reiterated that he cannot force them to allow the City to locate a substation on their property. If the station must be located on the proposed site, he would like it to be a win-win situation by improving the area. The Parks Department has a limited budget and as part of the mitigation effort, it could be a way to kickstart a park and clean up the area. The Green Canyon site and Hugie Park are too far away. The City has impact fees that help pay for new infrastructure and utilities. He agrees that this area is used frequently. Areas on the east side of the City are more difficult to find locations for substations. There is one at Pioneer Park that is not visually appealing but serves a high load. There is another station in a residential area at 1000 North 300 East. The challenge is that it must go in the vicinity of the service area and tie into current lines. He can investigate some of the other areas that have been mentioned. Regarding public safety, EMF studies of high voltage areas are inconclusive. He does not know why USU denied the sites that were proposed. The lines cannot be buried. It is difficult because the City is growing, which can be a challenge. To serve the citizens of the area, a substation will have to go in somewhere in the area, wherever it is decided, there will be mitigation and improvements put in.

Mayor Daines has reached out to Neil Abercrombie from USU and has a meeting with President Crockett in a couple of weeks. She will follow up with Mr. Abercrombie. She has received copies of the emails that have been sent in and will share them with USU.

Commissioner Lucero noted that USU recently earned the prestigious *Carnegie Community Engagement Classification* which reflects “exemplary practices for community engagement”. Recipients who receive this honor are committed to mutual benefit and reciprocity in community engagement. This could be a leverage point and should be brought into the discussion.

Mr. DeSimone suggested continuing this discussion to work with USU and look at other possible sites.

MOTION: Commissioner Lucero moved to **continue** PC 20-032 to the August 13, 2020 meeting. Commissioner Croshaw seconded the motion.

Moved: J. Lucero **Seconded:** R. Croshaw **Approved:** 6-0

Yea: Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Lucero, Nielson, Ortiz **Nay:** **Abstain:**

PC 20-035 Harvest Meadows Subdivision – requesting continuance to July 23, 2020.

[Design Review & Subdivision Permit] Travis S. Taylor/Johnson Property Holdings, LC, authorized agent/owner, request a 39-lot subdivision on approximately 6.46 acres for 16 townhome buildings and 23 single-family home lots at approximately 1136 North 560 West in the Mixed Residential (MR-9) zone; TIN 05-041-0006.

MOTION: Commissioner Dickinson moved to continue PC 20-035 to the July 23, 2020 meeting. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

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

Yea: Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Lucero, Nielson, Ortiz **Nay:** **Abstain:**

PC 20-033 LDC Amendment – Public Works Design Standards 17.29 & 17.30

- continued from June 25, 2020. [Code Amendment] Logan City requests to amend Chapters 17.29 “Standards, Specifications and Improvements” and 17.30 “Supplemental Development Standards” of the Land Development Code to adopt the City of Logan Public Works Design Standards for sanitary sewer systems, culinary water systems, storm drain systems, and street systems. Amend 17.29.170 to clarify location, design, placement and landscaping of storm water management systems.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone reviewed the information to adopt, by reference, the City of Logan Public Works Design Standards for sewer, water, stormwater, and roads as well as two other minor amendments, one clarifying the placement of stormwater systems and the other clarifying the residential infill subdivision standards.

The road standards include cross sections and design standards for the local residential streets (< 2,000 vehicles per day), gridded residential collector streets (< 6,000 vehicles per day), collector streets (< 12,000 vehicles per day), minor arterial streets (12,000 – 25,000 vehicles per day) and major arterial streets (12,000 – 38,500 vehicles per day). The design standards specify minimum right of way and pavement widths, number of lanes, design speeds, lane, and parking widths, and sidewalk park strip widths. The attached document details this information for each of the distinct road types.

17.29.170 Stormwater, Stormwater Detention, Stormwater Retention

The proposed amendments to this Section require that stormwater facilities be integrated into the overall landscaping of a site and that the stormwater facilities are to be located either in the side or rear yards of a project rather than the front yard. The purpose of these changes is to help ensure the stormwater detention/retention pond is not an afterthought but rather integrated into the overall site design. If a project is unable to integrate a stormwater detention facility into the overall landscaping, they can explore other on-site subsurface options.

17.30.180 Residential Infill and Flag Lot Development Standards

The proposed amendment eliminates the infill standards for subdivisions greater than 9 lots to minimize the confusion on which standards apply to a larger subdivision. The infill standards were adopted to regulate small projects or individual lots going into the center of a block behind rows of existing homes. A subdivision larger than 9 lots should be evaluated as a subdivision according to Chapter 17.40 Subdivisions.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Commissioner Dickinson asked how stormwater will be enforced, the wording in 17.29.170: *“stormwater facilities be integrated into the overall landscaping of a site, and that the stormwater facilities are to be located either in the side or rear yards of a project rather than the front yard”* seems confusing. Mr. DeSimone said the wording *“side or rear yards”* can be taken out for clarity, the idea is that it not just be an open area. He gave a good example of the CETC project that integrated the stormwater retention into their overall landscaping along the street. He said it is further clarified within that section in *“6. At grade, open, or above ground stormwater facilities shall be in the side and rear yards and not within the front yard. Underground stormwater facilities may be located in the front yard.”* Commissioner Lucero noted that the concern seems to be handled by 6 and *“4. All stormwater facilities shall be integrated into the required landscape plan and overall site design.”*

Mr. DeSimone clarified for Commissioner Croshaw that trees are kept out of the sight distance triangle. Commissioner Croshaw said some trees have a low branching pattern that makes it difficult to see around. Mr. DeSimone said staff relies on the City Forester to determine what species is appropriate in what areas.

Commissioner Ortiz asked if Section 17.29.170 2 (added wording) *“Any modification to a natural drainage way requires review and permitting by the Department of Public Works before initiating any work.”* applies to floating areas. Mr. DeSimone said any are that has natural drainage is not altered without input by the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Goodlander noted that there have been concerns with past projects requesting 35' roads, and whether these standards would clear those issues up. Mr. DeSimone said this does not include any provisions for an alleyway. Mr. Housley pointed out that a project could develop on one lot (like the Champlin Development at 1600 North 200 West) and it would be treated as a parking lot, however, if it is a dedicated public road, 66' is the smallest allowed.

MOTION: Commissioner Ortiz moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for an amendment to the Land Development Code as outlined in PC 20-033 with the findings for approval as listed below. Commissioner Croshaw seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Utah State Law authorizes the 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.
4. The amendment will clarify the minimum design standards acceptable for typical infrastructure associated with new development in Logan City.
5. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendments.

Moved: E. Ortiz **Seconded:** R. Croshaw **Approved:** 6-0

Yea: Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Lucero, Nielson, Ortiz **Nay:** **Abstain:**

PC 20-034 LDC Amendment – ADA, Subdivisions & Procedural Updates 17.39, 17.40, 17.43 - continued from June 25, 2020. [Code Amendment] Logan City requests to amend Chapters 17.39 “Permit Authority” to include section on accommodating ADA; 17.40 “Subdivisions” to clarify preliminary plat reviews; and 17.43 “Design Review Permits” to clarify wording.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone reviewed the request for several minor amendments to the Land Development Code (LDC) including adding ADA reasonable accommodation language, cleaning up the Subdivision Chapter, and cleaning up the procedural language for Track 1 vs Track 2 design review applications.

American with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accommodations – 17.39.060: Added language defining the application and review process for establishing a reasonable accommodation due to a specific physical and/or mental disability of an individual. This is consistent with both the ADA and the Federal Fair Housing Act and ensures an individual has an equal opportunity to enjoy housing opportunities of their choice without compromising the integrity of the underlying zoning regulations. An example of a “reasonable accommodation” is allowing the placement of a wheelchair ramp within a setback area with the condition that when the individual needing said ramp is no longer at that household, the ramp is removed.

Subdivisions - 17.40: Minor clean-up work of wording and document structure. The Final Plat Map Waiver for two lot subdivisions was in the wrong subsection and we clarified some other language throughout this Chapter.

Design Review Procedures – 17.43: Minor clean-up work of wording and clarifying the references to the correct review process for either a Track 1 or Track 2 permit.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Commissioner Goodlander asked about the difference between a plat and a plat map. Mr. DeSimone said it is nomenclature and the changes are just making it consistent.

Mr. DeSimone said a workshop about Track 1 and Track 2 applications will be scheduled at an upcoming meeting. Commissioner Dickinson said she does not understand the difference between Track 1 and Track 2 and would not be comfortable approving the changes at this time. Mr. DeSimone said in this amendment only the references are being clarified. Mr. Housley said there are no actions being taken on Track 1 and Track 2, which are already in place.

Commissioner Dickinson does not understand all the changes in Section 17.40.060 such as removing “~~4. The subdivision lots maintain or enhance neighborhood character~~”. Mr. DeSimone said a lot cannot “maintain or enhance character”, there is no way to quantify or qualify. It is being removed because it is not a tangible standard. Mr. Housley said this is not enforceable language. Mr. DeSimone explained that a subdivision plat is mechanical and is controlled by setbacks, lot sizes, etc.

Mr. DeSimone clarified for Commissioner Goodlander that there is a 2-step process for subdivision plats. A preliminary plat is the first level of review, once that is approved, Staff makes sure that the conditions of approval are met, and a final plat is drafted and sent to the County to be recorded.

MOTION: Commissioner Goodlander moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for an amendment to the Land Development Code as outlined in PC 20-034 with the findings for approval as listed below. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Utah State Law authorizes the 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.
4. The amendment will provide a process to ensure a reasonable accommodation request is met in compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, clarifies the subdivision process, and clarifies the procedural requirements for a Track 1 and Track 2 permit.
5. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendments.

Moved: S. Goodlander **Seconded:** E. Ortiz **Approved:** 6-0

Yea: Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Lucero, Nielson, Ortiz **Nay:** **Abstain:**

PC 20-036 LDC Amendment – Wireless Telecommunication Updates 17.38 & 17.62

[Code Amendment] Logan City requests to amend Chapters 17.38 “Wireless Telecommunication Facilities” and 17.62 “Definitions” to update the placement and design standards for wireless telecommunication facilities.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone reviewed the request for several amendments to the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Chapter stemming from the last cell tower decision made by the Planning Commission. This is a proposal to firm up the placement, design, and co-location standards along with some minor cleanup work on the graphics and text. The proposed placement and design changes are summarized below:

Placement and Design Requirements – 17.38.050: (Proposed new language)

The Planning Commission shall consider the following factors when deciding to grant permit approvals for a wireless telecommunication facility:

- A. Compatibility: compatibility of the facility with the height, mass and design of buildings, structures, and uses in the immediate vicinity;
- B. Screening: whether the proposal uses existing or proposed vegetation, topography, or structures in a manner that effectively screens the facility;
- C. Disguise: whether the facility is disguised in a manner that mitigates potential negative impacts on surrounding properties;
- D. Parcel Size: whether the facility is located on a parcel of sufficient size to adequately support the facility and meet minimum setbacks;
- E. Location on Parcel: whether the facility is situated on the parcel in a manner that can best protect the interests of surrounding property owners, but still accommodates other appropriate uses on the parcel;
- F. Location in General: whether location or co-location of the facility on other structures in the same vicinity is practical without significantly affecting the functionality of the facility;
- G. Future Co-location: the willingness of the applicant to allow co-location on its facility by other personal wireless services providers on such terms as are common in the industry; and

- H. Stealth Design: how well the applicant has incorporated stealth design, as defined in Chapter 17.62, into the overall design and location of the proposed facility.

Existing Towers and Poles – 17.38.060: Clarified co-locating standards as they relate to the distance the face of the antenna can extend out from the pole (3'); the height of a proposed antenna above the existing tower; and a 25% height bonus for co-locating onto an existing tower or pole.

Monopoles and Towers – 17.38.090: Clarified the heights of just poles or towers, and clarifies the additional height an antenna or similar elements may extend above the tower; clarifies the distance the face of the antenna can extend out from the pole (3'), and establishes that a pole or tower shall be located at least 150' away from the nearest existing residential structure.

Definitions - 17.62: Replaced the definition "Stealth Telecommunication Facilities" with "Wireless Telecommunications Facility Stealth Design".

The proposed changes to the Land Development Code are minor and help clarify certain substantive and procedural issues. Staff would recommend that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Council for their consideration.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Commissioner Goodlander asked about the change that supporting structures extend no more than three feet (changed from 1 foot) beyond the side of the tower or pole. Mr. DeSimone said the change in Section 17.38.090 clarifies the requirements and helps allow for more stealth design.

Mr. DeSimone clarified for Commissioner Ortiz that all factors will be reviewed and determined how/if they apply to specific situations and then findings will determine if they are applicable. He confirmed that Section 17.38.060 is designed to encourage co-location on existing towers.

Mr. DeSimone explained for Commissioner Goodlander that the goal of the design requirements is to allow the Commission to have some "teeth" in making decisions. Towers cannot be prohibited; however, the objective is to end up with a better product.

Chairman Nielson asked if a chain-link fence with slats would be acceptable within Section 17.38.090 B.3 "*Any associated mechanical or electrical equipment shall be enclosed with a 6' solid fence or wall*". Mr. DeSimone said if it is solid, it would qualify.

MOTION: Commissioner Croshaw moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for an amendment to the Land Development Code as outlined in PC 20-036 with the findings for approval as listed below. Commissioner Dickinson seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Utah State Law authorizes the 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.
4. The amendment clarifies the location, placement, and design standards for wireless telecommunication facilities.
5. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendments.

Moved: R. Croshaw **Seconded:** R. Dickinson **Approved:** 6-0

Yea: Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Lucero, Nielson, Ortiz **Nay:** **Abstain:**

PC 20-037 LDC Amendment – Commercial Design Standards 17.09, 17.12 & 17.20

[Code Amendment] Logan City requests to amend Chapters 17.09 “General Development Standards; Residential Zones” to clarify carport standards; 17.12 “General Development Standards; Districts and Corridor Zones” to clarify the use of architectural/decorative concrete; and 17.20 “Historic District Overlay Zone” to clarify sign review and appeal period.

STAFF: Mr. DeSimone reviewed the request several minor amendments to the residential, commercial, and historic preservation chapters. These are generally minor amendments. The proposed changes are summarized below:

Garages, Parking, and Accessory Structures – 17.09.030: Generally cleanup work to clarify that a building permit is required for accessory structures larger than 200 square feet along with other minor text changes.

Building Design Standards – 17.12.020 & 030: Cleaned up some of the text and added a reference to architectural concrete and decorative concrete as acceptable building materials and finishes. The Planning Commission had some discussions about the use of concrete as a building material and as a finish material, and whether it was or should be acceptable. This discussion originated during the Mill Creek residential project at 1st West and 1st South and the consideration of a large amount of exposed concrete due to the nature of the project’s design. Below are a couple of references to both architectural concrete and decorative concrete (compliments of Google). I have added language into the Code that treats concrete, whether architectural or decorative, as a suitable and acceptable exterior finish.

Architectural concrete refers to concrete that while providing an aesthetic finish to a building also serves a structural function. *Decorative concrete* typically refers to concrete flatwork or building elements such as panels, that while enhanced with texture or color, are not structural building members. (Portland Cement Association/cement.org)

Architectural concrete is concrete that will be permanently exposed to view and therefore requires special care in the selection of the concrete materials, forming, placing, and finishing to obtain the desired architectural appearance. (American Concrete Institute)

Historic District Overlay – 17.20: Corrected the exterior sign review process (signs are reviewed at staff level) and corrected the appeal period from 10-day to the 30-day appeal period as required in the State Code.

The proposed changes to the Land Development Code are minor, help to clarify certain substantive and procedural issues. Staff would recommend that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Council for their consideration.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Commissioner Dickinson asked about the reason for the removal of “~~All structures greater than two hundred (200) square feet in size shall require a building permit. Prefabricated carports or canopies are prohibited in all residential zones~~” under Section 17.09.303. Mr. DeSimone said people of various incomes cannot always afford a garage and would like to use a carport.

Commissioner Ortiz pointed out a small typo.

MOTION: Commissioner Ortiz moved to **recommend approval** to the Municipal Council for an amendment to the Land Development Code as outlined in PC 20-037 with the findings for approval as listed below. Commissioner Croshaw seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Utah State Law authorizes the 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 Title 17.51.
3. The amendment is consistent with the Logan City General Plan.
4. The amendment is minor and clarifies residential and commercial design standards.
5. No public comment has been received regarding the proposed amendments.

Moved: E. Ortiz **Seconded:** R. Croshaw **Approved:** 6-0

Yea: Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Lucero, Nielson, Ortiz

Nay:

Abstain:

WORKSHOP ITEMS for July 23, 2020:

- ✓ PC 20-038 Living the Good Life Building (Design Review & Conditional Use Permit)

Meeting adjourned 8:10 p.m.