



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting of August 13, 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, August 13, 2020. Chairman Nielson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

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

Staff Present: Russ Holley, Tanya Rice, Debbie Zilles, Kymber Housley, Bill Young, Craig Humphreys, Jess Bradfield (City Council), Jeannie Simmonds (City Council)

Commissioner Newman moved to approve the minutes from the July 23, 2020 meeting as submitted. Motion seconded by Commissioner Lucero. The motion was approved unanimously.

Councilmember Bradfield, the City Council liaison to the Planning Commission addressed the Commission. His hope is to foster good communication between the Commission and the Council. Commissioners have been appointed for a reason and he encouraged members to use their voice. The City has plans and Future Land Use Maps, however, at times there may have been mistakes made. Plans are a “point in time” and things can change over time. There is a need to ensure the City has the resources necessary to be successful, and the best way to do that is through zoning. He told the Commission to “do what you think is right, no matter what, and push for what you think is best for the community”. Commissioners should “vote their conscience” and the City will benefit. If there are ever questions about the intent of an ordinance, he encouraged seeking clarification from the Council. He thanked the Commission for all their work.

PUBLIC HEARING

PC 20-032 Deer Pen Substation – Requesting continuance to September 10, 2020

[Design Review & Conditional Use Permit] Logan City requests to install a substation at approximately 1880 East 1500 North in the Recreation (REC) zone.

MOTION: Commissioner Newman moved to **continue** PC 20-032 to the September 10, 2020 meeting as requested. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

Moved: D. Newman **Seconded:** R. Croshaw **Approved:** 7-0

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

Nay:

Abstain:

PC 20-040 A-OK RV Park – Requesting continuance to August 27, 2020

[Zone Change & Design Review & Conditional Use Permit] Danny MacFarlane/Stam Checketts Properties LLC, authorized agent/owner, request an RV park with 86 sites, 10 cabins and a 3,500 SF office/administrative building, and to rezone the 7.87-acre property located at 800 West 2000 South from Commercial (COM) to Recreation (REC); TIN 03-006-0006.

MOTION: Commissioner Goodlander moved to continue PC 20-040 to the August 27, 2020 meeting as requested. Commissioner Dickinson seconded the motion.

Moved: D. Newman **Seconded:** R. Croshaw **Approved:** 7-0

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

PC 20-011 Foothill Residential Subdivision [Subdivision Permit] Nic Porter/Foothill Lofts Residential, authorized agent/owner, request a 23-lot subdivision on 8.37 acres located at approximately 1250 North 1200 East in the Neighborhood Residential (NR-4) zone; TIN 05-011-0005.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request for a 23-lot single-family subdivision. The square-shaped property slopes slightly downward from east to west and sits between older single-family homes to the east and the currently under-construction Foothill Lofts apartments to the west. To the south, sits two churches and the land is partially vacant to the north. The proposal shows lot sizes ranging from 10,100 SF to 16,986 SF. The layout creates small blocks and an outer perimeter of lots with 60' wide road cross-sections throughout the proposed subdivision. The proposed layout shows four (4) possible street connections/stubs with two connections directly to 1300 East street.

This 8.37-acre piece was part of the 19.36-acre property that was historically used for gravel extraction in association with the Legrand Johnson Construction Company. Several years ago, the business ceased operations on the site. The split zoning designations of Mixed Residential Medium (MR-20) and Neighborhood Residential (NR-4) was established in July of 2017 by the Logan City Council (Ordinance 17-17), approving 9.0 acres of MR-20 (180 dwelling units) and the remaining ~10 acres as NR-4 single-family residential zoning. With the construction of the Foothill Lofts apartment complex on the 9 acres and the street dedication of 1300 East, the remaining NR-4 area became 8.37 acres in size. To reach the agreement of 9 acres of MR-20 and the remaining areas to be NR-4, which was codified with the ordinance adoption, it took months of public meetings and debates. This area was approved for a 19-lot single-family subdivision with 60' streets and 10,000 SF minimum lots sizes in September 2018 and has since expired. The Logan City Council denied a rezone request from this applicant from NR-4 to NR-6 on July 7, 2020.

PROPONENT: Nic Porter said the southern stub is not intended for future connection, only to allow access to a lot. They are aware of problems regarding egress and the resident's concerns. The third stub is viable and there is precedent with the City "to let us stub there and not require the ground that Logan City vacated". He does not understand the vacation that occurred in 2017. He has a drawing with 26 lots, without the third (north) access, which seems like a good compromise. He understands why the adjacent neighbors may not want it, but Logan City has a long-standing history of connecting roads. The 1300 North road is on recorded plats and it "has always been known that a road would go in". He understands there are some challenges in acquiring the land. The HOA has made it clear that they are not willing to sell their land, which would mean the City would have to exercise eminent domain and go back on the road vacation. He recommended considering the 26-lot concept which removes the north and south stubs. He does not understand what impact this would have on the neighborhood and why residents would oppose it. The adjacent neighborhood has indicated that they want homes for young families and are now opposing the connection. The 26-lot proposal is a good compromise and the Commission has a

history of making exceptions, so a precedent has been set. He does not think 26 lots merits three connections and encouraged the Commission to “take a stance and not pander to a few individuals”. Denying the egress is not as straight forward as it seems, there are some challenges in LDC §17.31.170. He thinks the 26-lot concept is a great compromise, but said he also has a proposal for 25-lots and another egress.

Commissioner Goodlander asked if he had done any preliminary investigation into the cost of a road. Mr. Porter said typically only a stub is required and a future developer would have to incur some costs for future connection.

Commissioner Newman pointed out that the proposal was for 23 lots and now the ask is for 25 or 26 lots at the last minute. He asked why 20 lots with two connections is not acceptable. Mr. Porter said the request is based on what is allowed within the Code, the Commission can allow up to 26 lots with two egresses, there has been a precedent for it. Commissioner Newman asked if these would be single-family homes or senior living. Mr. Porter said that is to be determined and should not be relevant to the discussion.

Commissioner Dickinson asked if, as proposed, there would be signage for a dead-end street put up. Mr. Porter advised that there is nothing currently proposed, but they can look at that. With the 26-lot concept, the road can be curved to provide a better layout (and avoid the southern stub).

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

Marc Leager said Mr. Porter seems cooperative, but asked whether he, or Mr. Champlin is the decision-maker. On August 27, 2019 there was a meeting in his yard with the adjoining neighbors and two representatives from Champlin Development. The project could have begun then with 19-20 lots and two egresses, instead, they wanted a rezone of the property from NR-4 to NR-6 to increase density, which was recently denied by the City Council. Now they are requesting another concession for 23 lots. The egress is worthless unless there is a road; he questioned who would pay for the road and how many concessions will be demanded. This is getting quite tiresome. There should not be an egress to the north and the plat should be redesigned to stay within the limit of two egresses (which would be 20 lots). Mr. Leager has great respect for the Commission and appreciates their work. He strongly requests that the Commission deny this application. A 20-lot subdivision would be good for the City and the neighborhood.

Dave Higham said when he purchased his property, the City requested that they deed 25' for a future right-of-way. In 2017, when the Logan Station subdivision was proposed, he was told in an email from the City Engineer that “everything has been approved for the Logan Station subdivision to move forward. As we discussed previously, I am moving forward with the right-of-way vacation on 1300 North”. He is not interested in selling that piece of property or having an access road go through his backyard. There has been a lot of change over the years and there are many owners that would be affected by an egress road, most of whom are not supportive. When he built his home, he put mature landscaping in, a 60' road would not work because there is not adequate space. Due to the elevation profiles in the area and the detention pond, the house to the south is built up with an 8-12' of drop between that home and the pond, which would require a retaining wall. He suggested putting in a wide sidewalk to connect with the existing neighborhood because connection is important. He asked the Commission to deny this request.

Craig Petersen said the 19-lot subdivision was not approved as part of the entire project (with the apartments) as the property was owned by two separate entities. There would be no problem if the request was for 20 lots with two egresses, but 23 lots and three egresses have more implications.

Construction costs for a road would be about \$100,000, the property would have to be obtained through eminent domain (which is a long, expensive process), a retaining wall will likely have to be built and the detention pond – which is there for a reason – will need to be addressed. He would be satisfied with 23 lots and two egresses.

Mr. Porter said the debate should not be about the number of lots, but rather an owner's right to use their property within the requirements of the Code. They are not asking for a zone change, but the opportunity to follow the regulations within the NR-4 zone. Mr. Petersen disagreed and said it is about the numbers because they are asking for an exception.

Brent Carruth said the road widths, with 26 lots, would be quite narrow. He agreed with the importance of the detention basin as Mr. Petersen mentioned.

Craig Champlin said they do not want the third egress; however, they own property which could allow for up to 26 lots. There have been exceptions made in the past for other projects and he does not understand why the same courtesy is not extended to them. The 50' road meets the Fire Code. It was not too long ago that 30 lots could be allowed without a third connection. They want the right to be able to build the amount of lots that are allowable within the zone. He owns the property, but the adjacent neighbors act like they own the property. He would like to maximize the amount of lots allowed in the NR-4 zone and the Commission can eliminate the third connection.

Christine Higham said there has been a lot of history with this property and they have come back time and time again to fight for their cause. She said 19-20 lots would be fine. Mr. Champlin can do anything with his property, if it is within the rules, but when he wants to take away some of her property for another egress, she has a problem. When they purchased their property, they gave up 25' to the City but continued to take care of and maintain it and she was grateful when it was given back in 2017. To have to rehash this issue again is quite frustrating. They have no plans in selling the property, it would have to be taken by eminent domain, which as she understands should only be used in rare cases for the good of many at the sacrifice of one, which does not apply to this case. She said it is unclear why a subdivision that was previously approved is being proposed again. She trusts the Planning Commission. Once the developer builds the project they are gone, but this is her community.

Janice McAlister is frustrated that they are here again after fighting the same battle for many years. She wants to maintain the quality of the neighborhood and was relieved when the Council denied the zone change request and kept the property zoned NR-4. She does not want it denser than 19 lots. She would prefer to see single-family homes rather than another retirement community. The drainage basin is very important. She requested that the Commission remain firm on promises made and deny this proposal.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Newman said developing a road will be quite costly. 20 units would not require a stub so he questioned whether the desire for 3 additional lots would compensate the cost of the additional connection.

Commissioner Goodlander asked about the original plat, when 1300 North was proposed to go through, and whether this proposed stub would be straight across to the cul-de-sac or there would be a jog in the road. Mr. Holley said 1300 North was proposed to align with the cul-de-sac, the proposal does not follow that same alignment due to the layout.

Commissioner Ortiz asked how the original plan (in 2018) was conditioned and approved. Mr. Holley explained that a previous developer had proposed a 19-lot subdivision with two street connections (approved at the same time as the apartments) which met the Code requirements. That project approval has since expired, and this is a new proposal.

Commissioner Croshaw questioned the southern stub connection (which connects to the church parking lot) and whether the City has a right-of-way. Mr. Holley said the City does not. Commissioner Croshaw asked if it would become a prescriptive easement. Chairman Nielson pointed out that this is fenced off. Mr. Champlin said that was never intended as a stub, only to allow access to lot 6.

Mr. Holley pointed out that this was submitted and legally noticed for a 23-lot subdivision, which is what the Commission needs to consider. The request for more lots would have to come back before the Commission after being duly noticed. 26 lots might create some lot width issues (would have to be reviewed).

Mr. Housley, the City Attorney, said the Commission does have some discretion. The general standard is 20+ lots require three connections. The Code is clear that a simple stub can meet that standard, however, if a decision is made that it is inadequate, there needs to be specific findings detailing the reason.

Chairman Nielson noted that the last project where an exception was made was in a different zone and the railroad tracks were a mitigating factor in the decision and should not be used as a comparison. He is familiar with the area, lives nearby, and understands that the detention pond has overflowed several times, so that is a serious issue to consider. The Commission cannot consider 26 lots, the proposal was for 23 lots, and that is what will be considered. He does not think the City should have to spend money to put a road in or force eminent domain.

Bill Young, the City Engineer, said the detention pond can be moved, however, finding an adequate location and/or piping could be quite expensive. A road can also be put in, but it will be expensive and difficult. Commissioner Dickinson asked if the City has any intention of ever putting a road in there. Mr. Young said there was previous preservation for a right-of-way, which was platted, but there was some discrepancy. The City Council, by State Code, vacated the right-of-way. The Public Works Department would never pursue it to be a critical connection to the overall City grid system.

Commissioner Newman appreciates Mr. Champlin's comment about being able to put in the number of lots allowed within the zone. The law that gives property owners rights, also protects neighboring properties. He tends to lean toward 20 lots with two egresses. The cost to the City may be substantial in having to either put a road in and/or move the detention basin to allow the developer to put in more lots. The previous project where an exemption was allowed had very different circumstances.

Commissioner Ortiz said, in his opinion, the northeast and south connections are not viable. The question is whether to allow 20 or 23 lots. Because there are only two valid connections, he is trying to find justification for the extra lots. The past example is not a precedent to allow for future projects as each project is different. The zone allows for the number of lots, but the required connections are difficult to justify.

Commissioner Lucero agreed that the northeast stub is not viable, however, it seems to meet the Code, by the obligation of the developer putting the stub in and a future developer finishing the connection. In this case, where a future connection will not happen, it is a performative measure of abiding by the Code and does not seem to accomplish what the Code sets out to do. The previous project that keeps being mentioned, was a very different context. She would be interested in exploring viable connectivity though a possible sidewalk solution.

Commissioner Goodlander said the (1300 N) road does not seem to be a viable option. The Code allows up to 20 lots with two egresses and exceptions can be made if there are mitigating factors, however, she does not see that in this situation. It is the Commission's job to ensure that a project meets the requirements of the Code and not that a developer can maximize their profits.

Mr. Holley confirmed for Commissioner Croshaw that lot widths are measured from property line to property line and lots 1 and 15 meet the width; easements do not play into the width calculation. Commissioner Croshaw said there are several reasons why the proposal is not workable and believes a 20-lot layout would work.

Commissioner Dickinson said the north connection is not viable due to financial constraints and right-of-way issues and should not be counted as a third connection.

Mr. Holley pointed out that the Code indicates that an access should be stubbed for future connection. The north stub could be eliminated, the south stub could be kept as shown and could be possibly connected at some point. A stub does not mean it has to be connected immediately.

Commissioner Newman asked for clarification that a stub, that may or may not ever be used, can qualify; Mr. Holley said "future connection" is not defined by time. Commissioner Dickinson said the one to the south is not feasible either, which allows only the two to the west.

Chairman Nielson said if the stubs are not feasible, it does not make sense to count them, so allowing the south stub to count would be making an exception.

Mr. Holley referred the Commission to LDC §17.31.170 which addresses this issue. Each circumstance is unique and site specific and the Commission should determine the feasibility of the connection in each situation.

Mr. Housley pointed out that LDC §17.31.170 does not specifically define feasibility or viability. He noted Subsection C *"The installation of street stubs to connect with future development on adjoining parcels is consistent with the connectivity requirements of this Chapter; however, all development will be reviewed for impacts created by incremental growth, including an analysis of the impacts on future connectivity and compliance with minimum fire access requirements. Depending upon the project location and regardless of the number of dwelling units or lots proposed within a specific phase, stubbing a road for a future connection to an adjoining parcel may be determined to be inadequate. Logan City may require, as a condition of project approval, that rather than install a street stub, the proponent is required to construct a public road connecting to a public roadway consistent with the provisions of this Title and Fire Code access requirements."* There is no specific definition of viability, but it is implied.

Commissioner Lucero said if a "stub" is what is required, then it seems to comply as 23 lots with 3 egresses, however, there seems to be a consensus that it should be required to follow the Code with 20 lots and two egresses; the challenge is that it seems as if this discussion is going around in circles.

Commissioner Goodlander said the north stub is not feasible. The south stub technically meets the requirement, but is also not viable, it seems like there should be a better way to design. The challenge is whether to have it designed to meet the Code with 20 lots or allow the 23 lots with some exception.

Commissioner Dickinson said there is clearly not a viable third stub. Commissioner Croshaw agreed that the southern stub, which has a fence, does not seem to be accessible or possible for a "future connection" because there is a church located there.

Commissioner Goodlander suggested instead of denying the project, possibly continuing it so the developer could design another plan that meets the Code requirements.

MOTION: Commissioner Dickinson moved to **deny** a 23-lot subdivision as proposed and outlined in PC 20-011 because the northeast stub is not feasible for connectivity and neither is the southern connection due to financial constraints and right-of-way issues, which does not allow a third point of connectivity that would allow 23 lots. Commissioner Croshaw seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR DENIAL

1. The proposed street stubs are not shown in practical areas that can be feasibly implemented or constructed within the NR-4 zoning district.
2. With only two street connections, the LDC Table 17.30.170.E.2 limits the maximum number of lots to 20. The proposed 23 lots do not comply with this table and there was not a compelling reason presented in the review process to modify the standard.
3. The existing storm water retention pond, additional property acquisition, and topographical challenges make the proposed northern stub location impractical to feasibly connect.
4. The recent church development and the over 600' dimension to the nearest street makes the proposed south stub impractical.

Moved: R. Dickinson **Seconded:** R. Croshaw **Denied:** 5-2

Yea: Croshaw, Dickinson, Goodlander, Nielson, Ortiz **Nay:** J. Lucero, D. Newman **Abstain:**

PC 20-039 Blue Spring Business Park [Design Review Permit] Jason Larsen/Quayle Family Properties LLC, authorized agent/owner, request to construct two buildings, one 86,240 SF and the other 73,920 SF. The buildings will be shell buildings for future tenants that have not been determined at this time. The primary uses will be office, warehouse, light manufacturing, or other similar uses on 24.95 acres located at the corner of 1000 West 1000 North in the Industrial Park (IP) zone; TIN 05-050-0005;-0021.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request for two (2) new industrial buildings, one 86,240 SF and the other at 73,920 SF. The 34' tall concrete tilt-up style buildings are positioned along a new section of 800 West with parking lots, loading docks and landscaping also proposed. The submitted plans show future phases with six (6) additional buildings along the 1000 North and 1000 West frontages. The total project site, including the future phases, is approximately 35 acres in size and configured in three (3) parcels. This proposal includes a boundary line adjustment to align with phase lines. The phase one area is approximately 9.63 acres.

PROPONENT: Jason Larsen said AI's Sporting Goods will be in building 5 and another office/lab tenant will be in building 4. The parking calculations have been done thoughtfully. There will be transparency added to the south facade of building 5 to meet the requirement. The subsequent phases will be driven by economics.

PUBLIC: Sid Bodrero, representing the irrigators in the area, pointed out that there is an irrigation ditch, located to the south of the storage sheds, that is proposed to be under one of the buildings. He asked how that issue and storm water will be addressed. Overall, he is supportive of the project. Mr. Holley said the Engineering Department will work through these issues when the drawings are submitted.

COMMISSION: Mr. Holley confirmed for Commissioner Newman that the east elevation will be considered the street-facing facade

Commissioner Goodlander asked about the Engineering condition "*800 West shall align with 800 West to the south of 1000 North not offset as shown on the submitted plans*" and whether they own enough property to make it align. Mr. Holley said they do, and the intersection is critical for the alignment of traffic, he also confirmed that there are two accesses.

Mr. Holley confirmed for Chairman Nielson that the 16' acceptance lane will be included in a future phase.

MOTION: Commissioner Lucero moved to **conditionally approve** a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 20-039 with the conditions for 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. The Planning Commission approves parking locations as shown.
3. The Planning Commission accepts the 27% transparency on the east facades.
4. The south façade of building #5 shall have increased transparency or other approved elements similar to transparency to equal 27% of the façade area.
5. Walkways shall be added in areas that connect the surrounding streets to the building entrances and outdoor amenity areas.
6. A Performance Landscaping Plan, prepared in accordance with LDC §17.32, 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. Open and usable outdoor areas shall total a minimum of 83,896 SF.
 - b. 18 SF of interior parking lot landscaping shall be provided per parking stall.
 - c. A total of 192 trees and 480 shrubs, perennials and ornamental grasses shall be provided.
 - d. Street trees shall be provided every 30' along adjacent streets.
7. All dumpsters shall be visually screened or buffered from public streets by using fencing, walls and landscaping.
8. Rooftop mechanical and/or building wall mechanical equipment shall be placed out of view from the street or screen from view from the street.
9. Exterior lighting shall be concealed source, down-cast and shall not illuminate or cast light onto adjacent properties.
10. No signs are approved with this permit. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
11. No fences are approved with this permit. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
12. Surface storm-water retention and detention facilities shall not be in front yard areas if open and should be in areas away from public streets and buffered from view.
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. Environmental
 - i. Minimum inside measurement of a double enclosure without gates is 22' wide x 10' deep. No gates are required but if desired it is a minimum of 24' wide. Minimum 20' overhead clearance on approach and over the enclosure. Place bollards in the back and on the front corners of enclosure.
 - b. Engineering
 - i. Provide water shares or in-lieu fee for increased demands to City system.
 - ii. Provide storm water detention and/or retention per Logan City design standards. This includes the onsite retention of the 90% utilizing Low Impact Design methods.
 - iii. Provide private water utility agreements and storm water agreements
 - iv. Dedicate 66' of right of way for 800 West and construct infrastructures
 - v. Dedicate right of way along 1000 North as required to construct a 102' minor arterial road as designated in the Logan Transportation Master Plan.

- vi. Dedicate right of way along 600 West as required to construct an 80' major collector road as designated in the Logan Transportation Master Plan. Additional right of way may be required to provide right hand turn lane and acceptance lane at intersection. Coordinate with Public Works Department during design to finalize these requirements.
 - vii. Pavement sections shall be as specified in the new Logan City road design standards. Pavement section along 800 West shall be that of a collector road if it is going to be used by truck traffic. Alternate is to submit a pavement section from a Geotech Engineer based on ESAL and soil conditions.
 - viii. Accesses to site shall be as specified in the new City design standards for road classification.
 - ix. Access from 1000 West shall be at gridded street locations as approved by UDOT through the CAMP.
 - x. Complete road section along 1000 West per UDOT requirements and City standards, include but are not limited to: providing a 16' acceptance lane from 1000 North onto 100 West; construction of a sidewalk; construction and landscaping of a park strip to comply with the Community Development and UDOT requirements; dedicate right-of-way, if required, to UDOT; and any other requirements as stipulated by UDOT.
 - xi. Coordinate with Logan City/North Logan City regarding the construction and installation of a 48" sewer line planned for 800 West and 1000 North.
 - xii. 800 West shall align with 800 West to the south of 1000 North, not offset as shown on submitted plans.
- c. Fire
- i. Fire sprinklers and alarms are required in buildings greater than 12,000 SF. Fire hydrants will be required within 400' of all points around the exterior of all buildings and within 100' of all fire department connections (FDC). Looped water mains are preferred. Dead end roads longer than 150' shall have an approved turnaround. A plan that includes the fire apparatus radius on all fire access roads is required.
- d. Water
- i. Each unit's water main needs to have their own RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested on the water main as it enters each unit before any branch offs or possible connections. Each unit is independently controlled and protected. Properly sized drain required to serve dump port of B/F.
 - ii. Landscape irrigation systems fed from Logan City water must have a high-hazard backflow assembly installed and tested.
 - iii. All backflow assemblies must be tested within 10 days of turning in water to them and annually thereafter.
 - iv. Fire suppression systems that connect to Logan City water (with no added chemicals) must have a minimum DC (ASSE1015) installed and tested. Fire risers and B/F assemblies must be installed as per Logan City standards.
 - v. All points of use of water must comply with the 2018 IPC and State of Utah Amendments, during and after 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, site layout, materials, landscaping, and setbacks.
2. LDC 17.43.080 authorizes the Planning Commission to make design adjustments not associated with numerical standards and requirements if they are consistent with surrounding areas and do not compromise future approvals.
3. The large-scale semi-truck loading docks and circulation conflict with automobile parking and warrant a design adjustment.

4. The allowance of the parking lot locations will not compromise the neighborhood character in this area for large-scale shipping and warehousing projects as similarly sized projects in the area have similar parking lot locations.
5. The project provides required off-street parking.
6. The project complies with maximum height, density and building design, open space standards and is in conformance with Title 17.
7. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.
8. 1000 North and 1000 West provides access and are adequate in size and design to sufficiently handle all traffic modes and infrastructure related to the land use

Moved: J. Lucero **Seconded:** R. Dickinson **Approved:** 7-0

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

Nay:

Abstain:

PC 20-042 CAPSA Parking Lot Addition [Conditional Use Permit] Joseph Beck/CAPSA authorized agent/owner, request to add eleven (11) additional parking and landscaping to their newly acquired .20-acre adjacent lot located at 310 West 1000 North in the Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) zone; TIN 05-046-0017.

STAFF: Ms. Rice reviewed the request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to construct 11 new parking stalls on their newly acquired property (310 West 1000 North) located immediately west of their existing CAPSA location (308 West 1000 North). The intended use of the additional parking is to support the services provided on the adjacent main CAPSA campus. Typically, lots zoned in NR-6 are not approved solely for parking lot use, however, combining the two properties with a boundary line adjustment would legitimize CAPSA's parking lot request.

CAPSA acquired an adjacent property west of their existing main campus. The intended use of this property is parking to support the services conducted by CAPSA. This is contingent upon a property line adjustment between the two CAPSA-owned properties. This permit focuses on the physical changes and impacts of replacing a single-family home with a parking lot. Maintaining or enhancing neighborhood character is the most difficult part of the CUP approval. The proposed additional parking lot has increased the parking capacity from 73 stalls to 84 total stalls. The new parking is pushed to the minimum setback on the west property line but offers a 50' buffer in a 25' setback along the north property line.

PROPONENT: Joe Beck, the project architect, explained that this lot was recently acquired by CAPSA to help with additional parking. The use of the lot for parking was made because the facility is landlocked and there is a need for additional parking. There is protected staff/client parking for the shelter facility that accommodates up to 32 tenants located behind the facility within a locked gated area and is not available to the public. The additional parking will be for after-hours meetings, outreach and trainings which will increase with the recent new addition. There will be landscaping around the perimeter of the lot.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Mr. Beck confirmed for Commissioner Croshaw that there is street parking along 1000 North in the rare event that it is needed.

Ms. Rice confirmed for Commissioner Ortiz that disability parking was considered and factored in with the recently approved addition, closer to the building.

Commissioner Goodlander said the recent addition was approved with adequate parking and now they are seeking more, she questioned if there is an increased need. Ms. Rice said at that time it was compliant, however, this now provides an opportunity to serve more after-hour needs.

Commissioner Dickinson said she is conflicted because this is in an NR-6 zone, however, it is located next to the large CAPSA building and they have done a good job with the landscaping. She questioned what would happen should CAPSA relocate at some point. Mr. Holley said a Conditional Use Permit runs with the land, so it could still maintain the use. This is the time to review the request and ensure that there are adequate conditions for approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Lucero moved to **conditionally approve** a Conditional Use Permit as outlined in PC 20-042 with the conditions for approval as listed below. Commissioner Croshaw seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. A property line adjustment will be recorded with Logan City Public Works prior to issuance of a building permit.
3. Per LDC 17.32.70, new parking lot border landscaping shall match the Type "B" buffer for front yards and the Type "C" for side yards to best buffer a parking area of this size in the NR-6.
4. A pedestrian connection/sidewalk shall be provided from the building to 1000 North for alternative modes of transportation.
5. 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. **Engineering**
 - i. Any existing water or sewer services that will not be used in the future shall be capped at the City utility main line.
 - ii. Provide storm water detention/retention per Logan storm water design standards for new development.
 - b. **Water/Cross Connection**
 - i. All landscape irrigation systems fed from Logan City water must have a high-hazard backflow assembly installed and tested.
 - ii. All backflow assemblies must be tested within 10 days of turning in water to them and annually thereafter.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The project, as conditioned, is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties because of the site layout, landscaping and setbacks.
2. The project conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The project provides landscaping for project site in conformance with Title 17.
4. The project provides off-street parking in compliance with the LDC.
5. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.
6. The surrounding streets provide access, utilities and are adequate in size and design to sufficiently handle all traffic modes and infrastructure related to the land use.

Moved: J. Lucero **Seconded:** R. Croshaw **Approved:** 7-0

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

Nay:

Abstain:

WORKSHOP ITEMS for August 27, 2020:

- ✓ PC 20-041 Children's Justice Center (Conditional Use Permit)
- ✓ PC 20-043 Larson Childcare (Conditional Use Permit)

Meeting adjourned 8:25 p.m.