



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting of December 10, 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 via electronic session on Thursday, December 10, 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, Dave Newman, Eduardo Ortiz

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

Commissioner Ortiz moved to approve the minutes from the November 12, 2020 meeting as submitted. Motion seconded by Commissioner Dickinson. The motion was approved unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

PC 20-040 A-OK RV Park – **requesting continuance to the February 25, 2021 meeting**
[Design Review & Conditional Use Permit] Danny MacFarlane/Stam Cheketts Properties LLC, authorized agent/owner, request an RV park with 86 sites, 10 cabins and a 3,500 SF office/administrative building located on a 7.87-acre property located at 800 West 2000 South; TIN 03-006-0006.

MOTION: Commissioner Lucero moved to **continue** PC 20-040 to the February 25, 2021 meeting. Commissioner Newman seconded the motion.

Moved: J. Lucero **Seconded:** D. Newman **Approved:** 7-0

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

PC 20-055 Palatial Living – **Project has been withdrawn**

PC 20-058 Smith's Fuel Center [Design Review Permit] Roger Gough/Smith's Food & Drug Centers Inc., authorized agent/owner, request to construct 5 fuel dispensing units complete with a fuel center canopy, attendant kiosk and associated concession sales on 7.08 acres located at 750 North Main Street, in the Commercial (COM) zone; TIN 05-025-0002.

STAFF: Ms. Rice reviewed the request for a new fuel center for Smith's Marketplace, complete with a 185 SF kiosk to be used for a filling station attendant and concession sales. The proposal includes streetscape improvements along Main Street, landscaping improvements and a 3,986 SF overhead canopy with five (5) multi-product fuel dispensers. The total project site is approximately .40 acres of the 7-acre parcel. The subject site is currently lined for parking on the northwest corner of Smith's Marketplace.

PROPOSER: Troy Wolverton said the trash dumpster is proposed in that location in order to maintain as many parking stalls as possible; moving it to the east would create a loss of parking.

PUBLIC: An email from Bill Peterson, the owner/operator of McDonalds, in support of this project was received and distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Ms. Simmonds asked about signage. Mr. Holley has not received an application yet. The proponent might be able to collocate on the existing pole sign or use the canopy above the gas pumps. Ms. Simmonds asked if the canopy would count as sign square footage; Mr. Holley said it would count as “building sign” square footage.

COMMISSION: Chairman Nielson asked what the trash enclosure will be built out of and/or how it will be adequately screened. Ms. Rice said it will be cast stone and the screening will be included in the landscaping plan, which will be reviewed.

Commissioner Ortiz said the proposed location is a premium spot and suggested considering changing the location to the east edge, along 800 North.

Ms. Rice pointed out that Smith’s requires 239 parking stalls and there are currently 338 stalls, so there is plenty of parking. The trash bin is 12’, if it is moved, some stalls on the east would be lost, but more parking could be put where the bin is currently proposed so there will likely not be any net loss of parking.

MOTION: Commissioner Ortiz moved to **conditionally approve** a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 20-058 with the conditions of approval as listed below. Commissioner Newman seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. A minimum of 1 stacking space for self-serve bays shall be provided.
3. 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. Street trees required along public streets every 30’. Coordinate species and location with the City Forester.
 - b. A total number 8 trees and 20 shrubs, perennials and grasses, shall be provided.
 - c. The trash enclosure shall be buffered and screened from 800 North Main Street with shrubs and vegetation.
4. The trash enclosure shall be located along 800 North at the eastern edge of the project boundary.
5. Exterior lighting shall be concealed source, down-cast and reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of a building permit and shall comply with current LDC regulations.
6. No signs are approved with this permit. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the LDC.
7. No fences are approved with this permit. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the LDC.
8. Surface storm water retention and detention facilities shall be in areas away from public streets and buffered from view.
9. 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. Water

- i. The water main line serving this new building will have to have an RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested as it enters the building before any possible connections or branch offs, as per 2018 IPC Code, Utah Amendments and Drinking Water rules.
 - ii. If a deep bury yard hydrant is installed it must be after the RP (ASSE1013) backflow assembly. (Suggest looping the line from inside building after the RP to outside to feed the yard hydrants).
 - iii. Project shall comply with all current plumbing codes, Utah State Amendments, Utah Division of Drinking Water rules and regulations, including, but not limited to, those pertaining to backflow protection and cross connection prevention.
- b. Environmental
- i. Minimum 60' straight on access required. Approach must be level, no slopes.
 - ii. Minimum inside measurement for a double enclosure is 24' wide x 10' deep.
 - iii. Minimum inside measurement for a single enclosure is 12' wide x 10' deep.
 - iv. Place bollards in the back of enclosure to protect walls.
 - v. Gates are not required, however if desired, they must be designed to stay open during the collection process.
 - vi. Barrel hinges are suggested for the gates. Need full 12' clearance so gates must be designed to open completely.
- c. Engineering
- i. Site Plan calls for a 6" sewer lateral. Based on the number of fixtures in the building the maximum size the City will allow is 4" at a minimum slope of 2%.
 - ii. Site plan shows an oil water separator, however, plans provided do not show drainage area to the separator and associated piping/surface flow, nor does it show drainage piping from the separator to site/City drainage system. At a minimum, all area around the pumps needs to drain to the oil water separator.
 - iii. The current catch basin that drains north half of the existing parking lot has been isolated from parking lot per site plan.
 - iv. Other drainage comments will be addressed at plan review for building permit.
 - v. Provide a development agreement for all work to be done in UDOT or City right-of-way.
 - vi. Based on current criteria from State Storm Water Standards, development is not increasing impervious area by more than 10%, therefore, no additional storm water detention/retention ponds or retention of the 80% storm event is required.
 - vii. If discharging storm water to catch basin in 800 North Main Street, there may be additional requirements from UDOT due to the gas station where that connects to storm drainage system under Main Street which is a UDOT road.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The project is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties because of the building design, materials, landscaping, and setbacks.
2. The project conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The project provides adequate landscaping and screening in conformance with Title 17.
4. The project provides adequate off-street parking.
5. Main Street and 800 North provide access and are adequate in size and design to sufficiently handle automobile traffic related to the land use.
6. The project meets the goals and objectives of the Commercial (COM) designation within the Logan General Plan by providing services near high-capacity roadways and is designed in way for easy circulation of both pedestrian and vehicles.
7. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the LDC and the Municipal Code.

Moved: E. Ortiz **Seconded:** D. Newman **Approved:** 7-0

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

PC 20-059 Foothill Lofts 25-lot Subdivision [Subdivision Permit] Nic Porter/Foothill Lofts Residential LLC, authorized agent/owner, request a 25-lot subdivision on 8.37 located ~ 1300 North 1300 East in the Neighborhood Residential (NR-4) zone; TIN 05-011-0005.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request for a 25-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 new Foothill Lofts apartments to the west. To the south, sits two churches and partially vacant land is downslope to the north. The proposal shows lot sizes ranging from 10,004 SF to 12,531 SF. The layout creates an inner block with an outer perimeter of lots accessed by a looping 60' wide road. The proposed layout shows three (3) street connections onto 1300 East and a storm water retention area along the west border.

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. 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 Ord. 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 10-acre NR-4 area became 8.37 acres in size. This area was approved for a 19-lot single-family subdivision with 60' streets and 10,000 SF minimum lots sizes in September of 2018 and has since expired. On July 7, 2020 the City Council denied a rezone request from this applicant from NR-4 to NR-6. The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) identifies this property as Detached Residential (DR) which are described as single-family home developments.

PROPONENT: Nic Porter said he has been working on this project for the last 18 months, this is the thirteenth iteration of the project. At the last meeting, the Commission was very clear that three (3) connections would be required. All possible connections to the north and east have been fully explored. They are aware that the LDS church would not allow for a connection, nor would that make sense. The last proposal (with two (2) connections) made more sense, but the Commission did not accept that design. There are other developments in the City (e.g. Johnson Cove) that have shown that two (2) connections are enough. This proposal meets all the Code requirements and has the required three (3) connections. He hopes the Commission can set aside any personal preferences and objectively consider this proposal and the rights of a landowner. This will set precedent for future developments.

PUBLIC: Emails from Jack & Marsha Peterson, Michelle Parry and Marc Leager were received and distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting and have been included in the project file.

Marc Leager said this is a peculiar arrangement. He is sorry that they could not have stayed with the 23-lot design because it had two connections, which he thought met the Code. He is unclear about the orientation of the "island houses". It looks like there are lots that will be bound by three streets on the site plan, however, the lot size seems to indicate that the north boundary of the south lot will have a portion that is not owned by the property owner. He questioned how property owners will know the boundary lines. The third connection seems to be "a gimmick", a way of satisfying the Code but does not add anything to the attractiveness of the development. He would hope that the developer would work harder to find a more attractive layout.

Jack Peterson submitted a letter to the Commission but wanted to share a few thoughts. He said the original agreement was that this would be a 19-lot single-family home development with the multi-family portion that is there now. Neighbors gave up the right to what they were promised. He asked if a deed restriction was ever recorded and believes it should have happened, however, whether it did or did not occur, it does not change his position. He is confident that a GRAMA

request of former Mayor Petersen's emails would show a discussion and detail what the intent with the residents was; he is confident that is in writing somewhere. He called Mr. Holley, asking him to include in this report the "19-lot issue" and does not think that was covered to the extent he would have liked. On the phone call, he asked about the project and Mr. Holley said; "it is not ideal, in fact, not good at all". The staff seems to be recommending approval because it meets the provisions of the Code, but it is still not a good situation. He does not care if there are four or five entrances, "it does not change anything, it does not have anything to do with was really promised or what we were told that we could get here" whether written or unwritten – it was an agreement. Wasatch Development did not get a written agreement from the residents of Hillcrest that they could build a 180-unit development. On the call, Mr. Holley indicated that he had no idea what will be done, however, the staff report summary and plat description shows it as "Foothill Senior Living". He has lost confidence with that fact. Senior living will not add students to the school district. He thinks there have been many false statements being made. He firmly stands with, and represents, many other residents and thinks another design should be made with 19 lots and two (2) connections.

Ms. Simmonds asked about sidewalks. Mr. Holley advised that the road is 60' and will have sidewalk, park strips, curb and gutter on both sides, with crosswalks at the intersections.

Brent Carruth applauded the Commission's decisions in the past to deny the proposal. He agrees with Mr. Porter's statement that this decision will set a precedent. He encouraged the Commission to deny the current proposal and uphold the original intent/agreement of the 19-lot concept.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Lucero asked about the Code section(s) that specifically address the unusual issue of lots being encircled by residential roads. Mr. Holley explained that the owner of the lot can choose the orientation; lots 18 and 20 front two streets so it would be similar to a corner lot. Mr. Housley, the City Attorney, said specific information can be found in LDC 17.31.70.

Mr. Holley answered for Commissioner Croshaw that the maximum height of the home could be 35' high and fencing in the front allows for 4'; fencing on the sides/rear allows up to 6'.

Commissioner Goodlander asked if the storm water area could count as a 10' setback. Mr. Holley said it probably would. Fencing cannot be on the edge of the street, but it will be dependent on how it is platted. The storm water area could be considered as an easement or a separate property. Mr. DeSimone said there is an area to the west that is shown for storm water retention, which is a separate area and excluded from the lot ownerships. Mr. Holley said the fence could be put along the property line. An HOA will oversee open area maintenance.

Mr. Housley addressed the issue of the deed restriction. He said Mr. Peterson is correct that if the density were to be restricted to 19 lots, regardless of zoning, it would have required a deed restriction, but there was never any guidance for, or request from the Council to do so. A deed restriction was filed on the multi-family portion regarding heights and location of the buildings. No deed restriction was discussed or recorded regarding density.

Chairman Nielson asked about possible setbacks for lot 18. Mr. Holley advised that setbacks are measured from the property line (outside edge of the sidewalk) and are 25' in the front, 20' on the corner, 10' in the rear, and 8' on the side yard. Chairman Nielson asked how the setbacks would be determined without the storm water area. Mr. Holley said, in that case, it would be a considered a 3-sided corner and would be 20' if adjacent to another street. Homeowners of corner lots have always been afforded the ability to determine the orientation. With a 10,000 SF lot, it would likely be a 2,000+ SF footprint and could have two stories and/or a basement. The lot is 100' in depth, with setbacks, it would be about 70' deep.

Mr. Holley pointed out that a City cannot condition an applicant to only be senior living, that would be a developer's choice.

Chairman Nielson said the three (3) connections meet the letter of the law, but not the spirit of it. All streets exit onto the same road. He is of the opinion that the entrance points should be on different streets. Commissioner Dickinson agreed, although it is not ideal, it does meet the requirements of the Code. This is another situation where the Code, as written, is the problem. Chairman Neilson is concerned with the precedent that will be set.

Commissioner Lucero agreed that this proposal meets the Code as specified. She appreciates the long history connected with this property and the ongoing negotiations between developers and neighbors. The 19-lot issue seems to be a sticking point with many of the neighbors and it is unfortunate that there is nothing more official on the matter. She pointed out that 25 lots will not make an overall substantial difference regarding the density of what is allowed, it seems to be more a matter of principle. She applauded the involvement of Hillcrest residents.

Commissioner Newman thought when Wasatch Development was considering putting in 19-lots, they realized they would need more lots to make it financially successful. Mr. Holley said he is unsure the exact reason the property was sold. Commissioner Newman said, unfortunately, there may have been verbal agreements made over the years, however, the property has been sold several times. This proposal is not ideal, he does worry about the precedent that will be set, however, it would be worse if the third connection was not required. He acknowledged that this is a landlocked piece of property and the applicant has explored several possible options. This is meeting the letter of the law, however, is one of the rare cases when there is not a "pretty outcome". To develop a Code that addresses every imaginable scenario is impossible. He does not like the storm water along the street; but would like to ensure that it is adequately landscaped.

MOTION: Commissioner Newman moved to **conditionally approve** a Subdivision Permit as outlined in PC 20-059 with the conditions for approval as listed below. Commissioner Goodlander seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. 25 lots are approved with this subdivision permit.
3. Three (3) street connections are required for this subdivision permit.
4. All lots on the final plat shall be a minimum 10,000 SF and 90' wide.
5. Street trees shall be provided on both sides of all streets every 30' on center.
6. Fencing shall comply with the Land Development Code (LDC) and receive a permit prior to installation.
7. The storm water areas along 1300 East shall either be placed underground or designed with landscaping that includes grass, swallow sloping sidewalls, curvilinear shapes, shrubbery and trees.
8. The final plat shall be recorded within one (1) year of this action or comply with LDC 17.58 Expirations and Extensions of Time.
9. Prior to recording of a final plat or issuance of a building permit, the Director of Community Development shall receive a written memorandum from the following departments indicating that their requirement has been satisfied:
 - a. **Fire**
 - i. Place hydrants within 600' of all buildable area of all lots.
 - b. **Engineering**
 - i. Provide water shares for, or an in-lieu-of fee, for both indoor and outdoor demands of development.

- ii. Road width, pavement sections, and accesses to comply with new City design standards if roads are considered public right-of-way.
- iii. Provide storm water detention/retention per Logan City Storm Water Design Standards. This includes onsite retention of the 90% storm event using Low Impact Design methods.
- iv. Provide storm water and private utility agreements as required.
- c. Water/Cross Connection
 - i. All landscape irrigation systems fed from Logan City water must have a high-hazard backflow assembly installed and tested. No dual source feed systems allowed without Logan City's prior approval and installation criteria (RP & swing joint) is met and inspection is passed. All backflow assemblies must be tested within 10 days of turning in water to them and annually thereafter.
 - ii. Water meter setters must meet City standards.
 - iii. All points of use of water must comply with the 2018 IPC and State of Utah Amendments, during and after construction.
- d. Environmental
 - i. Residential carts will be provided.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The subdivision meets the requirements in the Land Development Code (LDC).
2. The subdivision meets the goals and objectives of the NR-4 zone in the LDC and the General Plan.
3. The surrounding streets and infrastructure can adequately service the proposed development.
4. As conditioned, with Engineering standards, the development meets the required standards and specifications.

Moved: D. Newman **Seconded:** S. Goodlander **Approved:** 6-1

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

PC 20-061 Copperwood Townhome Subdivision [Subdivision Permit] Jake Thompson, authorized agent/owner, request a 19-lot subdivision for 18 townhomes and one single-family home on 1.6 acres located at 550 West 200 South in the Mixed Residential (MR-12) zone; TIN 02-036-0005;-0006;-0007;-0014.

STAFF: Ms. Rice reviewed the request for a subdivision of 1.6 acres into 20 total lots containing four multi-family buildings (two (2) containing 5 townhome units and two (2) containing 4 townhome units, totaling 18 townhomes), one (1) single-family home and a common lot containing private driveways, landscaping, open area and storm water facilities. The single-family home fronting 200 South is existing and won't be altered. The project site consists of 3 adjoining parcels totaling 1.6 acres on the southeast corner of 200 South and 600 West. The parcels are north of Copperwood Place Subdivision and east of U&I Furniture Warehouse

PROPONENT: Jake Thompson said they have done this style of townhomes in other areas of Logan which have turned out well. The front setbacks on the south end are 10' on both sides. The dumpster is proposed where it is for more centralized collection; it will be screened, but they would be willing to move it to the south end if necessary. He agrees with the need for connectivity. He said they can close the access point to 600 West, paint the curb red, to indicate no parking, and use 200 South. Parking is exceeded with the proposed on-site guest parking. He believes this is a great project which will improve the area.

PUBLIC: An email from Joshua Gardynik expressing concerns about the project was received and distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting and has been included in the project file.

Josh Gardynik said his biggest concern is that this looks very tight and closed in. Windows from one unit will be 20' across from the windows of another unit, although this might meet the Code it is concerning. This block used to be flood irrigated, and parts still are. Having irrigation coming from the north and having to be pumped up could be a problem. He does not want to see something developed that will cause a lot of problems; he is not against the development, but the proposed density. Fewer units would seem to work better than packing in "cookie-cutter" homes.

Ms. Simmonds asked if it would be appropriate to place the same type of conditions on the retention pond that were placed on the other project. She asked about lots 6 and 11. Ms. Rice explained that those are placeholder lots for another townhome unit.

Mr. DeSimone said the Commission can request that the applicant draw out exactly what is being proposed. Staff would suggest that the retention pond is conditioned similar to others (with landscaping) or moved to another location, which may force a redesign of the project based on the direction of water flow.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Newman asked why 23' is better than 25' for the connection to 600 West (as shown on the plat). Ms. Rice said that is what the Code suggests. Commissioner Newman asked about the stub at the south end that is shown as 25'. Ms. Rice said that is a fire turnaround. Mr. Young, the City Engineer, said the access to 600 West was reviewed and the Code suggested 22' (minimum travel lane 10' in each direction), typically a more comfortable width would be 24'. The 22' is only the paved area and does not include curb and gutter. He has not seen the actual cross-section. 600 West, in the new design standards, is intended to be a collector road in the future. This road is acceptable as constructed with signed right-in/right-out access. Mr. Holley said 27' is shown because of the design of the garages and perpendicular parking directly adjacent to them. Chairman Nielson asked if parking would be allowed along 600 West. Mr. Young said it is unlikely there will be parking along 600 West; it is currently a 66' right-of-way with the future intent for an 80' right-of-way, which means 7' of right-of-way will need to be dedicated along the frontage for corridor preservation.

Commissioner Goodlander said all that will be seen from the main road of the three internal units will be the garages. Ms. Rice said sidewalks are being proposed.

Chairman Nielson is uncomfortable looking at drawings of 6 units when only 4 units are being proposed. He is concerned that every unit looks the same.

Commissioner Croshaw is concerned with the size, everything seems very tight.

Commissioner Ortiz asked if the setbacks would change with the addition of sidewalks. Ms. Rice said everything will be quite tight. Mr. DeSimone advised that the Commission should not "design the project on the fly" but rather condition it for interconnectivity among the units and let the proponent meet the requirements.

Commissioner Ortiz asked if there are any provisions to help with vehicles coming from north/south to enter this development. Ms. Rice said this will be included in one of the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Goodlander is concerned with how to enforce the right-in/right-out access and whether signage alone will be enough. Her big concern is that there are not standards for private drives throughout the development. Mr. Holley said curb and gutter is not required, however, it can help with storm water. The only requirement for the drives is that they are large enough to accommodate emergency vehicles.

Mr. Rice answered for Commissioner Goodlander that the distance from the front fence to the front door is 10’.

Commissioner Goodlander questioned how water will get to the detention pond due to the elevation change. Mr. Young said a sump pump or box could be put in and water pumped into the pond, however, it may not be able to be handled only by gravity or surface flow. The issue can be worked out during the design review stage.

Commissioner Newman is concerned with moving the retention pond to the south end of the property due to water flow, which may require a complete redesign. He suggested continuing the discussion until after the applicant has time to address the issue with the Engineering Department. Chairman Nielson agreed and said he would like to see the actual building design for the 4-unit building and discuss possible future units.

Commissioner Goodlander does not like the idea of seeing garage doors, but it is similar to the design of others in the City (e.g. Bridgerland Meadows) and if it meets the Code, the Commission cannot deny it for not liking it. She agrees with the concerns about the retention pond and would like to see better connectivity in the design.

Commissioner Lucero questioned whether the identical facades are acceptable; Mr. Holley pointed out that the “cookie-cutter” concern applies to buildings fronting a public street, buildings facing the interior of a development do not have the same design requirements and can be similar.

MOTION: Commissioner Newman moved to continue PC 20-061 to the January 14, 2021 meeting to review the design of the buildings, connectivity, and better address storm water concerns. Commissioner Croshaw seconded the motion.

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

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

PC 20-062 Blue Spring Flex Buildings [Design Review Permit] Gus Pacheco/Jason Larsen, authorized agent/owner, request to subdivide the existing parcel into three (3) total lots and construct a 40,320 SF flex industrial building and a 1.5-acre storage yard. The building will have multiple bays with entrances on the south for customers and truck doors on the north on ~10 acres located at ~800 West 1000 North in the Industrial Park (IP) zone; TIN 05-050-0021.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request for two (2) new industrial buildings within the Blue Springs Business Park. The proposed “flex space” buildings are on the east side of the business park on an 8.45-acre site along 1000 North. The site plan shows three buildings in this area, all similar in footprint and layout.

This proposal is for the two outside buildings with the space in between being proposed as a temporary outdoor storage area for the tenants. The single-story tilt-up concrete buildings are proposed at 40,320 SF. The long rectangular buildings are proposed with parking areas to the south and shipping/receiving/loading areas to the north.

The Industrial Park (IP) zone does not have minimum lot sizes or minimum lot widths. Subdivisions in the IP zone do need to consider setbacks, open space, parking and other associated site improvements so that adequate acreage is provided for industrial land uses. This proposal shows three lots at 2.68 acres - 2.94 acres in size, which is adequate for the proposed building sizes. The rectangular shaped lots have both cross access and independent access to surrounding streets.

PROPONENT: Jason Larsen said these buildings will not be large industrial centers, they are designed to be smaller flex-type buildings to house uses such as e-commerce fulfillment, office and retail. Large semi-trucks are not anticipated. The loading dock doors are for delivery trucks. The north side of the building could be used for supplemental parking, depending on the tenant. He explained that the buildings are designed to create a consistent theme, but they are open to make changes if necessary.

Gus Pacheco said they will address the detention pond during the design review process.

PUBLIC: Mr. Holley confirmed for Ms. Simmonds that improvements will be done along the entire frontage of 1000 North (in front of all three lots).

COMMISSION: Commissioner Newman questioned the parking requirements, with respect to large trucks and loading docks. Mr. Holley explained that in cases where semi-trucks use the back areas of a building, parking in the front is appropriate.

Commissioner Newman asked about storm water detention; Mr. Holley said it can be put in allowable areas, but a specific location can be conditioned if the Commission deems it necessary.

Commissioner Dickinson feels ok with these two buildings being similar in design because of the space in the middle where a future building will go, however, she questioned what happens if a building never goes in. Mr. Holley said the design cannot be conditioned on “the future” so if no building goes in, the question is whether the Commission feels the space between the buildings is adequate to break up the similar building facades.

Commissioner Ortiz feels comfortable with the building designs being similar due to the middle open space and commended the proponent for having more parking than what is required. He agrees with condition 5 about the transparency, especially on the ends and corners of the buildings.

Commissioner Goodlander said, because the buildings are part of an industrial park, she understands the need for a consistent theme and questioned whether the colors could be varied to create enough of a difference. Mr. Holley said it would require more than just a color change, it would have to meet at least three (3) out of the eight (8) elements. Mr. DeSimone pointed out that the Commission does have discretion with design-related issues and can approve it with the middle open section (future building site).

Chairman Nielson likes the continuity with the other buildings in the area.

MOTION: Commissioner Goodlander moved to **conditionally approve** a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 20-062 with the conditions for approval as listed below. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. Three (3) lots are approved with this subdivision.
3. The Planning Commission accepts the identical building facade design because a third building with a different facade design will be placed between in the future.
4. The Planning Commission approves parking locations as shown with the addition of the Type “B” landscaping buffer between the streets and the parking lots.
5. The corner street, facing elevations adjacent to 800 West and 600 West, shall add architectural features similar to the south facade and at least 27% transparency.

6. The side setbacks shall be 20' or more between the building and the property line.
7. The outdoor storage areas shall be screened with a 6' tall solid fence and have landscaping placed in front in a Type "B" design as per LDC 17.32.070.
8. Walkways shall be added in areas that connect the surrounding streets to the building entrances and outdoor amenity areas.
9. Each building shall provide a minimum of 48 parking stalls and a bike rack.
10. A Performance Landscaping Plan, prepared in accordance with §17.32 of the LDC, 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 73,616 SF.
 - b. 18 SF of interior parking lot landscaping shall be provided per parking stall.
 - c. A total of 168 trees and 420 shrubs, perennials and ornamental grasses, shall be provided.
 - d. Type "B" buffers along the front parking lot and the storage yard areas.
 - e. Street trees shall be provided every 30' along adjacent streets.
11. All dumpsters shall be visually screened or buffered from public streets by using fencing, walls and landscaping.
12. Rooftop mechanical and/or building wall mechanical equipment shall be placed out of view from the street or screen from view from the street.
13. Exterior lighting shall be concealed source, down-cast and shall not illuminate or cast light onto adjacent properties.
14. No signs are approved with this permit. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
15. No fences are approved with this permit. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
16. 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.
17. 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 60' straight on access required. Approach must be level, no down or uphill slopes.
 - ii. Minimum inside measurement for a double enclosure is 24' wide x 10' deep. Minimum inside measurement for a single enclosure is 12 ft. wide by 10 ft. deep.
 - iii. Place bollards in the back of enclosure to protect walls.
 - iv. Gates are not required, however, if desired, they must be designed to stay open during the collection process.
 - v. Barrel hinges are suggested for the gates. Need 12' clearance so gates must be designed to open completely.
 - b. Engineering
 - i. Provide water shares or in-lieu-of fee for increased indoor and outdoor 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 section 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. Alternative is to submit a pavement section from a Geotech Engineer based on ESAL and soil conditions.
 - viii. Accesses to the site shall be as specified in the new City design standards for road classification(s)
 - ix. Access from 1000 West shall be at gridded street locations as approved by UDOT through the CAMP.
 - x. 800 West shall align with 800 West to the south of 1000 North not offset as shown on submitted plans.
 - xi. Design shall be approved, and plat signed off by canal company and/or ditch users regarding the piping.
- c. Fire
- i. Fire sprinklers and fire 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. Applicant shall provide an AutoCad drawing of the site with the maneuvering specifications of the largest fire apparatus: Inside turn - 17', curb-to-curb - 32', wall-to-wall – 36'.
- d. Water
- 1. Each unit's water main needs to have own RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested on the water main as it enters each unit before any branch offs or possible connection, so each unit is independently controlled and protected. Properly sized drain required to serve dump port of B/F.
 - 2. All landscape irrigation systems fed from Logan City water must have a high-hazard backflow assembly installed and tested.
 - 3. All backflow assemblies must be tested within 10 days of turning in water to them and annually thereafter.
 - 4. 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.
 - 5. All points of use of water must comply with 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. The Land Development Code (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 600 West provide access and are adequate in size and design to sufficiently handle all traffic modes and infrastructure related to the land use.

Moved: S. Goodlander **Seconded:** E. Ortiz **Approved:** 7-0

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

PC 20-060 Woodruff Neighborhood Specific Plan – Logan City requests to adopt a neighborhood specific plan for the Woodruff Neighborhood.

STAFF: Mr. Smith introduced the specific plan designed for the Woodruff Neighborhood.

PUBLIC: LaDonna Connors has lived in the area since 1990. She does not believe that the Council has listened to people with regards to the 100 West corridor. She thinks roundabouts could be instrumental with traffic flow and safety. Many people in this area own their homes and plan on staying there. She would not like to see any more high-density housing. The Plan needs to be advertised well when it will be heard at the Council so residents will have an opportunity to provide input.

Commissioner Dickinson has lived in the Woodruff neighborhood for over 24 years, it is an amazing place to live and this is a good plan.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Goodlander asked if there were specific areas of the plan that Mr. Smith would like Commission to review and consider. Mr. Smith suggested looking closely at the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP), specifically the resource reserve areas along the highway. He also asked the Commission to consider anything that may not have been addressed and should be.

Commissioner Lucero asked how these plans are utilized once they are adopted. Mr. Smith explained that the Commission will recommend approval to the City Council who will formally adopt it. After adoption, the FLUP will be updated and recommendations from the plan can be used as a guideline and referenced when reviewing projects in the area. Mr. DeSimone noted that these plans deal with specific neighborhood/area issues and can be used as referential document.

Commissioner Dickinson asked when the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) will be updated. Mr. DeSimone said it will be updated once the Council formally adopts the plan.

Commissioner Goodlander asked Mr. Smith to forward a copy of the presentation slides to the Commission members for review.

Commissioner Ortiz pointed out that this neighborhood has the lowest unemployment rate and one of the highest poverty rates in the City, which ties in with the type of housing in the area. He asked if there are past reports of the neighborhood and if there has been any progress made. Mr. Smith said this plan is the first comprehensive look at the area, although the census information does contain some historical information.

Ms. Simmonds noted that when the General Plan was adopted, one of the requirements was to adopt a specific plan for each of the neighborhoods. This is the third one (out of 6 areas). Mr. Smith said Woodruff is a dynamic area with lots of transportation changes and growth opportunities and it has taken some time to complete this comprehensive plan. Ms. Simmonds said the City may want to explore the idea of redefining neighborhoods into smaller homogenous areas. Mr.

DeSimone said the neighborhood areas are arbitrary lines based on the school district boundaries. Everyone in the area has a different perspective on what should be considered a neighborhood.

Commissioner Newman said single-family homes being turned into rentals is always a concern. The percentage of home ownership is decreasing throughout the City and should be addressed and included in future discussions. Mr. Smith noted that there is some home ownership data in the plan, a 10-year study was done showing that this area remains 80% owner-occupied, second only to the Hillcrest area. Part of this is likely due to the lack of student housing demand in the area (due to the proximity from campus). Mr. DeSimone noted that under federal law the City cannot regulate ownership of homes. Looking at ways to generate interest to live in areas, through other means, can help. Mr. Smith pointed out that homes along busy streets (like 1000 West, 100 West and 100 East) generally do not incentive families to live there.

MOTION: Commissioner Lucero moved to **continue** PC 20-060 to the January 14, 2021 meeting. Commissioner Dickinson seconded the motion.

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

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.