



**Minutes of the North Logan City
Planning Commission
Held on March 4, 2021
At the North Logan City Library, North Logan, Utah**

**(The time stamps throughout the minutes below, located next to an item, indicate the time an item begins in the recording of the meeting.)*

***00:00:05**

The meeting was called to order by Lyndsay Peterson at 6:30 p.m.

Commission members present were: Nan Isaacson, Lyndsay Peterson, Jeff Coleman, Craig Cartwright and Dwight Whittaker. (Eric Hansen was excused.)

Others present were: Ben Steele, Jeanine Anderson, Craig Loosle, Carlos Anderson, Barbara Middleton, Steven Moore, Rod & Mary Jackson, Jon Keller, Lydia Embry, Brad Crookston, Spencer Burt, Alan Luce and Marie Wilhelm.

Adoption of Agenda

00:00:23 Motion

Nan Isaacson made a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. Dwight Whittaker seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Craig Cartwright.
An invocation was given by Dwight Whittaker.

Approval and Follow-up of Minutes for February 18, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

00:02:32 Motion

Jeff Coleman made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Nan Isaacson seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

New Business

6:35 Public Hearing to receive public input on the consideration and possible recommendation of a proposed rezone of approximately 8.88 acres located at approximately 2000 North 600 East (parcel 04-084-0018) from Residential Single-Family Estate 1 acre lots (RE-1), to Residential Single-Family 15,000 sq.ft. lots (R-1-15). (Visionary Homes)

00:03:48

Spencer Burt explained the location and the proposal to rezone this to Residential Single-Family, 15,000 square foot lots, which he said is about a third of an acre. He said that this is 8.88 acres and will have a maximum density of 22 lots. He said the Planning Commission is only considering the rezone tonight. He gave a bit of the history of the situation and explained that this parcel was previously considered for a rezone a few times, approximately two years ago. He said they ultimately had a workshop that included several residents of the area, some City Council and Planning Commission members, and staff; and from those discussions it was determined that the City wanted something more in the R-1-20 density, or potentially R1-15, rather than R1-10.

Applicant Ben Steele said he was there representing Visionary Homes, for this project he said they're calling Banbury. He used a displayed concept drawing of the project and discussed the meeting they had with the Design Review Committee, and some of the items they discussed. He said because of where it is located, the plan is very simple; and further discussed the roads, which he said are finished on the north and the south of this parcel, except right where this sits, which side of the street he said will need to be improved. He said this is the first time Visionary Homes has gone before the City for residential development. He said he doesn't think they're asking for anything unfair or unreasonable in this rezone and commented further.

00:13:15

Lyndsay Peterson read aloud the guidelines for speaking at a public hearing and opened the public hearing at 6:00 p.m.

Craig Loosle said he lives adjacent to this. He said he doesn't object to the R-1-15 and thinks this is a good fit for their neighborhood versus townhomes or the previously proposed high-density, 55-and over development. He said he doesn't think he saw anything on the concept plan about a storm protection plan and said he is concerned about that. He said he lives on 1980 North above 600 East; and said they don't have a stormwater protection plan, he said because it was not in effect when that subdivision was built. He said there is a retention pond that takes care of the area the area west of 600 East. He said his concern has always been that when it rains, it comes down 1900 North over 600 East and almost fills the retention pond. He said Mark Hancey purchased that because it went into a tax default and nobody wanted to take care of it, and explained further. He said he realizes that this is just a rezone at this point, and does not object to it; but that at some point, he would like to see what the stormwater protection plan is, and that it's not dumping it over 600 East and down 2000 North, down into the existing retention pond.

Steven Moore said it's encouraging what we've seen today, because he said he's been adamantly opposed to some of the prior plans, therefore the "landlord is listening." He said in the last meeting, there was some discussion relative to why we are picking on just this one plot, when we should be looking at the bigger picture for that entire area. He said there is farmland to the east and the conceptual diagram is showing a street heading further east to 800 East. He said it would make sense to him, that if the zoning is going to be changed for that area that is already R1, he thinks the whole thing should be changed to R-1-15. He said what he does not want to do is come back a few years later and have to start fighting all over again, because the east side of that property will be fighting for these higher densities. He also said he wanted to suggest that he thinks the frontage would be on those side streets and not onto 600 East, because he said he thinks it's safer.

Carlos Anderson said he lives just north of this. He said he was the "driver" of the secondary water that was put in that covers between 900 East where the canal is, and from 2100 North to 2200 North. He said they learned a lot when they put their system in and said he is willing to help them and share their experience with these developers, and explained further. He discussed the fact that they put a big enough pipe in to deliver the water that was needed. He discussed the situation further.

Barbara Middleton said she likes the lot sizes and that this plan is much better than what they saw before. She asked, when these developments are made, where the parks and play places are for the kids. She said it does not have to be a City park. She said the road there is in really bad shape, likely because of all the water that sits there. She said one or two of those lots could be a detention pond, and also a development play space for kids, with an open space area for kids to play. She said otherwise, kids are going to go out on 600 East, and commented further. She said the schools and Elk Ridge Park are far away. She said something we really need to think about as we develop these farmlands and create these neighborhoods, is where kids can go to play besides their own property or a large park much farther away. She said as this concept plan gets developed, this is something that needs to be there, as well as working with water retention and detention for flood control.

Mary Jackson said she lives nearby and pointed to where on the site plan; and said there is a road in this area that is not being shown on the plan, which she further described using the map. She explained the access issues that existed with the other proposals, and asked if it is going to be the same situation with this plan, and detailed this further.

Rod Jackson said now that the church owns [an adjacent piece of land], secondary water was put through his property. He asked if that [water] will still be going to this housing.

Spencer read aloud a comment letter from citizen Brent Sandburg which said the following:
Please let the developer know that my wife, Allyson, and I appreciate the consideration they have given to prior feedback from those who will be neighbors to this development. We fully support the plan as currently platted for single family homes.

As there were no further public comments, Lyndsay Peterson closed the public hearing at 7:06 p.m.

00:28:47 Discussion

Spencer addressed the questions that were raised during the public comments. He said in terms of rezoning the whole piece; the Planning Commission could decide to rezone the whole piece, and mentioned another piece that could also be rezoned. He said, however, that would require another public hearing, which he further explained. He referred to street frontage; and said currently they are shown to have frontage on the side streets, and said once the concept plan is finalized, there will be a more in-depth plan. He said in terms of the irrigation questions, that will be part of the development process. He said the developer will be required to speak with the irrigation company. He also said he believes this land is currently irrigated and that the developers have the shares; but that they do need to ensure that the delivery will be adequate and have a rough outline of a plan, and commented further. He said regarding parks: there are no parks in this development and no parks are required in the code. He said there are park impact fees that will go towards developing other parks, and commented further. He said in terms of the "flagged" section of land that was mentioned that was purchased by the church [The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints]; he said that area is not under consideration for a rezone in this meeting and is not owned by the applicant, therefore will not be part of this development. He commented on the area further.

Ben Steel said he would love to discuss the water situation with Carlos Anderson about the line, which he explained further. He said he understands the water is there, and there is a lot of pressure. He said he appreciates the comments spoken in favor of the development, which he said is uncommon, and commented further.

Craig Cartwright asked for confirmation about whether the Planning Commission was just considering the rezone and not the concept plan, which Lyndsay said that was correct.

Ben said they will be coming before the Planning Commission with a concept plan and commented further. He said the retention areas do end up becoming semi-play areas for the kids, but that the current concept plan does not include a separate park space in this development.

Nan Isaacson asked if the applicant would be willing to take a lot or two away to create a park area.

Ben said with a development this size, that would likely not be feasible. He said they would have to review the retention areas, and where the parks are in the City.

Jeff Coleman said he went back and read the minutes regarding previous proposals on this so he could understand the public feedback, as well as City Council and Planning Commission feedback; and said he appreciates the applicant's responsiveness to the citizens. He said his concern is that we give a nod affirming a rezone on this; but that to fit in stormwater means less or smaller lots. He said the lots and road layout currently match and fit in with the surrounding neighborhoods. He said we will likely see less lots, and to manage stormwater means smaller lots. He said that is going to be a big issue for him as they consider this tonight, and that we also heard from the citizens two weeks ago that we need to watch scale.

Ben said one way to do that is to incorporate the detention basin in the lot, and explained further.

Jeff said any approval from him tonight would be based on maintaining a certain lot size, and commented further.

Ben said he's not against retention basins as they do provide open space, and rarely have water in them. He said this is really the first attempt at a concept plan, but there a lot of deficiencies at this point.

Nan Isaacson said she agrees with Jeff's comments. She said it's a lovely plan as it is; but she

doesn't want the Planning Commission to approve this rezone, just to have the applicant "squeeze" more homes in, and commented further.

Ben said the zoning allows for 22 homes and this has 21, and said there won't be any more "squeezing". He said as far as Visionary goes, even with the setbacks here, it still allows them to put some fairly large footprints here. He said there will be a wide variety of homes with this and commented further.

Nan asked if they would be selling the lot with or without the home. Ben said they purchase the lot, and choose their customizations from Visionary Homes, which he explained further. He said none of these lots will be sold to another builder, they will all be built by Visionary.

Lyndsay asked about Mary Jackson's point regarding the road.

Ben referred to this "stub road" and said it was discussed with staff. Spencer explained the previous situation which was a concern, and explained the changes made to better plan for this.

Ben said it does cost the developer to build that road and commented further.

Jeff asked if the City is requiring the stub road. Spencer said yes, they are required to provide connections, and detailed the situation further.

Jeff asked if they could make the approval of the rezone conditional upon the approval of the concept plan. He said he does not want this to be rezoned and then sold off.

Spencer said the way that is managed is that they enter into a development agreement with them before the City Council approves it, and those points are put into the development agreement.

The discussion continued.

Alan Luce said they can approve it and make it conditional upon a number of lots, but not on the concept plan. Or they would have to come back in two weeks with a development agreement that it's conditional upon approval based off of that concept plan.

Jeff said his concern is with the number of lots and explained further. He said he's only comfortable approving this based on what he's seen so far. He said if they come back at the point of concept plan, and things are different or Visionary has backed out and sells it someone else; he thinks it would need to be heard again by the public and the Planning Commission.

Spencer asked Alan how to move forward, and they discussed this further.

The commission continued to discuss various issues and options, as well as how to move forward. The previous proposals were discussed. Spencer also explained the Density Determinate Subdivision option being done with this development and how it works, and that because of it, the risk is low with this.

Jeff said he is comfortable with the Density Determinate situation.

01:02:30 Motion

Craig Cartwright made a motion to make a positive recommendation to the City Council on this rezone. Dwight Whittaker seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

Set Next Agenda and/or Adjourn

01:03:30

Spencer Burt said he's been looking into getting a consultant to work on the General Plan, and said there are some grant opportunities that may fund this. He said he will keep the Planning Commission informed about this, and explained further. He said the General Plan hasn't been updated as a whole since 2013.

Lyndsay Peterson asked about the Planning Commission reviewing the Policies and Procedures, which Spencer addressed, and said he would get a copy of those to the commission.

Spencer said they are planning a joint workshop with the City Council for the second meeting in May; and that the City Council would be joining a Planning Commission meeting.

Lyndsay asked that, when they were discussing rezoning the whole area on this plan tonight, whether there is a benefit to this, and having a cohesive plan like that. Spencer addressed this

North Logan Planning Commission

March 4, 2021

and explained that once something is rezoned, it sets it a little more "in stone" and explained further.

Spencer said the planning conference he recently mentioned to the Planning Commission was canceled due to COVID-19. He discussed the upcoming spring Utah League of Cities and Towns conference taking place from April 21-23, with the main meetings occurring on the 21st and 23rd, and being held in St. George. He said the fall conference is usually better training-wise, but this one is also beneficial. He said there is a budget for Planning Commissioner training, which would include travel, hotel and the conference fee. He said he will send out information to the Planning Commission, and if anyone is interested, to let him know.

Spencer discussed what might be upcoming agendas.

01:09:02 Motion

Nan Isaacson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Jeff Coleman seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at: 7:47 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission:

March 18, 2021

Transcribed by Marie Henchman

Recorded by



Scott Bennett/City Recorder