

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

**Minutes of the North Logan City
Planning Commission
Held on October 3, 2013
At the North Logan City Offices, North Logan, Utah**

10 The meeting was called to order by Chris Nelson at 7:03 p.m.

11 Commission members present were: Chris Nelson, Kevin Christensen, Brad Crookston, Geri
12 Christensen, Brett Robinson and Joan Findlay. (Nathan Hult was excused).

13
14 Others present were: Roger Anderson, Bob Wright, Russell Goodwin, Jake Young, Danny
15 Mcfarlane, Lydia Embry and Marie Wilhelm.

16
17 The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Joan Findlay.
18 An invocation was given by Brett Robinson.

19
20 **Adoption of Agenda**

21 *Kevin Christensen made a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. Brad Crookston seconded*
22 *the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.*

23
24 **New Business**

25 Continued consideration and possible recommendation for the development plan/agreement and
26 preliminary plat for the Green Canyon Square Development, a mixed-housing development being
27 proposed in the MR-8 city center zoning, at approximately 200 East and 2500 North, North
28 Logan. (Sierra Homes)

29 Chris Nelson introduced the item and opened it up for the Planning Commission to continue their
30 discussion on this from the previous meeting.

31 Jake Young addressed various minor questions from the commission. Kevin Christensen asked
32 about the percentage of units to be allowed as rentals. Jake said he asked about this, and that
33 what is in place is the average of the industry standard; and confirmed Kevin's statement, that
34 this agreement precludes someone from being able to buy several or all of the units at once and
35 turn them into rentals; while, as Jake said, this gives owners the flexibility to rent their units out in
36 necessary situations.

37 Joan Findlay asked about the maintenance of the alleyways.

38 Chris Nelson said the City's position is to not maintain them, and that they be maintained by the
39 HOA.

40 Brad Crookston said in reviewing the City's code, he did not think we even have the right to
41 accept them, unless we change the code, and commented further. He said the developers would
42 have to develop the roads to meet City standards, and would have to be a certain width, have
43 curb and gutter, etc.

44 Jake said when the City Center code was done, there were standards for streets that go with the
45 development and was part of the planning. He said the alleyway was part of that and went
46 through Public Works, and we got their approval. He said North Logan never had a standard
47 before for alleyways; and that they are a common street method, but they have just never been
48 used before in North Logan. He said we are making a transition, where a certain part of North
49 Logan is going towards a more compact and urban type of development and an alleyway is a
50 good transportation method for that. He said the planning moved from the "old world" to the "new
51 world" and that City engineering is still stuck in the old world. He said we are okay with the
52 decision that North Logan has made that they are not going to maintain the alleyway, but that this
53 really puts a question mark out there for developers in the future in using alleyways. He
54 commented further on the benefits of alleyways. He said that North Logan will really need to
55 consider this in the future. He said other cities in Utah do plow alleyways.

56 The commission further discussed alleyways and the layout with Jake. Jake said an alleyway is a
57 planning technique that is very successful in other parts of Utah and has just not really happened

58 in Cache Valley.
59 Brad said a lot of cities do alleyways; they just do not maintain them.
60 Brett Robinson discussed the issue of who maintains alleyways, and that the HOA will just have
61 to have appropriate fees to cover the costs of maintaining them.
62 The conversation continued.
63 Danny McFarlane (developer's engineer) said that these homeowners should get a reduction in
64 the tax rate since there road does not front the same kind of street that other homeowners do,
65 and commented further.
66 The commission discussed putting this issue on a future agenda for further discussion.
67 Chris asked various minor questions of the developers, including regarding the sealing of the
68 foundation; and the design faces of the building and whether they correlate with the City Center
69 code.
70 Chris mentioned a "typo" in the development agreement, on page seven, section 4.1, where there
71 is a reference to something that does not exist in the document. The commission discussed with
72 the developers how to resolve this.
73 Brett Robinson said he appreciated these developers being the first to develop in the City Center.
74
75 *Joan Findlay made a motion to make a positive recommendation to the City Council contingent*
76 *upon staff's recommendations in the staff report, and with the clarification worked out on page*
77 *seven of the development agreement, as discussed. Brett Robinson seconded the motion.*
78 *Brad Crookston made a friendly amendment to include the comments from Public Works as part*
79 *of the staff report and motion. Joan Findlay and Brett Robinson accepted and seconded the*
80 *friendly amendment. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.*
81
82 Review the rough draft of some recommended changes to the city's sign ordinance. (Staff)
83 Chris Nelson introduced the item, which he mentioned was also briefly discussed at the City
84 Council meeting the previous evening. He summarized what Jeff Jorgensen had said about it at
85 the council meeting, in that staff realized there was not an ordinance in place that would facilitate
86 the design and placement of signs at locations like public service facilities, such as churches,
87 schools and government buildings. Chris said that Nancy Potter discussed ensuring an
88 appropriate site distance for signs depending on the speed of the road, and distance of the sign
89 at the intersection. He said there was also discussion among the council about potentially
90 controlling the design element of the sign. He explained that this is the Planning Commission's
91 first look at this to review and consider, and that they do not have to pass it at this meeting. He
92 commented further.
93 The commission discussed this, including what the City's standards may be for signs, in general.
94 Chris said the commission should get from staff what the standards are and work from there.
95 Joan explained that there are also standards in the Design Review Board.
96 Chris agreed and mentioned that Cordell Batt said he is the one who reviews the design and
97 standards of signs being considered. Chris said he also spoke to Chief Kim Hawkes about this
98 and commented further, particularly regarding the site distance triangle.
99 The conversation continued; and the commission agreed to put this on a future agenda for
100 discussion after they receive more information from staff.
101
102 Continue discussion on process and timeline for working on the General Plan's Land Use
103 Element's Update/Revisions. Begin review of PC's review comments of land use element.
104 (Planning Commission)
105 Chris Nelson asked the commissioners to review the materials on the Land Use Element and be
106 ready to discuss this at the next meeting, and briefly discussed how to proceed.
107
108 **Set Next Agenda and/or Discussion**
109 In addition to the Land Use Element, Chris mentioned that they want to talk about the site-
110 distance triangle and secondary water rights for developments at the next meeting.
111

112 *Brad Crookston made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Joan Findlay seconded the motion. A*
113 *vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.*

114
115 The meeting adjourned at: 8:12 p.m.
116

117
118 Approved by Planning Commission: November 7, 2013
119

120 Transcribed by Marie Wilhelm

121 Recorded by

122
123
124



Scott Bennett/City Recorder