



58 There was discussion about the traffic on that street, especially in relation to the street not being  
59 open on one end at this point, and whether there is concern about when it becomes a through  
60 street.

61 This was discussed at length.

62 Ms. Backlund explained that the parents have to come in to sign the children in and out of her  
63 daycare.

64 Robert Burt recommended potentially approving this and then reviewing this again when the  
65 street she lives on becomes a through street in the future.

66

67 *Robert Burt made a motion to approve this conditional use permit with the condition that it be*  
68 *reviewed within a year after the 1200 East goes through to 2500 North. Bruce Lee seconded the*  
69 *motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.*

70

71 Discussion of several follow-up issues the City Council has tasked the Planning Commission with.  
72 (Staff)

73 Cordell Batt reminded the commission of their recommendation on the fence and the proposal on  
74 this ordinance to take out the word "hedge", and he asked the Planning Commission to review  
75 this revised ordinance. Cordell said that they will wait until any and all changes are made, and  
76 then take all of the potential changes through the public hearing process at the same time.

77 Cordell referred to the letter from the Mayor and discussed various points with the commission,  
78 which they discussed further.

79 In relation to the item regarding "extended property lines", Cordell explained what the code says,  
80 and said it is for use in *commercial* zones, *not* residential; and further explained the details of the  
81 ordinance, and how the Hubers were attempting to apply the commercial ordinance rules to their  
82 residence, which was not accurate.

83 The Planning Commission agreed to the following statement to the Mayor and City Council:

84 *That the commercial code relating to "extended property lines" is in relation to the commercial*  
85 *zone and does not apply to residential.*

86

87 The Planning Commission discussed the issue of "deviation from current codes to match with  
88 previous construction". Cordell explained that this is essentially an infrastructure issue, not a  
89 planning issue. He commented further, and said this item is used commonly to facilitate a  
90 subdivision going in where there is existing infrastructure; and that it is typically the decision of  
91 the City's Public Works department to review the situation, and determine what the best match is  
92 to what exists. He further explained how this process is typically done and how it works with the  
93 surrounding area, which is always done openly, and not "in secret" [as has been suggested by  
94 the Hubers]. Per a comment from Bruce, Cordell confirmed that this is done on a case-by-case  
95 basis. Cordell explained various details further. He said the current situation gives the flexibility  
96 for the City engineer to make the call out in the field, and do what is best; and allows the  
97 landowner to be able to plan his own property. Per a comment from Brad, Cordell confirmed  
98 that with new construction, the new standards are followed without question; and also said that  
99 this happens very infrequently.

100 The Planning Commission discussed this at length, and Cordell addressed various questions  
101 from the commission. Cordell mentioned that this is the first time this has ever come up since he  
102 started working for the City thirteen years ago.

103 The discussion continued at length, and they discussed various related items and situations.  
104 After further discussion, the consensus was that what is in place, is working.

105

106 The Planning Commission's statement on this issue relating to deviating from code, to the Mayor  
107 and City Council is: *What is in place is working effectively, therefore, there should be no change*  
108 *to the ordinances.*

109

110 The Planning Commission discussed the next issue regarding the City's Transportation Master  
111 Plan, brought up by the Hubers regarding potential access considered years previously in which  
112 their cul-de-sac might have a road access through to 2200 North, which Cordell explained. He  
113 further discussed the "historical documents" relating to this, and showed that both options were  
114 considered and possible; and that the Master Plan Roads Plan only includes roads which are

115 arterial and collector in the major grid plan of the City, and explained further. He discussed other  
116 roads in the City that are similar, and addressed various questions from the commission, and  
117 their discussion continued. Cordell and the Planning Commission agreed that the Master Plan is  
118 to maintain the integrity of North Logan's main roads.

119  
120 Robert Burt made the following statement on behalf of the Planning Commission to the Mayor  
121 and City Council: That in relation to the Master Plan Roads Plan, the City should not make any  
122 further requirements as far as placing lower level roads on the Master Plan, and requiring  
123 property owners to comply to that. And that if there is a road that "rises" up to the level of a  
124 Master Plan road, then the process is already in place for a public hearing for it to be  
125 considered.

126  
127 **Set Next Agenda and/or Discussion**

128 There was further discussion and comments about connectivity to the east bench.

129  
130  
131 *Brad Crookston made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Bruce Lee seconded the motion. A vote*  
132 *was called and the motion passed unanimously.*

133  
134 The meeting adjourned at: 8:04 p.m.

135  
136  
137 Approved by Planning Commission: March 17, 2016

138  
139 Transcribed by Marie Wilhelm

140  
141 Recorded by  
142   
143 Scott Bennett/City Recorder