

1 **Minutes of the North Logan City**
2 **Planning Commission**
3 **Held on March 17, 2016**
4 **At the North Logan City Library, North Logan, Utah**
5
6

7 The meeting was called to order by Brad Crookston at 6:30 p.m.

8
9 Commission members present were: Bruce Lee, Robert Burt, Brad Crookston, Brett Robinson
10 (who arrived after the approval of the minutes) and Geri Christensen. (Nathan Hult was
11 excused).

12
13 Others present were: Dayton Crites, Ryan Reeves, Brian Lyon, Alan Luce, Cordell Batt and
14 Marie Wilhelm.

15
16 The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Bruce Lee.
17 An invocation was given by Brad Crookston.

18
19 Adoption of Agenda

20 Cordell Batt explained that item number three will not be discussed at this meeting. Cordell also
21 mentioned that he would not be able to attend the next Planning Commission meeting. He said
22 there may not be a meeting, but if so, Jeff Jorgensen will attend in Cordell's place.

23
24 *Bruce Lee made a motion to adopt the agenda as amended. Robert Burt seconded the motion.*
25 *A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.*

26
27 Approval and Follow-up of Minutes for February 18, 2016 and March 3, 2016 Planning
28 Commission Meetings

29 *Robert Burt made a motion to approve both of the above-referenced sets of minutes. Bruce Lee*
30 *seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.*

31
32 *Brett Robinson arrived at this time.*

33
34 **New Business**

35 Consideration of a concept plan for a commercial/industrial 1 lot subdivision located at
36 approximately 2850 N 400 W, just west of the Eagle Creek Business Park. (Vefina,LLC)

37 Cordell Batt explained the situation and oriented the commission the location of the site. He said
38 there are existing roads in this area, and this proposal is for one lot to be developed, and one to
39 remain a parcel. He said when Eagle Creek did their development, they only did half of the road;
40 and said that these developers are asking to only do the part of the road for the one improved lot
41 that they are proposing with this, and are not therefore proposing to finish the whole road. He
42 clarified the comments from Public Works, and said the City does not want the road to be done
43 piecemeal and done in little sections; but would rather have it done all at once, unless there is
44 good reason to do otherwise. He said this area is 11.65 acres, with lot one being 5.5 acres,
45 combined with the parcel being 6.15. He said this is in the MC/Industrial Zone and commented
46 further. He further discussed which reports staff is requiring, and which ones they are waiving, as
47 listed in the staff report. He said the applicant still needs to let the City know whether they have
48 water rights, and if so, what they plan on doing with them. Cordell explained that typically we'll
49 have the developers put a note on the plat reflecting which water rights go with each lot or parcel.

50 Cordell addressed various questions from the commission and said staff is recommending
51 approval on this with the conditions set in the staff report.

52 Ryan Reeves explained their intentions for this development; including explaining that the road
53 there was intentionally built as half of a road, until they knew what they were going to with the rest
54 of the eleven and a half acres. Brian with Alliance Engineering, explained the road development
55 further, which essentially concurred with what Ryan Reeves said, in that they weren't ready to
56 develop the road further, or as Cordell said, or knew where to put curb or driveway cuts until more
57 development occurs there.
58

59 *Bruce Lee made a motion to approve the concept plan along with staff's recommendations. Brad*
60 *Crookston seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.*
61

62 Discussion with Cache County Trails Planner on North Logan's trails and how he can help us
63 coordinate on the regional planning of trails and how we need to make important connections with
64 our trails happen.

65 Dayton Crites, Cache County Trails Planner, gave a presentation on the benefits of trails and how
66 he is trying to better our City's plan for trails, and all that entails. He discussed the lack of clarity
67 for codes in relation to building our trails. He presented a draft plan for our City and how it
68 compared with our own current trails plan, and how to potentially work forward through it.

69 He continued to explain various items through his presentation, including the different types of
70 trails, and answered various questions from the commission. There was further discussion about
71 how the City code needs to include language for having trails, as well as other related items.

72 The discussion continued at length.
73

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

76 The Planning Commission continued to discuss and review the list of follow-up issues originally
77 given to the Planning Commission by the Mayor.

78 Cordell Batt discussed item number four on the list in relation to infrastructure issues, and read
79 the question from the letter regarding the Huber's issue in relation to City code. He further
80 delineated the rights of both the homeowner, as well as the City, in these right-of-ways and park
81 strips held by the City. He also said that when the City is required to do work in the City's right-of-
82 way piece in front of a residence and potentially disturbs what a resident has installed there, such
83 as plants; the City works hard with that resident to make it right, which is handled primarily by the
84 Public Works department.

85 The commission discussed the Huber's question regarding the maintenance of these right-of-
86 ways, particularly in relation to snow removal. Cordell explained that it is the requirement of the
87 homeowner to remove the snow, and not to push it out onto the road, etc. He also discussed the
88 public nuisance ordinance in relation to right-of-ways, such as with the overgrowth and removal of
89 weeds. He discussed these items further and addressed various questions from the commission.

90 There was a question about the City requiring the homeowner to maintain these park strips, in
91 relation to how much right the citizen has to improve these park strips and what they can do
92 there; and that if the land is not owned by the citizen, why they should be required to take care of
93 it. Cordell explained that the citizen *does* have a say in what happens there; but that if the City
94 needs to come in and do work in these right-of-ways, the City has full right to do so. Cordell also
95 said there is case law that shows that the City has the ability to require citizens take care of
96 adjacent property because it is next to theirs, and they are responsible to take care of it. He
97 briefly explained the process that takes place when a homeowner does not maintain these park
98 strips. He also said there is not something specifically included in the ordinance about requiring
99 the homeowners to maintain snow removal, and there needs to be. He said he included some
100 language to that effect in the code, in the section regarding snow removal, based on what is
101 already required in the code.
102

103 The Planning Commission agreed to the following statement made by Robert Burt to the Mayor
104 and City Council in relation to the maintenance of public right-of-ways: Property owners shall
105 maintain the public right-of-way adjacent to their property, to the same standard and level as
106 required of their own real property, as outlined in City Code Section 12.
107

108 Brad Crookston said that when this is written up, we need to make sure that it is clear that this is
109 for the area of planting strips, and curb, gutter and sidewalk area, etc., between a home and the
110 street in front of the home; not trails behind properties or things like that.

111 Cordell said this will be a change to the code, in addition to the previous change to the hedge;
112 and then they will make one ordinance that includes all of these changes, along with holding a
113 public hearing.

114 The Planning Commission discussed item number six from the letter regarding the Huber's
115 comment: "changes to the infrastructure within an existing subdivision constitute an amendment

116 to a subdivision plat". Cordell said this was incorrect because a change to a plat is just that, and
117 that infrastructure has nothing to do with platting. He explained further.
118 After further discussion, the Planning Commission agreed that this should remain as is.
119 The Planning Commission agreed to the following statement to the Mayor and City Council in
120 relation to a potential plat amendment: Any minor changes made, even to the City's right-of-way,
121 does not require a plat amendment, public noticing, nor a public hearing.
122
123 Cordell discussed item number seven from the letter with the commission regarding the layout of
124 a plat; and explained the reasons in this situation for the owners not to combine the parcels. Alan
125 Luce explained that it is sometime advantageous to keep lots and parcels separate for various
126 reasons, including for purposes relating to property taxes and how the lots are categorized.
127 Cordell explained that the Hubers attempted to use City Center code to say that these roads had
128 to be connected to all parcels, essentially, which was not appropriate for this area, and explained
129 further; and reiterated that the code that the Huber's tried to use does not relate for their area, as
130 it does not apply to this subdivision.
131 The Planning Commission continued to discuss various related items, including the benefits of
132 low-impact roads.
133
134 The Planning Commission agreed to the following statement to the Mayor and City Council:
135 What the City already has in place for this functions well, as is.
136
137 Robert Burt discussed the issue of regulating trees and shrubs on a lot, which Cordell addressed
138 and the Planning Commission discussed at length; and agreed that there really is no way to do
139 that. They also discussed that North Logan does not want to be the kind of City that regulates
140 this type of thing, outside of what an HOA may or may not do.
141
142
143
144 *Brad Crookston made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Bruce Lee seconded the motion. A vote*
145 *was called and the motion passed unanimously.*
146
147
148 The meeting adjourned at: 9:18 p.m.
149
150 Approved by Planning Commission: April 7, 2016
151
152 Transcribed by Marie Wilhelm
153
154 Recorded by
155
156



Scott Bennett/City Recorder