CITY OF LOGAN, UTAH
ORDINANCE NO. 18-16

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CENTER STREET NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGN STANDARDS OF LOGAN CITY, UTAH

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOGAN, STATE OF UTAH AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: That the Center Street National Historic District Design Standards are hereby amended as attached hereto as Exhibit A.

SECTION 2: This ordinance shall become effective upon publication.

PASSED BY THE LOGAN MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, STATE OF UTAH, THIS DAY OF September, 2018.

AYES: Anderson, Bushfield, Jensen, Cogan, Simmonds

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

Thomas C. Jensen, Chair

PRESENTATION TO MAYOR

The foregoing ordinance was presented by the Logan Municipal Council to the Mayor for approval or disapproval on the day of September, 2018.

Thomas C. Jensen, Chair

MAYOR’S APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL

The foregoing ordinance is hereby approved this day of September, 2018.

Holly H. Daines, Mayor
MEMORANDUM TO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

DATE: August 7, 2018
FROM: Mike DeSimone, Director
SUBJECT: Ordinance No. 18-16 (Center Street Historic District Design Standards Update)

Summary of Planning Commission Proceedings

Project Name: Center Street National Historic District Design Standards Update
Request: Historic Design Standards Adoption
Project Address: Center Street Historic District
Recommendation of the Planning Commission: Approval

On June 14, 2018, the Planning Commission recommended that the Municipal Council approve the Center Street National Historic District Design Standards Update.

On April 16, 2018, the Historic Preservation Committee recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Center Street National Historic District Design Standards Update.

Planning Commissioners vote (5-0):
Motion: D. Newman
Second: R. Dickinson
Abstain: S. Goodlander
Nay: none

Attachments:
Staff Report (Amber Pollan)
Ordinance #18-016
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from May 10 & June 14, 2018
Historic Preservation Committee Minutes from February 5, March 5, April 2 & April 16, 2018
November 18, 2017 Open House Summary Slides
Final Draft
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Municipal Council for the adoption of the Center Street National Historic District Design Standards.

REQUEST
The City of Logan requests review and adoption of an update to the Historic District Design Standards for the Center Street National Historic District. The update has been guided by a Steering Committee comprised of members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, City Council, City Administration, historic preservation consultants and general public, and includes a comprehensive review and update of the existing guidelines with an emphasis on incorporating current best practices, technology, and materials innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Center Street National Historic District Design Standards
The Center Street National Historic District was adopted by Logan City and the United States Department of the Interior National Park Service in 1979. The District includes residential, commercial, institutional, and public properties within the purple bounds on the map below:

Historic Districts are designated through survey and review processes to designate an area that is worthy of preservation in the community. The properties in the District provide benefit to the
Plan Update
The changes from the 2003 document to this update are primarily in the document format and the inclusion of supplemental materials and graphics. The actual standards are based on the State and National standards for historic buildings. The document was rearranged to include all residential building aspects in one section and all commercial building aspects in another. The Standards document was modified to try and be more user-friendly and provide more resources to building owners. Throughout the document, resource boxes are included in order to provide further assistance pertaining to building elements. Blue boxes highlight additional resources while grey boxes provide useful tips and information. Hyperlinks are also provided so that digital users can quickly access related websites and applicable city ordinances. A complete list of additional resources and their full URL’s are located in the Appendix. The resource boxes are intended to provide supplemental information to help the user implement the design standards and perform a successful rehabilitation project. Illustrations or photos are included throughout the document to an associated topic to further clarify the intent of a design standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY
Staff would recommend that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Municipal Council.

PUBLIC REVIEW/INPUT/COMMENTS
Summaries of public comments from open houses and Historic Preservation Committee meetings are included as attachments to the report.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION
Legal notice was published in the Herald Journal on January 21, 2018, posted on the Utah Public Meeting website on May 1, 2018, and public notices mailed out on March 20, 2018.

AGENCY AND CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS
No comments have been received.

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
The Planning Commission bases its decisions on the following findings:

1. Utah State Law authorizes local Planning Commission to recommend resolution changes to the legislative body (Municipal Council).
2. The Center Street Historic District Design Standards provide for administration and preservation of the Historic District and appropriate review of projects.
3. Extensive public notification and public involvement processes were utilized during this plan preparation and adoption.
community by preserving the buildings, architectural styles of times in Logan’s past, and places of unique history to the valley. In 1978, Logan City undertook a survey of the area and consultants did research to determine the age, condition, history, and architecture of the homes. The area that included the most homes over 50 years old, in good condition and with contributory history or architecture was designated and adopted as the Historic District in 1979. Surveys have been done periodically- in 1999 and 2011- to verify that the area still meets historic standards. The District currently has about 75% of the structures as contributory.

Logan City has developed design standards for Residential and Commercial buildings, sites, and signs located within the Center Street Historic District. These standards function as a benchmark for the preservation and treatment of historic properties and new construction within the historic district. The design standards provide a basis for making informed and consistent decisions by the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee and staff when reviewing applicable requests. The Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) reviews new single-family construction, exterior modifications, and nonresidential new construction and exterior modifications within the District.

There have been standards adopted since 2003 for exterior changes to properties in the District. The update process was initiated to review the standards for compliance with State and National guidelines, get input and incorporate current best practices, technology, and materials innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under National District Standards.

**Process Timeline**

The process to this point has included the following meetings and involvement:

- **Summer 2015-** an RFP was issued for a consultant for the production of the Historic District Design Standards Update.
- **September 2015-** IO Design was selected and contracted as the consultant for the project scope of work. A Steering Committee was arranged with the following members.
  - Staff- Aaron Smith, Amber Pollan, Debbie Zilles, Kirk Jensen, Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley
  - HPC representatives- David Lewis, Tom Graham, Christian Wilson (alternative)
  - Planning Commission representatives- Dave Newman, Russ Price, Tom Jensen
  - District Residents- Evan Stoker, Gene Needham IV, Jeff Gilbert, Katie Stoker
  - District Business Representatives- Gary Saxton, George Daines, Jonathan Jenkins, Kristan Fjeldsted
  - Real Estate/Historic Property experience- Heather Hall
  - City Council representative- Jeannie Simmonds
  - Consultants- Kristen Clifford, Shalae Larsen
- **October 19, 2015-** Joint Steering Committee and HPC kick-off meeting
- **November 18, 2015-** Open house was advertised to all 530+- owners in the Historic District. A post card was mailed with information on the open house and an invitation to provide input in to the update of the Standards. Staff and consultants were available to review the Standards, collect feedback, and answer questions.
- **December 9, 2015-** Steering Committee meeting to review open house comments, precedent studies from other cities, and review proposed outline for update. The slide show from this meeting is attached.
- **March 9, 2016-** Steering Committee Meeting to introduce Draft #1 for questions and comments
- **March 26, 2016-** HPC Workshop on Draft #1
- **Summer/Fall 2016-** Continued to collect comments on Draft #1 and work through revisions with Staff.
- **November 2016-** Draft #2 provided and staff review continued.
- **April 3, 2017-** HPC workshop and public meeting to review Draft #2
Agenda

- Introductions
- Open House Summary (November 18, 2015)
- Precedent Cities - Guidelines Summary
- Precedent Cities - Visual Preference Discussion
- Proposed Outline - Logan HD Design Standards
- Questions/Comments

November 18 - Open House Summary

Frequently Discussed Topics:
- Misconception/Frustration with Approval Process
- More Guidance on HPC Approval v. Staff Approval v. No Approval Required
- Simplify Window Approval Process
- Negative Feedback with Color Regulation
- Interest in Tax Credit Process

Written Comments/Questions:

- HPC Approval Process is Onerous and Expensive
- Continue Street Lighting Fixtures throughout District
- Consider hiring an Ombudsman or provide a list of professionals for questions/advice
- Focus on Big Picture, not Minutiae
- Equal Treatment amongst projects
- Paint should not be regulated
- Allow use of new technologies (building materials, windows, siding, etc.)
- Consider having levels of “sensitivity” (i.e. Houses on the National Register v. Not)
- Interest in Tax Credit Process and National Register Nomination Process
Precedent Cities - Guidelines Summary

- Ogden, UT
- Park City, UT
- Salt Lake City, UT
- Provo, UT
- Breckenridge, CO
- Madison, IN

Title 17 - Landmarks

- 17-4-1: Rehabilitation Standards = Secretary of the Interior's Standards
- 17-4-2: Special Standards for New Construction
  - Height
  - Front Elevation
  - Windows
  - Front facade
  - Open Space
  - Entrances
  - Materials; Texture; Color
  - Roof
  - Elements; Appurtenances
  - Size
  - Building Directional Character

Codifying Documents:

- Title 17 - Landmarks
- Landmarks Policy
- Design Guidelines for New Construction (25th Street)
- East Central Zoning Ordinance (Residential)

Landmarks Policy

- Motto & Philosophy Statement
- Landmarks Reviews:
  - Additions
  - Major changes to the building or site
  - Roofs where the proposed new material differs from what exists
  - Signs
  - Paint
- Staff Reviews:
  - Repair of deteriorated elements
  - Paint if previously painted
  - Awnings
  - Site improvement replacement or repair
  - Fencing replacement or repair (if same as original)
  - Re-roofing (if replacing with same)
  - Re-approval of expired C1A's
Color

Using color schemes that reflect those found on historic buildings is preferred. Color selection shall be reviewed by staff and decisions ratified by the Landmark Commission.

45. Use colors to create a coordinated composition for the building.
   a. The facade should "read" as a single color scheme.
   b. Metallic and "deep-pig" paint are not permitted in the Downtown.

46. Base or background colors should be muted.
   a. Use the natural colors of the building materials, such as the natural color of native sandstone, as the base for developing the overall color scheme.
   b. Reserve the use of bright colors for accents only, such as highlighting entries.

26. A covered or protected rear alley entrance, clearly intended for public use, but subordinate in detail to the primary entrance, is permitted.
Awnings

49. Fabric awnings are encouraged.
   a. Canvass awnings with a matte finish are preferred. High gloss finishes are inappropriate.
   b. Operable awnings are encouraged.
   c. Rigid frame awnings may be used, but should stop at the top portion and may not be included in the valance.
   d. Use colors that are compatible with the overall color scheme of the facade. Solid colors or simple, neutral stained patterns are appropriate.
   e. Simple shed shapes are appropriate for rectangular openings.
   f. Semi-circular shapes are not appropriate for fronts.
   g. Odd shapes, built-out awnings, and bubble awnings are inappropriate.
   h. The angled plane should appear larger than the vertical valance plane of the awning, and the valance is not to exceed 12" to 14" in height.

52. An awning may include signage on the valance portion only.
   (See the design guidelines for signs that direct the use of signage on awnings.)

East Central Zoning Ordinance

- Building Design Standards (Infill)
- Exterior Materials (Brick, Stone, Wood, Hardiplank, Stucco)
- Roofs - Pitches & Materials
- Porches (Required)
- Front Yard Fences (wood, decorative metal, vinyl, hedges)

Park City

- Design Guidelines for Historic Districts & Historic Sites:
  - Introduction
  - Purpose
  - Districts & Sites
  - Historic Overview
  - History
  - Building Types & Styles
  - Design Review Process
  - Guidelines for Historic Sites
  - Guidelines for New Construction in Historic Districts
Historic Structures

- Design Guidelines for Historic Structures:
  - Roofs
  - Exterior Walls
  - Foundations
  - Doors, Windows
  - Mechanical, Utility, Service
  - Paint & Color
  - Parking Areas, Garages, Driveways
  - Additions
  - Re-Location/Re-Orientation

Sites

- Design Guidelines for Historic Sites:
  - Building Setbacks & Orientation
  - Stone Retaining Walls
  - Fences
  - Steps
  - Landscape & Site Grading
New Construction

- Site Design
- Setback & orientation
- Fences
- Landscaping
- Primary Structures
  - Mass, Scale & Height
  - Building Elements (Roofs, Materials, Windows & Doors, Porches, Paint Color)
- Reconstruction of Non-Surviving Structures
- Signs, Awnings

Salt Lake City, UT

Regulating Documents & Resources

- Preservation Program Philosophy
  - What is Historic Preservation & Why is it important?
- Community Preservation Plan
- Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (21A.34.020)
- SLC Design Guidelines
  - Commercial Design Guidelines
  - Historic Apartment & Multifamily Buildings Design Guidelines
  - Residential Design Guidelines
  - Signs Design Guidelines

Certificate of Appropriateness Procedure

- Landmark Commission Reviews:
  - Any exterior construction requiring a building permit
  - Removal and replacement or alteration of architectural detailing (porch columns, railing, window moldings, cornices and siding)
  - Relocation of a structure or object on the same site or to another site
  - Construction of additions or decks
  - Alteration or construction of accessory structures
  - Alterations to windows and doors, including replacement or changes in fenestration patterns
  - Construction or alteration of porches
  - Masonry work including, but not limited to, tuckpointing, sandblasting and chemical cleaning
  - Construction or alteration of site features including, but not limited to, fencing, walls, paving and grading
  - Installation or alteration of any exterior sign
  - Any demolition
  - New construction
  - Installation of an awning over a window or door
Certificate of Appropriateness Procedure

Staff Reviews:
- Minor alteration of or addition to a Landmark site or contributing site and/or structure;
- Substantial alteration of or addition to a noncontributing site;
- Partial demolition of either a landmark site or contributing structure;
- Demolition of a noncontributing structure; and
- Installation of solar energy collection systems that are not readily visible from a public right of way.

Commercial Design Guidelines

Overview
- Why should use the Guidelines
- Financial incentives
- Historic Overview

Building Types/Architectural Styles

Rehabilitation/New Construction
- Site Features
  - Stone/brick
  - Building Materials & Finishes
  - Windows
  - Architectural Details
  - Roofs
  - Foundations
  - Additions
  - Awnings/awnings
  - Doors/door
  - Staircase Elements
  - Mechanical Equipment & Service Utilities

Design Guidelines

User-Friendliness
- Digital accommodations (links, etc.)
- Design Criteria & Building Evaluation Sheets
- Maintenance Tips
- Additional Information

Commercial Design Guidelines

Design Objective
- Historic site features, as an integral part of the original development pattern, should be retained as part of the street scene. New site features should be compatible with their content and reinforce the historic character of the neighborhood.

General
1.1 Historically significant site features should be preserved and maintained.
- This can include original site features such as fencing, retaining walls and driveways.
- Grading profiles and slopes in front of commercial buildings should be retained where they are a feature or characteristic.
- Repair masonry retaining walls, walkways and drive strips using compatible mortar mixes and materials.
Commercial Design Guidelines

- **Storefronts**

  **Design Objective**

  Historic storefronts should be retained, repaired and restored if necessary. Later alterations that have achieved historical significance should be retained and preserved.

  An alternative design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic building should be considered where an original facade is missing and no evidence exists of its original appearance.

Commercial Design Guidelines

- **New Construction**

  13.1 The traditional historic development pattern should be recognized and maintained in new development.
  13.5 The height of a new building design should reflect the established building scale of the setting and area.
  13.6 The massing characteristics of the area should form the basis for the scale of new development.
  13.7 The street facade should appear similar in scale to the established scale of the current street block.

Commercial Design Guidelines

- **Windows**

  **Design Objective**

  Preserve, maintain and repair original windows. Concealing, enclosing or covering historic windows should be avoided. If replacement windows are necessary due to deterioration, match the historic windows in size, design and material.

  4.1 The position, number, pattern and arrangement of original windows in a building facade should be maintained and preserved.
  4.2 The traditional ratio of window opening to solid wall ("solid to void") should be maintained on a primary facade.
  4.3 The size, shape and proportions of original window openings should be retained.
  4.9 Storm windows should be installed when possible to enhance energy efficiency rather than replacing a historic window.
Residential Design Guidelines

Format

The design guidelines' format and structure establish a hierarchical framework that provides general and detailed design advice and also design options where the design guideline readily relates to the circumstances of the project, the site or building. Where the relationship is less obvious, on the other hand, and the specific guideline/s do not directly address the individual circumstances of the case, the design objective and the context character definition discussion immediately preceding the guideline/s, provide general direction on the design intent and appropriate solutions.

Additions

Design Objective
The design of a new addition to a historic building should ensure that the building's early character is maintained. Older additions that have taken on significance also should be preserved.

8.2 An addition should be designed to be compatible in size and scale with the main building.
8.3 An addition should be sited to the rear of a building or set back from the front to minimize visual impact.
8.4 A new addition should be designed to be recognized as a product of its own time.
8.7 The historic alignments and rhythms that may exist on the street should be defined and preserved.

Building Materials/Finishes

2.1 Primary historic building materials should be retained in place whenever feasible.
2.4 Match the size, proportions, finish, and color of the original masonry unit, if replacement is necessary.
2.7-2.9 Protect original masonry and wood from deterioration.
2.18 Consider removing later covering materials, except where these might have achieved historic significance.
Provo, UT

16.06 Standards & Guidelines for Historic Rehabilitation and Preservation
- Historic Character and Purpose of the Property Preserved
- Special Guidelines for New Construction in Historic Districts
- Guidelines for Rehabilitation

Handbook of Design Standards
- Intro
- Architectural History
- General Design Principles
- Design Standards for Rehabilitation
- Design Standards for New Construction
- Relocation of Historic Buildings

Provo, UT

- 16.06.10 Historic Character & Purpose of the Property Preserved
- 16.06.020 Special Guidelines for New Construction
  - Height
  - Proportions of Windows & Doors
  - Relationship of Building Masses & Spaces
  - Roof Shape
  - Landscaping
  - Scale
  - Directional Expression
  - Architectural Details
- 16.06.030 Guidelines for Rehabilitation
  - The Commission shall utilize the U.S. Department of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation as an aid to applicants in formulating plans for the rehabilitation, preservation, and continued use of historic buildings. Conformance with the Guidelines for Rehabilitation shall be a factor in judging compliance with this Title.

Breckenridge, CO

- Windows
  - Preserve the functional and decorative features of original windows
  - Protect historic wood by painting
  - Avoid changing the position of historic windows
  - Maintain original window proportions
  - Maintain original subdivisions of windows
  - Protect and maintain significant stylistic elements. Limit paint removal and re-application of paint
  - Repair original features when feasible

*Separate documents available for special standards for "character areas" within the Historic District (7 character areas)
Commercial Buildings

- Maintain the original size and shape of the storefront opening. Preserve the large panes of glass that were a part of the original storefront opening when possible.
- Preserve the glass at the sidewalk line where feasible to define pedestrian zone.
- Using an accent color on the door is encouraged.
- Maintain the kickplate that is found below the display window. Coordinate the color scheme of the kickplate with other facade elements.
- Preserve the transom above the display windows, if it exists. Use glass in the transom if possible. As an alternative, use the space as a sign or decorative panel. Keep the background a dark color.
- Preserve the size and shape of upper story windows. Do not block down or expand the opening to accommodate a stock window that does not fit the building.
- Coordinate the color of the awning with the color scheme for the entire building.
- Avoid closing down the original window opening to fit new window sizes. If the original openings are presently blocked, consider restoring them.

Madison, IN

- Commercial Guidelines
- Residential Guidelines
- Code of Ethics
- Rules of Procedure
- COA Application & Instruction
- Fast Track Application & Instruction

New Construction & Infill

- Should be compatible with the character of the existing historic resources and general characteristics (scale, form, and materials).
- Reinforcing the surviving historic character is the goal, not responding to hybrid character that is influenced by existing incompatible buildings.
- New buildings should be similar in scale with the historic context of the respective character area.
- Use the standard method for calculating the exposed floor area for partially exposed floors.
- Build to heights that are similar to those found historically. Primary facades should be no more than one or two stories.
- Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar to those found on historic and supporting buildings.
- New buildings that can be interpreted as products of the present, and not false interpretations of the past, are preferred.

Purpose of Historic Guidelines

- To safeguard the heritage of the City by establishing a historic district
- To establish the means of protecting the district's natural and man-made heritage while providing guidelines for compatible new architectural development
- To stabilize and improve property values within the district
- To foster civic beauty and improvements
- To strengthen local economy
- To promote the use of the historic district for the education, pleasure and welfare of the citizens of the city, state and nation.
Design Approval Process

- Historic District Board of Review (HDBR)
  - Certificate of Appropriateness Required:
    - Demolition of any building or structure;
    - Moving any building or structure;
    - Conspicuous change in the exterior appearance of existing buildings by additions, reconstruction, or alteration other than changes in color;
    - Any new construction of a principal building or accessory building or structure subject to view from a public street;
    - Changes in the type of material or in the design of an existing sidewalk;
    - Changes in existing walls and fences or construction of new walls/fences if along public street right-of-ways; and
    - Addition or alterations to signs.
  - Minor actions that are considered routine maintenance generally do not require a COA.
  - The HDBR emphasizes preservation over repair, repair rather than replacement, and replacement in kind if repair is not feasible.

Commercial Design Guidelines

- Introduction
- Design Guidelines
- New Construction
- Site & Setting
- Moving Buildings
- Demolition
- Appendices
  - Secretary of the Interior's Standards
  - Basic Maintenance Advice
  - Definitions & Terms
  - Bibliography
  - Incentives & Assistance for Rehabilitation
  - Resources
  - Madison National Historic Landmark Boundary Maps

Residential Design Guidelines

- Introduction
- Design Guidelines
- New Construction
  - Decks
  - Ramps
  - Rear & Lateral Additions
  - Infill Buildings
- Site & Setting
  - Driveways, Sidewalks, and Walkways
  - Pools/Fountains/Gazebos, and Pergolas
  - Landscape Elements
  - Parking Lots
  - Utilities
- Moving Buildings
- Demolition
- Appendices
Design Guidelines

Energy Efficiency

- Historic Preservation is “Green”. The greenest buildings with the least impact on the environment are those that already exist. Historic buildings embody energy that was expended in the past - the energy put forth to make the bricks, lumber, and details. Debris from demolition makes up 25-30% of all materials discarded in landfills. Preservation and rehabilitation precludes this wasteful loss of materials. Preserving and recycling an existing historic building has less negative impact on the environment than new construction.

Windows

- Let the Numbers Convince You. Do the Math

    Storm window and single-pane original window
    $722,116 Btu  $132.20  4.5 Years

    Double-pane thermally broken replacement of single-pane window
    $626,928 Btu  $115.07  40.5 Years

    Low-e glass double-pane thermal replacement of single-pane window
    $903,772 Btu  $105.10  34 Years

    Low-e glass double-pane thermal replacement of single-pane window with manual window
    $132,497 Btu  $52.28  34 Years

Visual Preference
Logan Design Standards - Proposed Outline

Overview
- Historic Overview (Brief History of Logan)
- Preservation incentives
  - Federal & State Tax Credits
  - RDA
  - Home-Buyer Assistance Program
  - Facade Improvement Program
  - Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant
- Four Treatments of Historic Properties
  - Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, & Construction

The Historic Preservation Committee & Project Review
- Track 1 (black & white)
  - Track 2 (more subjective)

Maintenance
- Exteriors Walls
- Repair
- Cleaning Brick
- Painted Brick/Removing Paint from Brick
- Landscape & Vegetation
Logan Design Standards - Proposed Outline

- Demolition
- Relocation of Buildings
- Sustainability
  - Guidelines/Resources for LEED & Energy Star
  - Solar Arrays
  - Windows
  - Recycling Guide/Program
- Appendices
  - Utah State Historic Preservation Office
  - Secretary of the Interior’s Standards
  - Information & Resources
    - Utah Heritage Foundation Windows Guide (to be completed Spring, 2016)
    - Utah Heritage Foundation Property Owner’s Guide
  - Old Windows Made Easy: The Simple Way to Restore Wood Windows (Scott A. Sidler)
  - www.windowpreservationsalliance.org
- Glossary of Terms

Questions/Comments?
Minutes of the meeting for the Logan City Planning Commission convened in regular session on Thursday, June 14, 2018. Chairman Price called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Regina Dickinson, Sandi Goodlander, Dave Newman, Tony Nielson, Eduardo Ortiz, Russ Price

Commissioners Excused: David Butterfield

Staff Present: Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley, Amber Pollan, Bill Young, Craig Humphreys, Paul Taylor, Kymber Housley

Minutes from the May 10 and May 24, 2018 meetings were reviewed. Commissioner Nielson moved that the minutes be approved as submitted; the motion was seconded by Commissioner Newman. The motion was approved unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

PC 18-020 AutoCare Garage Building [Design Review Permit] Cartwright AEC/AutoCare Properties LLC, authorized agent/owner, request a new 10,400 SF garage building for storage of tow trucks on 3.32 acres located at 1240 South Hwy 89/91 in the Commercial (COM) zone; TIN 02-087-0014.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request for a new 4,964 SF garage building, designed to house tow trucks and other equipment for Autocare Collision Repair & Towing. The grey metal building has a series of overhead roll-up doors along the south facade. A small employee and customer lounge area with restrooms is planned on the east side of the building. The submitted site plan shows perimeter landscaping areas, state impound yard and a parking lot directly south of the proposed building. The vacant 3.32-acre lot is positioned east of the existing Autocare property and main building along Hwy 89/91.

PROPOONENT: Justin Campbell, the project architect, said the intent is to meet all the requirements as best as possible.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Chairman Price asked about fenestration on the east facade. Mr. Holley said the east elevation is just under 30%, however, the south facade, which is being considered as the front, meets the requirement.

Mr. Holley clarified condition #3 for Commissioner Ortiz and explained that the Land Development Code (LDC) 17.19.070 requires that at least 50% of the overall width of the property contains building mass; however, considering the yard width of approximately 250’ and a building width of 94’, the building frontage would equal approximately 38%, which the Commission will need to approve or deny.
MOTION: Commissioner Goodlander moved to conditionally approve a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 18-020 with the conditions of 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. The building shall be set back at least 25' from the nearest bank of Spring Creek.
3. The Planning Commission accepts the 45-degree building angle and 38% building frontage.
4. A solid 6' tall fence shall be placed around the impound yard along with shrubs and trees placed outside the fence.
5. A performance landscaping plan, prepared in accordance with LDC §17.39, 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 8,872 SF or 20% of the developed site.
   b. A minimum of 20 trees and 50 shrubs, perennials and grasses shall be provided per acre of newly developed property.
   c. Shrubs, grasses and perennials shall be planted around storm water, garbage dumpsters and parking areas to visually screen these utilitarian areas from public view.
   d. Varieties and sizes of all plant material shall be specified in the plan and plant quantities shall be per LDC §17.39.050 and include a minimum of 25% evergreen varieties for year-round visual interest.
6. Garbage and recycling collection areas shall be screened and buffered with landscaping from Legrand Street.
7. 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.
8. No signs are approved. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
9. No fences are approved. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
10. 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. Fire Department
      i. Fire sprinklers and alarms will be installed per owner. Additional fire hydrant required.
   b. Engineering
      i. A new building located in a Special Flood Hazard Area. Building shall be constructed to comply with City, State and Federal codes. This includes providing analysis that the building does not displace water that will raise the 1% chance flood elevation. A construction in the floodplain permit will also be required.
      ii. Provide water shares or in-lieu-of fee for increased demand to City system
      iii. Provide storm water detention/retention for undeveloped area being developed.
      iv. Provide new water service to the building
      v. Provide new sewer service to the building
     vi. Maintain a 15' access along Spring Creek on both sides (from top of bank) for maintenance access per Land Development Code
  vii. Construct new access and approach to LeGrand Street. The City has a contract with LeGrand Johnson Construction to install curb and gutter and reconstruct road this summer. Coordinate construction efforts with City.
  viii. Install piping across Spring Creek capable of passing the 1% chance flow.
     ix. Obtain a stream alteration permit from the State Engineer's office for all work to be done next to or in Spring Creek.
c. Water/Cross Connection
   i. Water main must have a RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested as it enters the building before any branch offs or connections.
   ii. Landscape irrigation must have high-hazard backflow protection and be tested.
   iii. All 2015 IPC and State of Utah Amendments shall apply to points of use of water during and after construction.
   iv. Fire suppression system must have a DC (ASSE1015) installed and tested.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
1. The building is compatible with surrounding land uses of the COM zone and will not interfere with the use and enjoyment of adjoining or area properties.
2. The project conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The proposed use shall provide adequate off-street parking in conformance with Title 17.
4. The project, as conditioned, conforms to landscaping requirements in Title 17.
5. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.
6. The project has been amended to meet the requirements of Code and conditions of approval by City Departments

Moved: Commissioner Goodlander  Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz  Approved: 4-2
Yea: Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman, Ortiz  Nay: Nielson, Price  Abstain: 

PC 18-023 Del Taco  [Design Review Permit] Melanie Child/Amsource University Village LLC, authorized agent/owner, request construction of a new 2,773 SF fast-food restaurant at 497 East 1400 North in the Commercial (COM) zone; TIN 04-086-0019.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request for a new 2,773 SF Del Taco commercial fast food restaurant. The project includes landscaping improvements, a new 39-stall parking lot, drive-thru window and outdoor patio/dining area. The site is a 0.74-acre property with shared vehicular access to 1400 North and is partially paved and landscaped. Mr. Holley reviewed the amended south elevation – increasing windows to meet the 30% transparency requirement and adding a door. The proponent believes the drive-thru, facing the street provides a safer environment.

PROPOPENT: Eric Hitzelberger, the son of the business owner, said the franchise has been known as a “top operator” and they are excited to locate to Logan.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Mr. Holley confirmed for Chairman Price that there will be an outdoor patio area.

Mr. Holley answered for Commissioner Goodlander that the building will be 38’ from 1400 North.

Chairman Price appreciates the additional glazing.

MOTION: Commissioner Nielson moved to conditionally approve a Design Review Permit as outlined in PC 18-023 with the conditions of 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. The building shall be oriented to face 1400 North, with either the proposed north elevation or east elevation located adjacent from 1400 North.
3. All public pedestrian entrances shall have weather protection provided above.
4. A minimum of 20 parking stalls, 8 stacking positions in the drive-thru aisle and a bike rack shall all be provided.
5. Sidewalks that cross the drive-thru aisle shall have curb cuts and crossing markings.

6. A performance landscaping plan, prepared in accordance with LDC §17.39, 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 along all adjacent streets provided every 30’ on center unless otherwise noted by the City Forrester.
   b. Open and usable outdoor areas shall total a minimum of 6,446 SF.
   c. A total of 14 trees and 37 shrubs, perennials and grasses, shall be provided. 25% of the trees shall be evergreen.

7. The drive-thru shall be buffered and screened from 1400 North with shrubs and flowers.

8. All dumpsters shall be visually screened or buffered from public streets by using fencing, walls and landscaping.

9. Rooftop mechanical and/or building wall mechanical equipment shall be placed out of view from the street or screen from view from the street.

10. Exterior lighting shall be concealed source, down-cast and shall not illuminate or cast light onto adjacent properties.

11. No signs are approved with this project. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.

12. No fences are approved with this project. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.

13. 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. The approach must be level, no down or uphill slopes.
      ii. Minimum inside measurement for a double enclosure is 24' wide x 10' deep. Double stacking of dumpsters is not acceptable.
      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. Morning winds can be a problem in this area.
      v. Barrel hinges suggested for the gates. Need full 12' clearance so gates must be designed to open completely.
   b. Engineering
      i. Provide private water utility agreement for University Village subdivision private water line.
      ii. Provide on-site storm water detention/retention/Low Impact Design practices to meet current City Storm Water Design Standards, this includes retention on site of the 90% storm event.
      iii. Provide water shares for increased water demand.
      iv. No civil plans submitted with application, all Public Work comments regarding site will be provided when plans are available to review.
   c. Water
      i. This unit needs to have its own RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested on the water main as it enters this unit before any branch offs or connections.
      ii. Landscape irrigation must have a high-hazard backflow assembly installed and tested.
      iii. Fire suppression systems must have a minimum DC (ASSE1015) installed and tested. Fire risers and B/F assemblies must be installed as per Logan City standards.
      iv. All points of use of water must comply with the 2015 IPC and State of Utah Amendments, during and after construction

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
1. Project is compatible with surrounding land uses and will not interfere with use and enjoyment of adjacent properties because of building design, site layout, materials, landscaping and setbacks.
2. The project conforms to the requirements of Logan Municipal Code Title 17.
3. The project provides adequate open and usable outdoor space in conformance with Title 17.
4. The project provides adequate off-street parking.
5. The project met the goals and objectives of the Commercial (COM) designation in the Logan General Plan by providing services near high-capacity roads and is designed in a way for easy circulation of both pedestrians and vehicles.

6. The project complies with maximum height, density and building design 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. 1400 North provides access and is adequate in size and design to sufficiently handle all traffic modes and infrastructure related to the land use.

Moved: Commissioner Nielson  Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz  Approved: 6-0
Yea: Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman, Nielson, Ortiz, Price  Nay: Abstain:

PC 18-024 Woodmoore Pointe Rezone – continued from May 24, 2018 [Zone Change] Sterling Land Holdings, LLC/Wesethel, LLC, authorized agent/owner, request a zone change from Neighborhood Residential (NR-6) to Mixed Residential (MR-9) on 16.69 acres located at approximately 1100 West 1800 South.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request to rezone approximately 16.69 acres of property from NR-6 to MR-9 with the intention of developing the property as multi-family attached housing. The property is currently vacant and fronts both 1800 South and 1100 West along the north and east side of the parcel. The generally flat property has a canal that bisects the parcel, running north and south, along with an area of standing water near the south border. Both 1800 South and 1100 West streets do not have curb, gutter and sidewalk along the property frontage. The property has primarily been used for agricultural and grazing purposes in the past.

The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) indicates this area as Mixed Residential (MR). The area could be considered transitional, with commercial and industrial employment centers located east of the site and existing multi-family homes to the north. With single-family developments located to the south and west, the proposed MR-9 zone could help to further buffer or transition away from these existing neighborhoods. Based on the draft Woodruff Neighborhood Plan information, the Woodruff Neighborhood has approximately 140 total acres currently zoned as mixed residential uses out of the total 2,219 acres (6%). Commercially-zoned properties total 170 acres, or approximately 7% with most of the neighborhood zoned NR, REC and RC.

With the addition of a new traffic signal at Highway 89/91 and 1000 West (approximately ¼ mile away), it is anticipated that new commercial uses will develop adjacent to this intersection. MR-9 development on this site would further the argument of locating MR-9 developments within walking distance to service and employment centers.

PROPOSPENT: Bryce Goodin, Sterling Land Holdings/Visionary Homes, explained that they are requesting a rezone of the property for a townhome project which will bring more affordable housing to the area. Chairman Price asked about future access. Mr. Goodin distributed a preliminary concept plan for members to review.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Commissioner Newman asked if there was an existing road at 1900 South. Mr. Holley said there is, and it is proposed to continue west out to 1400 West where there is an already-established right-of-way. The cul-de-sac to the south is a private road in the mobile home park.

Chairman Price asked about the critical wetlands. Mr. Holley said they have not been delineated at this point, however, he believes it will be 10-15% of the site, mainly located in the south, central portion.
Mr. Holley pointed out that although this is only a rezone request, the idea is for a future development of 145-150 townhomes. Commissioner Dickinson asked how many single-family homes could fit if the property was zoned NR. Mr. Holley said, depending on the layout of the roads and wetlands, there could be 90 homes. It is often difficult to reach maximum density.

Chairman Price pointed out that regardless of a specific project, consideration should be given to the change of the zone and to ensure it is the correct context for any project that would be allowed within the designated zone.

Commissioner Ortiz noted concern with the general transition from north to south and questioned whether this is a good fit. Mr. Holley explained that City-wide, Logan has districts of density rather than a slow transition. There is high-density near the University, and more density in the northwest part of the City then other areas. The Woodruff Neighborhood has pockets of higher density.

Mr. Holley clarified for Commissioner Newman that the area to the north is MR-12, the zone to the east is Commercial and south and west are predominately Neighborhood Residential (NR-6). In the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) most of the area is listed MR with Commercial to the east. Commissioner Newman said, over time, the FLUP anticipates that the NR zone will eventually turn into MR. Mr. DeSimone agreed and said it will eventually change over time as the market dictates.

Commissioner Dickinson asked if this is considered a transitional area. Mr. Holley explained that as future Commercial development comes in along 1000 West, this could area provide a transition to the established neighborhoods to the west. Mr. DeSimone pointed out that the idea is for a gradation of intensity of uses and to buffer the Commercial area with limited multi-family areas that gradually step down to single-family areas. The duplexes to the north are multi-family, the intensity of the trailer parks (unit count per acre) are far greater than NR-6 and closer to an MR-12 zone.

Chairman Price said 1000 West, near Highway 89/91, will likely become a Commercial node and it would be difficult to expect this area to remain Neighborhood Residential.

Mr. Holley pointed out that the FLUP indicates areas to the north and south of this property as MR, areas west as NR and east as COM.

Mr. Holley said through the years, the Planned Unit Development (PUD) areas slowed down and PUD’s were eventually eliminated by the City. When development began again, the area had to be rezoned as MR-9 to maintain the plot sizes that were originally approved.

MOTION: Commissioner Newman moved to forward a recommendation of approval to the Municipal Council for a zone change as outlined in PC 18-024 with the findings for approval as listed below. Commissioner Goodlander seconded the motion.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
1. The location of the property is compatible in land use with the surrounding Commercial areas to the east and MR-12 areas to the north.
2. The property can fulfill the purpose of the General Plan and Land Development Code by providing a range of housing types for all stages of life.
3. The property is in an area and surrounded by streets and infrastructure that can handle and appropriately serve MR-9 development.
4. The MR-9 zone is limited in density, height and required to provide sufficient open space and landscaping to ensure neighborhood compatibility.

Moved: Commissioner Newman Seconded: Commissioner Goodlander Approved: 5-1
Yea: Goodlander, Newman, Nielson, Ortiz, Price Nay: Dickinson Abstain:
PC 18-025 Logan Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility [Design Review & Conditional Use Permit] Mark Nielsen/Logan City, authorized agent/owner, request construction of a new 44,273 SF wastewater treatment facility and additional building height on 23.7 acres located at 2445 West 200 North; 1825 West 600 North in the Public (PUB) zone; TIN 12-042-0005; 05-053-0016.

STAFF: Ms. Pollan reviewed the request to the construction of a new Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility on the west side of Logan. There is an existing treatment facility with ponds and this facility would replace the treatment function of the pond areas, which have been in place since about 1970. The Facility will include construction of 18 new structures, including 8 new buildings and 10 facilities such as generators, clarifiers, and bioreactors. The site area off Highway 30 will be fenced and have a gated entry 100' from the road. The site off 600 North has a gate at approximately 1000' from the facilities to secure the site. There is a landscaped berm/buffer proposed along the Highway 30 frontage of the facilities to screen it from the roadway. Utilities will be expanded and extended along 600 North and routed around the south side of the ponds to serve the new construction.

PROPOPENT: Mark Nielsen, the project manager, said they would like to get started on the project soon. Chairman Price said he is glad to see this begin.

PUBLIC: None

COMMISSION: Ms. Pollan clarified for Chairman Price that the operations building is proposed to be 18' in height.

Commissioner Newman asked about putting windows in where there are large expanses of blank walls. Craig Carolla, the project engineer, explained that many of the buildings will be for processing and contain equipment and piping where windows will not work.

Chairman Price noted that this is a processing plant, which is a unique application.

Commissioner Nielsen complimented the design of the building.

MOTION: Commissioner Nielson moved to conditionally approve a Design Review & Conditional Use Permit as outlined in PC 18-025 with the conditions of approval as listed below. Commissioner Dickinson seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. Plans for building permit review will need to include property lines so that setbacks can be verified for compliance.
3. Parking to be provided at a minimum of ten (10) parking stalls. The parking area at the operations building is to be screened with additional landscape plantings between the stalls and the security fence.
4. A performance landscaping plan, prepared in accordance with LDC §17.39, shall be submitted for approval to the Community Development Department in conjunction with the issuance of the building permit. The plan shall include the following:
   a. The landscaped buffer along the Hwy 30/200 North portion of the project to include trees, shrubs, and grasses, as proposed, to screen areas from public view.
5. A maximum building height of 44' for the Dewatering Building is permitted.
6. 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.
7. All dumpsters shall be visually screened or buffered from public streets by either the use of landscaping, fencing or walls.
8. No signs are approved with this project. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.

9. No fences are approved with this project. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.

10. 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 buildings with culinary water will need to have their own RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested on the water main as they enter the buildings before any branch offs or connections.
      ii. Any landscape irrigation connected to culinary water must have a high-hazard backflow assembly installed and tested.
      iii. Fire suppression systems must have a minimum DC (ASSE1015) installed and tested. Fire risers and B/F assemblies must be installed as per Logan City standards.
      iv. All points of use of water must comply with the 2015 IPC and State of Utah Amendments, during and after construction.
      v. Non-approved water system (utility water) must be labeled and colored purple. Pipe should be purple if possible also.
   b. **Engineering Department**
      i. Access from SR-30 shall be approved by CAMP.
      ii. Provide water shares and/or in-lieu-of fee for all increased demand for indoor, process water and outdoor use from potable water system.
      iii. All water, sewer, storm water and roads shall comply at a minimum with Logan City Design Standards and Construction Standards & Specifications.

**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 to adjacent development.
2. The project substantially conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
3. The project meets the goals and objectives in the General Plan for the Gateway and Public designations by providing for a public use with enhanced setbacks, extensive landscaping, and incorporation of natural features into the overall site design.
4. The project development utilizes, and is providing adequate utilities, infrastructure, and roads.
5. Additional building height for the project is meeting the need to provide for public safety for the project and the setback will minimize the visual impact of the additional building mass.
6. The project, as conditioned, complies with maximum height, density and building design.
7. The project met the minimum public noticing requirements of the Land Development Code and the Municipal Code.

**Moved:** Commissioner Nielson  **Seconded:** Commissioner Dickinson  **Approved:** 6-0

**Yea:** Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman, Nielson, Ortiz, Price  **Nay:**  **Abstain:**

---

**PC 18-026 Ted’s Service & Convenience** [Design Review & Conditional Use Permit] Landmark Companies Inc/Edward Rick, authorized agent/owner, request construction of a 6,600 SF service repair station with outdoor storage and convenience store on 1.44 acres located at 3142 South Hwy 89/91 in the Commercial Services (CS) zone; TIN 03-013-0009.

**STAFF:** Mr. Holley reviewed the request for a new convenience store and vehicle service/repair shop on 1.44 acres. The proposal includes streetscape improvements, a new 17-stall parking lot, 21-stall impound/holding yard, landscaping improvements, 6' privacy fencing and gas pumps.

**PROPOPENT:** Mark Reeder, from Landmark Companies, said the architect has proposed placing the fuel tanks next to the building, meeting all requirements. Ms. Goodlander asked if the current tanks meet all the applicable standards. Mr. Reeder said they do and they will be re-tested.
Logan City requests adoption of the Historic District Design Standards (HDDS) for the Center Street National Historic District. The update has been guided by a Steering Committee comprised of members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, City Council, City Administration and public, and includes a comprehensive review and update of existing guidelines with an emphasis on incorporating current best practices, technology, and materials innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

**STAFF:** Ms. Pollan briefly summarized the process, intent and overall review of the changes.

**PUBLIC:** Jeannie Simmonds said the goal of the update is to make it simpler and more usable for property owners. She would be concerned if the Planning Commission was not involved in a large-scale development, especially within the TC zone.

**COMMISSION:** Chairman Price asked for clarification on what items would fall under Track 1. Ms. Pollan explained that changes or modifications that meet all appropriate criteria could be reviewed under Track 1; staff will review and make that determination.

Chairman Price questioned whether all facades of a building will be reviewed or just those visible from a public street. Ms. Pollan said there are requirements for all facades and the entire structure would be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Committee. Issues related to use would be reviewed by the Planning Commission. He expressed concern that the Planning Commission would not have any oversight on projects within the Historic District.

Commissioner Ortiz asked about the tax credits for property owners within the Historic District. Ms. Pollan said the Historic District is a recorded designation on the property. Promotion and public information is something the City wants to continue to improve.

Chairman Price said the changes are a good improvement.

Mr. DeSimone said the challenge is where to draw the line between jurisdictions of the Historic Preservation Committee and the Planning Commission. This is an issue that the Municipal Council may want to consider. Ms. Simmonds suggested large elements (such as height) be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Mr. DeSimone said the City recognizes the flaw in the way it is written with regards to clarity. Chairman Price said including a liaison between groups might be helpful.

Ms. Simmonds said she will raise this issue with the Council as they review the project.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Newman moved to forward a recommendation for approval to the Municipal Council for adoption of the Center Street Historic District Design Standards as outlined in PC 18-021. Commissioner Dickinson seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Newman  Seconded: Commissioner Dickinson  Approved: 5-0
Yea: Dickinson, Newman, Nielson, Ortiz, Price  Nay: Abstain: Goodlander

**WORKSHOP ITEMS for June 28, 2018**

- PC 18-027 Adams Office Building [Code Amendment & Design Review Permit]

Meeting adjourned 7:39 p.m.
Chairman Price noted that the canopy is required to be placed parallel to the highway. Mr. Reeder said the building will be a mix of masonry/metal/glass materials. The overhead doors will contain glass, the east elevation will have two full glass garage doors. The east side of the convenience store can have spandrel glass added if necessary, but that is where storage/coolers will be located.

PUBLIC: Glen Zollinger owns the property to the west of the proposed development and has concerns about the drainage design, specifically how runoff will be handled. There is no drainage outfall from his property. The current development has a functioning storm retention basin. He wants to ensure that any runoff will be maintained and addressed correctly in the original design.

An email, outlining concerns regarding water retention, parking, landscaping, access, fuel tanks and conflict of interest, was received and distributed to Commission members prior to the meeting from Doyle Zollinger. Mr. Zollinger was in attendance and said that the City does not have utilities that far south, and asked where Ted’s gets service from. Mark Nielsen said water is a groundwater well, which will be impacted by the road improvements. When the new station is constructed, there will be a new groundwater well. Fire flow is still being addressed. Mr. Zollinger asked about a septic tank. Mr. Nielsen said the Health Department will review and approve the design of the system. There are a few options being considered for addressing the concerns. Mr. Zollinger said it is difficult to hear in the Council Chambers. Chairman Price encouraged Mr. Zollinger to contact staff with specific concerns.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Newman asked about sidewalk location. Mr. Holley said there will be one along the south and east. 2000 West will become a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Holley explained for Commissioner Ortiz that the condition prohibiting inoperable or stationary vehicles placed outside of the delineated parking stall areas will be enforced on a complaint basis.

Commissioner Nielsen asked about the requirement for a solid fence. Mr. Holley said he will leave the details up to the proponent.

Bill Young, the City Engineer, said not all the specific details have been completed. Storm water will have to meet all the applicable requirements (defined in Engineering section of conditions of approval) and will be reviewed during the building/design review process.

Commissioner Goodlander pointed out that if approval is granted without seeing the other elevations, the Commission will have no control over what will be done and she is not comfortable with that idea. Chairman Price agreed.

Mr. Reeder noted that they are trying to address and eliminate parking cars in need of repair out in front of the business. The goal is for vehicles to be in the building or in the storage yard.

The Commission asked that the information be distributed prior to the next meeting. Mr. Holley said it will sent out with the agenda packets.

MOTION: Commissioner Newman moved to continue PC 18-026 to the June 28, 2018 meeting for additional information on building elevations, materials, design of the gas pumps, canopy height, fuel tanks on the north side of the building, landscaping, fencing, parking, curb, gutter, park strip, storm water retention and access. Commissioner Goodlander seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Newman  Seconded: Commissioner Goodlander  Approved: 6-0
Yea: Dickinson, Goodlander, Newman, Nielsen, Ortiz, Price  Nay:  Abstain
Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded for the Logan City Planning Commission meeting of June 14, 2018.

Michael A. DeSimone
Community Development Director

David Butterfield
Planning Commission Vice-Chairman

Russ Holley
Senior Planner

Amber Pollan
Senior Planner

Debbie Zilles
Administrative Assistant
Minutes of the meeting for the Logan City Planning Commission convened in regular session on Thursday, May 10, 2018. Chairman Price called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Sandi Goodlander, Dave Newman, Tony Nielson, Eduardo Ortiz, Russ Price, Jeannie Simmonds (Council liaison)

Commissioners Excused: David Butterfield, Regina Dickinson

Staff Present: Mike DeSimone, Russ Holley, Amber Pollari, Bill Young, Debbie Zilles

Minutes from the April 26, 2018 meeting were reviewed. Commissioner Nielson moved that the minutes be approved as submitted; the motion was seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. The motion was approved.

PUBLIC HEARING

PC 18-019 Dominion Energy Fabrication Shop [Design Review & Conditional Use Permit]
Ensign Engineering/Questar Gas Company, authorized agent/owner, request a 7,500 SF fabrication warehouse for pipeline supplies and a conditional use for outside storage on 2.7 acres located at 895 West 800 North in the Industrial Park (IP) zone; TIN 05-052-0025.

STAFF: Mr. Holley reviewed the request for a new 7,500 SF fabrication warehouse on the undeveloped half of the existing 2.7-acre property. The main building is on the east side of the property surrounded by parking areas and landscaping. The vacant gravel-surfaced side of the property is being used for vehicle and equipment storage. The street frontage along this property currently contains curb, gutter, park strip and sidewalk with three driveway accesses to 800 North. The proposal includes moving the west driveway access to the east, approximately 50’, and designating it as “exit only”.

The Land Development Code (LDC) 17.17.030 permits a wide range of land uses in the IP zone, including, but not limited to, manufacturing, warehousing, commercial storage and commercial contractor uses. Outdoor storage of materials or equipment requires a Conditional Use Permit. The applicant is requesting outdoor storage along the western boundary of the development. The types of materials and equipment planned for storage include trucks, trailers and pipes. An 8’ tall chain link fence is currently located along the south, west and north property lines.

PROPOUNENT: Cameron Duncan, the project engineer from Ensign Engineering, said the fence will be relocated to the back of the sidewalk to allow for landscaping in front. He submitted revised plans with the addition of 6 windows across the top portion of the facade. Additional landscaping and the fence will help break up the elevation on the lower portion of the building. Because landscaping in the back area (which is only for employees) seems useless, he would like the to locate the entire 20% to the portion of the building that is visible to the public. There is an existing shed on the west side that will be difficult to move because of utilities. pedestrian connectivity to the public right-of-way will be incorporated.

PUBLIC: None
COMMISSION: Mr. Holley pointed out where the existing fence is and where the new fence is being proposed. The proposal includes adding a gate for an "exit only" access point. The proposed gate will either swing inward (not out into the public right-of-way) and/or will slide horizontally on a track system.

Mr. Holley advised that the Land Development Code requires buildings in the Industrial Park (IP) zone to be designed with blank walls limited to no more than 40’ in length and up to 30% transparency on street-facing elevations. Breaks in blank walls could be in the form of windows, columns, wall articulations, and material and/or color changes. The building will be white, with a proposed blue strip along the low-pitched roofline.

Mr. Holley clarified for Commissioner Goodlander that the distance between building D and E is approximately 25’.

Commissioner Ortiz said that the condition requiring open space is confusing and asked whether the required 20% includes 10% open space and 10% outdoor space. Mr. Holley said it does; the applicant was given the option of considering the entire project site (requiring a total of 23,522 SF) or just the fabrication shop building (requiring a total of 12,857 SF).

Chairman Price noted that trellising and other surface treatments are intended to augment the required transparency and not replace it.

Commissioner Goodlander asked how the addition of the windows on the revised plan affects the total percentage. Mr. Holley advised that the addition of the small windows equals about 4% of transparency, which is significantly below the required 30%.

Commissioner Newman said, although the Code needs to be followed, his inclination is to accept additional landscaping considering this is a fabrication/warehouse facility.

Mr. DeSimone called attention to the approval criteria section in LDC 17.50.080 C-5 “Adjustments to design standards and guidelines such as building placement, building orientation, form, materials, fenestration, articulation, wall planes or facade variation may be approved by the Planning Commission with findings that demonstrate the proposed design changes are not due to financial considerations on behalf of the project proponent, are consistent with surrounding land use patterns and community design, will not compromise future projects or design, and any deviations reflect the City’s desire to encourage and permit development that has lasting value to the community.” The determination that should be made in this case is whether the addition of windows will add any value to the project (because it is a fabrication use) or whether enhanced landscaping can provide appropriate screening. Projects are reviewed on a case-by-case basis with the Commission having latitude to adjust some items as deemed necessary.

Chairman Price asked about the percentage of leeway the Commission is allowed. Mr. DeSimone said the Commission has up to a 10% allowance from the base standard for height, bulk, open space, landscaping, setbacks, lot coverage and floor area requirements.

Commissioner Goodlander noted that trees will help create some height variation. Chairman Price agreed, however, said that landscaping is required and should not count as a tradeoff for transparency, especially on a street-facing facade.

Commissioner Nielsens agrees with the requirement of 30% transparency. Employees should have an opportunity to be able to enjoy natural light. Landscaping and transparency are both required and one should not be allowed to negate the other. Commissioner Ortiz agreed and pointed out that it is an important element from the community’s perspective.
Commissioner Nielson suggested removing the option for a trellis feature and requiring 30% transparency as required by Code. Commissioner Goodlander asked if 20% transparency would be acceptable as it would increase what is being proposed by quite a bit. Chairman Price said, because it is such a large blank wall, there is a need for vertical articulation. Mr. Holley agreed that windows are a good option to help meet the requirement for breaking up a blank wall.

MOTION: Commissioner Newman moved to conditionally approve a Design Review & Conditional Use Permit based on the submitted plans, with the reduced transparency (at 4%) and enhanced landscaping. The motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION: Commissioner Nielsen moved to conditionally approve a Design Review & Conditional Use Permit as outlined in PC 18-019 requiring 30% transparency on the south side and the removal of the option for creative landscaping. The motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Goodlander asked if the windows could be translucent. Mr. Holley advised that windows are required to help provide relief; translucent-type windows are acceptable and popular because they allow natural light as well as meet the requirement for transparency.

Commissioner Goodlander said requiring 20% would quadruple the transparency that is proposed.

MOTION: Commissioner Goodlander moved to conditionally approve a Design Review & Conditional Use Permit as outlined in PC 18-019 with the amended conditions of approval as listed below, including 20% transparency. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
1. All standard conditions of approval are recorded and available in the Community Development Department.
2. The south facade of the proposed building shall have 20% transparency or translucent panels placed in a manner that does not leave more than 40 linear feet of blank wall.
3. Additional sidewalks, or delineated pedestrian walkways, shall be established on that connect the fabrication shop building to 800 North, or improve a new pedestrian walkway that connects the main building to 800 North.
4. Open space and outdoor space shall total 12,857 SF for the fabrication shop building project site or a total of 20% (23,522 SF) of open space and outdoor space for the entire property, including the existing main building, may be established on the property.
5. A minimum of 31 parking stalls shall be provided on-site. Any new parking stalls created near the fabrication shop shall be outside of the 30' front yard setback and located at either the side or the rear of the building.
6. Outdoor storage areas shall be screened from view from 800 North and neighboring properties with a solid fence and any material or equipment that is stacked more than eight feet in height shall be setback from the property line a minimum of 20 feet.
7. Weather protection shall be provided above all pedestrian entrances. A performance landscaping plan, prepared in accordance with LDC §17.39, 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. A total of 29 trees and 73 shrubs, perennials and grasses, shall be provided.
   b. Street trees shall be planted along 800 North every 30' on center.
8. Exterior lighting shall be limited to 32' in height and shall be concealed source, down-cast and shall not illuminate or cast light onto adjacent properties.
9. Dumpsters be visually screened/buffered from public streets by landscaping, fencing or walls.
10. No signs are approved with this permit. All signage shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
11. No fences are approved with this permit. All fences shall be approved and permitted by staff in accordance with the Land Development Code.
12. 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. Engineering
   i. Provide water shares or in-leu of fee for increased water right demand to City system.
   ii. Provide new sewer lateral and water meter/service line to new building
   iii. Provide storm water detention/retention to meet current City standards for portion of lot being used for building, access, and staging areas. This will include the retention of the 90% storm on site and the implantation of LID practices where possible
   iv. Remove and replace curb and gutter at previous access to parcel with high back curb. Remove approach and restore landscaping in park strip.
   v. Construct all new approaches per APWA standards

b. Water
   i. Water main must have a RP (ASSE1013) installed and tested as it enters the building before any branch offs or connections.
   ii. Landscape irrigation must have high-hazard backflow protection and be tested.
   iii. All 2015 IPC and State of Utah amendments shall apply to points of use of water during and after construction.
   iv. Fire suppression system must have a DC (ASSE1015) installed and tested.

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 project conforms to the requirements of Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.

3. As conditioned, the project provides adequate open/usable outdoor space in conformance with Title 17.

4. The project provides adequate off-street parking.

5. The project meets the goals and objectives of the Industrial Park (IP) zoning designation within the Logan General Plan.


Moved: Commissioner Goodlander   Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz   Approved: 5-0

Yea: Butterfield, Goodlander, Newman, Nielson, Ortiz, Price   Nay:   Abstain:

PC 18-020 Autocare Garage Building [Design Review Permit] Cartwright AEC/Autocare
Properties LLC, authorized agent/owner, request a new 10,400 SF garage building for the storage of tow trucks on 3.32 acres located at 1240 South Hwy 89/91 in the Commercial (COM) zone; TIN 02-087-0014.

Mr. Holley advised that the applicant has requested this to be continued to the next meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Goodlander moved to continue PC 18-020 to the May 24, 2018 meeting as requested by the applicant. Commissioner Ortiz seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Goodlander   Seconded: Commissioner Ortiz   Approved: 5-0

Yea: Goodlander, Newman, Nielson, Ortiz, Price   Nay:   Abstain:
PC 18-021 Center Street Historic District Design Standards – Logan City requests review and adoption of an update the Historic District Design Standards for the Center Street National Historic District. The update has been guided by a Steering Committee comprised of members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, City Council, City Administration and public, and includes a comprehensive review and update of the existing guidelines with an emphasis on incorporating current best practices, technology, and materials innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

STAFF: Ms. Pollan explained that the City is requesting review and adoption of an update to the Historic District Design Standards for the Center Street National Historic District and outlined the primary changes.

The Historic District was adopted by Logan City and the U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service in 1979. The District includes residential, commercial, institutional, and public properties within the purple boundaries indicated on the map below:

Historic Districts are identified through a survey and review process to designate an area worthy of preservation. The properties in the District provide benefit to the community by preserving buildings, architectural styles and places of unique history. In 1978, Logan City undertook a survey of the area and consultants did research to determine the age, condition, history, and architecture of the homes. The area that included most homes over 50 years old, in good condition, and with contributory history or architecture, was designated and adopted as the Historic District in 1979. Surveys have been done periodically - in 1999 and 2011 to verify that the area still meets historic standards. The District currently has 75% of the structures designated as contributory.

Logan City has developed design standards for residential and commercial buildings, sites, and signs located within the Center Street Historic District. These standards function as a benchmark for the preservation and treatment of historic properties and new construction within the historic district. The design standards provide a basis for making informed and consistent decisions by the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee and staff when reviewing applicable requests. The Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) reviews new single-family construction, exterior modifications, and non-residential new construction and exterior modifications within the District.

There have been adopted standards in place since 2003 for exterior changes to properties in the District. The updated process was initiated to review for compliance with State and National guidelines and incorporate current best practices, technology, materials and innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under National District Standards.
The changes are primarily formatting, with the inclusion of supplemental materials and graphics. The actual standards are based on State and National standards for historic buildings. The document was rearranged to include all residential building aspects in one section and all commercial building aspects in another. The document was modified to become more user-friendly and provide more resources. Throughout the document, resource boxes are included to provide assistance pertaining to building elements. Blue boxes highlight additional resources while grey boxes provide useful tips and information. Hyperlinks are provided so that digital users can access related websites and applicable ordinances. A complete list of additional resources and URL’s are in the Appendix. The resource boxes are intended to provide supplemental information to help implement design standards and perform a successful rehabilitation project. Illustrations and/or photos are included throughout the document to further clarify the intent of a design standard.

The updated document will be provided to discuss at the next meeting.

PUBLIC: Tom Sorenson asked if the changes included any consideration for more visitor access or building layout. Ms. Pollan explained that the standards do not require anything other than standard maintenance and upkeep, however, when changes are proposed, they are reviewed and approved for historic significance. During the public open house process, several comments were received about promotion of the District. This concept is not tied to this update; however, staff will be reviewing ways to provide more public information and outreach, especially to property owners within the District. Mr. DeSimone pointed out that the City’s GIS department has provided a map, which can be accessed on the City’s website, which identifies historic homes and provides information and photos.

COMMISSION: Chairman Price pointed out that RDA improvements and downtown redevelopment will have an impact on the District (such as the Emporium site). Ms. Pollan agreed and explained that the existing Emporium building has a “C” evaluation. A new building would be considered a “D” designation because it would not be an historic building.

Chairman Price asked if the 50-year building mark is considered a “rolling” timeline. Ms. Pollan advised that periodic surveys include structures and/or properties that may not have qualified for historic designation previously. He asked Ms. Pollan to research if there is a certain percentage of structures that are required to be maintained at an A or B classification.

Chairman Price pointed out that he and Commissioner Newman were involved with the steering committee. The addition of the sidebars with resources, tips and links are very useful.

Commissioner Newman questioned whether other 50+-year-old buildings would be considered and whether the boundary would ever be extended. Mr. DeSimone explained that the District’s specific boundaries are federally recognized and there is currently not political will to re-examine or extend them. Ms. Pollan noted that staff does have information on areas and structures outside of the current boundary. A broad survey was completed in 2011.

Chairman Price said he has been a member of the Historic Trust for many years and often the case is to create a second, contiguous district rather than expansion of an established one.

Commissioner Ortiz appreciated the time and work put into the process and addition of information into the document.

MOTION: Commissioner Ortiz moved to continue discussion and review of PC 18-021 to the May 24, 2018 meeting. Commissioner Newman seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Ortiz  Seconded: Commissioner Newman  Approved: 5-0
Yea: Goodlander, Newman, Nielson, Ortiz, Price  Nay: Abstain
OTHER BUSINESS

Hidden Cove Subdivision
Mr. Holley presented the changes made to the front facade as requested by the Commission at the April 26, 2018 meeting. The changes in variation include the roofline, materials, colors and fenestration.

Commissioner Nielson asked about pedestrian connectivity to the northernmost building. Mr. Holley said that may need to be addressed if the Commission does not feel like what has been proposed is considered as "reasonably convenient." Mr. Holley will talk with the applicant regarding this issue.

Mr. Holley confirmed for Chairman Price that the requirements regarding the dumpster location will be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Department.

The Commission agreed that the changes made (with some adjustments to connectivity) have met the request.

2018 Commission Bylaws Update
Proposed changes to the current bylaws, which have been reviewed by the Legal Department include:

F. DUTIES OF SECRETARY
Add:
5. Ensure Commission members have access to all available training resources and opportunities from the Utah League of Cities and Towns or other relevant sources.

H. ETHICAL CONDUCT
1. (e) Ex-Parte Communication is communication to a Commissioner from any person about a pending administrative decision matter before the Commission that occurs in the absence of other parties to the administrative decision matter and without notice and opportunity for all parties to participate in the communication. People often refer to these communications as "one-sided," "off-the-record," or private communications between a Commissioner and any person concerning an administrative decision matter that is pending or impending before the Commission. One-sided communication does not mean that the communication must occur in privacy or among two people to be an ex-parte communication. Even public communication before a large audience may still be an ex-parte communication if other parties to the proceeding do not have notice of, and an opportunity to, participate in the communication. Communications regarding legislative decisions are not considered ex-parte communications.

   (g) "Public comment" is valuable in all public decision-making. Public comment is a meaningful way to gather additional relevant information so as to make an informed decision. Public comment is most meaningful to decisions made by the Commission when controlled, rational and based on fact.

2. A Commission member shall not:
   (e) Engage in a conflict of interest. A Commission member experiencing, in his/her opinion, a conflict of interest, should declare his interest publicly, abstain from voting on the action, vacate his seat, and may remain in and exit the room during consideration of the action. He should not discuss the matter privately or publicly during the Commission meeting or at any time with any other Commission member prior to a final decision and/or appeal on the matter. The vote of a Commission member experiencing a conflict of interest who fails to disqualify himself shall be disallowed, determined by a majority vote of the remainder of the Commission. A conflict of interest may exist under these rules although a Commission member may not believe he/she has an actual conflict; therefore, any Commission member who has an actual conflict, or a member who has a question as to whether a conflict of interest exists under these rules should raise the matter with the City Attorney for a determination to be made as to whether a conflict of interest exists; or
(g) Rely on public clamor to support decisions.

6. Commission members may seek information from other members the Planning Department, counsel to the Commission, staff serving the Commission, or the staff of other departments or agencies advising the Commission. No member shall express any bias, prejudice, or individual opinion on proper judgment of the case prior to its hearing and determination. When appropriate, additional information will be provided to all Commission members and added to the public record.

8 Conflict of Interest/Disqualification. Any member declaring a conflict of interest shall be disqualified, shall leave the room, and shall not participate in the discussion and vote pertaining to that matter.

Other minor grammatical changes will be made.

Chairman Price and Commissioner Nielson said the recusal process (leaving the room and not participating in a discussion or vote) should be consistent with the Municipal Council procedure.

MOTION: Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the updated bylaws as discussed and presented. Commissioner Goodlander seconded the motion.

Moved: Commissioner Nielson  Seconded: Commissioner Goodlander  Approved: 5-0
Yea: Goodlander, Newman, Nielson, Ortiz, Price  Nay:  Abstain:

WORKSHOP ITEMS for May 24, 2018
✓ PC 18-022 Herm's Inn [Conditional Use Permit]
✓ PC 18-023 Del Taco [Design Review Permit]
✓ PC 18-024 Woodmoore Point Rezone

Meeting adjourned 7:10 p.m.
Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded for the Logan City Planning Commission meeting of May 10, 2018.

Michael A. DeSimone
Community Development Director

Russ Price
Planning Commission Chairman

Russ Holley
Senior Planner

Amber Pollan
Senior Planner

Debbie Zilles
Administrative Assistant
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
April 16, 2018

City Hall Council Chambers • 290 North 100 West Logan, UT 84321 • www.loganutah.org

The meeting of the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee convened in regular session on Monday, April 16, 2018. Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Thomas Graham, Amy Hochberg, David Lewis, Keith Mott, Gary Olsen, Christian Wilson, Amy Anderson (Council liaison)

Committee Members Excused: Viola Goodwin

Staff Members Present: Mike DeSimone, Amber Pollan, Russ Holley, Paul Taylor, Debbie Zilles

Minutes as written and recorded from the March 5, 2018 were reviewed. Mr. Olsen moved that the minutes be approved as submitted, Mr. Wilson seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Minutes as written and recorded from the April 2, 2018 were reviewed. Mr. Wilson moved that the minutes be approved as submitted, Mr. Graham seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

HPC 18-001 Center Street Historic District Design Standards – The City of Logan requests review and adoption of an update to the Historic District Design Standards for the Center Street National Historic District. The update has been guided by a Steering Committee comprised of members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, City Council, City Administration and public, and includes a comprehensive review of the existing guidelines with an emphasis on incorporating current best practices, technology, and materials innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pollan recapped the updates and previous discussions:

- A Public Open House was held March 29, 2018 with 50 people in attendance.
- Track 1 and Track 2 requirements were outlined
- Primary changes include the addition resource boxes (Quick Tips, Maintenance Tips or Suggested Resources). The resource information does not include “regulatory” language and is intended to be a useful tool.
- Solar panels were reviewed (page 32)
- One of the major objectives is to ensure continued efforts include promotion of the District.
- Minor changes to the History section (dates adjusted for accuracy).
- Preservation Incentives (page 12) was clarified to read ‘Total rehabilitation expenditures must exceed $10,000 in a 3-year period’.
- Color is not regulated, however, property owners are encouraged to use colors that are historically and traditionally common – this section, although not a review standard, is provided to help owners.
- Links will be reviewed and updated.
- Minor grammatical changes on page 55.
- Update acknowledgements page to include current Council and Committee members.
- Miscellaneous grammatical edits throughout the document.
- Added section on mechanical equipment (9.12.3 page 52)
Chairman Lewis recapped that at the last meeting, the document changes were reviewed page-by-page. The links, resources and color suggestions are all great additions and this will serve as a very helpful online tool.

Mr. Olsen asked about solar equipment that might be visible from the street. Mr. Graham said he would hate to restrict a property owner’s ability to utilize solar power and suggested reviewing requests on a case-by-case basis.

Chairman Lewis asked how the differences should be handled (e.g., a dark roof with asphalt shingles where flush panels would blend in versus a red terra cotta style roof and/or panels that are propped up. Mr. Wilson said, although most convenient, solar equipment does not necessarily have to be mounted on the roof; there are different options available. Mr. Olsen mentioned there are several homes in the Cliffside area that have them located in the backyard.

Ms. Pollan said staff will review solar systems within a Track 1 request, she will do some research regarding any specific state regulations.

Mr. Wilson suggested keeping the process simple, however, they should not be allowed on a front-facing facade. Mr. Graham said, although this is not a historic element, he would not be opposed to allowing it if it were done correctly. Mr. Wilson agreed. Mr. Mott said it is difficult to envision a way to do it without affecting the historic character of contributory buildings and whether it might affect eligibility for tax credit. Mr. Wilson said they could be allowed in special circumstances where there is no other option available and they are not deemed to be detrimental.

Mr. Olsen asked if there were any solar panels currently in the District. Ms. Pollan said they are handled by the Building Department and require a permit to install. She is not aware of any in the Historic District.

Chairman Lewis said this issue can be revisited; Mr. Graham agreed and said it may not even become an issue. Chairman Lewis said he anticipates it becoming more common in the future.

Mr. Wilson said the Committee could determine how predominate it would be in each situation. Mr. Holley said the language indicates “not visible from the street” and may require more clarification for possible interpretation. Mr. Wilson suggested adding “parallel to the public street”. Mr. DeSimone said the wording “should be” provides allowance for review to protect the integrity of a structure.

It was determined to leave the wording as is for now, understanding that it is based on interpretation, and can be changed if determined necessary.

Chairman Lewis confirmed that 7.2.1 (5) will read “Door and window replacements”. He questioned whether “Exterior masonry work” would include repairs. Ms. Pollan said repairs would be considered as maintenance and handled through Track 1 review.

Ms. Hochberg asked about changes that are made which do not go through the formal process and whether there would be any recourse or follow-through. Ms. Pollan explained that there is a violation process which falls under Code Enforcement.

Ms. Hochberg wondered if limiting improvements is the right choice because upgrades can often enhance the appearance. Mr. DeSimone said the reason for the standards is to represent all facets of history and ensure that changes are considered within a historical context. Chairman Lewis noted that Committee can accommodate for some leeway in certain situations.
Mr. Wilson pointed out that the objective is certainly not to discourage improvements but to encourage positive steps in conjunction with the historic character of the District.

Ms. Pollan said the surveys provide information on what is historic on a structure, which can allow for more than one option to be considered. Mr. DeSimone said, based on the historic style of the era, the Committee can provide a wide range of options and opinions.

**MOTION:** Mr. Wilson moved that the Historic Preservation Committee forward a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission for adoption of the Historic District Design Standards (HDDS) as presented. Mr. Olsen seconded the motion.

Moved: Christian Wilson  Seconded: Gary Olsen  Passed: 5-0
Yea: Graham, Hochberg, Mott, Olsen, Wilson  Nay:  Abstain:

**OTHER**
Mr. Olsen asked about the status of the Zion's bank ATM. Mr. Holley said he talked with the contractor from California a week ago. Mr. Olsen said he believes they are stalling, there are options to get it corrected timely. He is offended that they are not following what has been approved by the Committee. Mr. Holley said they confirm that they are working on it, however, the formal enforcement process can be started.

Ms. Pollan updated the Committee on the Town Center Rezone project that was recently forwarded to the City Council from the Planning Commission.

**WORKSHOP**
✓ HPC 18-003 Somebody's Attic Facade Remodel.

The next meeting will be held on May 7, 2018.

Meeting adjourned at 1:03 p.m.
Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded at the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee meeting on April 16, 2018.

Michael A. DeSimone  
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The meeting of the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee convened in regular session on Monday, April 2, 2018. Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: David Lewis, Christian Wilson, Amy Anderson (Council liaison)

Committee Members Excused: Thomas Graham, Viola Goodwin, Amy Hochberg, Keith Mott, Gary Olsen

Staff Members Present: Mike DeSimone, Amber Pollan, Russ Holley, Paul Taylor, Debbie Zilles

** A quorum was not present, no decisions or vote could be taken, however, discussion and public comment were received. Minutes of the March 5, 2018 meeting will be approved at the next meeting.

**HPC 18-001 Center Street Historic District Design Standards** - The City of Logan requests review and adoption of an update to the Historic District Design Standards for the Center Street National Historic District. The update has been guided by a Steering Committee comprised of members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, City Council, City Administration and public, and includes a comprehensive review of the existing guidelines with an emphasis on incorporating current best practices, technology, and materials innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pollan recapped the overall layout of the plan and updates, which are in line with state and federal standards.

- A Public Open House was held March 29, 2018 with 50 people in attendance.
- Track 1 and Track 2 requirements were outlined.
- Primary changes include the addition resource boxes (Quick Tips, Maintenance Tips or Suggested Resources). The resource information does not include "regulatory" language and are intended to be a useful tool in assisting owner to understand and meet the required design standards.
- Solar panels were reviewed (page 32).
- One of the major objectives is to ensure continued efforts include promotion of the District.
- Minor changes to the History section (dates adjusted for accuracy).
- Preservation Incentives (page 12) was clarified to read "Total rehabilitation expenditures must exceed $10,000 in a 3-year period".
- Color is not regulated, however, property owners are encouraged to use colors that are historically and traditionally common – this section, although not a review standard, is provided to help owners.
- Links will be reviewed and updated.
- Minor grammatical changes on page 55.
- Update acknowledgements page to include current Council and Committee members.
PUBLIC COMMENT: A written letter from Marilyn Austin Smith was received and distributed to the Committee prior to the meeting, requesting that her property at 132 West Center be removed from the Historic District. After review and discussion with Ms. Smith it was determined that her home meets the requirements and will remain in the district.

Nancy Cheal, owns the building at 88 W. Center, inquired if Logan is seeking a National Historic designation. Ms. Pollan explained that Logan City has had a designation in place since 1978. Chairman Lewis said the standards have been in place since 2003, this process is to update them. There are very few specific changes to the actual standards because they conform with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The biggest change to the document is providing more resource information and suggested tips/tools. He confirmed that existing structures do not have to change anything, this would only apply when renovations or major repairs are being made.

Brandon McKay lives at 528 W. Center Street and noted that there are no standards for non-contributory homes within the District. Ms. Pollan said the regulations would fall under the applicable zoning standards. Mr. McKay asked for better clarification in the document. Mr. DeSimone said even if a structure is considered non-contributing, any additions, renovations and/or repairs would have to comply with the standards. Mr. McKay said he cannot apply for funding for historic repairs. Mr. DeSimone advised that clarifying language can be added, however, projects in the District will need to be reviewed. Mr. McKay said other cities have specific appearance standards, Logan seems to be quite confusing.

Ms. Pollan pointed out that 75% of the structures in the District are considered contributory

Dawna Carlisle asked how projects are reviewed (i.e. landscaping and porches). Ms. Pollan said staff is happy to discuss specific cases, provide information as to what is allowed and offer historic resources. Mr. DeSimone explained that the City does not regulate residential landscaping but can help provide guidance to a homeowner.

Chairman Lewis noted that it can, at times, seem daunting; the Committee does not want to become a barrier for improvements. Members are willing to work with owners to achieve their goals and comply with the Historic District standards. The objective is to accommodate as wide of a range of options as possible and help provide guidance. The Committee is comprised of architects and construction professionals.

Maurine Burt asked if there have been any changes in the last couple of years. Ms. Pollan explained that an appeal process was added by the state legislation, however, the last adoption date was in 2003.

Chairman Lewis outlined the differences between Track 1 and Track 2 reviews. Track 1 proposals can be reviewed and approved by Staff, whereas, projects that have more significant changes (altering architectural details, changing windows, etc.) include more subjectivity in the decision-making process. The Committee provides a more thorough review and public involvement.

Mr. Wilson noted that most of the proposals reviewed by the Committee are commercial projects

Chairman Lewis encouraged continued review, there is always room for improvement. He appreciates the public feedback and advised to contact Staff with any questions or comments.

The next meeting will be held on April 16, 2018.
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The meeting of the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee convened in regular session on Monday, March 5, 2018. Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Viola Goodwin, David Lewis, Keith Mott, Gary Olsen, Christian Wilson, Amy Anderson (Municipal Council liaison)

Committee Members Excused: Thomas Graham, Amy Hochberg

Staff Members Present: Mike DeSimone, Amber Pollan, Russ Holley, Paul Taylor, Debbie Zilles

Minutes as written and recorded from the February 5, 2018 meeting were reviewed. Mr. Mott moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Mr. Olsen seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

**HPC 18-002 Anderson Seed & Garden – Front Entrance Reconstruction**

Anderson’s Seed & Garden / Mark & Ronnette Anderson TRS, authorized agent/owner, request to remodel the existing and damaged storefront areas of the exterior building facade at 69 West Center Street in the Town Center - Historic District (TC-HD) zone; TID 06-026-0002.

**STAFF:** Ms. Pollan explained that on January 16, 2018, the building was hit by a vehicle and damaged extensively. The front is currently boarded and the business would like to restore the use of that entrance. The request is for a front entrance reconstruction, which includes replacing the east Center Street entrance and display area that was recently destroyed and removing and replacing the existing entry of the west entrance. The proposal includes removing existing materials and recessed entries and replacing them with double doors, lower kickplate areas, display and transom windows.

**PROPOUNTE:** Mr. Anderson explained the reason for the proposal is due to a vehicle accident that caused significant damage to the front facade. They can either recess the entrance or construct a flush wall frontage like the original construction. The flush design allows for more interior space. The objective is to improve ADA access with ramps and double doors. Although the reason for the improvement is from damage that occurred, the proposal will improve the overall appearance of the building. They would like to proceed immediately as it is their busy season and he encouraged the City to create an expedited process for these types of emergency situations.

**PUBLIC:** None

**COMMITTEE:** Mr. Wilson asked if recess entries were standard. Ms. Pollan explained that the Historic District Design Standards CR-1 requires the original storefront to be maintained. Recessed entries with large display windows are generally historic and are encouraged. The standards are based on the historic design style of the 1900-1930 era.
Mr. Wilson said recessed entrances help with weather protection and safety concerns. Ms. Pollan said the standard is based from a historical/architectural standpoint, however, she agreed there are many other benefits for a recessed entryway. In this case, either flushed or recessed would be appropriate.

Mr. Anderson said the biggest concern is when the metal sign was removed, it exposed the brick which had been protected. The brick is deteriorating each day. It gets wet and absorbs the moisture, freezes, thaws and shatters. He is unsure how they will ultimately save the brick. The roof was recently redone and all the brick on the roof had to be covered.

Mr. Mott prefers the higher kickplate and the recessed (at least door length) entry. Mr. Olsen agreed that the recessed design will protect the doors and pedestrians.

Chairman Lewis said the recommendations include either flush or recessed entry and a higher kickplate. He suggested letting the proponent make the determination on the entry. Mr. Anderson said he will talk to his contractor about the Committee’s recommendations.

**MOTION:** Mr. Olsen moved that the Historic Preservation Committee conditionally approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for HPC 18-002 as presented with the conditions for approval as listed below, including a strong recommendation for a recessed entry. Mr. Mott seconded the motion.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**
1. Any representations at the Historic Preservation Committee hearing that are approved shall be incorporated into the final action and recorded on the Certificate of Appropriateness.
2. The Historic Preservation Committee approves the flush-wall storefront and door system. The metal finish to be bronze, as proposed, including the double doors, display windows, and transom window panels.
3. The kickplate shall match the pilaster base, be a masonry material, and consistent with the building’s color scheme.
4. Signage requires a sign permit, to be approved by the Department of Community Development.
5. The proponent is responsible to ensure that construction is appropriately permitted and inspected by the Building Division through timely scheduled inspections.
6. Failure to comply with conditions of approval shall void the permit and require a new hearing.

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL**
1. The project complies with all requirements imposed by Title 17 of the Logan Municipal Code.
2. The project is consistent with the objectives and purpose of the General Plan and Logan Municipal Code Title 17 by helping to maintain the Town Center (TC) zone as the central location for the community’s historic and cultural resources.
3. The project is consistent with the objectives and purpose of the Historic District as it is restoring the original storefront of a contributing building.
4. A Certificate of Appropriateness is issued, that is limited to, and promotes preservation and enhancement of structures listed as contributory by the National Register of Historic Places.
5. The project substantially complies with standards outlined in the Center Street Design Review Standards and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Moved: Gary Olsen    Seconded: Keith Mott    Passed: 4-0
Yea: Goodwin, Mott, Olsen, Wilson    Nay:    Abstain:
HPC 18-001 Center Street Historic District Design Standards – The City of Logan requests review and adoption of an update to the Historic District Design Standards for the Center Street National Historic District. The update has been guided by a Steering Committee comprised of members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, City Council, City Administration and the public, and includes a comprehensive review and update of the existing guidelines with an emphasis on incorporating current best practices, technology, and materials innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The Historic Preservation Committee will be holding a workshop to review the final draft document.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pollan advised that there has not been a public open house held yet, she would also like to receive more input from the Steering Committee and Logan Downtown Alliance Design Committee. She outlined the main changes, including separating residential and commercial to individual sections and including more detail (i.e. material, finishes, doors, and roof additions). Additional graphics, tips and helpful ideas for applicants has also been included throughout the document.

Chairman Lewis has a few wording corrections that he will forward to Ms. Pollan.

Mr. Olsen likes the helpful ideas, especially dealing with materials. He would suggest including more options of what can and cannot be done, such as illustrations of both bad and good examples.

Ms. Pollan said windows are a big concern. Mr. Olsen agreed and said there is a new window, made from a composite material that looks like wood and is designed specifically for historic use. Ms. Pollan advised that it is necessary to consider changes as technology and materials that can be used for historic design evolve over time. Chairman Lewis noted that materials are constantly progressing and it would be better to define the design rather than specific material brands.

Mr. Holley asked for the Committee’s thoughts on residential windows and whether the front, street-facing facade should be deemed the principle facade with different requirements than secondary windows. For example, wood on front windows and allowing vinyl to be used on side and rear elevations for cost efficiency. Mr. Wilson said sometimes restoring historic windows can be very expensive. Although there should be a standard met, if it is too cost prohibitive, nothing will be done and it is better to do some improvements. There should be some flexibility and sensitivity allowed on secondary facades. Mr. Olsen noted that a corner would be considered a primary facade.

Mr. DeSimone said the challenge in the Historic District is that many homeowners are lower-income. Focusing on the primary facade is the most important goal to help improve the overall appearance. Mr. Wilson agreed that it is difficult to afford to live in some of the historic homes and repairs and restoration can be quite expensive. Chairman Lewis said there are better and worse type of windows, however, “better” is a subjective term and can be difficult to define. Chairman Lewis said the size and basic look should be considered. Mr. Wilson said the windows should maintain a similar look regarding size, shape and design. Mr. DeSimone said the consultant’s recommendation was a requirement to repair existing windows, which can be challenging and expensive for a home owner.

Ms. Pollan explained that the standards are intended to allow for different choices. Mr. Holley said they are written in a way which requires a match in dimension, however, material can be different. Mr. Wilson said “function” should be added to match.
Ms. Pollan advised that if it is a residential replacement of windows only, not changing or altering the look or design of the structure, it may be beneficial to have staff review and approve rather than require a Committee hearing. Chairman Lewis said this would be covered in the track review section. Ms. Pollan said “window replacement” could be added to a Track 1 review, which would expedite the process. Chairman Lewis asked about idea of rebuilding versus replacing. Mr. Holley said each circumstance is unique and would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Goodwin appreciates Mr. Olsen’s historic color schemes, which will help avoid offensive colors. Ms. Pollan said there are also links provided for additional resources and examples for historic paint colors.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Olsen asked for an update on the Zion’s Bank ATM. Mr. Holley said he has been in contact with Raymond Construction. They have advised that they have stone on order from Israel (a 16-week delivery timeline) that will be used on the project. He will follow up with them by the end of the month.

Ms. Pollan advised that the Planning Commission is still reviewing changes to the Town Center (TC) zone, which include height, setback and transition standards. This issue will not impact the Historic Preservation process.

Mr. Olsen pointed out that while working on the demolition of the old Walker Bank structure, they have discovered some classical features and stunning historic materials.

The next meeting will be held on Monday, April 2, 2018 at 12:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 1:12 p.m.
Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded at the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee meeting on March 5, 2018.
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The meeting of the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee convened in regular session on Monday, February 5, 2018. Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Tom Graham, Amy Hochberg, David Lewis, Keith Mott, Gary Olsen, Christian Wilson

Committee Members Excused: Viola Goodwin

Staff Members Present: Amber Pollan, Russ Holley, Debbie Zilles

Minutes as written and recorded from the August 7, 2017 meeting were reviewed. Mr. Wilson moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Mr. Mott seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

**HPC 18-001 Center Street Historic District Design Standards** – The City of Logan requests review and adoption of an update the Historic District Design Standards for the Center Street National Historic District. The update has been guided by a Steering Committee comprised of members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, City Council, City Administration and the public, and includes a comprehensive review and update of the existing guidelines with an emphasis on incorporating current best practices, technology, and materials innovations which are appropriate and acceptable under the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The Historic Preservation Committee will be holding a workshop to review the final draft document.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Pollan provided an overview of the final draft/update of the Historic District Design Standards and provided a brief review of the Historic District boundaries. The Steering Committee will receive a copy of the draft this week. A public open house will be set up later this month, afterward, a timetable for the adoption process will be scheduled. The update will be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Committee, the HDSS Steering Committee and Logan Downtown Alliance. The Historic Preservation Committee will meet on March 5 to continue discussion and review. A public hearing will be held on March 19. The tentative dates for the Planning Commission to review the document are April 12 and 26, after which it will be forwarded to the Municipal Council for review and adoption in early Spring.

The layout of the draft includes residential and commercial being broken down into specific sections. The goal was to keep the information brief, but robust enough to provide guidance for projects in the Historic District. The project application will be amended, once the update is adopted, to ensure consistency with the standards. Illustrative graphics, tips, guidelines and resources have been included in each section.

Ms. Pollan explained the process for Track 1 review and outlined the type of projects that could qualify for administrative review.

Mr. Olsen said he would like to include historic color schemes added.
Mr. Wilson likes the organization format of the document.

Ms. Pollan said, because the standards are used by different groups of people (i.e. applicants, developers, staff, architects, committees), the goal is for the information to make sense to everyone.

Chairman Lewis commended the addition of tips, resources and examples and believes this will be quite useful.

Ms. Pollan pointed out that the current Town Center Rezone project that is being heard by the Planning Commission will not affect anything in the Historic District or the Historic Preservation Committee’s review process.

Meeting adjourned at 12:56 p.m.
Minutes approved as written and digitally recorded at the Logan City Historic Preservation Committee meeting on February 5, 2018.

__________________________    ____________________________
Michael A. DeSimone          David Lewis
Community Development Director Historic Preservation Committee Chairman

__________________________    ____________________________
Russ Holley                  Amber Pollan
Senior Planner               Senior Planner

__________________________
Debbie Zilles
Administrative Assistant
STATE OF UTAH
COUNTY OF CACHE, ss

Civil
PROOF OF PUBLICATION

On this 12th day of September, A.D. 2018 personally appeared
before me Jennifer Birch who being first being duly sworn, deposes and says that
(s)he is the Principal Legal Clerk of the PNG Media LLC, publishers of The Herald Journal
a daily newspaper published in Logan City, Cache County Utah, and that the
Legal Notice, a copy of which is hereto attached was published in said
newspaper for 1 issue(s) and that said notice also published on utahlegals.com
on the same day(s) as publication in said newspaper

Commencing on the following days:
09/06/2018

Jennifer Birch, Principal Legal Clerk

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 12th day of September, A.D. 2018

Laurie Jackson, Notary Public
Commissioned in the State of Utah
My Commission expires 10/18/2019

LEGAL NOTICE
LOGAN MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

SUMMARY OF AN ORDINANCE - The following ordinances
were adopted and approved by the Logan Municipal Council,
Logan, Utah on September 4, 2018.

ORD. 18-15 An ordinance adopting Logan Municipal Code
Title 2, Chapter 65, Access to Public Records.

ORD. 18-16 An ordinance approving the Historic District
Design Standards.

ORD. 18-17 An ordinance approving a zone change of 19.25
acres from Commercial (COM) to Mixed Use (MU) located at
607 West 200 North.

These ordinances are effective immediately upon publication.
Full text of the ordinances can be reviewed at the office of
the Logan City Recorder, City Hall, 290 North 100 West,
Logan, Utah during regular business hours.

Teresa Harris, City Recorder
Published September 6, 2018 Ref No. 1809245