CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
October 8, 2013

PRESIDING: Don Wood Mayor

PRESENT: Kathryn Murray Councilmember
Mark Shepherd Councilmember
Bruce Young Councilmember

EXCUSED: Kent Bush Councilmember
Mike LeBaron Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT: Adam Lenhard City Manager
JJ Allen Assistant City Manager
Brian Brower City Attorney
Greg Krusi Police Chief
Rich Knapp Administrative Services Director
Scott Hodge Public Works Director
Curtis Dickson Community Services Deputy Dir
Scott Hess Development Services Director
Nancy Dean City Recorder
Kim Read Deputy City Recorder

EXCUSED: Eric Howes Community Services Director


Mayor Wood called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE CDBG FUNDING ALLOCATION

Scott Hess, Development Services Manager, directed the Council to the handout reflecting the CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) amendments and reviewed them with the Council. He explained the funds for re-allocation were due to lack of spending by some applicants and the administrative costs were less than what had been appropriated. He informed the Council that it was staff’s recommendation to re-allocate the funds, approximately $35,000, toward the 450 West Infrastructure Improvement Project.

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, explained 450 West was located in the Melanie Acres Subdivision and stated the infrastructure project would include water, sewer and storm drain piping as well as curb, gutter and sidewalk and new asphalt pavement. He believed the cost of the project would be approximately $300,000 - $400,000. Mr. Hess pointed out CDBG funds were already programmed toward the project. He stated this would come before the Council for approval during a future policy session.
DISCUSSION ON DEVELOPMENT OF CITY PROPERTY ADJACENT TO PINNACLE APARTMENTS AND SUNDOWNER CONDOMINIUMS NEAR THE HILLSIDE SUBDIVISION

Mayor Wood requested those in attendance introduce themselves. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, reminded the Council the Northrup Grumman building, located at approximately 88 South 2000 East, had been vacant for some time and reported interest had been expressed by potential tenants. He stated the City would like to see the building occupied and announced a number of potential tenants had been negotiating with Brett Birkeland, LNR Partners, the owner of the building and Mark Alexander, Jones Lang LaSalle, property broker, for leasing the building. He disclosed one of the issues brought to light during the negotiation process was the lack of parking and reported the parking lot currently had 600 spaces. He mentioned the tenants had requested additional parking and pointed out the difficulty in expanding the parking lot.

Mr. Lenhard mentioned the City currently owned some property to the south of the building and reported it had come to the City approximately 16 years ago as part of the Pinnacle Apartment development in addition to property acquired by the City as part of the Hillside subdivision plat. He believed a portion of the property had been obligated for a future City park which had been identified in the Park Capital Facility Plan. He suggested the recreation obligation remain in the minds of the Council as it discussed and brainstormed ideas on how the City could facilitate additional parking. He reported one option could be a donation of land or a financial incentive and stressed both of those options would require formalities on behalf of the Council and reviewed them with the Council:

- A Finding of Significance placed on the value associated with any property donation
- Public Hearing allowing public comment if the property is valued over $75,000
- Cost Benefit Analysis known as a 10-8-2 Study mandated by State Statute which would identify the reasons for the City’s contribution

Councilmember Murray inquired if the City would have to locate additional park property to be identified as future park property development if it donated the park space for parking. Mr. Lenhard believed the City would only need to recognize some recreational/park facility should be located in that area. He commented the area was identified in the Parks Master Plan as a 3.26 acre park and indicated impact fees were being collected for future park construction. He believed if the size of the park were reduced it would need to be reflected in that Plan.

A visual presentation was shared illustrating the specific locations for vacant parcels of property surrounding the Northrop Grumman building. Mr. Lenhard suggested a smaller portion of the 3.26 acres could still be developed as a future City park and emphasized the City recognized its obligation in developing a park. Mayor Wood pointed out the additional requested parking would nearly double the parking at the facility.

Brett Birkeland, LNR Partners, explained the history associated with the Northrop Grumman building. He stated it would be very expensive to remodel the building for multiple tenants and shared estimated costs of approximately 2.2 million dollars. He explained the interested tenant needed eight per thousand parking ratio, which would be an additional 375 parking stalls. He shared the potential benefit to the City that the tenant would be employing approximately 1000 people. He expressed a desire to work with the City.
Mayor Wood inquired if the proposed costs included the additional parking. Mr. Birkeland responded those costs did not include additional parking spaces, he continued a civil engineer would need to assess and determine those costs. He reported there were no interested tenants with the current five per thousand parking ratio. He continued both large tenants were requesting the eight per thousand parking ratio. A discussion took place relative to market costs and value associated with the property. Mr. Lenhard requested the Council’s thoughts on using City property for the additional parking spaces.

Councilmember Young expressed his opinion the City was obligated to provide a City park even if the entire parcel wasn’t used for that purpose. He stated he was in favor of promoting economic development and bringing in quality jobs to the City; however, the City’s investment should be equivalent to the benefit.

Councilmember Murray clarified it was Mr. Birkeland’s opinion the building would remain vacant without the additional parking spaces. She inquired what taxes could be recognized by the City if the proposed tenant was a call center. Mr. Lenhard responded there would be no direct benefit to the jobs themselves other than taxes on usage such as franchise taxes or utilities. He believed those would be similar to what was collected when Northrop Grumman occupied the space. He suggested the Council consider the negative impact the vacant building had on the City. Mr. Birkeland commented once the building was occupied, the demand for other office space within the City would increase.

Mayor Wood pointed out the location of property identified on the illustration known as the “Old School property” which was also identified as park space. He suggested even though it consisted of wetlands, a boardwalk could be installed and other amenities which would meet the “park” component. Mr. Lenhard pointed out the location of the Canal Trail and how a potential foot bridge could be implemented and the southern portion of the property could be developed as the “park” amenity. He continued the City’s General Plan also reflected a public street connecting to the private drive and believed it would allow for potential access if some of the property was used for parking. A visual presentation was used to illustrate the above scenarios.

Councilmember Murray inquired how many acres would be needed for the requested additional parking. Mr. Lenhard responded the two designated “park” parcels contained 5.25 acres in total and believed 4.5 acres would be needed for 600 additional spaces. He also pointed out the challenges associated with the hillside slope in order to use the acreage for parking. A discussion took place specific to what Mr. Birkeland needed from the City and the restrictions he had with the property. He didn’t believe he was allowed to make the parking lot improvements. Mr. Lenhard commented the City didn’t have the wherewithal to complete the needed parking lot improvements.

Mr. Lenhard suggested Mr. Birkeland speak to the nature of the leases which were currently being negotiated. Mr. Birkeland stated negotiations were with two separate companies for long term leases (10 years). He continued both were non Hill Air Force Base related industries. A discussion took place specific to Mr. Birkeland’s schedule.
DISCUSSION ON THE CLEARFIELD STATION MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, explained a Public Hearing for the rezone associated with the Clearfield Station Master Development Plan was on the agenda. He reported the Planning Commission had not yet acted on the rezone application; therefore, there was no way the City Council could act on it during the meeting. He suggested opening the public hearing and receive any comments, then continuing the public hearing until the November 12, 2013 City Council meeting.

He announced a joint City Council/Planning Commission work session was scheduled for Wednesday, October 16, 2013, at 6:00 pm in the Multi-purpose room to allow both bodies to ask any and all questions and express concern specific to the Master Development Plan. He suggested each member become familiar with the Plan and be prepared for the October 16 meeting.

Councilmember Shepherd moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in a regular session at 6:56 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Young. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Murray, Shepherd, and Young. Voting NO – None. Councilmembers Bush and LeBaron were not present for the vote.

The City Council work session reconvened at 8:19 p.m.

DISCUSSION OF THE BUXTON RETAIL LEAKAGE ANALYSIS

Mayor Wood reminded the City Council the City had engaged a national firm to complete analysis on retail leakage within the City.

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, announced the project had been completed and reminded the Council of the previous discussions related to the leakage analysis. He mentioned the study would reflect which retailers would best benefit Clearfield City. He shared a visual presentation which would support the analysis completed by Buxton Company. He explained in addition to the study, the City would now have access to a program known as “Scout” which displayed illustrations identifying focus areas for development and shared an example how it would be used by City staff.

Councilmember Murray inquired why Scout identified a need for retail in the City, yet the studies completed by the developer and UTA reflected retail wouldn’t compliment the Rail Stop. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, responded that specific area would lack an “Anchor” component, essential to large development.

Mr. Allen stated staff had identified 20 businesses and indicated Buxton would be notifying the selected businesses announcing Clearfield City would be contacting them in the near future and shared an example. A discussion took place on whether the study would be used to market downtown and Clearfield Station as well as Legend Hills.
Mayor Wood expressed concern if the City had enough staff to effectively use the “Scout” tool and if the 12 month window were too short of a time frame for its effectiveness. Mr. Lenhard agreed staff was extremely lean but believed the tool would be effective for economic development. He indicated the City would continue to subscribe with Buxton in order to have access to the information on a continual basis.

Mayor Wood asked if representatives from Legend Hills were on board with the City’s efforts. Mr. Allen reported they were appreciative of the City’s efforts. A discussion took place on how staff should proceed specific to contracting for additional Economic Development efforts.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 12th day of November, 2013

/s/Don Wood, Mayor

ATTEST:

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Clearfield City Council meeting held Tuesday, October 8, 2013.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder