

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
March 24, 2015

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Keri Benson	Councilmember
	Kent Bush	Councilmember
	Ron Jones	Councilmember
	Mike LeBaron	Councilmember
	Bruce Young	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	Adam Lenhard	City Manager
	JJ Allen	Assistant City Manager
	Brian Brower	City Attorney
	Kelly Bennett	Police Lieutenant
	Scott Hodge	Public Works Director
	Scott Hess	Development Services Manager
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Rich Knapp	Administrative Services Director
	Terrence Jackson	IT Manager
	Lee Naylor	Accountant
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
	Kim Read	Deputy City Recorder

VISITORS: Brian McKenzie – Davis County Elections, Curtis Koch – Davis County Clerk, Nike Peterson – Planning Commission

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE 2015 MUNICIPAL ELECTION

Nancy Dean, City Recorder, introduced Brian McKenzie, Davis County Elections, to the Council and he shared a visual presentation explaining the process of a vote by mail election.

Mr. McKenzie reminded the Council that the County’s 2014 election had been conducted by mail and reported it had been very successful. He added the by mail election had increased voter engagement by allowing the voter to obtain more information about candidates or issues on the ballot. He indicated his office received numerous phone calls and commented it was a great opportunity to engage and respond to questions by the voters. He reported the election had a great response which reflected a tremendous turnout and stated County elections in even numbered years would be conducted by mail in the future. He stated the one drawback to conducting a by mail election was the increased cost for the election to the cities and suggested the Council consider whether the by mail election would be worth the investment.

Ms. Dean requested Mr. McKenzie speak to the signature verification process used when voted ballots were received at the County offices and Mr. McKenzie explained the process to the Council.

Councilmember Benson asked when the voted ballots were counted. Mr. McKenzie responded the voted ballots were counted as soon as they were received at the Clerk's office; however, nothing was tabulated until election night.

Councilmember Bush pointed out the significant number of residents waiting in line to vote at the Davis County Library on Election Day in November 2014. Mr. McKenzie responded the voting center experienced a much higher turnout than was anticipated and reported the County intended to have more vote centers open on Election Day for future elections. He stated if the City chose to conduct a by mail election it was not necessary to have a designated voting center although the County highly recommended it in order to accommodate voters desiring to participate in the "voting process". He announced it would be his recommendation that City Hall be the designated voting center if it was determined to proceed with a by mail election. Ms. Dean stated that would also be her recommendation.

Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion the by mail election would result in a higher turnout. Councilmember LeBaron agreed with Mayor Shepherd's comment and believed it would be worth the extra cost.

Councilmember Bush pointed out the challenges associated with campaigning because once the ballots had been mailed the candidates would have no idea which voters had completed and returned their ballots. Mr. McKenzie responded his office could provide daily updates to candidates reflecting which ballots had been returned thus allowing the candidates to continue campaigning to or target those who had not submitted a ballot. He stated the candidate would pay a subscription fee and receive an email every night with the information.

Curtis Koch, Davis County Clerk, explained the County had learned a lot from the last election being conducted by mail and stated one of the issues which would be taken to the Legislature would be tightening the time frame in which ballots had to be mailed out from 28 days to 14 days which would help with campaigning.

A discussion took place relating to the following and Mr. McKenzie responded to each item:

- Verification of signatures
- Write-in candidates
- Secrecy/Privacy of the vote
- Duplication of ballot
- Same day voter registration pilot program

Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Koch left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Ms. Dean reviewed other specifics relating to a by mail election:

- The City wouldn't need to provide early voting.

- The City could combine some public notices recognizing a small decrease in those costs.
- The proposed increase in cost would be approximately \$3,000 each election.
- Links on the City's website to the Lt. Governor's website would allow the candidates to submit email addresses and contact information to voters.
- Participation in the same day voter registration pilot program.

The Council directed Ms. Dean to proceed with a vote by mail election.

DISCUSSION ON FUTURE LAND USE STRATEGIES

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, explained staff was interested in Council's direction and feedback regarding future land use strategies and stated Nike Peterson, Planning Commission Chair, had been invited to be part of the discussion. He stated recent interest regarding development within the City was higher than at any time within the past several years. He continued staff was seeing a number of land use applications or developers expressing an interest to visit with the Council regarding multi-family or higher density projects. He stated staff desired a specific direction from the Council and cautioned the Council to discuss the issue in general terms not specific to a particular parcel of property or project. He wanted to know what the Council envisioned as the future for Clearfield City. He shared a visual presentation which provided the Council with the following:

- Planning Commission and City Council approved an amendment to the General Plan in 2014 which removed all restrictions on multi-family housing allowing the City to consider each project on its own merit.
- The General Plan had two land use categories which allowed for residential zoning - mixed use and residential.
- He shared statistics related to residential occupancy from 2011.
- Provided statistics related to lot supply.
- Reviewed redevelopment sites.
- Provided population statistics.

Mr. Lenhard asked the Council to consider the following questions:

- Is there a place for additional multi-family housing within the City?
- If so – where?
- Are there places in which the Council would prohibit multi-family housing?

A discussion took place regarding future growth responding to the above questions.

Councilmember Young suggested the redevelopment should result in an improvement to the properties and whether the rooftops would support commercial growth. Councilmember LeBaron stated he wouldn't be in support of stand-alone multi-family development along the Main/State Street corridor. He emphasized the importance of commercial/retail on the ground level with housing above and it being constructed simultaneously. He recognized that bringing additional retail to the area would dilute other retail in the area but by allowing continued residential development would also bring more users of the retail opportunities. Mayor Shepherd stated developers argued that some areas were nearly impossible to develop as a mixed use particularly middle of the block parcels. Councilmember LeBaron commented the middle of the block scenario could change as streets change and other development occurred around it. He disagreed

with the philosophy of allowing development of any kind just because it was proposed. He expressed his opinion

Mayor Shepherd reported apartment growth was increasing at ever-increasing rates statewide and the trend was being recognized in several communities.

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, suggested the Council consider whether quality was a significant factor. Councilmember Bush responded quality was more important than quantity. Mr. Allen asked how the Council would respond if a developer proposed a class A, purely residential project for a designated redevelopment site on the State/Main Street corridor with no commercial whatsoever. Councilmember LeBaron responded he wouldn't be in favor of the project. Councilmember Young stated it would depend; he pointed out how initially the development could be quality but that development would still be there in 30 years and would the quality still be there at that time. Councilmember LeBaron expressed concern about building a bedroom community to shop elsewhere.

Mr. Lenhard pointed out the City currently had a significant amount of vacant commercial properties along the State/Main Street corridor. He stated the City needed to consider if requiring additional commercial development in conjunction with residential development might weaken the ability for developers to ever have a solid tenant.

Nike Peterson, Planning Commission Chair, believed the question should be what the City could do to encourage development of whole sections of the City rather than a giant corridor or one designated area. She continued it might be good to consider development on a mixed use level where the development was more controlled and involved large scale areas. She stated she was nervous about higher density residential developments but it appeared to be the trend. She explained the Planning Commission was demanding higher quality but there seemed to be a lot of push back from developers wanting the City to let up on its standards in order to decrease costs. She appreciated the City Council's support on holding to the demand for a quality product.

Councilmember LeBaron moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in a regular session at 7:00 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Benson. All voting AYE.

The City Council work session reconvened at 8:00 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON FUTURE LAND USE STRATEGIES CONTINUED

Mr. Lenhard requested the Council provide guidance to staff which could be considered or conveyed when meeting with developers regarding future development projects.

Mayor Shepherd asked the Council what the sufficient balance would be in requiring a certain amount of commercial/retail development in conjunction with residential development. Councilmember Jones inquired if the City could require a certain designated percentage as it would probably be project specific. Scott Hess, Development Services Manager, responded the Commercial Residential (C-R) Zone had a twenty percent requirement for the total floor area of the project to be commercial development. He added the Downtown Redevelopment (D-R)

Zone, didn't have that same provision and it had also been amended eliminating the provision for determining a specific percentage of a commercial component which would now be negotiated through a development agreement.

Councilmember Bush liked the idea of a certain percentage but believed considering those types of development on a case by case basis was more realistic. Brian Brower, City Attorney, mentioned a rezone request for property was always discretionary on behalf of the City Council. Mr. Lenhard mentioned several of the zones within the City allowed mixed uses with certain levels of flexibility.

Councilmember LeBaron mentioned he appreciated Chair Peterson's comments which spoke to specific parcels and how it could be developed into a walkable urban area within the next 40 years and what was needed to accomplish that result. He believed there were possibly portions of Main Street which would need a residential component in order for the development to look attractive to retail development and suggested they could be located within the middle of blocks while the outer parcels could be reserved for commercial development at a later time.

Mr. Lenhard summarized the Council believed there was a place for multi-family housing and its location along major transportation corridors would be very important as well as some commercial component. Councilmember LeBaron expressed his opinion that a high quality project might get some consideration if a broader area were looked at for additional retail development. Mr. Lenhard stated staff would convey to developers that the Council would be expecting a high quality, aesthetically pleasing product to get positive consideration. Mr. Allen clarified the Council might be willing to consider purely residential projects which were separated from major intersections in order to build up the critical mass which could support commercial development at intersections. Councilmember LeBaron agreed provided the development happened as Mr. Lenhard just mentioned and staff clarified how the area would need to look with respect to other commercial development in the area. Councilmember Young suggested the City should not be in a rush to approve additional multi-family housing without first witnessing the impact of projects already approved but not yet completed.

Mayor Shepherd pointed out the delays associated with the development at the rail stop and cautioned the Council about those types of development. He informed the Council about Layton City's Frontrunner station which had the retail/commercial component on the ground level with multi-family housing above and announced even after one year the commercial component was still vacant.

Mr. Allen mentioned the Riverwoods project in Provo and mentioned that development took quite a long time before its success was recognized. He expressed his opinion it would be difficult for something like that to be successful along the Main/State Street corridor.

Councilmember Jones inquired if City services could support an additional 1500 apartments in regards to police, fire, schools, etc. Mayor Shepherd responded the housing was concentrated; therefore it shouldn't be an additional burden.

Mr. Lenhard announced the City had a process in place for developers desiring to present projects to the City. He informed the Council that staff would be instructing developers to follow the process through the Planning Commission allowing the Land Use Authority to make a recommendation to the Council.

DISCUSSION ON THE 2015/2016 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, announced staff was prepared to discuss revenues, capital projects and equipment for the budget process.

Rich Knapp, Administrative Services Director, explained the entire breakdown of revenues would be included in the tentative budget and stated the his presentation was a summary. He reviewed historical revenues relative to all funds with the Council. He indicated the most significant change was specific to tax revenue. Mr. Lenhard commented the City anticipated an increase in property values by the Davis County Assessor and recommended the City hold to the assessed .0018 tax rate. Mr. Knapp mentioned the other change was specific to the intergovernmental revenue and its relation to the E911 revenues. Mr. Knapp reviewed the other revenues with the Council and announced all business had received notification to begin collecting the PARAT (Parks, Arts, Recreation, Aquatics and Trails) Tax.

Mr. Knapp informed the Council that the miscellaneous revenue increase was due to the anticipated earnings the City could potentially recognize by using a third party for its invested funds as opposed to using the State Treasury. He announced staff was being conservative regarding its revenue projections.

Mr. Lenhard reminded the Council that in the past staff had been conservative in compiling its budgets and expressed his opinion this was probably the end of the year end surpluses. He noted staff would be targeting a twenty percent fund balance reserve. He believed that number would still be a healthy figure.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the following with the Council:

- top revenue sources for the City
- property tax revenues received by the City
- Aquatic Center revenues
- Court Fines
- Water charges/high water users
- Pass through for the North Davis Sewer District (NDS).

Mr. Lenhard distributed the capital projects handout to the Council and identified the projects which had been funded in the budget figures. He discussed the following:

- Steed Park irrigation and electrical upgrades
- Phase I of the holiday lighting
- Ann Street street light
- Mabey Pond
- Canal Trail
- Design Study for Public Works Shop Facility

- Arts Center
- 700 South improvements.

Councilmember Jones moved to adjourn as the City Council and reconvene as the CDRA in a work session at 8:50 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Benson. All voting AYE.

The minutes for the CDRA are in a separate location

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 28th day of April, 2015**

/s/Mark R. Shepherd, 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, March 24, 2015.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder