CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
January 24, 2017

PRESIDING: Mark Shepherd Mayor

PRESENT: Kent Bush Councilmember
Nike Peterson Councilmember
Vern Phipps Councilmember
Tim Roper Councilmember
Bruce Young Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT: Adam Lenhard City Manager
JJ Allen Assistant City Manager
Stuart Williams City Attorney
Scott Hodge Public Works Director
Spencer Brimley Development Services Manager
Greg Krusi Police Chief
Eric Howes Community Services Director
Summer Palmer Administrative Services Director
Rich Knapp Finance Manager
Trevor Cahoon Communications Coordinator
Nancy Dean City Recorder
Kim Read Deputy City Recorder

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: Brady Jugler, Michael Millard, Ron Jones, Mallory Baudry, Chris Uccardi, Robert Browning, Steve Parkinson, Michael Britton


Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

INTERVIEW PLANNING COMMISSION CANDIDATES

The Council interviewed the following candidates to be considered for the vacancy on the Planning Commission: Jeff Baker, Sherrie Reynolds, Stuart Jones, Joshua Squire, Alan Thompson, David Tomczak, Karece Thompson and David Greaves.

DISCUSSION ON PLANNING COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

The Council discussed the candidates following interviews and considered each for the vacancy. Mayor Shepherd expressed his desired to appoint Steve Parkinson, currently an alternate member, to fill the regular member vacancy created by Tim Roper’s appointment to the City
Council. He stated he also wanted to reappoint Robert Browning. The Council agreed with appointing Karece Thompson as an alternate member to the Planning Commission.

A discussion took place regarding other committees or projects where some of the candidates could be used.

Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in a City Council policy session at 6:58 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Young. All voting AYE.

The work session reconvened at 8:23 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON GATEWAY SIGNAGE

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, reviewed the status of the gateway signage project with the Council. He emphasized the main priority during the design process was the potential changes proposed for the 650 North and 700 South freeway interchanges. He continued the base of the signs had been redesigned should they need to be moved during construction of the interchanges. He shared a visual illustration regarding the proposed signs and shared specifics with the Council. He announced the total cost for the two signs was approximately $93,000, including the construction costs and site preparation, and stated it was within budget. He stated he was hopeful the signs would be in place within the next 3 to 4 months and stated if the Council agreed with the changes to the project, he would move forward with the installation. There were no objections from the Council.

Councilmember Young moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in a joint work session with the Planning Commission at 8:30 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. All voting AYE.

DISCUSSION AND UPDATE FOR THE PROJECT KNOWN AS CLEARFIELD STATION

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, reviewed the history associated with the Clearfield Station project and shared a visual presentation pointing out the following:

- UTA & Thackeray Garn entered into an agreement for the development of the 70-acre site in January 2012.
- Thackeray Garn provided an initial concept plan in June of 2012.
- The Mixed-Use Zone, Master Development Plan (MDP) and Master Development Agreement (MDA) were approved in the spring of 2014.
- Site Plan and other necessary approvals occurred in the spring of 2015 with the City expecting groundbreaking that summer.
- HUD financing for the housing portion of the development took Thackeray Garn two years to secure and were not received until late 2016.
- Some approvals had expired and the agreements were never executed and relationships between all the parties were strained.

Mr. Allen informed the Council that a large, light manufacturing company had expressed interest in developing on the UTA site. He also indicated Thackeray Garn had expressed a willingness to
release its interest in a majority of the site to make way for the manufacturer in exchange for approvals to develop the previously approved Phase 1B, a residential phase with 216 multi-family units. He indicated the large, light manufacturer interested in the site would need 15 to 20 acres for the first phase of its development with additional phases would take the final development to 50 acres. He stated the manufacturer wanted to be under construction on the site by May 2017.

Mr. Allen explained the first steps to changing the development plans for the site was the termination of an existing agreement between Thackeray Garn and UTA, then Thackeray Garn would need to close on its HUD financing by March 27, 2017, which would assist in funding the residential portion of the development (building permit required by HUD in order to close). He also indicated the City would need to grant an extension on the previous plat approval by its Planning Commission, reapprove the Site Plan and approve a zoning change for the 10-acre portion being developed residentially. He emphasized all subsequent steps hinged on the first one and a discussion followed. Scott Hess, Planning Consultant, explained how the proposed process would be specific and beneficial to this project only. The discussion continued and Mr. Allen suggested the negotiations were a path forward to recognize progress at the site and believed the housing would be the same project as previously proposed and shared a visual illustration.

Councilmember Young asked about the road configuration and proposed changes for the future intersection at 1000 East and State Street. Mr. Allen responded Thackeray Garn would be working with the Legislature during its current session to secure funding for the offsite improvements. He also indicated Thackeray Garn, UTA and/or the manufacturer would ultimately be responsible for their share of the costs to complete all the improvements.

Mr. Allen stated the City was waiting for the manufacturer’s official decision regarding the site and would work quickly to accommodate the manufacturer’s needs and timeline. He added the exact transaction for property acquisition still needed to be worked out, as well as, rail access because the manufacturer would need to use UTA’s rail for operations.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the City was confident it could provide the necessary infrastructure associated with the development of the property, such as water, sewer and storm drain. Mr. Allen expressed his opinion the demand on the resources would not be any higher than the previous development proposal. He emphasized the City was committed to providing what was necessary in a timely manner.

Mr. Allen stated the City currently had a Community Development Area (CDA) in place that would provide a tax increment incentive for the development. He reported the first tranche for the CDA was required to trigger by March 2017 but that deadline would not be met so there would need to be amendments to the interlocal agreements previously negotiated with the other taxing entities. He expressed his opinion there should be enough support among the taxing entities to accomplish the amendments. He also indicated the City would have Tax Increment Participation agreements with both Thackeray Garn and the manufacturer. He stated Thackeray Garn’s participation would be limited to no more than it was actually spending on public improvements while the manufacturer’s incentive would be tied to job creation and the
incentives being brought to the community. He emphasized the intent of the City’s efforts was to recognize the timely development of the property.

There was a discussion about the possible pitfalls for the City should the development not happen. Paul, Drake, UTA representative, stated UTA’s present interest was to work with the City to develop the property around the station in such a way the both the City and UTA would benefit.

Councilmember Peterson stated she still had reservations but believed it was time for the City to be bold. She continued there was a lot of potential for the proposed changes to be a good thing for the City. She expressed her opinion the proposal was the best plan she had seen so far on how to move forward with the development of that particular property. Mr. Allen agreed. He stated the project had been in a stalemate and the proposal was a way forward.

There was a discussion about how the rewards appeared to outweigh the risks for the development of the property. Councilmember Phipps commented there were only a few options but this particular option appeared to be the best way to get that property developed.

Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn the joint work session and reconvene in a CDRA Council work session at 9:29 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. All voting AYE.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 28th day of February, 2017

ATTEST:

/s/Mark R. Shepherd, Mayor

/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, January 24, 2017.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder