Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED REZONE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 880 SOUTH STATE STREET FROM COMMERCIAL (C-2) TO MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3)

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, stated the Council needed to have a discussion about the specific property at 880 South State Street; however, he anticipated philosophical discussion about land use along the corridor of State Street. He reminded the Council how the City had participated with Davis Behavioral Health in demolishing the homes on the property located at 880 South State in an effort to make the property more marketable. He stated the property owner had made a similar request to rezone the property two years ago and it was denied. Mr. Allen recalled the reason was to obtain a plan for the development of surrounding areas before considering development of that specific property. He indicated the City commenced the process for the Downtown Small Area Plan and had a market analysis completed to determine what development would be feasible and realistic. There was a discussion about the market study,
retail meltdown, e-commerce, growing economy, rising trends and growth of the City over the past several years.

Mr. Allen redirected attention to the Downtown Small Area Plan (SAP) which used economic data as the means of creating the plan in addition to public surveys, open houses, workshops, interviews, etc. He stated once the process was completed, the Council approved the Downtown Small Area Plan and incorporated it into the General Plan. He indicated the SAP identified various place types which included “Town Residential,” which allowed commercial uses but also established a range of uses and encouraged a mix of housing options. Mr. Allen continued the property proposed for rezone was a mid-block location and could be considered town residential. Mr. Allen explained Lotus Clearfield Townhomes was a proposal similar to one denied by the Council prior to having the SAP completed. He described the front building as a three story and rear buildings designed as two story townhomes. He added the applicant for the rezone was unable to attend the meeting; however, expressed a desire to receive feedback from the Council regarding the proposed rezone. There was a discussion about the potential development along the State Street corridor.

Councilmember Bush asked if the Lotus Clearfield Townhomes would be a for sale product. Mr. Allen responded the intent was to develop a for sale townhome. Councilmember Bush expressed concern about having only a residential use on the three acres of property, especially when other multi-family sites developed throughout the City had been required to develop commercial uses in addition to residential uses.

Mayor Shepherd stated the SAP included the idea of having commercial properties at and near the intersections. He mentioned State Street was now a thoroughfare and the property at 880 South State was a strange piece of property because there was no other retail around it. He noted it would be difficult to get retail on the piece because it was mid-block and without other draws to bring the desired commercial uses which usually developed closely together in the same blocks.

Councilmember Phipps stated the SAP, which included the State Street corridor, was intended to encourage both commercial and residential uses. He acknowledged that residential and commercial might not develop together. He expressed his opinion that the amenities seemed to be the draw for people to reside and stay in a given area. He added when the City turned down residential development it was with the hope that the development of the downtown area would include entertainment, restaurants, or other amenities for its residents, which seemed to be thriving in the current economy. He expressed concern that the City had not yet developed a place where people would want to set up roots. He continued it would be wise to have development in the City that would enhance a draw for livability.

Councilmember Young stated the property at 880 South State was located in an area between key locations identified as “pearls” in the SAP. He recalled the real focus for the SAP was development surrounding Mabey Pond. He expressed his opinion that having residential was not necessarily a concern for that particular property. He added the biggest issue was that the City had a plan for the corridor. He suggested the City’s main areas of focus for development should be with Mabey Place and Clearfield Station.
Councilmember Bush asked if there were any design standards in place when the SAP was created. Mr. Brimley responded when the SAP was created it gave broad descriptions of place creations. He continued form-based code would give it more detail and direction for the design standards. He noted the SAP was intended to be the framework to help identify what types of development were desired for the downtown area.

Councilmember Bush expressed concern with allowing just residential development on that particular property. He also acknowledged the property did not lend itself to retail development. He suggested the developer needed to provide some type of amenity to the City if it allowed that property to be developed for a residential use. He suggested a park might be a way to help meet open space requirements for the property as well as provide such an amenity. He continued the developer might be willing to reconfigure the design to combine the open space required into a park that could be developed and donated to the City in exchange for allowing greater density for the property.

Councilmember Peterson stated she was not opposed to housing at the location of 880 South State; however, she had concerns with timing and development prior to having a form-based code in place. She expressed her opinion the overall plan and design standard guidelines were necessary before development occurred. Councilmember Peterson suggested any development would need to age well and design standards would help by offering consistency along the corridor. She noted the entire area would likely not be developed all at once so a form-based code would help insure one project was not aged out prior to further development. She recognized the City was starting to infill and she expressed concern the City would lose congruency if it allowed development prior to having a form-based code.

Mr. Allen stated once a form-based code was approved it would replace, at least for the corridor, traditional zoning. He noted the Council would not have control over land use but rather input only to the form of the development. There was a discussion about form-based code and developing guidelines that could help govern development that would blend and age well.

Councilmember Young stated the SAP indicated what the City should do with the area. He continued if residential was allowed then it should fit within a form-based code and the definition of what that piece was intended to become. He expressed his opinion that it may be too early to have a form-based code until the City had a larger developer to come with an anchor development which would help define the image of the area. Councilmember Peterson disagreed and felt it should be a policy decision and the City should define what a given area should look like rather than the developer. There was a discussion about whether or not a residential development was desired near the Aquatic Center along the City’s corridor prior to establishing a form-based code.

Councilmember Roper recalled the reason the Council had not previously approved residential for the area of 880 South State Street was because of all the residential development proposed for Clearfield Station. He stated he was just not sure if a residential development was optimal for that property. Councilmember Phipps agreed and commented the City should look for a development on that particular property that would capitalize on the City’s jewel across the street, the Clearfield Fitness and Aquatic Center. Councilmember Roper suggested perception
was everything and residents were noticing and complaining that the only development currently being pursued in the City was multi-family residential uses.

There was a discussion about the development within the downtown area and how to insure the City’s desired quality. Councilmember Peterson suggested having an area plan along with design standards and then holding to them would allow for the desired development. Councilmember Young acknowledged there would still be some risk but the City needed to finish its part by developing a form-based code.

The consensus of the Council was to finish the process of developing a form-based code which would offer a framework for future development. Mayor Shepherd asked how long it would be before the form-based code process was completed. Mr. Allen stated the process to finalize the form-based code would take approximately a year.

**DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE 700 SOUTH 1000 WEST INTERSECTION PROJECT**

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, stated staff solicited bids for the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of 700 South and 1000 West and to reconstruct a portion of 700 South. He indicated the reconstruction would upgrade the culinary water and storm drain pipelines in 700 South from 1000 West to 1500 West, as well as work on an irrigation ditch. Mr. Hodge noted the budgeted amount for the project was $1,200,000. He added only one bid was received from Staker Parson Companies with a bid amount of $1,644,022.15. He expressed his opinion contractors were busy with other projects limiting those willing to bid on the City’s project. Mr. Hodge expressed the need to begin promptly if the project was to be completed prior to the end of the construction season. He also indicated the City could choose to delay the project and rebid later in the year which might produce more competitive bidding, but there were no guarantees the bids would be lower. He mentioned the piping costs in the bid were priced considerably higher than bids received earlier in the year.

Councilmember Phipps asked if it was critical the project be completed before winter. Mr. Hodge replied it was not; however, the neighborhood had been anxious for the work to be completed. There was a discussion about urgency versus cost. The consensus of the Council was to delay the project and rebid it later in the year to perhaps allow for a more competitive bid that might better meet the City’s budget for the project.

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

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED**
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