

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
March 21, 2017

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush Nike Peterson Vern Phipps Tim Roper Bruce Young	Councilmember Councilmember Councilmember Councilmember Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	JJ Allen Stuart Williams Spencer Brimley Greg Krusi Scott Hodge Summer Palmer Trevor Cahoon Nancy Dean	Assistant City Manager City Attorney Development Services Manager Police Chief Public Works Director Administrative Services Director Communications Coordinator City Recorder
EXCUSED:	Adam Lenhard	City Manager

VISITORS: Rebecca Reimann, Sonja Vargas

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

CITY COUNCIL NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE AT ANTELOPE ELEMENTARY
LOCATED AT 1810 SOUTH MAIN

Mayor Shepherd, the City Council, and staff welcomed residents to the open house highlighting different City services. Residents were provided with information about the budget, economic development, planning and zoning, police department efforts, code enforcement, emergency preparedness, fire safety, utility and road projects and recreational opportunities. The open house adjourned at 7:30 p.m. Following the City Council Open House, the City Council met in the executive conference room located at the Clearfield City Building, 55 South State Street, to convene in a CDRA work session.

The portion of the meeting held at Antelope Elementary adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

The Council reconvened at City Hall, 55 South State Street, Clearfield, Utah, at 8:10 p.m.

Councilmember Peterson arrived at 8:10 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO CITY CODE TITLE 6 AND TITLE 11 REGARDING RESIDENTIAL FOWL REGULATIONS

Spencer Brimley, Development Services Manager, explained staff was directed to look at the possibility of amending the Clearfield City Code to allow chickens in residential areas throughout the City. He noted the City had last looked at permitting chickens in residential areas in 2009 but had not amended the ordinances to allow the use. He stated that allowing chickens in residential areas was best addressed in Title 11 of the City Code but could include amendments to Title 6 as well. He explained the Planning Commission addressed the issue during its March 1, 2017 meeting. He indicated staff originally proposed the ordinance allow up to five chickens but after receiving public comment, the Planning Commission recommended the ordinance allow up to six chickens on lots at least 6,500 square feet with some minimum requirements for the chicken coop and run. He informed the Council that Layton City charged a fee for a chicken license but the Planning Commission was not recommending a fee. He reported there had been no negative comments from the public on the issue.

Councilmember Peterson expressed concern about how the amendments to Title 11 of the City Code would affect Title 6. She continued she didn't want to see smaller lots with up to nine animals. She stated those types of uses did impact adjacent properties. She added there needed to be a balance between allowing residents to use their property how they wanted and protecting the rights of neighboring property owners.

Councilmember Phipps asked what was significant about allowing up to six chickens. Rebecca Reimann, resident, explained the number of hens tied to the production of eggs.

Councilmember Bush expressed his concerns about allowing chickens in residential zones. He stated his experience with chickens on a farm had not been positive due to the smell and noise. He suggested chickens were farm animals and intrusive to residential neighborhoods. He added it was important for the Council to consider the needs of all the residents of the City when making decisions that impacted the quality of life in neighborhoods. He expressed his opinion that the only reason there had not been any opposition voiced by residents was because they didn't know it was being considered. He believed the City would receive a lot of complaints about chickens if the use were allowed. Councilmember Peterson stated pets in general were a problem in residential areas. Councilmember Bush agreed the number of chickens, if allowed, should be tied to the household pet allowance.

Councilmember Young explained he had attended the Council meeting the last time the issue was addressed prior to being elected to sit on the Council and there were residents who were against allowing the use. He continued he had recently talked to some residents and there were those that were opposed to allowing chickens in residential areas. He expressed concern that allowing six chickens, a dog and a cat on small lots would be intrusive to adjacent properties. He expressed his opinion that chickens should be allowed but one chicken should be considered one animal unit in the ordinance.

Mayor Shepherd stated allowing up to six chickens did not bother him. He expressed his opinion that two dogs could be more disruptive than six chickens.

Mr. Brimley explained the residents wishing to have chickens were looking at the animals for production of a product that would benefit their families. He suggested it might be inconsistent to say one chicken was one animal unit because dogs and cats didn't produce a product.

Councilmember Young indicated the intent of regulating the number of animals was to reduce the impact to adjacent properties. Councilmember Phipps commented there were chickens near his home and he had not noticed a negative impact.

Councilmember Roper asked if residents with existing chickens would be required to notify the City under the new ordinance. Mr. Brimley responded they would be required to come to the City and submit the proper paperwork for the use to be permitted. Mayor Shepherd asked if a license would be required. Mr. Brimley explained the Planning Commission had not recommended a license or fee rather an approval that would be documented in a file.

Mayor Shepherd shared some of the regulations Bountiful City had for allowing chickens. There was a discussion about distance between coops and adjacent properties, sizes of coops and runs, and other restrictions that might be used to reduce impacts to adjacent properties.

Councilmember Bush asked if the ordinance allowing the use would be regulated by Animal Control or Code Enforcement. Mr. Brimley replied enforcement would be handled collaboratively between the two. Chief Krusi explained Animal Control would address regulations about the animals while code enforcement would address the other regulations.

There was a discussion about other cities' regulations for the keeping of chickens and how well those regulations appeared to be working. Mayor Shepherd suggested mirroring most of the Bountiful regulations. There was a consensus that Bountiful's regulations covered many of the Council's concerns.

Councilmember Young stated he was not against allowing chickens but rather controlling the number allowed to reduce the impact to adjacent properties.

Councilmember Peterson commented other types of pet owners were required to pay a fee and obtain a license for their animals. Councilmember Young stated dogs were required to be licensed but cats were not. Mr. Brimley explained the intent of the regulation was to get residents to want to be compliant so the Planning Commission was recommending against a fee associated with the license. Councilmember Bush suggested a fee was necessary. Councilmember Young suggested the enforcement was usually paid by those violating the regulations. Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion the fee should be one time only.

Councilmember Bush referred back to regulating the number of chickens. He suggested two chickens equal one household pet allowance. Brady Jugler, Planning Commission Chair, commented chickens were used for production so it might not be fair to compare them to other residential animals. Councilmember Young commented he viewed the number of chickens based on the burden it created in the neighborhood. After a discussion on how to address the number of chickens allowed, there was consensus from the Council to consider two chickens as one household pet allowance.

DISCUSSION ON THE GENERAL PLAN COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE

Spencer Brimley, Development Services Manager, explained the Council approved the Downtown Small Area Plan last fall. He stated the intent was to now incorporate that plan into the City's General Plan while making a few other amendments. He reviewed the proposed amendments with the Council. He noted the proposed changes included language about potentially increasing density in the R-2 and R-3 residential zones in an effort to move development away from three-story, garden-style apartments.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Acknowledgements Page:

- Staffing changes have been identified and will be updated to reflect current positions for Elected and Appointed Officials and City Staff.
- Council appointments and replacements
- Commission changes and new appointments
- Staff Changes, including reorganizations

Table of Contents

- Inclusion of Exhibit 4 for the Downtown Small Area Plan of Clearfield City

Chapter 1 - Introduction

- Minor changes to language of the General Plan have been made, nothing in this section has been changed substantially. Reorganization has taken place along with some minor wording changes.

Chapter 2 – Land Use

Table for current land use in the City has been updated with acreage and percentage for each land use

- Land Use by Type
- Land use by zoning category
- Overlay zones will be moved to the end of the section as “Cancelled Zones”
- Minor language updates to Agricultural and Residential districts
- Proposed changes to increasing density in R-2 and R-3 zones
- Inclusion of the MIDA or “Falcon Hill” District
- Land use guideline language was reviewed with minor changes
- Changes to Goals and Policies for Land Use Element
- Remove references to HAFB “zone”

Chapter 3 – Transportation

- Goals and Policies of the Transportation Element
- Goal 2 for the completion of SR193 to be removed – Completed.
- Including language for truck routes and reducing impacts of trucks not intended for such heavy traffic.

Chapter 4 – Affordable Housing Element

- Update to language discussion on affordable housing.
- Update statistics from analysis for impediments for 2010 – 2014

Exhibit 1: Future Land Use Map of the General Plan

- Consideration for areas in the City to have land use designation changes:
 - Changes to the map consistent with recommendations and plans included in the Downtown Small Area Plan.
 - Mixed Use – 1700 S and 1000 E
 - Property directly west of CAFC land use change
 - Clearfield Station changes to be made, consistent with new plans for site.

Exhibit 2: Transportation Map of the General Plan

- 300 North designated as a truck route
- Update map for other road projects that had been completed
- Incorporate changes from Downtown Small Area plan for connections
- Road completed for University Ridge Subdivision to be indicated

Exhibit 3: Trails Master Map of the General Plan

- Canal trail be realigned to the canal right-of-way, rather than meandering through the neighborhoods.
- Incorporate changes from Downtown Small Area plan for connections

Add Exhibit 4: Downtown Small Area Plan

Councilmember Bush expressed his opinion that the City might want to see different densities allowed in different areas rather than by zone. Mr. Brimley agreed and explained those recommendations would be part of the City's efforts as it began its work to draft small area plans for other geographic locations.

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, referred to the Future Land Use map and directed the Council to the property at the corner of 1000 East and 1700 South. He asked what type of future use the Council preferred for that parcel. There was a discussion about possible future uses for that property. The Council did not feel like the future plan for the parcel needed to change with the proposed amendments.

Mr. Brimley informed the Council that the amendments would be on the March 28, 2017, policy session agenda for consideration.

DISCUSSION ON A RECREATION ACTION PLAN

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, explained the value and power of recreation. He emphasized the City wanted to continue to provide high quality recreation programs in spite of the recent obstacles the division had been facing. He informed the members of the Council that they should have received a copy of the new Recreation Action Plan earlier in the day. He

expressed his desire to restore the reputation of the programs to the heights they had known in the past through the plan.

He introduced the slogan adopted as part of the Plan and defined each term.

RISE UP: Respect
 Inclusion
 Skill-building
 Excellence
 Unity
 Professionalism

Mr. Howes reported implementation would include training in every staff meeting. He continued the slogan would be printed on staff shirts, posted on signs at all sites, included on all recreation division advertisements, introduced at every parents and coaches meeting, and included in the parents and coaches code of conduct.

Mr. Howes reviewed the timeline associated with implementing the new plan. He indicated the timing was good to implement the program quickly because the next program to start would be in three weeks – tiny tot soccer. He committed to attend every parents and coaches meeting to communicate the plan and its various elements. He stated staff expected parents to hold each other accountable, as well as the staff and coaches.

Mr. Howes reviewed the Program Cycle for recreation programs. He stated every recreation program, class, or activity had a written program which included: program title, general mission and programming philosophy, need for the program, designed goals of the program, operational details, program evaluation plan, and the disposition decision plan. He also reviewed the Cost Recovery Model for the programs.

Councilmember Bush asked that the Code of Ethics include references to the use of strong language. Mr. Howes responded that was only slightly addressed and he would revise it to make it more clear. Councilmember Bush asked that referees be trained to explain the rules and how the calls were associated to those rules. He also wanted the referees to take the time to explain violations. Mr. Howes stated that could be addressed by the coaches. The Council wanted referees to be trained to teach that concept as well.

Councilmember Peterson stated the Code of Conduct did not identify the consequences for violations. Mr. Howes responded that would be a good addition to the plan and he would add it. He suggested the City might want to develop and pattern a program similar to Lehi City's program.

Councilmember Phipps suggested including some language about how coaches needed to build respectful relationships with parents. Mr. Howes stated that topic was discussed in parents and coaches meetings. Councilmember Phipps suggested it might be emphasized more strongly. He commended Mr. Howes for his work and passion for recreation. Councilmember Bush also commended Mr. Howes. Mayor Shepherd thanked Mr. Howes for his good work.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 25th day of April, 2017

/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 21, 2017.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder