

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
August 21, 2018

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush	Councilmember
	Nike Peterson	Councilmember
	Vern Phipps	Councilmember
	Tim Roper	Councilmember
	Karece Thompson	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	JJ Allen	City Manager
	Summer Palmer	Assistant City Manager
	Stuart Williams	City Attorney
	Scott Hodge	Public Works Director
	Greg Krusi	Police Chief
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Spencer Brimley	Community Development Director
	Brad McIlrath	Senior Planner
	Rich Knapp	Finance Manager
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
	Wendy Page	Deputy Recorder

VISITORS: Adam Hughes – Better City, Jared Hadley, Brady Jugler – Planning Commission Chair, Katherine Morrell – Economic Development Corporation of Utah (EDCUtah), Ruth Jones

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE CLEARFIELD STATION AREA PLAN

Mayor Shepherd stated he was committed to coming up with a better plan for the Clearfield Station Area than was presented by IBI Group during work session on July 31, 2018. He mentioned the challenge for the City was Utah Transit Authority (UTA) owned the land; however, was working jointly with the City for the creation of its Station Area Plan. He encouraged the Council to help with the creation of a proposed concept which could be presented to UTA with components that fit the needs of its shareholders.

Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, welcomed the Council, public, and Adam Hughes of Better City and Katherine Morrell from EDCUtah. He recognized the expertise and experience of the IBI Group; however, mentioned there was a community aspect to the planning as well which had not been recognized. He explained the discussion was intended to allow additional idea exploration and time for creation of a concept plan that would balance the City's objectives and the property owner's objectives.

Mr. Brimley noted staff, along with Mayor Shepherd, met last week with Benj Becker of Zions Public Finance, who was a sub-consultant for the IBI Group on the development of the Station Area Plan. He reported Mr. Becker had provided the City with some of the economic analysis that was completed regarding the site. He reviewed the charrette parameters including the need to base the site's design on reality, balanced goals and objectives of its stakeholders, form and function rather than density and use, ridership aspects, appropriate community uses, road connectivity, pedestrian and bike networks, recreational uses, and also the consideration of the 216 housing units already under construction on the site.

Mr. Hughes asked if there were any uses which were not being considered. Mr. Brimley indicated the draft plan presented commercial, retail, multi-family, townhomes, and recreation. JJ Allen, City Manager, suggested UTA may feel that industrial uses would not match its need for ridership and was better suited for other areas of the City.

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, stated staff met with Benj Becker to discuss concerns with the drafted plans presented to the City Council and Planning Commission and wanted to find out what worked financially for the site. He reviewed feasibility data which included types of uses, value per square foot, construction costs, the spread, and feasibility for development. He commented either prime office or retail uses would be feasible; however, secondary office or retail uses would not be feasible unless it was incentivized. He acknowledged multi-family was driving the development market because it was more feasible and had less risk. Mayor Shepherd mentioned that trend would continue because additional housing options were currently needed in order to keep up with the future increased population projections. He noted the current housing market was struggling statewide to keep up with the demand for affordable housing as well.

Mr. McIlrath continued Mr. Becker pointed out there was a lack of class A or higher office space in Davis County. Councilmember Bush asked whether the numbers for the development's feasibility came from national, state or local averages. Mayor Shepherd responded it was based on local numbers specific to the site. Councilmember Bush wondered if other components were added to the site would the feasibility for other uses increase. JJ Allen, City Manager, responded there were factors which could alter the synergy of the site so the spread became more beneficial to a developer. Mayor Shepherd commented the cost to develop would not change so the spread should remain the same; however, a developer could find other components of value and might consider the risk to be worth it. There was a discussion on those things which could impact development. Mr. Hughes reported Utah had few comparables for the site because there were only a few locations for Transit Oriented Development (TOD). He explained without comparables it made its economic analysis challenging.

Mr. McIlrath indicated the current administration in Washington DC was allowing cities to have areas referred to as "opportunity zones" which was a new program. He explained opportunity zones would be a resource to help promote economic development because investors would be afforded huge tax savings for specific periods of time. Mayor Shepherd stated not all cities met the qualifications for an opportunity zone; however, the City qualified for two. Mr. McIlrath reviewed the financial opportunities and impacts for the site as well as additional impacts to parking, employment, and population relative to the various uses.

Mr. Brimley highlighted the items staff gleaned from the meeting with Mr. Becker which could be considered when planning for the site's development.

- There were limited sites in Davis County that could support large-scale office development, outside of Farmington.
 - The Clearfield site was the only one positioned around a Frontrunner Station.
 - The Clearfield site was in an Opportunity Zone.
- Other, smaller sites for office development had desirable visibility, median incomes, and retail support options.
 - Clearfield could incentivize through tax increment financing to be competitive.
 - Clearfield should promote its Opportunity Zone to attract office development.
 - UTA's participation in joint development was critical to any office success and viability.
- Retail conditions in Utah and adjustments due to online or delivery services were discussed.
- Davis County retailers wanted strong traffic counts, growing populations, healthy median incomes, daytime populations, and destination locations to draw customers.
- Top retailers were discussed and what each needed as well as the fiscal impacts for the City if those retailers were located at the site.
- Multi-family remained in high-demand due to solid market fundamentals.
- Population forecasts showed strong increases for Davis County over the next 20 to 30 years.

Mr. Brimley noted it was important to realize the City had the opportunity for creating something unique at the site which invited others to be a part of it. He recognized the original plans presented to the Council appeared to be lacking the community element. He explained the economic analysis was prepared as a broad overview which provided context and could be used for consideration while preparing the concept plans for the Clearfield Area Station.

Mr. Hughes wondered what the overlying timeline was for UTA to sell the property. Mayor Shepherd explained the current Board had no intention of selling the property; yet, it could change its course as the new board was restructured. He mentioned the current Board was set on partnering for its development; however, it was limited to participate in the development of eight TOD sites. He reported UTA was involved with five sites currently and only had three remaining; yet, Clearfield's site was not on the list as one of the top three other projects. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion it would be best if UTA sold the property because other ventures had previously not worked out favorably for the City. He continued if UTA were to partner in the site's development, then the City would need to present a plan that was amazing, feasible, and could happen quickly so it would consider adding it as one of the remaining three projects. He feared if the site's plan was not persuasive for partnership its progress could be held up for years which would be detrimental to the City.

The Mayor and City Council shared proposed design concepts and expressed concerns and desires for the site's development.

Mayor Shepherd indicated on Friday, August 17, 2018 he met with staff and Real Salt Lake (RSL) to discuss its sincerity about having an influence at the site by developing a soccer facility

for an RSL Academy. He reported the meeting went well and he shared potential ideas for further development opportunities which could be explored. He indicated the original plan for the site proposed a school as part of the development. He stated earlier in the day when meeting with the Davis County School District, representatives indicated their displeasure with Davis County for triggering the first tranch of the established Community Development Area (CDA) given the fact that only apartments were being developed. He explained that meant the District was sharing tax increment for housing alone which was strictly against its policy. He expressed his worry of not being able to have any future tax increment projects approved by the School District if the Clearfield Station Area project failed to provide economic incentives other than housing.

Mayor Shepherd reviewed the key elements to his design which consisted of a soccer facility with close proximity to the rail and visibility to the street on the south end, a school in the location originally planned, high density housing, office space, commercial space with frontage along State Street, townhomes, green space, a ropes course, a bike pump track, and retail in various locations. There was a discussion on RSL's location, potential uses, timing, and the catalyst opportunity it could be for the site's development.

Mayor Shepherd elaborated the original cap planned for housing of 550 apartments. He expressed his desire that the number not increase much more; yet, was not opposed to a higher number if it were the right mix of housing and other uses. He stated parking structures were also included in the design and thought pockets of micro homes may also be a good option for affordable housing in the area. There was a discussion about parking specific to UTA's parking requirement of a parking structure with 700 stalls, underground parking options, and it's funding.

Councilmember Peterson highlighted her design concept which had strategically placed the sports facility where it could be visible and accessible to the station's platform. She expressed appreciation for the review of the economic analysis during the meeting and felt it was a key element lacking from the presentation by the consultants during the work session on July 30, 2018. She noted the key elements included with her plan were townhomes, a school, the required parking structure, office space, a park, mixed use space for offices or condo units, a limited number of housing units within walkable distance from the train, mixed use space with retail on the ground floor and offices above it along State Street, and potential for property acquisition on the north end which would include purchasing another trailer park. She acknowledged her ideal housing cap would not go above the original 550 units without a compelling reason for an increase, but if housing units increased she would prefer to see it accommodated vertically rather than using more land. She reasoned surface parking was not a preferred use for the land and wondered if pedestal parking might be an option to conserve space for other purposes.

Councilmember Roper stated he had a difficult time envisioning the area's development because of the apartments which were already being constructed on the site. He acknowledged he was not opposed to increasing the number of multi-family housing units; however, he wanted to keep things in a balanced ratio. He shared the components of his plan with the Council which included recreation facilities, school, townhomes, office, and retail spaces. He indicated he liked having retail along the main corridor, but was concerned about the access to the site and traffic getting backed up to and from the area. He expressed his opinion that the housing perception needed to

change as the population continued to grow and it would not be such a bad thing to increase in density.

There was a discussion on housing for the site which included what the compelling reasons for it might be: the desire for higher quality units; its compatibility with the other uses; and, creating a place where it could be supported with infrastructure, retail, and business uses, so the City would not absorb expenditures for services without the offsets in revenues to sustain higher density. Councilmember Peterson said she would not mind having a conversation on density once the other key elements of the site were in place to support it.

Councilmember Phipps reviewed his concept which he had prepared with its stakeholders in mind. He mentioned he had been involved in the planning for the site for a long time and was excited to participate in a meeting where ideas could be shared to help build a community. He identified the stakeholders and recognized them as residents, land owners, commuters, and planners. He commented each would have a significant impact on the site's development and use. He felt it would be important to respect the internal community as well as Hill Air Force Base as uses were planned for the site. He expressed the City had an ethical obligation to the challenges for the School District especially since there was an increase in class sizes due to the apartments without the offset to revenues as was initially planned. He reported he had envisioned the site as a community of its own and felt transportation was an essential element. He reviewed other key elements which included a RSL facility which had proximity to a bike trail, road, and train; retail close to the soccer facility; office space with shared use to help with parking; retail and mixed use along the frontage road; residential use that allowed for great views, access to things, and nearby green space of its own; school; and townhomes which were somewhat isolated near the current residential neighbors.

Mr. Brimley identified three of the plans presented so far created a boulevard concept. Councilmember Phipps said since he was a commuter, he thought others might appreciate a way to exit the parking quickly so he made it a straight access rather than a roundabout.

Councilmember Bush noted his design would need to change after hearing the updated information about RSL. He commented his perspective as a previous planner helped him encompass many things into his plan. He felt it would be important to have good street connectivity with routes to all sides of the city. He acknowledged a connection to Depot Street would be critical for the site's development. He shared his design which included the key elements of a school near a detention basin that could have usable open space; a park plaza closer to State Street where it was visible; a convenience store and gas station; 500 to 550 housing units; retail bottom floor with mixed uses above it; and adequate parking for residents, retail, office, commuters, and visitors. He expressed his opinion he would rather have housing increase vertically than using more land and felt the footprint of residential use should be considered rather than the number of units.

Councilmember Thompson stated he agreed it would be important to have good relations with the School District regarding the development of the site. He expressed his opinion there should not be too much residential included with the project and the previously determined number of 550 seemed reasonable. He thought having too much residential would be an issue because of

parking and affordability. He reviewed his plan which included a larger area for retail and office space in hopes of attracting corporate headquarters to the site; as well as a bank; a sports facility in a visible location; townhomes; and green space throughout the site. He acknowledged a ropes course would be of interest for the site but he had considered having green space as well. He felt art which would be welcoming and represent the community should have a presence near the station. He proposed an amphitheater on the site and commented it could help bring in the community. He recommended the site be used to attract some of the City's current businesses which might be affected by other areas of development in the City so they could stay local, specifically Grounds for Coffee. He explained his suggestions were to reduce the amount of apartments and increase green space that would attract people there to provide patronage for area retailers and restaurants.

Councilmember Bush commented he had also included with his plans a location near the tracks opposite the soccer facility a spot for a cinema theatre and restaurants.

Mr. Brimley thanked the Mayor and City Council members for their efforts and ideas shared. He invited Adam Hughes and Katherine Morrell to share thoughts and experiences based on the industry that affected the City's planning for the Clearfield Area Station.

Mr. Hughes expressed appreciation for the plans shared and the rationale behind the proposed uses. He thought some significant elements for consideration should be branding; preserving a corridor for office space which appeared to be under represented with the growing pains of commuting; and creating a destination or sense of place. He recognized the train station in Clearfield was unique from its neighbors Farmington and Ogden because it could be developed as a walkable concept which could attract ridership and quality of life amenities.

Ms. Morrell stated the company she worked for focused on corporate improvement, but her specific role concentrated on community strategies specific to corporate recruitment or expansion opportunities. She mentioned recently studies had been done by EDCUtah validating the average sizes and need for office space. She explained the Clearfield site had potential for office uses and suggested it could be developed with the best intentions of capturing it. She noted it would be important to find ways for office space to be integrated with other uses to be most effective. She explained a workforce population would need housing; therefore, attracting other amenities to the site would help make its location desirable for work, play and livability. She expressed her appreciation for the City's vision and drive that was demonstrated during the meeting.

Mr. Brimley asked if there were any additional questions before developing a collaborative concept plan. The Mayor and City Council reviewed the presented plans, discussed the proposed uses, and prepared a concept plan for the Clearfield Station site's remaining 60 acres which could be presented to UTA for its review.

Councilmember Thompson moved to adjourn at 8:30 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Bush. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 11th day of September, 2018

/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, August 21, 2018.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder