

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
February 18, 2020

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

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
	Kelly Bennett	Police Chief
	Adam Favero	Public Works Director
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Spencer Brimley	Community Development Director
	Brad McIlrath	Senior Planner
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Manager
	Jenn Wiggins	Digital Media Specialist
	Kelli Bybee	Communications Assistant
	Johnny Vuong	Web Development Intern
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder

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

Councilmember Thompson arrived 6:06 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11, CHAPTERS 8 AND 9
FOR REGULATIONS OF ACCESSORY BUILDINGS IN A-1, A-2 (AGRICULTURAL),
AND R-1 (RESIDENTIAL) ZONING DISTRICTS

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, explained the City Council adopted new regulations for accessory buildings in residential zones in April 2017. The purpose of the amendment was to allow residents to better utilize their properties based on the size of their lot or parcel and not by the zoning classification.

Mr. McIlrath stated recently it came to the attention of staff that some of the accessory building standards were not removed from the A-1, A-2, and R-1 zones when the changes were made and those standards were in conflict with the standards found in Title 11, Chapter 13 of the City Code. The purpose of the proposed amendments was to clean up the conflicting language by

removing provisions in the residential zones in favor of the standards outlined in City Code § 11-13-38.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11, CHAPTER 11B - MOTOR VEHICLE SALES

Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, stated the amendments to motor vehicles sales were reviewed by the Planning Commission. He presented the Planning Commission's recommendations.

There was a discussion on the proposed language and the following changes were recommended:

- Change the language in Paragraph 2 – Terms and Conditions to say “...terms and conditions for motor vehicle sales *establishments*...”
- In the Purpose section, Paragraph 3 Approval, move that paragraph to the Standards section.
- In the Standards section, Paragraph 2 Permanent Structures, remove the language, “...unless otherwise noted...” from the paragraph.
- In the Standards section, Paragraph 3 Architectural Detail, add a paragraph that clearly defined architectural detail. Use subparagraphs (a) and (b) to assist in creating the definition.
- In the Standards section, Paragraph 3 Architectural Detail, subparagraph (c) add some language to clarify the blank wall limitations.
- In the Standards section, Paragraph 4 Fencing, remove subparagraph (b) that says, “All fencing must be decorative in nature.”
- In the Standards section, Paragraph 5 Landscaping, subparagraph (a), remove the words “blend well” and add “...visible *from the public right-of-way*...”
- In the Standards section, Paragraph 5 Landscaping, subparagraph (b) provide additional clarification on the landscape buffer.
- In the Standards section, Paragraph 9, second sentence should say, “This includes sweeping and maintaining the asphalt, *keeping the property and establishment* free of debris, trash and weeds, etc.”
- Remove the penalty paragraph if addressed somewhere else in the City Code.

There was a discussion regarding the ratio of customer and employee parking stalls to vehicles allowed on the motor vehicle sales lots. Mr. Brimley stated it was consistent with other jurisdictions. He explained how difficult the current parking standards were to calculate and enforce. Councilmember Peterson liked the standard being clearly set forth. She shared her experience serving on the Planning Commission and the challenges associated with trying to get business owners to understand the need for sufficient parking and recognize the impact to the surrounding areas when it was limited.

Councilmember Thompson shared his concerns that the proposed amendments were over regulation attacking affordability. He continued the consumer would be the one ultimately paying for the higher standards for amenities. He expressed his opinion it was a significant impact to the consumer. Mayor Shepherd suggested it was the governing body's responsibility to enhance the look and image of the City. Councilmember Thompson understood that look and

feel were a livability standard. He expressed his opinion that it was also important not to control the market to the degree that it negatively affected the consumer.

Councilmember Thompson agreed that some of the current motor vehicle sales lots were adversely packed with vehicles. He suggested it might be better to actually regulate the size of lots that could be used for motor vehicle sales. Councilmember Peterson pointed out the proposed amendments would require the businesses to be located on lots of not less than one acre. She asked if there was a different size preferred. Councilmember Thompson stated he was comfortable with a one acre limit but wondered if it might even be too small. Mayor Shepherd cautioned that requiring a larger lot than one acre really started to impact affordability and business viability.

Councilmember Thompson reiterated his concern that the proposed regulations were a significant negative impact to the consumer. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion that the proposed regulations were also a measure for the business owner to evaluate whether the business opportunity was viable.

Mr. Brimley reminded the Council that the proposed regulations only applied to areas of the City zoned for C-2 (Commercial) use. He stated that more or less limited their use to Antelope Drive or the southern areas of the City. He continued the main corridor of the City was governed by the Form Based Code. He added existing businesses would remain as legal non-conforming. The proposed regulation would govern new business. He believed a one acre minimum was appropriate for the City.

Councilmember Thompson asked if there would be a potential phase out of motor vehicle sales along the corridor in the future. Councilmember Peterson referred to the staff report and how it highlighted the possible effects of a phase out on future sales tax revenue. She suggested the proposed regulations had the potential to generate additional sales tax revenue if done properly. There was a discussion about sales tax revenue, the market, and how it was generated by different businesses and the City's efforts to encourage businesses to reinvest in the success of the community.

JJ Allen, City Manager, wanted to clarify what the Council's desire was for the minimum lot size for motor vehicle sales establishments. The Council agreed that the proposed regulation of a lot size not less than one acre for new motor vehicle sales establishments was sufficient.

QUARTERLY COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE

Trevor Cahoon, Communications Manager; Jen Wiggins, Digital Media Specialist; Kelli Bybee, Communications Assistant; and Johnny Vuong, Web Development Intern, highlighted communication items including the recent resident satisfaction surveys; upcoming events such as Celebrate Clearfield Week, adding a teen egg hunt on April 10, 2020, Arbor Day, Everyone Matters Day, the Fourth of July celebration, and the web development progress.

Mr. Cahoon highlighted the results from the resident satisfaction survey. Mayor Shepherd commented the survey appeared to recognize the City's outreach efforts. The results indicated a

majority of residents felt like Clearfield was a great place to live and felt included. Councilmember Roper commented it looked like the City was making progress in communicating with its residents.

Mr. Cahoon explained net promoter scores and how they worked. Net promoter scores had three categories: detractors, passives, and promoters. To arrive at a net promoter score one would subtract the detractors from the promoters to understand the results. Mr. Cahoon reviewed the net promoter scores identified in the survey with the Council and commented the way to improve a net promoter score was to focus on the passives. He reviewed some critical data from the feedback of the passives:

Positives

- Parks
- Local library
- Locally owned businesses

Negatives

- Not walkable
- Too few entertainment options
- Limited types of businesses
- Lacked identity

There was also a discussion on the monthly soirees, open houses, and pop-up parties and what direction the Council would like to see that type of communication happen. It was decided to hold that type of activity three to four times per year and possibly on Monday nights.

Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn at 8:26 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Thompson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 12th day of May, 2020**

/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, February 18, 2020.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder