

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
June 16, 2020

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

The meeting was held electronically via Zoom Meeting address:

Zoom Meeting
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84885788302>
Meeting ID: 848 8578 8302

PRESIDING VIA
ZOOM MEETING: Mark Shepherd Mayor

PRESENT VIA
ZOOM MEETING: Kent Bush Councilmember
Nike Peterson Councilmember
Vern Phipps Councilmember
Tim Roper Councilmember
Karece Thompson Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT
VIA ZOOM MEETING: 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
Brad McIlrath Senior Planner
Rich Knapp Finance Manager
Nancy Dean City Recorder

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT VIA ZOOM MEETING: David Bloomfield, Karen Blackwood, Robert Browning, Brogan Fullmer, Kathryn Murray, Nicole Bigelow, Chris Uccardi - Chair

NOT PRESENT: Bobby Austin, Brett McAlister

Visitors: Jordan Swain – Utah Transit Authority (UTA), Tim Merrill – UTA, Bruce Bingham – Hamilton Partners, David Abraham – Arch Nexus, Ryan Hales, George Arnold, Andrew Bybee – Stack Real Estate, Nathan Ricks – Stack Real Estate, Trevor Evans – Stack Real Estate, Ken Shields – Hamilton Partners, Doug Thimm – Arch Nexus

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE CLEARFIELD STATION MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mayor Shepherd welcomed everyone attending live and virtually. He explained the plans for Clearfield Station had been underway with Hamilton Partners, Stack Real Estate, and Arch Nexus for about nine months. He noted a draft of the Master Development Plan (MDP) had been shared with the Planning Commission and City Council. JJ Allen, City Manager, pointed out that the purpose of the joint discussion was to allow the partners to provide an introduction to the draft MDP that had been in the planning stages for a long time to the group. He pointed out that the application and public process would be underway shortly.

Councilmember Thompson arrived at 6:13 p.m.

Trevor Evans, Stack Real Estate, complimented staff for its partnership in working together to date. He stated the concept plan was introduced to the Council and Planning Commission in December of 2019. He mentioned the goal was to build people up by building sustainable, mixed-use, attractive, realistic, and transit-oriented (SMART) communities.

Mr. Evans reviewed the June 2020 Master Plan. He explained the biggest material change in the plan since December was on the northeast side of the site. He pointed out additional residential was added above the commercial uses. He pointed out residents would help feed the commercial and make it more viable. He mentioned the density was necessary to make the commerce thrive.

Jordan Swain, UTA, stated the area was part of a transit-oriented development (TOD) and would connect Clearfield with the regional commuter rail system. He reviewed the transportation plan with its connections, grid system, and streets designed for multiple modes of travel. He pointed out the existing bus service would operate more efficiently and offer a first class mile connection in the future.

Ken Shields, Hamilton Partners, reviewed the land use area overall plan and uses proposed for the development. He mentioned the residential had been reduced slightly and now was planned to be 730 units in four complexes. He explained the density was planned to be high to give the retail the greatest chance for thriving. Mr. Shields noted Hamilton Partners was talking to a potential large user that would make the center vibrant. He expressed his opinion it would be one of UTA's nicest transit stops. He pointed out that there would be private and public open spaces and the City would have open space in the southeast area that could be used for a park. Mr. Shields said the connections to trails and streets had been planned well for interactions between the various modes of transportation that would be drawn to the area.

Mr. Allen pointed out that the area on the southeast designated for a park was currently a street so it would need to be vacated before that area could be beautified. Councilmember Peterson wondered if it was the street included with the Thackeray Garn project known as Boxcar Street. Mr. Allen answered it was but the use no longer existed and so what was being presented was a better plan for that area. Councilmember Peterson wondered if there would be a large expense to

vacate it and move on the new plan. Mr. Allen explained the obligation to Thackeray Garn would take another couple of years of tax increment revenue to meet; however, the City's bond package could be set up for generating revenue to build the necessary amenities for the project.

Councilmember Bush questioned if the open spaces would be maintained by the City. Mr. Allen responded there was a page in the Master Development Agreement (MDA) which outlined the open space maintenance but recalled the public open space would be maintained by the City in addition to the privately owned open space by the gym. Doug Thimm, Arch Nexus, acknowledged an exhibit to the MDA specifically described the maintenance responsibilities. He pointed out that the private space by the gym would be privately owned but publically accessible so the City would maintain that area as a contracted service.

Mr. Evans, stated the first phase of the project would be for horizontal improvements and include road infrastructure, City parks, and super pads. He noted phase two was planned for vertical improvements with the intent of having the residential and commercial develop together. He reviewed the square footage of each footprint for office, multifamily units, retail, gym, and townhomes.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the building to the east of gym that was not marked would be a continuation of mixed-used residential. Mr. Evans answered yes. Councilmember Phipps wondered if a commercial component was planned for the mixed-use residential buildings on the far south. Nathan Ricks, Stack Real Estate, responded there could be a commercial component on the corners over time. Mr. Thimm indicated the buildings would have a commercial appearance to them so the base of the building could have a lobby, café, fitness center or clubhouse.

Councilmember Peterson questioned how the phasing of the project would be affected if the initial build would be entirely residential. Mr. Ricks responded the plan was to do residential and commercial in tandem. He explained the first commercial building would be the gym and that would be going on at the same time as one phase of mixed-use residential buildings. He pointed out that the first focus would be around that core and then as market demand dictated others would be developed. He emphasized the need to have office space shovel ready and the importance of preparing the horizontal improvements as soon as possible.

Councilmember Peterson asked how the commercial development would tie into the project phasing if the intent for the mixed-use residential buildings was to initially be primarily residential use. Mr. Evans answered it would likely be the office buildings. Mr. Ricks stated the commercial development had not been specifically tied to office because there had been many changes as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with office work space, so there were no concrete answers. He expressed his opinion that office space would still be needed for the long haul. He emphasized the need for flexibility to allow the market to drive the development so it could thrive and survive.

Councilmember Thompson wondered if having the super pads shovel ready would include futuristic components for parking, travel, and technology. Mr. Ricks indicated 5G was the future as well as driverless vehicles. He pointed out the site was a real gem and if enough density was

in place it would create a hub. He continued the office buildings were planned for the future and would need to be designed for software and technology companies to have adequate spacing and technology needs. He mentioned employees would want to have nice amenities and the gym would be a big draw, plus the great location within the State for other forms of recreation.

Councilmember Thompson questioned if there were any plans to encourage or take advantage of travel diversity in the future. Mr. Swain responded there was no desire to build a park and ride facility, so more flexible parking would be built into the development initially. He explained part of building for the future was leaving things as flexible as possible. He pointed out that one of the best ways to be ready for autonomous vehicles was by keeping street systems dimensional and fluid. Mr. Swain expressed his opinion that Arch Nexus had accomplished that with its design of the street systems and connections.

Councilmember Thompson expressed his opinion that in order to attract the commercial the City deserved, the site would need to be on the cutting edge. Mr. Swain indicated technology was currently an intrinsic part of the market; thus, part of staying cutting edge was leaving some space open so when the paradigm changed those spaces could be built into something that was appropriate for that time. He voiced his opinion that the draft MDP did that very well.

Mayor Shepherd acknowledged recently he and staff had participated in a virtual meeting with a company that was supporting the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) program and looking at the site for future office space because its employees could not work from home due to the need for a high security environment. He pointed out that there were likely opportunities for other future companies coming in and it would be crucial to have the area shovel ready.

Mr. Swain explained UTA was looking into double tracking the FrontRunner as soon as it was economically affordable so keeping the MDP flexible could work allowing for adaptability in the future.

Mr. Allen mentioned the intersection at 1000 East and State Street had been a topic of discussion since the very beginning stages of working on development plans for Clearfield Station fifteen years ago. He pointed out that the design in the draft MDP created a main intersection at the new Station Boulevard across from 1150 South which was at the northeast corner of the project. He mentioned the intersection at 1000 East and State Street would have a raised median which would prohibit any thru traffic from going north and south and allow only right turns. Mr. Allen explained the draft MDP also created a new intersection at 1450 South and State Street which was an extension of 1450 South through property which the City did not currently own. He continued the main entrance at 1150 South from the east side of the street would be required by UDOT to be a right in, right out access so no through traffic would be allowed onto 1150 South from the station. He acknowledged currently there was a lot of traffic that flowed north and south along 1000 East and those drivers would have to adapt to a new traffic pattern. Mr. Allen stated there was no solution that was perfect and could not be criticized; however, he felt the traffic design planned was well thought out and was the best of all possible solutions. Mayor Shepherd agreed.

Chris Uccardi, Planning Commission Chair, asked if there was going to be a pedestrian component as part of the design along State Street for the children from the south walking to schools on 1000 East. Mr. Allen answered there would be a crosswalk at the new main intersection on the north side. He reported initially UDOT was not liking the idea of a crosswalk on the north side of the intersection at 1150 South, but there would be one on the south side of the intersection at 1450 South. Mayor Shepherd indicated the students would need to cross at 1450 South but both 1150 South and 1450 South intersections would be signalized. There was a discussion about pedestrian crossing and safety. Mr. Swain pointed out that every intersection designed would address pedestrian crossing and be as friendly as possible within the requirements of UDOT.

Robert Browning, Planning Commissioner, wondered if it was stated that left turns would not be allowed onto State Street from the main entrance of the development. Mr. Swain reported there would be a left turn allowed from Station Boulevard to State Street; however, there would not be through traffic allowed to 1150 South. Mr. McIlrath asked if there would be a pedestrian access out of the station at 1150 South. Mr. Swain indicated there would be a pedestrian connection on the south end of the intersection and the development team was pushing to have one on the north end as well but there had been some complications working with UDOT.

Councilmember Bush questioned if UDOT was okay with the proposed street layout and if 1450 South was extended to State Street who would be responsible for purchasing the necessary properties to accomplish that connection. Ryan Hales, Transportation Engineer, explained in working with UDOT to move forward with the plan, the 1450 South access to State Street would allow for two intersections instead of the one at 1000 East. He pointed out it would allow the City to retake 1000 East in front of the schools as a neighborhood street rather than the main thoroughfare it had become. He mentioned having the raised median and rerouting the intersections to the north and south would help to split up the traffic which was a favorable option for UDOT. Mr. Hales indicated the access point on State Street at 1150 South and the raised median at 1000 East were planned to occur simultaneously. He continued the road at 1450 South would likely happen in the future and be part of a Master Transportation Plan used for future development and growth as funds became available. He stated there was the potential to obtain funding through the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC). Mr. Allen indicated the City would take the lead to acquire the necessary rights-of-way for those connections from 1450 South to State Street. He pointed out the City had already made application to the County for third quarter sales tax revenue to help with it.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if there were specific plans for the transit plaza area or if it would be a grassy area. Mr. Swain responded there was nothing designed specifically yet, but it would be a high priority to make it a comfortable and beautified place. Councilmember Phipps wondered if it would be an amenity for the office. Mr. Swain answered yes it would have multiple uses and be shared space.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the ground floor of the parking structure could possibly be for commercial space. Mr. Ricks acknowledged it could be utilized in that manner but the viability of it and location would be key. Mr. Allen stated the draft MDP allowed for the commercial aspect but did not mandate it. Mr. Thimm indicated the development of the parking structure

would be market driven but there would be a buffer and walking paths to the rail station. Mr. Ricks added the development was probably a fifteen year build, so the parking structure could be a while out.

Chair Uccardi wondered if each pad would be considered for a specific use since the area was zoned for mixed-use. Mayor Shepherd indicated each use considered for a specific pad would be an allowed use in the Mixed-Use (MU) zone. Mr. Swain noted the MDP would be the ordinance that controlled the development. Mr. Allen stated once the MDP and MDA were adopted the only thing the Planning Commission would see would be site plans. He added if there were any departures from the MDP an amendment would be required.

Councilmember Roper expressed his optimism about the presented plan. Mayor Shepherd voiced his excitement. Mr. Ricks stated the draft MDP was a step closer to a great TOD that would be one of a kind if done right. There was a discussion about places that could be visited to observe the work of the development partners.

Karen Blackwood, Planning Commissioner, asked since the area was intended to be a destination point had there been any talk with UTA about FrontRunner service on Sundays. Mr. Swain expressed hope the demand would require service for seven days a week and UTA was working towards it. Mr. Ricks added this project was the future for development and Clearfield was fortunate to have the opportunity.

Councilmember Phipps reported he had several questions and would write them up to save some time. He pointed out on page 56 of the draft MDP the front setback had a zero foot minimum with a ten foot maximum. He asked if it was really a zero foot setback. Mr. Thimm said yes it meant there could be a zero foot setback because streets were defined by a glass line at the edge of the sidewalk. Mr. Ricks responded it did not mean the whole block would be lined up against the edge of the sidewalks because there would be variation in the street line to provide a very urbanistic feeling.

Brogan Fullmer, Planning Commissioner, asked if there had been any considerations given for having charging stations for electronic vehicles within the development. Mr. Shields answered yes, Hamilton Partners was currently designing a site in Sandy with several charging stations. He pointed out that it would be an attractive feature.

Commissioner Fullmer wondered if the draft MDP had taken any consideration for alternate transportation methods such as cycling from the rail to the gate on Hill Air Force Base. Mr. Swain acknowledged there had definitely been those considerations within the site. He explained outside the site was harder to control. Mr. McIlrath mentioned the City had been working with other cities in the region to create an active transportation plan that would create bike lanes along State Street that included a buffer. He explained eventually the goal was to have a cycle track completely separated from traffic. Mr. Allen pointed out planning was the first step and the building could take time; however, the State was typically able to assist with funding for planned efforts of that type.

Commissioner Fullmer questioned if any considerations had been given to light and noise pollution or green space along the buildings themselves with landscaping up the building. Mr. Thimm responded the reduction of light pollution would be followed as part of the design. He said green walls could come in time as it was designed. He noted guidelines and regulatory portions of the draft MDP were sustainable with the right type of materials. Mr. Ricks added trees were important to make it inviting. He pointed out that it was hard to sustain green walls in Utah because the State had a dry climate and the maintenance was costly but there could be options to explore.

There being no further business to come before the Council and the Commission,
Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn the joint work session and reconvene in the executive conference room on the third floor in City Council work session at 7:24 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 14th day of July, 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, June 16, 2020.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder