CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 PM WORK SESSION
September 2, 2025

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

PRESIDING: Mayor Mark Shepherd

PRESENT: Mayor Mark Shepherd, Councilmember Nike Peterson, Councilmember Tim Roper, Councilmember Megan Ratchford, Councilmember Dakota Wurth

ABSENT: Councilmember Karece Thompson

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager Spencer Brimley, City Attorney Stuart Williams, Community Services Director Eric Howes, Community Services Deputy Director Curtis Dickson, Police Chief Kelly Bennett, Public Works Director Adam Favero, Community Development Director Stacy Millgate, Planner Tyson Stoddard, Community Relations Director Shaundra Rushton, City Recorder Nancy Dean, Deputy City Recorder Chersty Titensor

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

FOURTH OF JULY RECAP

Curtis Dickson, Deputy Community Services Director, asked for Council's feedback on the Fourth of July events. He shared the statistics of participation, cost, volunteers needed, staff hours, and number of staff needed.

Mayor Shepherd suggested they consider limiting the number of VIP passes since airmen did not seem to be attending the dinner. Councilmember Ratchford asked if there might be an opportunity to add activities like a scavenger hunt, or bingo game to keep their attention during the lull during the dinner. Councilmember Peterson said they used to have programming all day long, which became a challenge for staffing. She said there had been a decision to have a lull. Mayor Shepherd mentioned he would like to have a Clearfield's Got Talent, but did not want Staff to be responsible for it, nor the City to fund, but maybe people outside the City that could organize it. Counclmember Peterson suggested it could be organized to be part of the America250 efforts and be a more regional effort.

Mr. Dickson reviewed the America250 Program in Utah and the ways Clearfield City would participate. Mayor Shepherd recommended a 250 stencil for the Paint the Bridge party next year.

DISCUSSION ON THE PROCLAMATION TO DESIGNATE CLEARFIELD AS A JUSTSERVE CITY

Spencer Brimley, Assistant City Manager & Economic Development Director, introduced some of the other Utah JustServe partner cities. As a partner, the City would get recognition on the JustServe website and was required to include that the City encouraged volunteerism on the City's website. Mayor Shepherd thought it would be a good thing to ask for volunteers overall but especially for 4th of July activities. The proclamation would be on the agenda during the September 9, 2025 policy session.

DISCUSSION ON DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLINGS

Tyson Stoddard, Planner, opened the discussion of the ordinance amendments for detached accessory dwelling units by reviewing the proposed changes to Title 11, Chapter 19 of the Clearfield City Code. Mr. Stoddard pointed out proposed changes to Section 5 to add allowing ADUs within all single-family and agricultural zones with a lot size of 6,000 square feet and larger. Mr. Stoddard explained that agriculture zoned properties were included because many of the agriculturally zoned properties already had an existing single-family home on them and were large enough to accommodate an accessory unit. Mayor Shepherd questioned whether there were 6,000 sq. ft. lots in the City that would be amenable to an ADU, taking into consideration setbacks as well. Mr. Stoddard said an estimated size for an ADU unit for a 6,000 square foot lot would be 250 square feet bare minimum. Mr. Stoddard said he had reached out to a company that built accessory units, and they recommended a minimum of 480 square feet which would be closer to a studio apartment. Mayor Shepherd was still concerned about going that small for the lot size in the ordinance and pointed out in various meetings that the recommendation was a quarter acre lot or even a fifth of an acre. Councilmember Wurth wanted to remove a 250 square foot minimum because it was not functionally livable.

Councilmember Peterson said one of the pieces that needed to be addressed was in the event the City made concessions and allowed ADUs with smaller lots, an unintended consequence would be that the City would forgo the ability to have future build-out options. She thought it was important to understand as the City had conversations with legislators that going to smaller and smaller lots for single-family detached was unreasonable because the external ADU became something very different and that it was okay for cities to regulate the lot sizes for ADUs to protect defensible fire minimums. Mayor Shepherd could not imagine going smaller than a .20-acre lot (8700 square feet). Council seemed to agree. Councilmember Peterson pointed out that the regulations for an ADU would impact the regulations for sheds. Councilmember Wurth pointed out an ADU was a marginal option for creating housing opportunities. Mr. Stoddard agreed with Mayor Shepherd that he did not think the City would have many applications for ADUs. He said since the City implemented the IADU Ordinance it had seen approximately ten per year and they were for new construction and were not for retrofitting existing homes. He thought after passing a detached ordinance, the City would probably see five or less per year. Mr. Stoddard said the minimum lot size could be tied to the R-1-8 zone which had a minimum of 8,000 sq. ft. lots. Council seemed to be okay with that change.

Councilmember Ratchford brought up that the sizing of the ADU needed to be less than 50% of

the square footage of the primary residence and wondered if the language needed to be revised. Mr. Stoddard clarified that the language stated that the ADU could be no greater than 50% of the total floor area of the primary dwelling and the ordinance additionally included a maximum restriction of 1000 square feet. He said those size restrictions underscored that the units were "accessory" units.

Mayor Shepherd expressed concern about whether a mandate that a main residence be owner-occupied was enforceable with investment buyers owning homes. He was concerned that the City would end up with a slew of properties that were essentially duplexes. Mr. Stoddard agreed that enforcement was challenging. Mr. Stoddard suggested that before the registration of the ADU was complete, the owner would need to fill out a declaration of owner occupancy which would be recorded with the County. The challenge of enforcement was discussed. Councilmember Wurth pointed to the policy of Farmington City where they allowed the subdivision of the ADU into its own flag lot to mitigate the rental product issues. Mr. Stoddard said the Farmington ordinance was interesting and their city had discussed ways to provide ownership opportunities, but said it was a more complicated ordinance. Mr. Stoddard said the changes being proposed were similar than other cities. Councilmember Ratchford asked if the Council was concerned about the Olympics and what could happen. Mayor Shepherd said, long-term, the City was ultimately creating a business with an ADU. He questioned whether landlords needed to be required to have to have a permit or business license from the city to rent. He wanted a business license fee involved if the ADU property was involved in landlord relationship.

Councilmember Peterson asked if there was a way to flag the address of ADU properties to flag a change in utilities. Mr. Stoddard said it was part of the registration for an ADU process. Councilmember Peterson thought there needed to be some kind of safety net for those that did not officially register that there was a secondary process that would flag the property upon change of ownership. Councilmember Peterson thought the City needed to speak with the legislature about the business component where the money side was the big driver, maybe they get taxed differently to treat it like an investment property.

Mr. Stoddard asked for the Council' s feedback on development standards for internal and external ADUs. Starting with the Internal ADUs, Mr. Stoddard said the size requirement of 50% of the total primary floor area had to be removed because the legislature determined there could not be any area regulations. He touched on various other changes to the ordinance. He then turned to the External ADUs and presented the proposed changes to the ordinance. There was a discussion on height limitations and setbacks the Council wanted to apply. The Council confirmed the minimum size of 250 square feet for an external ADU. Councilmember Ratchford questioned the language that specified a separate sleeping area and wondered if it was distinguishing a studio or one bedroom requirement. Mr. Stoddard said it did not have to be a bedroom, but its own distinct area. Councilmember Peterson suggested that in addition to the maximum square footage restriction, it be restricted based on the size of the footprint of the primary residence as well. Mayor Shepherd suggested that it say the footprint of the ADU could not exceed the footprint of the primary residence, but could still have a second story on the ADU if it was a two-story primary residence. Mayor Shepherd suggested that the footprint of the ADU should not be more than 50% of the footprint of the primary residence with a maximum of 1000

square feet. Councilmember Peterson voiced that the second floor allowance should be eliminated. Mr. Stoddard thought the restriction of a maximum 50% of primary residence square footage and the cap of 1000 square feet protected the City. Mayor Shepherd also thought the City needed to eliminate the second story to stay true to the concept of an "accessory" unit. Mayor Shepherd mentioned that if the City allowed a two-story ADU, the ordinance would have to include language that restricted building within the trusses. The Council seemed to agree that they wanted to limit ADUs to one-story. Mr. Stoddard pointed out that a restriction like that would remove the ability for a resident to add an ADU over the garage. The Council seemed to agree that the language specified that the ADU could not be two stories unless it was above a garage. The Council determined that lofts were not acceptable.

The Council reviewed the lot-coverage restrictions. Mr. Stoddard explained that the percentages were the same as those for the accessory structures ordinance. Mr. Allen recommended the language be corrected to reflect the 8,000 square foot lot minimum. Mr. Stoddard said the parking section of the ordinance required one off-street parking space, not including the accessory parking which allowed gravel material. Mayor Shepherd recommended the additional off-street parking specify the requirement for cement material. Mr. Allen pointed out that a two-car garage with cement in front with two spaces would comply with the parking requirement. Councilmember Ratchford wondered if the City should look at restricting tandem parking. Councilmember Peterson thought that would be a landlord/tenant issue.

Mr. Stoddard said that the proposed ordinance specified that there be one meter for each water, gas, and electricity service and each meter would be in the property owner's name. He said other cities, even with detached ADUs, required one connection because they were considered accessory to the main property. Mayor Shepherd accepted that there be one meter, knowing that the meter might have to be upsized in certain circumstances. Councilmember Peterson liked that it limited capacity. Mr. Allen pointed out that adding the additional unit was an extra unplanned burden on the City's infrastructure, but there would be so few instances that he did not see it as a problem. Mr. Wurth pointed out that there would be more instances of families doubling up in single-family homes than ADUs, having the same effect on the system. Mr. Stoddard said that Lehi City was the only city charging an Impact Fee for additional utility hook-ups with ADUs. He said the State did not allow impact fees for Internal ADUs but allowed them for detached ADUs. Mr. Allen pointed out that if a property owner needed to upsize the water meter there would be a charge.

COMMUNICATION'S FY26 COUNCIL INITIATIVES

Shaundra Rushton, Communication Manager, led the discussion to determine Council's preferences for up to four initiatives that would be included in the Council's placemaking budget. Ms. Rushton reminded them that she had an additional $10k in the Communications budget that could be used as well. Ms. Rushton reminded the Council of items that had been included in the FY26 budget based on past recommendations: Christmas decor, murals, and jet statues 2.0. She identified the mural and new, bigger jet statues as two of the initiatives to include. Councilmember Peterson said she had feedback to bring back the bubble party. Councilmember Roper recommended rotating the various party types. The Council agreed to have a combined bubble/glow party.

Ms. Rushton said she had received some requests from councilmembers to have an apartment focus, so she suggested the creation of welcome packets for apartments, some messaging to combat apartment image, and a possible mini party at one of the complexes. Councilmember Peterson said she had received feedback that the bridge parties had become a love letter to the apartment community because it was easily walkable and geared toward an urban environment. There was a discussion on the ideas Ms. Rushton had presented and more suggestions were made.

Mr. Allen said if the City were to provide elected officials with resources to have a block party, it could not be a campaign event. The Council determined they would allocate $1,500-$2,000 for council-led block parties and enhance the block parties of others that would want to take the lead in their neighborhoods through the end of the year. Staff would be utilized to communicate with the apartment complexes.

Ms. Rushton informed the Council that the application to apply for the Davis County Mural Match was due on September 30, 2025. The County required that the site and design mock-up be solidified prior to submitting the application. Ms. Rushton thought the mural needed to be completed by the beginning of May 2026. It was determined that a new muralist would be asked to provide ideas for a new mural, and Communications would work on finding a new location. The Council decided that a small committee comprised of Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember Peterson and the Mayor would review the submitted mural ideas and provide feedback. Ms. Rushton would reach out to the new muralist and find a location. The County's match was up to $10,000.

Councilmember Roper moved to adjourn at 8:03 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Wurth.

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Roper, Councilmember Ratchford, Councilmember Wurth
NO: None

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 23rd day of September 2025

/s/ Mark R. Shepherd, Mayor

ATTEST:

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

I hereby certify that the forgoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Clearfield City Council meeting held Tuesday, September 02, 2025.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder