

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
7:00 PM POLICY MEETING
April 28, 2026

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

These meeting minutes were created with the aid of an AI-powered transcription and summarization tool – Otter.ai and ChatGPT. The output was used as a draft and was subject to human review, editing, and fact-checking to ensure accuracy and compliance with city standards before publication. The City Clerk is responsible for the final content of these minutes.

PRESIDING: Mayor Mark Shepherd

PRESENT: Mayor Mark Shepherd, Councilmember Nike Peterson, Councilmember Karece Thompson, Councilmember Dakota Wurth, Councilmember Megan Ratchford, Councilmember Danielle King

ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Communications Manager Shaundra Rushton, City Recorder Nancy Dean, Deputy City Recorder Chersty Titensor, City Manager JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager Spencer Brimley, City Attorney Stuart Williams, Victim Advocate Teresa Vigil, Police Chief Kelly Bennett, Community Services Deputy Director Curtis Dickson, Community Development Director Stacy Millgate

VISITORS:

Mayor Mark Shepherd called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Councilmember King led the opening ceremonies.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 16, 2026 – work retreat meeting

March 3, 2026 – work meeting

March 10, 2026 – work meeting

March 10, 2026 – policy meeting

March 24, 2026 – work meeting

March 24, 2026 – policy meeting

Councilmember Ratchford moved to approve the January 16, 2026 work retreat meeting, March 3, 2026 work meeting, March 3, 2026 work and policy meetings, March 24, 2026 work and policy meetings, seconded by Councilmember Wurth.

RESULT: **Passed [5 TO 0]**

YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember Ratchford, Councilmember King

NO: None

OPEN COMMENT PERIOD

Former Bountiful Mayor Kendalyn Harris addressed the Council, thanked the Council for its service and explained that she was a candidate for county commission, stated an interest in understanding what was happening in Clearfield, and expressed a willingness to speak further with councilmembers regarding their questions, ideas, or concerns. Mayor Shepherd thanked Ms. Harris for attending and for her comments.

The public comment period continued with residents from South Main Street addressing the Council regarding a recent sewer backup:

- Ben Peterson, stated that the damage stemmed from a blockage in the City's sewer line and requested that the City file a claim with its insurance carrier on behalf of the affected residents and "make it right."
- Evangelina Solis stated that the family had lived in the home for 45 years and had "lost everything" and expressed distress over the situation and the delayed response from insurance.
- Vicente Utrera, also addressed the Council. Mr. Utrera recounted discovering water in the basement early in the morning and seeing water and sewage overflow, damaging furniture and carpet and noted the emotional impact of the damage on family members, especially a parent who now refused to go downstairs because of the memories of the damage and smell.
- Lorri Shreeve stated that she considered herself fortunate compared to neighboring residents, as the sewage backup in her home was limited to several inches of raw sewage in a basement bathtub, with the rest of the basement mostly unaffected and the tub eventually draining. Shreeve said she attended the meeting primarily to support her neighbors, noting that those neighbors had lived in the area a long time and were now facing a severe financial burden.

Following the residents' comments, Mayor Shepherd responded that the City had already reached out to its insurance company regarding the incident. He stated that it was not yet clear whether the City's insurance would provide coverage, as a determination of fault would be required. He noted that insurance companies often denied claims they considered to be someone else's fault and acknowledged that the City might face similar challenges. Mayor Shepherd explained that the sewer line in question had been cleaned in July of the prior year, less than a year before the incident, and that the City was still working to determine exactly what had caused the blockage. He expressed personal sympathy for the residents' circumstances, referenced prior personal experience with a sewage backup in a private line, and reiterated that City staff were actively working with the insurance provider to determine options and potential coverage. He then asked if there were additional public comments; hearing none, the mayor closed the comment period.

RECOGNITION OF THE PROCLAMATION DECLARING THE MONTH OF APRIL EACH YEAR AS “SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH”

Mayor Shepherd introduced the next item as a recognition related to Sexual Assault Awareness Month. He noted that a few years earlier, the City had issued a proclamation declaring April as Sexual Assault Awareness Month in perpetuity, so that the proclamation would not need to be repeated annually. He reaffirmed that every April in Clearfield City would be recognized as Sexual Assault Awareness Month and introduced Jenna Nelson, the Youth Commission’s adult leader, to present on the topic.

Jenna Nelson addressed the mayor, council, staff, and residents and shared a detailed personal account of being sexually abused as a teenager in the mid-1990s by a trusted community instructor. She stated that she ultimately came forward 17 years later, but that the statute of limitations at the time—four years—made prosecution impossible. She reported subsequently working with the state legislature to change the law, resulting in passage in 2020 of House Bill 247, which extended the statute of limitations so that survivors of sex crimes committed against them between ages 14 and 18 now had until age 28 to report. Ms. Nelson noted that public awareness, discussion, and advocacy around sexual assault had improved over the years, but emphasized that continued education and support were needed. Ms. Nelson praised Clearfield City for being proactive by establishing a victim advocate position and invited the City’s victim advocate to explain available resources.

Clearfield City Victim Advocate Teresa Allen then addressed the Council and attendees, briefly introducing herself and explaining that she supported and offered resources to any victim in Clearfield, and could also connect individuals outside Clearfield with appropriate resources. Ms. Allen stated that she primarily worked with cases involving domestic violence, sexual assault, and child abuse. She explained that the role included helping victims navigate services, connect with financial support where available, and access other local and state resources. Mayor Shepherd thanked both Ms. Nelson and Ms. Allen for their remarks and work on behalf of victims and survivors.

DENIAL OF ORDINANCE 2026-06 APPROVING A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT TO REZONE THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 240 EAST 1700 SOUTH (TINS: 12-073-0133 & 12-073-0109) FROM C-2 (COMMERCIAL) AND A-1 (AGRICULTURAL) TO C-2 (COMMERCIAL), R-3 (RESIDENTIAL), AND R-1-6 (RESIDENTIAL) TO ALLOW FOR A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

Stacy Millgate, Community Development Director, provided a presentation and reminded the Council that the proposal, known as “Chelemes Row,” had been discussed at the March 24, 2026 policy meeting. Ms. Millgate described the proposal as including approximately 0.99 acres of commercial frontage along Antelope Drive, 18 attached single-family townhomes, and two single-family lots. She reported that staff had not received any new substantive information since the last Council discussion. Ms. Millgate reviewed the General Plan’s future land use designation, which identified the area as general commercial, allowing commercial uses and some mixed-use with residential, with commercial as the primary use. Ms. Millgate noted that under the current layout, the proposal amounted to roughly 40% commercial and

60% residential, and that staff had previously concluded the proposal was consistent with the General Plan. However, she stated that, as a legislative body, the Council had discretion to determine whether the proposal effectively constituted a General Plan amendment, and if so, could act accordingly. Ms. Millgate summarized prior Council concerns, including the lack of a second access from 1800 South that would eventually connect to 400 East. She reported that no new access had been proposed. Ms. Millgate also outlined elements the applicant wished to include in a development agreement, such as limiting permitted commercial uses to those compatible with City Code and Council concerns, requiring the 18 townhomes to be for sale with a minimum one-year owner-occupancy requirement, and establishing specific site design and development standards. She concluded by noting that the Council needed to decide whether to approve, deny, or further table the rezone request, and stated that the applicant was present and wished to address the Council.

Tanner Webster, applicant, thanked the Council and clarified that some additional information regarding the development agreement had been provided to staff, though it had not been reflected in the staff slides, and that the applicant had hoped for a work session to discuss those details. He stated that the applicant's goal was to develop the full site as a combined project including the existing C-2-zoned commercial area, townhomes, and single-family lots. Webster explained that the seller no longer had greenbelt status and was incurring higher property taxes, creating pressure to proceed with some form of development. Webster stated that without the residential component to help subsidize the project, the property would likely be developed as a more conventional, potentially less desirable, standalone commercial use. Mr. Webster expressed willingness to enter into a development agreement that would restrict certain commercial uses, such as prohibiting auto-body shops, and to work with the City on traffic considerations. Webster explained that the applicant had attempted multiple times to contact an adjacent private property owner regarding access but had received no response. He referenced discussions with City staff indicating that any future access connection to 1800 South and 400 East would require eminent domain and improvements to bring it up to City standards. Mr. Webster requested an opportunity for additional discussion in a work session to address the Council's concerns rather than an outright denial.

Mayor Shepherd summarized that the Council's primary concern from the prior meeting had been access to the residential units. He described the configuration as a commercial "flag lot" with multiple residential units located behind, served by a single driveway access, and expressed concern about the feasibility and safety of such an arrangement.

Councilmember Peterson then detailed her concerns, stating that while she appreciated the applicant's collaborative approach and interest in owner-occupied housing, the proposed development created a neighborhood effectively served only by a back-of-business access. She explained that the design would require residents to drive several hundred feet down a shared driveway or alley behind commercial properties, involving multiple property owners and creating complicated long-term maintenance and responsibility issues. She noted that in past situations where multiple entities shared access responsibilities, the City had eventually become involved when arrangements failed, placing a burden on taxpayers. Councilmember Peterson stated that building a new neighborhood without basic, adequate access—including appropriate road standards and emergency access—was unacceptable from a planning

perspective and that she could not support the proposal as presented. She acknowledged the City's need for housing, and the appeal of owner-occupied townhomes, but emphasized that without acceptable access, a residential component on the site could not be supported.

Councilmember King concurred with Councilmember Peterson's assessment, reiterating that the lack of a proper secondary access, and the improbability of obtaining such access in the near future, made the project unfair to prospective residents and too risky from a safety and planning standpoint.

Councilmember Ratchford asked whether the applicant had consulted with other professionals in the field, such as additional engineers or developers, to identify alternative approaches. Mr. Webster responded that they had consulted multiple engineers, architects, and home builders but had not identified a workable alternative access solution. He noted that some buyers might be willing to accept the inferior access in anticipation of a future connection, but the applicant understood that some others would not. Ratchford expressed further concerns regarding emergency access and the City's responsibility not to design new developments with substandard, single-access configurations that mirrored older, non-compliant patterns. Councilmember Ratchford emphasized the safety and operational implications of serving more than 20 homes with only one driveway access combined with commercial circulation.

Mr. Webster responded that the applicant had also spoken with the traffic engineer, who believed that, from a long-term planning standpoint, a minor collector connection to the south could be adequate; however, that improvement did not yet exist. Councilmember Wurth then asked whether the applicant had received any response from adjacent parcel owners, including Lakeview Apartments or MADEC Enterprises, that would give hope that access could be acquired or extended. Mr. Webster replied that access was ultimately controlled by the General Plan and City standards, and that while staff had indicated that any future connection would likely require eminent domain, outreach directly to those owners had been unsuccessful, with no responses received to multiple emails.

Mayor Shepherd acknowledged the complexity of the situation, noting the longstanding nature of the Chelemes family ownership and the difficulty created by another family member's refusal to participate in broader parcel consolidation or access solutions. He explained that, from a City perspective, full development of the area, including the eastern parcel, made long-term sense, but that the lack of cooperation from an adjacent owner created a substantial obstacle. Mayor Shepherd reiterated that without a viable access solution, it was difficult for the Council to support the rezone. Councilmembers continued to express that while they valued housing and appreciated the applicant's design efforts, the access issue remained a fundamental barrier.

Councilmember Thompson moved to deny Ordinance 2026-06 approving a zoning map amendment to rezone the properties located at approximately 240 East 1700 South based on the access limitations discussed, seconded by Councilmember Peterson.

RESULT: Passed [5 TO 0]

YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth,

Councilmember Ratchford, Councilmember King
NO: None

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2026R-06 APPROVING THE INTERLOCAL
AGREEMENT BETWEEN CLEARFIELD CITY, LAYTON CITY AND DAVIS COUNTY
TO CREATE A HOME CONSORTIUM FOR THE HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP
PROGRAM

Stuart Williams, City Attorney, presented the item, explaining that Davis County administered a HOME program and needed an interlocal agreement with entitlement cities such as Clearfield and Layton to pool resources and maximize funding for affordable housing. Mr. Williams stated that the agreement was essentially a renewal of a prior interlocal agreement and was intended to expand the supply of decent, affordable housing for low- and very low-income families, build local capacity to carry out affordable housing programs, and coordinate assistance for participants in developing affordable housing. He reported that the County was modifying aspects of the program to increase participation and was now partnering with Habitat for Humanity to use some funds for home improvement projects, which would benefit Clearfield residents. In response to a question from the mayor about whether the County provided emergency rehabilitation assistance, Mr. Williams stated that he could not speak definitively on behalf of the County but recognized the mayor's interest in any such options.

Councilmember Wurth moved to approve Resolution 2026R-06 approving the Interlocal Agreement between Clearfield City, Layton City, and Davis County to create a HOME Consortium for the HOME Investment Partnership Program, and authorize the mayor's signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Ratchford.

RESULT: Passed [5 TO 0]

YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth,
Councilmember Ratchford, Councilmember King
NO: None

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Mark R. Shepherd

- Reported attending the Clearfield High School scholarship awards event earlier that day, where the City's scholarship had been presented to Youth Commission Chair Addison Adams. He explained that the City did not select the scholarship recipient; instead, Clearfield High School selected the recipient based on City-provided criteria. The scholarship awarded was \$1,000.
- He also summarized recent involvement in meetings with the "America's Housing Comeback" initiative, which included discussions among home builders, planners, bankers, and realtors about planning strategies, particularly regarding parking requirements in city ordinances. He stated that there was growing consensus in the broader planning community that cities should consider not mandating minimum parking requirements because market forces, builders, and lenders would prevent severely under-parked projects. Mayor Shepherd noted initial skepticism

but indicated that it might warrant future consideration.

- Reported upcoming travel, including a trip to Savannah, Georgia, to join other mayors in kicking off Jewish American Heritage Month, followed by travel to Air War College and the Association of Defense Communities, where he had been assigned significant reading and preparation.
- He further noted that upon returning, the mayor and Spencer Brimley, Assistant City Manager and Economic Development Director, planned to attend the ICSC retail convention in Las Vegas, accompanied by a representative from Lakeside Development, to recruit and negotiate with potential retail businesses for Clearfield.

CITY COUNCIL'S REPORTS

Councilmember Peterson

- Nothing to report from Wasatch Integrated.

Councilmember Wurth

- Councilmember Wurth reported that the Parks Commission would be hosting a Steed Pond cleanup event on Saturday, May 16, 2026, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
- He also announced that the Crush Golf was scheduled to open on May 21, 2026.

Councilmember Ratchford

- Councilmember Ratchford reported that the Davis County Business Expo would be held the following day at the Davis Conference Center from 1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. She encouraged attendance, noting that there would be numerous vendors, including many focused on home renovation and restoration services, as well as food and giveaways.
- She also announced the “Giving Tea” event scheduled for May 19, 2026, at a venue in a neighboring city, explaining that it would serve spouses of deployed service members by providing a space for them to connect and build relationships.
- She reported on the Fire District, stating that the budget process was progressing smoothly and that a tentative budget was expected to be ready for presentation at the next board meeting.

Councilmember King

- Councilmember King reported that the Mosquito Abatement District was beginning operations earlier than usual due to a warm winter and noted that residents could request neighborhood spraying, which was funded through property taxes.
- She also provided an update on Communities That Care, highlighting the “CHAT” campaign that encouraged meaningful interactions between parents and teenagers. She reported that Communities That Care had conducted a walkthrough at the Clearfield Aquatic Center to place an installation promoting the campaign and that the organization had also released a parent survey to complement the annual student survey. Councilmember King explained that both student and parent data were used to identify risk and protective factors and to guide program and resource allocation in North Davis communities. She encouraged parents to complete the survey at tinyurl.com/northDavisparents.

Councilmember Thompson

- Councilmember Thompson addressed the sewer backup issue raised during public comments. He stated that upon learning of the incident, he had begun efforts to meet with Public Works to collect more detailed information on problem areas in the City’s sewer system, including similar incidents reported previously by another resident during the prior year’s Council campaign. He expressed concern that the incidents might indicate a broader issue affecting not

only Main Street but also other neighborhoods. Councilmember Thompson reported that the North Davis Sewer District had recently approved increased rates or requirements on grease traps, as part of its efforts to address grease-related blockages. He pledged to meet with Public Works within the week to gather data on known problem areas and to bring residents' stories forward to the Sewer District and within the City. He encouraged affected residents to email their experiences so that those accounts could be used to inform and support discussions with staff and the District.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

JJ Allen, City Manager

- Mr. Allen expressed appreciation to the residents who came to share their experiences of the sewer backup and acknowledged the tragic and heartbreaking nature of their circumstances. He assured attendees that staff would do their best to represent everyone fairly while continuing to work through the situation with the City's insurance provider, within the constraints of what could be promised.
- Thanked the Council for supporting staff professional development, noting that several staff members had recently attended a conference for city managers and that such training and peer-learning opportunities were valuable for improving City operations.

STAFF REPORTS

Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

- Ms. Dean provided a scheduling update, noting that a council work session was planned for the following week, that the May 12, 2026, Council meeting would include presentation of the tentative budget, and that the next regular Council meeting after that would be held on May 26, 2026.

Councilmember Wurth moved to adjourn at 7:54 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Thompson.

RESULT: Passed [5 TO 0]

YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember Ratchford, Councilmember King

NO: None

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 26th day of May 2026**

/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, April 28, 2026.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder