

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
May 24, 2022

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush Vern Phipps Tim Roper	Councilmember Councilmember Councilmember
EXCUSED:	Nike Peterson Karece Thompson	Councilmember Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	JJ Allen Summer Palmer Stuart Williams Kelly Bennett Adam Favero Eric Howes Spencer Brimley Brad McIlrath Shaundra Rushton Nancy Dean Joannie Strong	City Manager Assistant City Manager City Attorney Police Chief Public Works Director Community Services Director Community Development Director Senior Planner Communications Manager City Recorder Deputy City Recorder

VISITORS: Jenna Nelson, Katie Nicholson

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. He excused Councilmembers Peterson and Thompson.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO THE FORM BASED CODE REGARDING SIGNS

Spencer Brimley, Community Services Director, presented Council with requests from the Davis County Health Department and The Lotus Company for signage located in the Downtown Form Based Code (FBC) area that would not comply with FBC signage requirements. He determined to address each sign request separately and began with the Davis County Health Department's request.

Mr. Brimley reported that the Davis County Health Department wanted to remove their current monument sign with an electronic messaging center (EMC) and replace it with a new backlit monument sign without an EMC. He explained the sign was located within the C-V (Civic

Center) zone and presented the Form Based Code Analysis comparing the FBC Sign Regulations with the proposed sign as exhibited below:

FBC Sign Regulations	Proposed Sign
Height: 6 feet	Height: 8 feet
Size: 70 square feet	Size: 96 square feet
EMC: can be 50 percent or 20 square feet maximum	EMC: none
Base: minimum of 20 percent of sign	Base: 6 feet

Councilmember Bush asked for the reasoning behind the FBC sign regulations. Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, explained the location was meant to be more of a pedestrian oriented type of environment and therefore, it was concluded that a larger sign could have been an imposition. Mr. Brimley admitted that when the regulations were being established, the staff may have been too restrictive based on the assumption of an imposition when there really didn't seem to be one. He then questioned if there could be a need to amend the code to accommodate larger signs since there had been an influx of requests for them.

Mr. Brimley asked the Council for feedback regarding the proposed signage to ensure conformance with goals and objectives of the FBC while remaining responsive to possible issues for signage should they arise. There was a discussion on amending the Code or evaluating each request on a case-by-case basis. Councilmember Phipps mentioned he was intrigued by the consistency in the similarities of the change requests the city has been seeing. The main concern with evaluating on a case-by-case basis was the lack of consistency. The consensus was to amend the Code for C-V Zoning Districts to allow for larger monument signs.

Mr. Brimley reviewed the signage request from The Lotus Company with the Council. He mentioned that Lotus's goal was to make the sign unique, and a wall sign wouldn't achieve that goal for them, so they have requested a blade sign. Mr. Brimley informed Council that the FBC allowed for three-foot by four-foot blade sign and noted that the blade signs were intended to give direction and provide signage for a business on the ground floor. He explained that given the angle of the building to the roadway, if Lotus was to install a flat sign, there would not have the ability to showcase the sign. Mr. Brimley presented the Form Based Code Analysis to the Council as follows:

FBC Sign Regulations (Projecting or Blade sign)	Proposed Sign
Height: 3 feet or 4 feet	Height: 15 feet
Size: Maximum area – 12 square feet (36” x 48”)	Size: 52.5 square feet
Clearance: no less than 8 feet	Clearance: 21.6 feet from sidewalk
Permitted on front or corner side facades only; shall not extend above the eave or parapet	

Mr. Brimley presented a few options to the Council for consideration. Council could direct staff to accommodate signage through an existing Development Agreement with Lotus, amend the existing Code for Projecting or Blade Signs, add a new signage type to the Code, or to proceed in a different direction. There was a discussion on the pros and cons of the given options and the consensus was to amend the signage regulations in Code regulations for the U-R (Urban Residential) and U-C (Urban Commerce) zones.

UPDATE ON THE GENERAL PLAN PROCESS

Spencer Brimley, Community Services Director, briefed Council on the status of the update the City’s General Plan and wanted to discuss changes needed to achieve completion of the update to the General Plan. He reviewed the background and a timeline of the progression of the update. Mr. Brimley informed Council that a consultant had been selected and work had commenced. However, as of April 2022 staff ended the contract and was seeking to partner with a new consultant to complete the needed work on the update. He detailed the reasoning behind the decision to end the contract with VODA Planning and Design and noted the most significant determinant was the dissatisfaction with VODA’s General Plan. The provided general plan was academic or generic in nature and not specific to Clearfield City.

Mr. Brimley described the path forward for the project:

- The staff is drafting a revised scope to see work completed.
- Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) committed to provide funding based on the final scope.
- The staff believed public engagement was necessary to help the Planning Commission find success in the project through surveys, open houses, etc.

He conveyed the request for Council’s feedback on elements of the scope that were essential to Council and would help to define what success would look like. Regarding the request, Mr. Brimley provided recommendations:

- Keep the General Plan in its current form (out of date)

- Adopt the version of the General Plan provided by the consultant after final edits and corrections were completed by staff
- Hire a new consultant (along with WFRC funding) to finish the process of updating the plan with all the requirements necessary for compliance with recent and past LUDMA changes.
- Any additional options or considerations from the Council to complete the update.

There was a discussion surrounding the options, compliance requirements, and other Legislative additions that would need to be included in the General Plan. The Council decided to hire a new consultant to complete the process of updating the General Plan that included the requirements necessary for compliance with Land Use Development Act (LUDMA) changes.

Councilmember Roper moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in policy session at 6:49 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Bush. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Phipps, and Roper. Voting NO – None.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 14th day of June 2022**

/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, May 24, 2022.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder