

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
August 2, 2022

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
	Devin Rogers	Police Assistant Chief
	Adam Favero	Public Works Director
	Braden Felix	City Engineer/PW Deputy Director
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Spencer Brimley	Community Development Director
	Brad McIlrath	Senior Planner
	Rich Knapp	Finance Manager
	Shaundra Rushton	Communications Manager
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder

VISITORS: Katie Nicholson

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE PUBLIC FACILITIES (PF) AND CIVIC (CV) ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, provided background on the proposed Public Facilities (PF) and Civic (CV) zoning text amendments. The intent of the amendments was to align signage regulations for properties in the P-F and CV zones for monument signs, provide similar monument signs at City Hall and other parks as necessary, and to address other necessary changes for monument signs in the Downtown Form Based Code (FBC) area.

Mr. McIlrath reviewed the proposed changes to the P-F (Public Facilities) zone (11-10A-10: Signs).

Monument signs in the P-F zone:

1. Sign Area: No monument sign shall exceed one hundred and twenty square feet (120 square feet) in area, except as otherwise permitted.

2. Minimum Street Frontage: There shall be a minimum street frontage of one hundred feet (100') per monument sign. In no case shall there be more than two (2) monument signs per street frontage for any freestanding building on its own lot or for any property that is owned, maintained, and operated by the City.

3. Minimum Distance: No monument sign shall be located within one hundred feet (100') of another monument or freestanding sign on the same side of the street, whether on the same parcel or on an adjacent parcel.

4. Sign Height: Monument signs shall have at least a one-foot (1') pedestal, and the illuminated cabinet shall not exceed nine feet (9') for a total sign height of ten feet (10'). The height to the top of the sign as measured from the street curb may vary depending upon landscaping, but the combined height of the sign and any berming/landscaping shall not exceed ten feet (10').

5. Reader Boards: Reader boards (changeable copy areas) and electronic message centers (EMC) shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the total monument sign area.

6. Freestanding Monument Signs: A monument sign allowed by this section may be substituted with a freestanding monument sign.

Mr. McIlrath mentioned there were questions on the location of monument signs and other things referenced in Chapter 15 of Title 11. There was a discussion to add language in the above-mentioned section of code or to at least reference Chapter 15. Councilmember Bush questioned the “except as otherwise permitted” language in the first proposed change. Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, clarified the wording was in reference to a Zoning Administrator’s approval and did not necessarily need to be included. Mayor Shepherd suggested striking that language to alleviate any ambiguity. It appeared the consensus was to strike “except as otherwise permitted” from Sign Area.

Mr. McIlrath addressed concerns the Planning Commission had regarding the brightness of the reader boards. He mentioned placing regulations in code regarding lumens or foot candles and the need for a device to measure and ensure compliance. Councilmember Peterson mentioned that would be great to visit at another time. Braden Felix, City Engineer/Public Works Deputy Director, added that talk about lighting related to the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) had been a major point of discussion with questions surrounding the City’s standard on foot candles. He mentioned it would be nice to have a regulation going forward.

Mr. McIlrath reviewed the proposed changes to the Form Based Code signage (10.9 Monument Sign).

1. Description: A Monument Sign is freestanding; it is located in a front or side yard of a lot. Refer to Figures 10.9 (1), 10.9 (2), and 10.9 (3).

2. General Requirements

Monument Signs shall be developed according to the standards in Table 10.9 (1).

- (1) Multiple Tenants. Multiple tenant buildings on a lot with a width of greater than 300 feet, measured across the front property line, may have signage with the following

parameters:

- (a) Up to two Monument Signs on one frontage.
- (b) Signs shall be at least 150 feet apart.
- (2) Pole-Mounted Signs. Monument Signs may not be pole mounted.
- (3) Manually Changeable Copy. The area of any Manually Changeable Copy cannot equal greater than fifty percent (50%) of the area of the sign face on which it is located.
- (4) Monument signs shall have at least a one-foot (1') pedestal. The base shall relate to the adjacent building in terms of materials.
- (5). Electronic monument signs are permitted.

3. Sign Size Computation

The area of a two-sided Monument Sign is equal to the area of one Sign face. The area of a three-or four-sided Monument Sign is equal to the total area of each sign face. This measurement includes the sign, any cabinet in which it is enclosed and the electronic message center but excludes the base of the sign.

- (1) Measuring Height. Height shall include the sign face, base, cabinet, and ornamental cap.

Mr. McIlrath reviewed the proposed changes to Table 10.9(1) Monument Sign Requirements.

Table 10.9 (1). Monument Sign Requirements

Permitted Districts	All Districts
Sign Area	Maximum 70 square feet per sign face, corner lots may double size upon approval by Zoning Administrator. Monument signs in the CV Zone shall be no greater than 120 square feet per Sign Face.
Height	Maximum height for a monument signs (with at least a one-foot pedestal): the illuminated cabinet shall not exceed nine-feet for a total sign height of ten-feet.
Location on the Building or Site	Front or corner yards
Placement on the Building or Site	10-foot setback from driveways & side property line; 2-foot setback from front & corner property lines. ¹
Quantity	1 per public ROW frontage. Must provide for a clear view near any intersection of a driveway and a street
Internal Illumination	Permitted for individual letters and logos
Materials	Solid wood, metal & masonry; Plastic & synthetics permitted on Sign face; Electronic Message Board permitted in All Districts.

¹ If placed closer than five feet from the front and corner side property lines, sign must not be located in a sight triangle extending 10 feet from either side of an intersection of a driveway and a vehicular right-of-way or two vehicular rights-of-way.

Mr. McIlrath informed the Council that staff had recommended the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval for the zoning text amendment request based on the following:

1. The identity of Clearfield City should be strengthened by land use which improve the image of the community and foster a positive, healthy living environment conducive to long-term residency.
2. The proposed changes helped the City accomplish its goals of providing high quality municipal services and created a place where people wanted to be.

On July 20, 2022 the Planning Commission unanimously forwarded a recommendation of approval to the Clearfield City Council of ZTA 2022-060057, a zoning text amendment request by Clearfield City to amend Clearfield City Code as it applied to the regulation of monument signs in the P-F Zone, CV Zone, and the Downtown Form Based Code area. There was no further discussion on the item.

DISCUSSION ON THE REZONE OF PARKS TO PUBLIC FACILITIES (PF)

Mr. McIlrath presented the Council with a proposal for a zoning map amendment request by Clearfield City for properties designated as parks within the City from their current zoning designation to P-F (Public Facilities). He mentioned that it would be important for the City to maintain these areas as parks to retain the regulatory ability for what could or could not be developed within the park spaces. Rezoning the parcels to P-F would enable the City to maintain and regulate uses that were akin to municipal uses and services.

Mr. McIlrath identified the parks that would be included in the proposed rezone along with their current zone and approximate location:

Park	Current Zone	Location
South Steed	PF	300 North 1000 West
North Steed/ Pond	PF	301 North 1000 West
Trainwatch	R-3	200 West 250 North
Rose Garden	R-1-8	700 West 375 North
Hoggan	R-1-8	234 West 550 North
650 North	CC	650 North State Street
Ross	R-1-8	Island in Ross Drive Subdivision
Mabey	TR	310 South 500 East
Cob (City Office Building)	CV	55 South State Street
Bicentennial	R-1-8	931 East 600 South
Fisher	R-1-9	920 South 1000 East and 825 South State Street
Aquatic	R-1-9	825 South State Street
Central	C-V	326 East Center Street
Thornock	R-1-8	200 South 500 West
Hamblin* (200 South)	M-1	126 South 200 West
Cornerstone	R-1-8	2601 South Main Street

Jesse D. Barlow	A-1	2100 South 500 West
Island View	R-3	1800 South Main
Fox Hollow	R-1-O/ R-1-8	2050 South 575 East
Chelemes	R-1-O	2140 South 1000 East
Jacobsen	R-1-O/ R-1-8	1045 South 1350 West
Kiwanis	R-2	300 North Vine Street
South Main (2 locations)	R-1-O	2200 south 50 East / 2250 East South Main
Cemetery	P-F	1050 South State Street
Park's Building	P-F	58 East 550 South
Old Library Site	R-1-8	562 South 1000 East

Mr. McIlrath explained the intent of the rezone was to have all City parks with the PF zone and to ensure the continual use of the parks as a public facility. The rezone would include parks and some other open spaces, but only those that were publicly owned, and City maintained. There was a discussion about some areas that should have been included in the request that were not. Mr. Brimley took note of them and confirmed they would come through on a separate request since it was too late to notice them.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval for the zoning map amendment based upon the following:

1. The proposed zoning map amendment was consistent with the land use guidelines, goals, and objectives of the Clearfield City General Plan.
2. Development of the properties with uses other than those expressly of a municipal use was inconsistent with the current and future use of the properties as public open spaces.
3. Preservation of open spaces and city owned land was vital for current and future residents.

On July 20, 2022, the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval to the Clearfield City Council of RZN 2022-060056, a zoning map amendment request by Clearfield City to rezone the subject properties designated as parks within the City from their current zoning designation to P-F (Public Facilities). There was no further discussion on the zoning text amendment request.

DISCUSSION ON THE FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT FOR LEGEND HILLS PHASE 4

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, presented a proposal for a subdivision for the property located at approximately University Park Boulevard and 1450 South. The subdivision would create legal commercial lots for development. The subject property was identified in the General Plan as commercial and was zoned C-2 (Commercial). The request was to create four separate commercial lots and would not contradict or impede the goals of the General Plan. Mr. McIlrath reviewed the acreages for the four lots and noted lot 4 was planned for a hotel.

- Lot 1 – 2.06 acres
- Lot 2 – 4.95 acres
- Lot 3 – 0.9 acres
- Lot 4 – 2.06 acres (TownePlace Suites Hotel Site Plan)

On July 20, 2022, the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval to the Clearfield City Council for FSP 2022-060045 as conditioned:

1. Plans should be revised to address Clearfield City Planning and Engineering comments and requirements prior to obtaining final signatures and recording the plat.
2. The final subdivision plan shall include any necessary changes as outlined in the staff report or required by local agencies.
3. The applicant is responsible for the replacement or repair of deteriorated, damaged, or missing surface improvements surrounding the perimeter of the subdivision. This includes, but is not limited to curb and gutter, sidewalks, landscaping park strip improvements, driveways, etc.
4. Sidewalk shall be installed along Legend Hills Drive from University Park Boulevard to the property boundary at 1795 East 1450 South to connect the transit stop to the existing and future land uses.

There was no further discussion.

DISCUSSION ON THE THIRD QUARTER SALES TAX REIMBURSEMENT INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR THE 800 NORTH ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Mr. Felix presented the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for the 800 North Roadway Improvement Project. He mentioned the Davis County Council of Governments (COG) approved the City's 2021 application for funding. The application requested \$56,000 for the purchase of property located at 723 West 800 North and the installation of roadside improvements (curb, gutter, sidewalk, and power pole relocation). He mentioned the area was part of the mapped "Safe Route to Schools" pathway for Doxey Elementary.

Mr. Felix informed the Council that the City would be teaming up with Clinton City and had another application in requesting \$1,000,000 for bridge improvements. The County awarded the funds with the understanding that the cities (Clearfield and Clinton) would be contributing \$484,000 to the project and would issue the funds as a reimbursement.

Councilmember Thompson inquired about supply chain issues. Mr. Felix confirmed that concrete and materials made by concrete had been an issue but noted that the contractors they had been working with (mainly Geneva) had been preemptive in trying to find ways to get concrete. JJ Allen, City Manager, asked if the City had an agreement with the property owner. Mr. Felix stated they did not. Councilmember Bush asked about the timing. Mr. Felix replied he had spoken with the engineer to help prepare documentation necessary to acquire the property. Once the engineer has provided the exhibits, the appraisal could be pulled together, and then the City could approach the property owners. He mentioned the improvements would be spring 2023 at the earliest provided the funding went through.

Councilmember Thompson asked if there was a need to plan for contingencies. Mr. Felix confirmed it was a concern, however that was the amount the County was willing to provide. Mayor Shepherd clarified that the \$56,000 was awarded last year and was part of a larger project. Mr. Allen added that when the time came to budget for the project, if additional funding was needed, a request would come back before the Council. Mr. Favero, Public Works Director, believed there was a placeholder

in the budget for some of the project. He explained that after the County provided more information, it was decided to reapply with Clinton to do a total road reconstruct and that had changed the dynamic and led to some confusion with the timing. There was no further discussion.

DISCUSSION ON PARKS, ART RECREATION, AQUATICE AND TRAILS (PARAT TAX) REVIEW

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, requested guidance from the Council for the future utilization of PARAT Tax funding. He provided a review of how PARAT tax revenue had been utilized.

- Six playgrounds (North Steed, Fisher, Cornerstone, Hamblin, Island View and Central)
- Play Structure in the Leisure pool at the Aquatic and Fitness Center
- Pickleball Complex
- Arts Supervisor (PT-FT 1 year)
- Arts Center Renovation
- Court Resurfacing (Fisher, Kiwanis, Jacobsen, Barlow, Island View, and Fox Hollow)
- Dog Park at Barlow Park

Mr. Howes recapped the planned projects that PARAT Tax funds had been committed to but not expended.

- Canal Trail Connection (200 South – 300 North, Combined with WFRC Grant)
- Mountain bike trails along Rail Trail and at Chelemes Park
- Pickleball Court completion (Parking and pavilions)

He explained that PARAT tax revenue was on the ballot for approval in November of 2014 and the City first received funds in April of 2015. The renewal would be on the ballot in November of 2024. Mr. Howes provided a timeline of the PARAT tax revenue and noted that projects intended to be completed prior to the 2024 election would need to be included in the FY23 and FY24 budgets to be completed prior to the vote for an additional ten (10) years, and any projects that required an extensive site design would be difficult to complete prior to the 2024 election. Staff recommended any projects funded with the first round of PARAT Tax funding be limited to those that would require minimal site design.

Mr. Howes stated that initially with the PARAT tax revenue, the City didn't want to borrow from itself. The Council wanted to wait until the money was available before beginning a project. He explained that if that strategy was followed all the way through, that would be about five to six months of revenue that would not be realized before it was proposed to be on the ballot. Knowing the revenue would be coming in, there would be options to borrow from fund balance or other sources that could be repaid within a few months should Council be amenable to it. If not, the City would continue as directed. Councilmember Phipps commented that the closer the City got to the end of receiving PARAT tax revenue, the less funding there would be available. Councilmember Peterson stated she wasn't excited about borrowing it at the beginning of PARAT, but it made sense at the back end. Mr. Howes commented on how well the phased approach worked until nearing the end, but now the option of borrowing should be considered.

Councilmember Thompson asked if it would be possible to poll the community around the time of the ballot to see if there would be interest in keeping the PARAT Tax. Mr. Howes explained the marketing efforts the City had done to get the word out about what PARAT tax revenue was and what the City had accomplished with it. Mr. Allen added that providing some projects anticipated for the second ten years, would be a selling point. Councilmember Bush asked how much the balance would be once the planned projects were completed and was there anything that could be accomplished with impact fee revenue. Mr. Howes estimated the balance to be around \$600,000. He said that some projects could be done with impact fees but staff would need to look carefully at the use of impact fees committed to other projects.

Mr. Howes provided Council with a list of recommended projects reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Commission during the meeting on June 15, 2022. He commented that the listed projects were in the order recommended by the Parks & Recreation Commission.

1. **Park Pavilion Replacements.** The project would include replacement of the small pavilions in Bicentennial Park, Kiwanis Park, and Train Watch Park. Replacement of the large pavilion at Kiwanis Park, and new pavilions at Island View and Steed Pond. Most of these would include new concrete pads under the pavilions. *Estimated cost: \$225,000.*
2. **Skate Park Improvements.** The project would include the elimination of some of the grass inside the fence and pouring a concrete pad. New premanufactured skatepark elements would be placed on the new cement including lower elements for less advanced skaters. *Estimated cost: \$150,000.*
3. **Bicentennial Playground.** Bicentennial Park is the City's largest park without a playground. The project would include the creation of a new playground pit and the purchase and installation of the playground. The location proposed was on the west end of the park where the sidewalks exist but do not connect. *Estimated cost: \$150,000.*
4. **City Hall Playground.** With all the construction of apartments surrounding City Hall, staff recommended the addition of a large playground in the front of the building in the area just south of the front steps. This would also serve to reduce unnecessary grass and make the area much more inviting as a part of the downtown area. *Estimated cost: \$200,000.*
5. **Fish Cleaning Station at Steed Pond.** The addition of a fish cleaning station and shading pavilion would provide a location for cleaning fish on site and eliminate the need to dispose of fish guts in the existing garbage cans. *Estimated cost: \$45,000.*
6. **Dog Park Phase 2.** The new dog park at Barlow Park was extremely popular. The proposed addition would utilize the triangular space north of the existing dog park for a second dog park for smaller dogs. Some importation of fill material would be required to grade the site and irrigation would need to be installed. Other expenses would include additional fencing and the installation of a drinking fountain. *Estimated cost: \$45,000.*
7. **Mabey Pond Restroom.** The project would include the installation of a precast concrete restroom similar to the one installed at Cornerstone Park. *Estimated cost: \$90,000.*

8. **Mabey Pond Fish Cleaning Station.** The addition of a fish cleaning station and shading pavilion would provide a location for cleaning fish on site and eliminate the need to dispose of fish guts in the existing garbage cans. *Estimated cost: \$45,000.*
9. **Mobile Stage and Sound Equipment.** The stage could be used for the 4th of July or other events such as those conducted on the Center Street bridge. The purchase would also include a sound system. *Estimated cost: \$225,000.*

Mr. Howes asked for Council's thoughts on the proposed list. Councilmember Bush would like to see an all-abilities park somewhere. He believed it would be a great PARAT Tax use and draw. Councilmember Thompson suggested the integration of all-ability equipment into existing areas. Councilmember Peterson liked the idea of conceptualizing the all-ability idea in phase two. Councilmember Phipps suggested moving the skate park improvements lower on the list just above the mobile stage and sound equipment. He expressed concern with placing a playground at City Hall. Most of the Council seemed to agree with not wanting a playground at City Hall. Councilmember Peterson would like to see an art plaza at City Hall. Mr. Allen interpreted the intent behind the playground at City Hall to make it an inviting place. Mayor Shepherd commented on the professionalism of City Hall.

Mr. Howes asked for clarification on the projects Council would like to move forward with. There was a discussion on the necessity and importance of the proposed project list. The consensus was to proceed with park pavilion replacements, skate park improvements, Bicentennial playground, Steed Pond fish cleaning station, and the dog park phase two. Council did not want to proceed with the playground at City Hall.

DISCUSSION ON CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 23 (FY23) BUDGET

Rich Knapp, Financial Manager, reviewed proposed changes to the FY23 budget since the June 21, 2022 meeting.

- Added \$4,000,000 GOEO Grant – Clearfield Station
- Added \$5,390 for Youth Commission Advisor and Chaperone to NLC
- Added \$3,600 for new police officer laptops
- Parks and Facilities Mega bid reallocation
 - Net all parks & facility projects - \$230,000
 - \$870,000 decrease in General Fund Funded Projects
 - \$735,000 from Cemetery Expansion cut
 - \$622,000 PARAT
 - \$361,000 previously budgeted
 - \$840,000 Impact Fees
 - Will have excess in fund 45 for future year allocation.

Mr. Allen commented that it was a big ask to have the advisor and any chaperones cover their own costs for the National League of Cities (NLC), so it was decided to plug those costs into the budget. Councilmember Peterson appreciated the addition. Mr. Allen commented that when the new police officer position was added to the budget, some of the necessary equipment was not added to the budget.

Mr. Knapp explained if Council took the \$870,000 decrease to the General Fund and wanted to keep the \$735,000 set aside from the Cemetery Expansion cut, there would be an extra \$135,000 in fund 45. Community Services requested the \$135,000 budgeted for the cemetery expansion, which had been eliminated, be reallocated to fund facility projects at the Clearfield Aquatic and Fitness Center that would need to be addressed as soon as possible. Mr. Howes provided Council with a list of the facility projects along with the cost, description, and priority order.

Priority	Project	Cost	Description
1	Electrical issues (low voltage panels)	\$ 50,000.00	Replace panel
2	Drain Line	\$ 25,000.00	Leisure pool repair drain line where temp. fix was done
3	Sump pumps	\$ 18,000.00	Sump pumps in pit needs to be diagnosed and replaced
4	ERV'S	\$ 5,403.97	Energy Recovery Ventilation
5	5 secondary fail/safe chemical backup	\$ 8,250.00	Need 5 secondary fail/safe chemical backup
6	Heat Exchangers	\$ 5,974.94	Heat pumps torn apart and rebuild
7	A/C issues	\$ 7,000.00	A/C issues - programming
8	Repair slide	\$ 30,000.00	repair slide/temp fix
9	Backwash control units	\$ 37,000.00	Rebuild or replace backwash control units
10	#2 Filter	\$ 10,000.00	Filter #2 on leisure pool not filtering/rebuild
	Chlorine and Acid	\$ 5,000.00	Chlorine and Acid schedule 80 PVC lines pressure tested and replaced where needed
	Leak repair-chlorine tank	inc in Previous	repair leak on main chlorine tank
	Leak repair-lazy river	\$ 2,000.00	Repair small leak on lazy river
	Impeller (play structure)	\$ 1,500.00	Possibly a new impeller on toy needed
	Leak repair-toy pump	\$ 1,200.00	Small leak on toy pump
	Jet drains	\$ 6,000.00	All drains need to be jetted
	Drain grates	\$ 5,000.00	Several Drain Grates Cracking around pools-inside and out
	Showers serviced	in-house	Showers all need to be serviced
	Tile-hot tub	\$ 8,000.00	Missing tile in hot tub
	Tile-lap pool	x	Chipped tile around lap pool
	Wrought iron fence	x	Wrought iron fence on South side is falling. Needs repair
	Shut off valve	\$ 6,500.00	Shut of valve on leisure Broken. Has a band aid on it. Now sc doesn't leak water on motor
	UV lamp replacement	\$ 1,800.00	

Mr. Howes acknowledged there was a greater need than available funding, but the use of reallocated funds would provide the ability to make immediate improvements and address the key issues. Mayor Shepherd clarified that the budgeted amount in the General Fund would not be changed. Mr. Knapp reaffirmed the General Fund amount wouldn't change, just the reallocation of funds, however, more would be spent in PARAT tax revenue and Impact Fees.

Mr. Knapp mentioned the Council would be seeing the certified tax rate come through on August 9, 2022 for a public hearing and consideration of approval. There were no additional comments on the budget.

There was a discussion around the upcoming schedule. Councilmember Roper would be out on August 9, 2022, Councilmember Bush would be out on August 16, 2022. Mayor Shepherd would be out on August 23, 2022, and Councilmember Phipps would be out on August 30, 2022.

Councilmember Thompson moved to adjourn at 7:39 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Bush. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 23rd day of August, 2022

/s/ Mark 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, August 2, 2022.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder