

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
February 6, 2018

PRESIDING:	Nike Peterson	Mayor Pro Tem
EXCUSED:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush	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
	Brie Brass	Assistant City Attorney
	Spencer Brimley	Community Development Director
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
	Wendy Page	Deputy Recorder

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: Brady Jugler - Chairman, Chris Uccardi, Kathryn Murray, Mallory Call, Robert Browning, Michael Britton

VISITORS: John Janson – Civil Solutions Group, Jake Young – Civil Solutions Group

Mayor Pro Tem Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON FORM BASED CODE AND DRAFTED SIX CHAPTERS

John Janson, consultant, reviewed the principles of form based code which included place making, planning based on form rather than land use, being proactive in the approach to development, and implementing a clear vision. He identified the chapter components to the form based code which included the following: introduction – places and districts, street types, uses, building types, open space, landscaping, parking, signs, and administration. He reported most of the chapters were drafted. He also reviewed the drafted chapter on places/districts which identified the creation of the following districts: Civic Center (CV), Urban Commerce (UC), Town Commerce (TC), Corridor Commercial, (CC), Urban Residential (UR), and Town Residential (TR).

There was a discussion about whether or not the area addressed by the form based code would expand to include Clearfield Station on the UTA (Utah Transit Authority) property at the south end of the City. JJ Allen, City Manager, explained the City was working with UTA to develop a separate Station Area Plan for that property that would be similar in nature to the Downtown Small Area Plan. He continued if the City wanted to apply form based code to that development

it would need to look at that after the creation of the Station Area Plan. Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, stated form based code was recommended by the Downtown Small Area Plan as a tool to develop or redevelop the downtown by creating areas or nodes that would become place-making. He suggested the form based code was being developed to accomplish that goal. Mr. Allen added if the City saw a need to expand the area governed by the form based code to the north or south it would be at liberty to do so.

Councilmember Phipps commented he was expecting more continuity and a similar look and feel to the districts on both sides of State Street in the Mabey Place area. Mr. Janson stated the east side of State Street in that area was proposed to be Urban Commerce (UC) and the west side of State Street was proposed to be Urban Residential (UR). He explained both UC and UR were mixed use area but UR was predominantly residential. Mr. Allen explained the proposed districts around Mabey Place were based on the Better City plan to redevelop that area. Jake Young, consultant, added the UC district was intended to be the heart of the downtown which would bring the intensity of mixed use through density, restaurants, and retail. He also commented State Street was a significant barrier for pedestrians being able to access both sides of the street so it made more sense to plan for the businesses, commercial, and restaurants on the east side of State Street. He stated the west side was proposed to mirror the east side but with compatible, residential development. Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, explained both sides of the road would be considered urban and they would have similar building types creating a similar look and feel. There was discussion about the possibility of a pedestrian bridge so both sides of the street could be easily accessed. It was noted any type of pedestrian crossing would need approval from the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT).

Councilmember Peterson asked how the form based code would help Better City in its efforts to engage a qualified developer/developers for the area. Mr. Allen responded the City's current zoning ordinances were a barrier to redevelopment for the area. He explained the form based code made redevelopment opportunities more practical for developers but alone it would not accomplish the City's goals. He stated it was possible the City would need to provide additional incentives to developers. He expressed his opinion redevelopment of the whole corridor would likely take decades but Mabey Place would be a catalyst for spurring additional redevelopment along the entire length of the corridor. He emphasized that big box retail development was not part of the plan for the State Street corridor.

Mr. Young reviewed the details in the proposed form based code. He described the street types and standards and indicated the street would be addressed from building to building rather than just the asphalted area. Street types addressed Main/State Street, Mabey Place, Neighborhood Street, Commercial Street, and Alley. Street standards addressed street cross sections, area from the curb to the building, walkability, on-street parking configuration, bike lanes, lights, trees, street furniture, and mid-block crossing. He provided examples of possible layouts for street development based on the types and standards.

Councilmember Peterson asked if there was a way to use the form based code to address beautification through landscaping along the corridor. Councilmember Bush asked if the recommendations of the Beautification Committee were being incorporated in the proposed code. Mr. Brimley responded the proposed code would address streetscape which included landscaping. He added the recommendations of the Beautification Committee would need to be

reviewed to address recommendations that had not already been addressed by the City. Mr. Allen stated landscaping in the public right-of-way would be a major public expense. He added the cost was more than the planting; it was also continued maintenance of the areas.

Mr. Young reviewed building types and standards. Building types addressed mixed-use, multi-family, office, commercial, adaptive re-use, townhouse, mansion home, and civic. Building standards addressed height, building frontage, setbacks, location of parking, buildings behind buildings, transitions to existing neighborhoods, building interest (materials and façade changes), and the amount of glass allowed on the first floor. He provided examples of possible layouts for street development based on the types and standards.

Councilmember Phipps asked if energy efficiency had been addressed as a standard for the proposed plan. Mr. Young responded that would need to be addressed specifically by architects and developers. Mr. Brimley suggested developers would be more likely to consider energy efficient buildings if the City offered some sort of incentive for it.

Mr. Janson presented an alternate plan being considered by the steering committee for the Mabey Place area that would identify the UC district for the center of the eastern parcel with the UR district around the edges. Mr. Young explained the UC district was only for mixed-use so no residential only buildings were allowed but under the alternate scenario residential only buildings would be allowed on the back side of the mixed-use area. Mr. Janson stated another option was to make the development of the entire parcel part of a master development plan. Councilmember Phipps expressed a desire for the entire development to have a connected feel to it. He wasn't sure that was possible under the proposed alternate plan. Mr. Allen commented the type of development Better City was working toward would require a master development plan for the entire area.

Mr. Young reviewed open space types and standards. Open space types were identified as plaza, square, green, commons, pocket park, park (larger open space), and greenway. Open space standards addressed the encouragement of rooftop open space, ten percent of the site reserved for open space, fifty percent of the open space required to be publicly accessible, and the open space must be useable and likely maintained by the developer.

Councilmember Phipps commented rooftop open space would not likely be accessible to the public. Mr. Young agreed and explained fifty percent of the open space would still be required to be in a place that was accessible by the public. Councilmember Phipps asked if there was a plan for some or all of the public space being publicly owned. Mr. Young commented there would likely be some of the open space publicly owned. Mr. Janson said the form based code would propose the possibility of a dollar amount in lieu of the open space and those dollars could be earmarked for development of public open spaces and/or plazas. Mr. Allen asked if the in lieu amount would be in addition to park impact fees. Mr. Janson responded it would be in addition to any impact fees.

Mr. Young reviewed landscaping requirements for areas governed by the form based code which included requirements for landscaping along the streets, in parking lots, buffers, and screening. He stated the development would require ten percent of landscaping for the development area, the placement of street every forty feet, a minimum of twenty trees per acre, a minimum of fifty

shrubs per acre, and a limit of sixty percent grass to encourage water conservation. Mr. Allen asked if there was any overlap potential for open space and landscaping. Mr. Brimley responded the requirements for open space and landscaping would need to be met individually. Mr. Allen asked how the developers on the steering committee responded to the individual requirements. Mr. Brimley stated there had been no objections voiced but agreed it might need to be clarified to them so it was clear the requirements would need to be individually met.

Mr. Young explained the parking requirements and the opportunities presented by allowing shared parking in the mixed use areas. Mr. Janson mentioned the code would address LID (Low Impact Development) techniques for capturing storm water, parking for compact cars, shared parking, head-out parking, on-street parking credits, bike parking, parking once, and visitor parking.

Councilmember Phipps asked how parking requirements would affect snow plow season. Mr. Janson responded there may need to be requirements for signs that identify time for all parking to be off the street.

Mr. Janson reviewed the different types of signs proposed for the code. The sign types were wall signs, awning/canopy signs, marquee signs, window signs, project/blade signs, monument signs, and center identification signs. There was a discussion about what types of temporary signs should be allowed and how to regulate compliance. It was suggested temporary A-frame signs be allowed in some places.

Councilmember Bush asked what type of building materials were allowed in the code. Mr. Allen mentioned vinyl siding would not be allowed. Councilmember Peterson asked if there could be a limit to the amount of stucco on a building. Mr. Janson stated there would be a cap so there would be variety to the development.

Councilmember Bush referred to the placement of center medians on State/Main Streets cross sections. He stated he did not want to limit business access for cars traveling on the opposite side of the road. Mr. Janson responded the code would refer to its use occasionally and call out it should not be a barrier. Councilmember Peterson agreed those medians made it difficult to patronize local businesses.

Councilmember Bush expressed a desire to have foldouts to slow cars down since the developments were intended to have a lot of pedestrian traffic. Mr. Brimley responded it mentioned foldouts in the street section of the code for limited areas but they would not be allowed on State Street. He continued UDOT agreed to work with the City on improvements to State Street such as medians but it would not allow foldouts on State Street.

Mr. Janson reported the code needed some revisions and a date for an open house with the public was pending. Mr. Brimley hoped to hold that open house the end of February or first week of March. There was a discussion about what format to use for the open house and what night to hold it on. Mr. Janson recommended a mass mailing to all property owners in the City announcing the event.

The Council took a break from 7:36 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:49 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDING THE PLANNING COMMISSION RULES AND REGULATIONS

Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, stated the City Council recently organized a Youth Commission. He continued the Council had expressed a desire to appoint a member of the Youth Commission to serve on the Planning Commission. He reported the Planning Commission discussed amendments to its rules and regulations in January 2018 but asked for clarification on a couple of points from staff and the Council.

Councilmember Roper explained the youth serving on the Youth Commission were intelligent, thoughtful, and mindful of making a positive impact in the community. He expressed a desire to provide an opportunity for them learn leadership and how to express ideas that would have an impact in their community. Councilmember Phipps agreed it would be beneficial to have youth serve on the Planning Commission. He continued the youth would add a much needed perspective that had the potential to enhance the City's future livability as well as provide the youth the opportunity to lead and grow in a way that would help them feel like they had a voice. He expressed his opinion the opportunity was a good way to help the youth learn how government worked.

There was a discussion about what age was appropriate for a voting member of the Planning Commission, whether an individual under the age of 18 should be eligible to vote as part of the Commission, how the youth member's term should be structured, and what training should be required to be a member of the Planning Commission.

There was consensus on the following amendments to the Planning Commission Rules and Regulations:

- One Youth Ambassador may be appointed by the mayor with the advice and consent of the city council as a non-voting member.
- Except for the act of voting, the Youth Ambassador should carry the same responsibilities and participate in the meetings as all Planning Commissioners and should receive the same training.
- The Youth Ambassador was not required to be a duly qualified elector.
- The Youth Ambassador should be an eleventh or twelfth grade student or between the age of fifteen and eighteen years at the time of appointment.
- The Youth Ambassador must primarily reside within the jurisdictional boundary of the City during the term of appointment.
- The Youth Ambassador should serve a twelve month term.
- The Youth Ambassador could finish a term of appointment past the age of eighteen.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 27th day of March, 2018**

/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, February 6, 2018.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder