



**SPECIAL WORK SESSION
2267 N 1500 W
CLINTON UT 84015**

**City Council Members
Mayor Brandon Stanger
Council**

**Marie Dougherty
Dane Searle
Anna Stanton
J. Stark
Gary Tyler**

Planning Commission Members

**Chair – Dan Evans
Vice Chair – Dereck Bauer
Jolene Cressall
Mark Gregersen
Ed Olson
Tony Thompson**

Date of Meeting	October 3, 2023	Call to Order	6:00 p.m.
Staff Present	City Manager Dennis Cluff, Peter Matson, Police Chief Shawn Stoker, Treasurer Steve Hubbard and Lisa Titensor recorded the minutes. Land Use Attorney Todd Godfrey		
Roll Call/Attendance	Present were: Mayor Stanger, Councilmembers Marie Dougherty, Dane Searle, Gary Tyler, Councilmember J. Stark Councilmember Anna Stanton attended electronically Planning Commissioners Dereck Bauer, Jolene Cressall, Dan Evans, Mark Gregersen, Ed Olson and Tony Thompson		
Declaration of Conflicts	There were none.		
1. PLANNING PROJECTS AND ZONING ORDINANCE.			
Petitioner	Mayor Stanger		
Discussion	Mayor Stanger introduced Todd Godfrey who is a land use attorney with a great deal of experience here in Utah. He reported the annexation petition for the area extending to 4500 West and up to the county border made it through the comment period and no protests were filed so it is anticipated this area will now be a part of Clinton. The City needs to start thinking about the best development options for this area in addition there is a need to update the General Plan. He added that the buffer zones also need to be reviewed. Mr. Matson reported the Wasatch Front Regional Council has requested the City focus on		

areas of change and also identify activity centers when submitting a letter of intent to apply for a grant to update the General Plan.

Mr. Godfrey stated he works for a firm that represents several cities and towns in Utah. He has been heavily involved in land use since the late 1990's.

There has been significant growth in Utah over the past several years. He reported there have been cities that have not developed responsibly and some that have been patient and developed more slowly and responsibly.

The cost of housing is a serious issue. States around Utah are passing laws to remove single family zoning. Residential communities will be significantly impacted over time if this happens in Utah. Utah has tried to avoid this by the municipalities communicating with legislators and also developing outside the transportation corridors. There is substantial pressure for higher density housing for Utah from the executive office. Although there has been significant progress made to address land use issues over the past several years with improvements on the transportation corridors, the Utah Legislature will eventually need to consider some of the same laws that surrounding states are passing such as no single family zoning and legally binding general plans and making zoning decisions administrative.

By Clinton taking a broader look at housing affordability and availability questions, they are moving in the right direction. This will allow the City to make the decisions for zoning and development that will be in the best interest of the community. Communication with developers and negotiations over higher density options can help with influencing higher design standards which can no longer be required in standard subdivisions by statute due to recent legislation. Higher parking standards and improved infrastructure can also benefit from these negotiations.

He suggested the City decide what their maximum limits are in regards to density and the needs of the community to draft future ordinances and agreements that will protect the City.

He advised that if a development agreement is used, the entire agreement should be recorded against the property. He is not in favor of development agreements for standard 10,000 sq. ft. lot subdivisions. Anytime significant density is being discussed, development agreements are generally effective for allowing flexibility and preserving the character of the project over time. It can also be tailored to address necessary requirements for a specific development's characteristics. One downside to a development agreement is that is open to a referendum. Cities are not allowed to actively advocate on a referendum position but they can correct false information. He strongly encouraged that cities strictly follow their code both by the Planning Commission and the City Council. Public Hearings for transparency are very important.

Mr. Godfrey then discussed zoning overlays. He is strongly in favor of them because they are clear and transparent. A planned development overlay could identify and require specific characteristics within the code. The overlay zone review to approve a development plan is outside of the legislative process. He feels that complicated multi-family projects should separate each process; legislative processes should run first and be clearly delineated and separate from administrative processes.

He strongly suggested looking at undeveloped open areas in the City and seriously consider if they can handle densities that would support more availability of housing and if there is anything that could possibly be done to help create affordable housing; consider if allowing entitlements will increase the availability of housing.

He is strongly in favor of preserving open space. Conservation easements are a good way to preserve open space by binding all future development on larger spaces.

	<p>The Planning Commission and City Council appeared to be in consensus that several factors including infrastructure, street widths, open space, buffers, setbacks, parking, etc. in addition to maintaining the rural feel need to be taken into consideration when deciding what type of higher density housing is best for Clinton City.</p> <p>Mr. Godfrey explained the City has the ability to negotiate with developers on items they are in favor of such as architectural standards which the City is not legally able to require in standard residential developments.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.