



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

City Council Members
Mayor Brandon Stanger
Council
Marie Dougherty
TJ Mitchell
Barbara Patterson
Anna Stanton
Gary Tyler

Planning Commission Members
Chair – Tony Thompson
Vice Chair – Mark Gregersen
Dereck Bauer
Dan Evans
Jolene Cressall
Ed Olson

Date of Meeting	May 31, 2022	Call to Order	7:04 p.m.
Staff Present	City Manager Dennis Cluff, Peter Matson, Police Chief Shawn Stoker, Treasurer Steve Hubbard and Lisa Titensor recorded the minutes.		
Roll Call/Attendance	Present were: Mayor Stanger, Councilmembers Marie Dougherty, TJ Mitchell, Barbara Patterson and Anna Stanton; Councilmember Gary Tyler was excused. Planning Commissioners Dereck Bauer, Jolene Cressall, Dan Evans, Mark Gregersen, Ed Olson and Tony Thompson		
Citizens Present	Dean Hill		
Declaration of Conflicts	There were none.		
CLINTON CITY ECONOMIC PLAN PRESENTATION – ZIONS BANK PUBLIC FINANCE – HEATHER UPSHAW			
Petitioner	Peter Matson, Community Development		
Discussion	<p>Mr. Matson provided the following information in the staff report:</p> <p>This project was funded by an EDA CARES grant through the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC). The process began in 2021 with the consultant working with city staff to refine the analysis and information provided in the plan.</p> <p>An important part of a plan like this is the eventual implementation. The plan contains numerous demographic projections, comparisons to other cities, and an analysis of employment and retail opportunities. The document provides valuable data and background information that will be helpful in planning for the economic future of the city. The analysis shows that Clinton has desirable characteristics in many demographic categories. The proximity to major highway connections is crucial in Clinton’s growing economy. The potential to add major employers is notable, as is the opportunity to increase retail sales in various categories.</p>		

	<p>The analysis indicates the following ideas and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Capitalize on the low supply of available office space in Davis County – particularly with high demand for health services in this region. ▸ Focus on redevelopment efforts, specifically the former Macy’s store, in order to attract, for example, a niche grocer to the commercial center area. ▸ Create destination retail, i.e., concept stores, which will provide opportunities for customers to have experiences that are not replicated online. <p>Implement a Business Retention and Expansion Program (BRE) to increase the employment base within the community.</p> <p>Heather Upshaw gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the Clinton City Economic Plan as prepared by Zion’s Bank. The presentation is included as ATTACHMENT A.</p>
<p>REVIEW OF PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REGARDING WATER WISE LANDSCAPING STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES</p>	
<p>Petitioner</p>	<p>Peter Matson, Community Development</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Mr. Matson reviewed the following information included in the staff report:</p> <p>Staff has researched and reviewed several local and regional water wise landscaping ordinances to determine best practices regarding various regulations for consideration. The comparative table listed in Attachment B provides a summary of these regulations for review and consideration including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Residential and commercial park strip landscape materials. ▸ Maximum turf grass % for residential and commercial properties. ▸ Live plant vs. hardscape coverage for residential and commercial properties. ▸ Flip Your Strip and LocalScapes programs and references. ▸ Irrigation system and controller provisions. ▸ Requirements for water wise landscape plans to be stamped by a landscape architect. ▸ HOA provisions. <p>The majority of Clinton’s existing landscaping regulations for residential and commercial properties are found in Chapter 3 (Regulations Applicable to All Zones), Chapter 4 (Parking Regulations), and Chapter 19 (Performance Standard Zone). The regulations promote the use of turf grass as the default ground cover for streetscapes and rear/side yard buffers. In addition to the items listed above, other items for consideration could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Should residential standards be required with formal plan submittal and enforcement or should the focus be on the park strips and a maximum % of grass? ▸ Should small, medium and large commercial developments require different % of live plant material, grass or hardscapes? <p>Several local ordinances follow the general outline of the model water wise landscape code provided by Weber Basin Water Conservancy District. Clearfield and Herriman recently updated their landscaping ordinances based somewhat on the Weber Basin model code. Staff is of the opinion that these two codes provide solid examples on which to base Clinton’s update. Other codes address the issue by adding water wise standards as an appendix to the zoning ordinance or to the engineering standards to be used in times of severe drought. This, however, begs the question – Is water wise landscaping a temporary approach or is this to be a long-term shift in the city’s approach to water conservation moving forward?</p> <p>Mr. Matson provided a PowerPoint presentation included as ATTACHMENT B.</p>

	<p>Mayor Stanger asked the group to finalize their position on park strips. Councilmember Dougherty asked if the ordinance needs to contemplate alternate technologies in park strips, such as subsurface irrigation for grass, to maximize options for property owners. Mayor Stanger said he would rather simplify the ordinance to prevent confusion. The group was in consensus that grass will not be allowed in park strips going forward. Other living material will be allowed with drip irrigation (no overhead spray), but not required. Concrete will not be allowed (except on main roads).</p> <p>The conversation moved to grass percentages for yards in all new residential development. Mayor Stanger said Weber Basin had previously requested that cities restrict grass to 35% of all irrigable land on a property. He said he felt the City should set a percentage to regulate only the front and side yards, not the back yard. Commissioner Evans said restrictions on back yards would be difficult to enforce, and thus should not be regulated.</p> <p>Councilmember Dougherty said the City's goal is to save water. Regulations on only the front and side yards could have the appearance of conservation without really reducing overall grass amounts. She cited data from the state about the long-term nature of the drought. She recommended setting a 35% maximum grass allowance based on entire lot size, not just irrigable area, to reduce water use, maximize options for landowners, and spread the burden of conservation more equitably among landowners.</p> <p>Councilmember Stanton said leaders must consider the long-term impact on the look and feel of the City. She is concerned an ordinance that is too reactive will leave Clinton with an overabundance of rockscapes. She prefers restrictions based on entire lot size.</p> <p>Consensus was that grass at new commercial developments would be limited to 15% of irrigable area.</p> <p>The group considered a 50% minimum for living material in non-grass areas of front and side yards, outside of park strips. Mr. Matson asked if the ordinance should include recommendations based on Locascapes guidelines. The group agreed some guiding language and careful defining of terms would be helpful.</p>
--	--

REVIEW OF PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REGARDING ACCESSORY RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS (ADU's)

<p>Petitioner</p>	<p>Peter Matson, Community Development</p>
	<p>Mr. Matson reviewed the following information included in the staff report:</p> <p>House Bill 82, Titled “Single-Family Housing Modifications” was adopted during the 2021 legislative session. This bill requires municipalities to update their zoning ordinances that address internal accessory dwelling units to comply with Utah Municipal Code, Section 530. This bill requires cities to permit internal ADUs within single family homes. This portion of the code needs to be amended to be in line with State law but before a draft is prepared, input from the council and commission is needed to determine specific code provisions for internal ADUs and if the code should allow for different types of ADUs besides internal ADUs.</p> <p>In addition to requiring that cities allow for internal ADUs, State law indicates that municipalities may not restrict the size of the ADU in relation to the primary dwelling, or restrict total lot size and street frontage. Cities may regulate other aspects of ADUs such as parking, licensing, and utility meters. The attached table explains additional provisions and outlines Clinton’s existing code compared with State law.</p> <p>City staff continues to receive inquiries from residents about ADUs with many interested in detached ADUs such as “tiny homes” in the rear yard. When the planning commission discussed this issue, there was some interest in exploring detached ADUs in more detail to determine if this is a viable option for consideration.</p> <p>Detached ADUs may be worth examining if certain neighborhood impacts can be effectively addressed in the code. ADUs, particularly detached ADUs, can fill a need for families throughout the housing life cycle. Utah’s young and aging populations, as well as young</p>

	<p>adults, can benefit from this housing option.</p> <p>Staff will present several code options and diagrams showing how other communities regulate detached ADUs together with photo examples various sized units.</p> <p>The City Council and Planning Commission asked staff to look at what other cities are doing and bring back some options.</p> <p>They agreed anything brought forward should meet building code requirements.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	Councilmember Patterson moved to adjourn. Councilmember Dougherty seconded the motion. Councilmembers Dougherty, Mitchell, Patterson and Stanton voted in favor. Planning Commissioners Bauer, Evans, Gregersen, Olson and Thompson voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

ECONOMIC PLAN

CLINTON CITY – MAY 31, 2022



ATTACHMENT B

