



Clinton City Council Meeting Minutes
2267 N 1500 W Clinton, UT 84015

June 22, 2010

The Clinton City Council was called to order at 7:05 p.m. Mayor Adams asked those present to sign the attendance record.

Councilmember Anna Stanton led the pledge of allegiance and Councilmember Blair Bateman offered the invocation.

Mayor Adams called for a roll call of all those present

Present were: Mayor L. Mitch Adams
Councilmember Blair Bateman
Councilmember Joanne Hansen
Councilmember Cheri Reed
Councilmember Anna Stanton

Excused were: Councilmember David Pearson

Mayor Adams noted that Councilmember Hansen will be excused at 10:00 p.m. if the meeting is not adjourned.

Also present were: Chris Anderson, Steve Peterson, Erika Anderson, Mindy Haung, Aaron Bateman, Deborah Barlow, Marvin Burnett, Steve Hubbard, Ruth Collard, Sheila Bateman, Rebecca Bateman, Dan Sainsbury, Clifford Child, Chris Thomas, Community Development Director Lynn Vinzant, City Manager Dennis Cluff and Lisa Titensor recorded the minutes.

A. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH FOR MAY 2010 – CITY MANAGER DENNIS CLUFF

Mayor Adams identified that Mr. Cluff has been recommended as Employee of the Month for May 2010 by several employees.

He went on to report that Mr. Cluff is in his sixteenth year of service to Clinton City. Dennis is a hard working dedicated employee and although he works hard all year, it is especially appropriate to recognize him during this time due to the countless hours and effort he puts in to prepare the City Budget.

As the City Manager and Recorder, Mr. Cluff is responsible for many functions of the City. He oversees various aspects of the day to day operations and is charged with keeping all the official records of the city as well. On a daily basis, Dennis insures that the citizens receive the services the city is responsible to provide. He oversees a consistent coordination between departments

for the operation of the city while staying within the confines of the approved budget. These daunting tasks require a sense of personal conscientiousness that Dennis shows through his every action.

Dennis sets a good example for all of the city employees with his dedication. He insures compliance with the Council's directives and ordinances yet exhibits a sense of fairness when dealing with difficult issues involving both citizens and employees. Dennis represents the city well on several committees and councils interacting at the county and state level. He insures that the city keeps up on changes to the state statutes and that city ordinances are brought up to date when needed. His knowledge and commitment to the city is invaluable.

Mayor Adams expressed appreciation to Mr. Cluff for his dedication and service. He presented Mr. Cluff with a certificate and a gift basket from Texas Road House in recognition of his dedication.

B. APPOINTMENT TO THE PARKS ADVISORY BOARD:

Parks Board Co-Chair Chris Thomas introduced Steve Peterson as the recommended candidate to the vacant position on the Parks Advisory Board.

Mayor Adams said he is pleased to recommend Mr. Peterson to the Parks Advisory Board for a 2-year term, expiring in April 2012.

Councilmember Hansen made a motion to ratify the Mayor's appointment of Steve Peterson to the Parks Advisory Board for a two year term appointment. Councilmember Stanton seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

C. 7:00 P.M. Public Hearing Resolution 14-10 Certification of the Tax Rate for Fiscal Year 2010-11 and Adoption of the Final Budget:

Mr. Cluff explained that the current Tax Rate for FY 2009-10 is .001729. The proposed new tax rate is .001752. The State Legislature has again modified how the Certified Tax Rates are calculated. Two changes now go into effect. First, personal property valuation is now based on the previous year's value. And second future property tax revenues will be reduced by the 5-year average of the "Redemptions", which we call Prior Year Taxes. Part of the model for calculating the Tax Rate takes into account that about 7.2% of the billed taxes are not paid during the appropriate tax year. That amount is calculated into the tax rate so that the proper amount of tax revenue is received. Subsequently, in future years a good portion of that 7.2% is paid and sent to the taxing entities as Prior Year Taxes. This has been the process the State and County have employed for decades in calculating and distributing the property taxes. Starting with FY 2011-12 (the year after the new fiscal year) if we wish to continue receiving this "redemption" amount of taxes (to keep ourselves at least even with the previous year's tax revenue), we will need to hold a Truth in Taxation hearing. The Legislature exempted the need for a Truth in Taxation hearing with the FY 2010-11 budget in dealing with the "Redemption" value, but listed it in the Tax Rate information so it would be clearly identified for future years.

Councilmember Reed asked how the residents will be affected.

Mr. Cluff responded it is based on property value. If property values decreased, residents would actually pay less. If property values increased, residents would pay more according to this new requirement.

He clarified the numbers reflect what was identified in the proposed budget. He went on to say the Final Budget is very similar to the Tentative Budget other than a budget account has been added for the Arts Board in addition to a small adjustment in Recreation salaries. The new budget is balanced and has taken into account those revenue shortages and over expenditures from this fiscal year, which should provide the City with a good financial footing if the economy holds firm or improves.

Mayor Adams opened the public hearing at 7:33 p.m. and asked for public comment. There was no comment or questions therefore he closed the public hearing at 7:34 p.m.

Councilmember Bateman made a motion to adopt the Certified Tax Rate of .001752 for Fiscal Year 2010-11, and Adopt the Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2010-11. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion. Voting by roll call is as follows: Councilmember Bateman, aye; Councilmember Hansen, aye; Councilmember Reed, no. for reasons identified in previous minutes; Councilmember Stanton, aye.

Mayor Adams acknowledged that approval of Resolution 14-10 was not included in the motion.

Councilmember Bateman made a motion to amend the motion to include adopting Resolution 14-10. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion. Voting by roll call is as follows: Councilmember Bateman, aye; Councilmember Hansen, aye; Councilmember Reed, no. for reasons identified in previous minutes; Councilmember Stanton, aye.

D. 7:00 P.M.-PUBLIC HEARING-RESOLUTION 15-10, AMENDMENTS TO FY 09-10 BUDGET:

Mr. Cluff identified that at the end of the Fiscal year, amendments to the budget are necessary which requires the approval of the City Council. These deal with inter-fund and inter-department transfers.

He referred to Attachment A included in the staff report and identified that these amendments are very limited this year due to the overall budget reduction program that the city staff pursued the latter part of the Fiscal Year. However, a number of expenses that are variable in nature need to be supplemented. These include additional funds for:

- Street light power - electrical power cost increases;
- Volunteer/temporary Fire Fighters - cost of additional fire call-outs; more fire calls and less ambulance calls than anticipated.
- Animal Control - late charges from previous fiscal year paid during this fiscal year;
- Recreation salary/benefit cost adjustments - slightly under budgeted;
- Sound System for Recreation and ball fields - unbudgeted cost; and,

- Heritage Days Activities - additional costs and transfer of revenues which requires Council Action.
-

He also identified the transfer of \$161,800 in funds from the Housing Revolving Fund to the Land Acquisition and Development Fund as a loan to finish off the Civic Center and Park construction costs.

He said with the changes identified it will allow the 2009-10 budget to be balanced.

Mayor Adams said he feels that the HoDAG is the best place to borrow the funds at this time. He clarified that if a better idea is brought forward this can be adjusted.

Mayor Adams opened the public hearing at 7:43 p.m. and asked for public comment. There was none, therefore he closed the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

Councilmember Reed asked for clarification on the General Fund adjustment for the Recreation salaries.

Mr. Cluff responded that he had under budgeted for 2009-10. He said it has been adjusted for the upcoming fiscal year.

Councilmember Stanton made a motion to adopt Resolution 15-10, amending the budget for FY 2009-10. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion. Voting by roll call is as follows: Councilmember Bateman, aye; Councilmember Hansen, aye; Councilmember Reed, no, because she would like to find funds somewhere else; Councilmember Stanton, aye.

E. 800 NORTH 1000 W – 2000 W RECONSTRUCTION - DISCUSSION AND DETERMINATION OF DESIGN, ON STREET PARKING:

Mayor Adams asked if there were any citizens present to address this issue. There were none.

He commented that funding was made available for this project so quickly due to the 1800 North widening project and he is hesitant to deviate from UDOT's recommendations on how the street should be laid out.

Mr. Vinzant provided the Council with the following information in the staff report:

- Citizens living adjacent to the intersection of 800 North and 1500 West, on 800 North are concerned about losing their on street parking due to the striping plan that calls for left turn lanes.
- At this time left turn lanes are not warranted.
- UDOT standard drawings is that turn lanes are included at intersections of collector streets
- Not counting intersections with state roads there are five fully developed collector street intersections and they are either a round-about or have left turn lanes, (1000W/2300N, 1500W/2300N, 1000W/1300N, 1000W/800N, 1500W/300N)
- Intersections that are close to being fully developed and don't have a turn lane, (800N/3000W, 1300N/3000W, 2300N/3000W)
- The intersection of 800 N and 1500 West will be fully developed in all four directions

- The intersection will eventually warrant a left turn lane, especially when the 1800 North project starts
- The plan is to have turn lanes at the intersection of 2000 West and 1000 West where they intersect 800 North along with the signal. This is not a discussion item; the turn lanes go along with the signal.

Councilmember Reed said that the speed limit is 30 mph and will stay that way; several roads in Clinton don't have left turn lanes and they function just fine. She proposed just doing the striping at this point without a left hand turn lane and allowing the residents to continue to park on the street.

Councilmember Bateman pointed out that eventually the City will need to put the turn lane in.

Councilmember Reed made a motion to leave the painting off for a left hand turn lane on 1000 W to 1500 W with an option to put it in later if warranted.

There was a discussion on the motion.

Mr. Vinzant suggested painting a center line from 2000 W. to 1500 W. to help direct traffic.

Councilmember Reed said the quality of life of those residents needs to be considered.

Councilmember Reed restated her motion for a center line only from 1000 W to 2000 W with no turn lanes except at 1000 W and 2000 W. Center turn lanes are subject to change with increased traffic. Councilmember Bateman seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

F. 8:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING ORDINANCE 10-02Z, REZONE REQUEST FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 614 N 1500 W TO BE CHANGED FROM R-1-9 TO R-M:

Mayor Adams identified this is a rezone request for property located at 614 N 1500 W to be rezoned from R-1-9 to R-M.

Erika Anderson gave a presentation to the City Council regarding the request where she made reference to the following information which was provided in the staff report.

Dear City Council Members:

June 14, 2010

First off, I want to thank you for looking at my re-zone request for my property at 614 North 1500 West. I realize that you are probably tired of looking at this property, and you have been so kind to do so. As I feel such a part of the process of city government with Clinton City with my frequent visits, I wanted to think of this request in terms of how you will see it. If I were on City Council, I would want to have the whole story, to better understand the request and requestor. So, here is the scoop-and I thank you for reading further.

Applying for a re-zone

I wanted to tell you why I am applying for a re-zone, and not going another route, to allow for higher density on this parcel. When I talked with Steve and Lynn, there were two options: re-zone or write

an ordinance. I have no problem writing an ordinance; it just takes so much time. They informed me that it would be at least 6 months of review and revisions and changes. I would need to amend the PRUD ordinance to include R-1-9 property, and then add an R-1-9 column to the chart for bonus density, along with creating ways to make the density work. This option is without a fee. (Which was very appealing to me!) However, when I look at this option in your shoes, I see this as now an ordinance was created for one little parcel, and the door opened for everyone to come and say it was done once, so why not again? Then you now will have an R-1-9 density on the PRUD overlay. The other option is to apply for a re-zone to R-M. This option made much more sense since the guidelines are already in place for that zone. And the problem of setting precedence would not come into play, as City Ordinances supports higher density at this address as stated in the Master Plan Update 1984 Text, pg. 3 (higher densities in the eastern portion of the City), 10b, Planning District #3 (which is South of 800 North, and East of 1500 West.), and pg. 12, which states that areas may need to be zoned R-M as the need develops.

My situation

This brings me to my next bit of information that I feel like you should know about me. Again, if I were in your shoes, I would want to know the entire story, and use all the information possible in making a decision. I want to put this in a letter to you personally, as this is not something that I want to be on a public hearing agenda, so all can see my mistakes. I hope you will not think I am trying to bring out the sob story, I will try and portray it as distant as possible, but this is my life, and it is really in a bind.

I bought this property in 2007 with a partner of mine, who is my uncle. He has done developments before, and has been in the Real Estate industry for many years. He is a professional, and I trusted him that this would be a good investment. I was under the impression that this was a partnership, meaning that each partner had half of the risk, and half of the profits. I did some creative financing to make this work: I used my line of credit on my home for the initial purchase, with a Seller Carry-back for about 80K. I worked out a deal with the excavator that he would receive one of the lots for payment, since I did not have any more money to pay him, and I thought that my partner would be coming to the table with some funds as well. While this creative financing was taking place, I had come to the City for my Private Drive proposal. I did not foresee how much time it could take, so I missed my window to back out of the deal, and had to purchase the property, and continue with the process, or lose it.

When the improvements were installed, the excavator's invoice was around 95K. We still had our agreement, so all was good. We put it on the market, and waited for it to sell. In the meantime, the seller carry back was coming due. I was planning on having a lot sold, so I could pay that debt. That did not happen. My partner/uncle also bailed at this point. He filed for bankruptcy. I tried getting a loan on the property, but this was the beginning of 2008, when things had crashed, and due to my debt-to-income ratio, no bank would give me any loan. In fact, they practically laughed at my request. I could not find any way to pay the seller, and he had the option of taking the property from me if I did not pay him. I would lose all that I had put into it, and would still owe on the loan on my house, as well as the excavator, and the seller carry-back.

My Mom came into play here, and mortgaged her house for the 80K so I could pay the seller. Now, there was a mortgage on her home that had been debt-free. I still have my line of credit. I still have the excavator to pay. And, I am paying this mortgage on my Mom's house. (Bless her for saving me!)

Now, to the present. Nothing has changed on any of the loans, since I have only been paying interest. All the amounts are still the same; I have just dumped about \$22K of interest payments into it. I have tried every avenue possible to sell these four lots. I am competing with bank owned properties, and they can take the hit and write off the difference. As this is my home equity and my Mom's mortgage, I can't write off any difference.

I finally had to face reality and know that I can't compete with these bank owned properties. They are selling for 50K a lot. I owe 70K a lot. Why would any builder in their right mind buy my lots for 20K more? Clinton is a wonderful place; I lived here for 4 years. I know the property is worth more, but things are only worth what someone will pay. Builders are looking at the bottom line, and will go to West Point or Syracuse if it will save them 20K per lot. And that is what has happened.

The Solution

The only way to increase the value in this property is to increase the density. It will not go anywhere until this is done. I have had numerous builders contact me and say they want to built townhouses or condos, and this parcel is the perfect place for it.

I am not out to make your lives miserable. I am only doing the best with what has transpired from a mistake 3 years ago, to the place that I am now, and also present an idea that will benefit Clinton more than just an empty lot that will become a junk pile over time.

I really feel like this proposal that I have to present is a good idea for Clinton. Once all of us get past the ideas that are the "norm" and look outside the box, this is really a nice place to have a small condo project. I would much rather have had this sell as 4 lots two years ago, and been done. But I can't just quit. There is too much at stake with me, and if this simpler idea does not go through, then I will be back again with another idea. There is nothing else I can do. My job that I have been working has also succumbed to the economy, and gone under. I don't know how I will make the next month's payment. It would help me tremendously if this re-zone would work for you, and it would be a quicker process.

Recommendation Changes Needed:

After the three meetings and work sessions with Planning Commission, I feel like you need a little more information about why I am taking the approach that I have. After the request passed on June 2nd, I was thrown into a state of panic, because with these restrictions, I am in no better shape than when I began. There are two problems that I am hoping you will understand and help me remedy.

They had suggested 8 units on the property. The reason is because I have never provided a good rendering that will show how more would fit in a workable way. I have never professed to know condos, or how they can be placed. I also don't have the money to hire an engineer to place them on the property, as you can see from my money troubles detailed above. As I have researched, there are so many options for condos and townhomes, and a builder with experience will be able to do so much more with the property than I can. The reason why 8 units will not help me is this: I owe \$300K on this property as is. Dave Adams Sr., of the Adams Company who built Clearwater Condos in Layton, said lots for condos sell between \$25K-30K. If I only have 8 units, my total is \$200K. I am still owing \$100K for the rest of my life. How will I ever get out from under this? In Clinton City Ordinances, in the R-M zone, the amount of square footage that I have will allow 12 units. With 12 units at \$25K, I am breaking even at \$300K. I will loose all the money that I have been making payments with, but at least I can pay off my debts.

The other restriction that I am asking for you to consider is the square footage of 950 square feet. Two things come up here: the first, in order to make this property marketable, there needs to be all the options available for a builder to come and make this property work. With their experience, they can use the R-M zoning guidelines and create a flowing and beautiful project. They will also need to have more units with not such a large footprint so the money can be spent on beautiful exterior and park amenities.

I have also met with the neighbors across the street, who were concerned with their property values with a condo project going in. I have done research on this, and you will have another document with the findings. Bottom line: if the condo's have the same square footage as a single family home, the home is worth \$220K, and the condos are selling in the \$150's, that will hurt the single family home values. With the minimum of 550 in the zoning requirements, the condos will still have 1650 square foot minimum. People who are looking for condos are not looking for a huge home, but something that is functional and less work. They are also looking to pay less than they would for a home. With the restrictions that Planning Commission suggested, the condo would be 2850 square feet, and they would cost \$240K to purchase. This is not reasonable. Using the Clinton City R-M guidelines, the condo would be a nice size of 1650 square feet minimum, also be more cost effective so the purchase price of the condo will be in the 150's, and not be in competition with the single family homes across the street.

Attachments Detailed:

I have attached a chart that summarized the recommendations of the Planning Commission, and the changes that will make this project more viable and reasonable for the builder and purchaser, and for me.

Also attached is a rendering with 12 units on the property, with all correct square footage for the R-M guideline setbacks and square footages, with a park of roughly 1000 square feet and 11 extra parking stalls. Again, I am not a professional, and an experienced professional could do much better than me, but this will show that 12 units fit nicely, and there is still tons of open space.

I have also attached a setback requirement of the current R-M zoning setbacks, and what this proposed project has. Again, space-wise, this is correct.

Another attachment is a Findings of Fact that I wrote after hearing the concerns from the Public Hearing on June 2nd. I have given this document to the neighbors at a separate meeting that I had with them. I talked to the neighbors to the north about a possible continuation of this project to the North and they are in favor. I have attached a rendering with the road continuing North through their property. This is also correct space-wise, the road widens from my property to 30 feet, and the condo's portrayed are also within the guidelines of the R-M zone requirements.

And, lastly, a Development Agreement for Pollock Estates.

Summary

All in all, I have tried my best to be forthcoming, upright, and completely honest with you. I hope this letter helps to clarify the situation and give you all the information needed to make your decision on June 22nd. I appreciate the time you have taken to review these documents and letter. I am also happy to answer any questions you may have-801-928-3919, or ptpowerclean@comcast.net. Thanks, Erika Anderson

SUMMARIZED REQUIREMENTS

R-M Zoning Requirements	Community Development Recommendations	Reasons for Recommendations	Needed adjustments to make project work	Reasons for Needed Changes
No requirement in zoning ordinance.	100% Universal Design (ADA Accessible)	Create niche for Clinton City, allow density in exchange for niche.	Agree, no changes.	Agree
550 square foot minimum ground floor.	950 square foot minimum footprint per unit	Match R-1-6 zoning around property.	Use current zoning minimums.	Not compete with homes, raise the value.
6 units per 21,500 sq. feet. Property has 45,685, allow 12 units.	8 units maximum	?	Use current zoning minimums	Compete in market, allow each unit to be a better price.
No requirement in zoning ordinance.	100% cementous material exterior	Higher standard then surrounding buildings, allow density in exchange for nicer buildings.	Agree, no changes.	Agree
No requirement in zoning ordinance.	Professional HOA & Development Agreement allows for change with more property.	Protect rights of residents, care of landscaping, snow removal.	Agree, no changes	Agree
No requirement in zoning ordinance.	Common area with amenity	Allow density in exchange for nice amenity for residents.	Agree, no changes.	Agree

Mindy Haung asked the City Council as an individual in a wheelchair to consider a universal design concept for the development which would be unique to Clinton. She said this would be a benefit to individuals with disabilities. She explained it is very difficult for those with disabilities to find a home to live in. Home modifications to meet ADA requirements are very expensive. She asked the Council to consider if they had a family member this may benefit. She added that this type of design can be used by anyone including individuals with disabilities. She said there will be upgrades and single level access.

Ms. Anderson expressed appreciation to Ms. Haung. She said they both feel strongly that it will benefit disabled people.

She identified examples of developments in surrounding communities in her proposal and included slides of landscaping possibilities and also identified there will be an HOA

She presented a rough diagram including set back requirements and special requirements. She went onto review requirements in R-M zone. She identified the road is 20 feet wide and provided a slide with an example of a 20 foot road with a comparison of cars and a comparison of people.

She went on to provide an example of a similar development and provided an example of a 40 foot side yard and 35 foot rear yard

She went onto address Clinton City Ordinances and made reference to the 1981 Master Plan, pages 84, 85 & 87.

She then went on to the 1984 Master Plan Update; Pages 8, 10, and the R-M Zone on page 12.

She identified she is asking for the rezone because it provides the City Council with more flexibility. She explained she is trying to accommodate other home owners in the area and explained that some of them may want to add on to the project.

Dan Sainsbury of Layton a realtor, gave his professional perspective. He said it is difficult to find homes that are handicap accessible. He referred to comparables in Clinton and said that prices have stayed comparable; this development will actually increase the value of surrounding homes. It has the potential for prices to out pace other developments.

He then made reference to the prices of twin homes and comparables from 2004; he said prices have continued to increase even with the economy over the past few years. These types of homes are still selling. He continued that it is tough to find single level homes. This would be an asset to the City and it is needed in many other cities as well.

Ms. Anderson discussed the cost of the proposed homes based on a 10-20% profit margin. She gave a comparison of 8 units vs. 12 units in the slide show. She explained there is a potential to add to the development with the purchase of additional property that is for sale. She identified there are additional costs for modifications to the current conditions

Finally, she asked the City Council to allow the R-M guidelines with 12 units, of universal design with a 550 sq. ft. foot print. She went on to address public comments from the previous public hearing.

- population – less people in multi-family vs. single family
- traffic – automobile trips per housing unit – condo traffic actually less
- property values will actually increase

She said 12 units per acre will meet her needs as well as raise property values and help current homeowners who wish to sell their property.

Ms. Anderson expressed appreciation for the Council's consideration.

Mayor Adams said he is concerned of setting a precedent.

Mayor Adams opened the public hearing at 8:47 p.m.

Deborah Barlow said she is concerned about increased density and long term ADA accessibility. She said her second concern is the width of the road and emergency service access. She said it is difficult for those vehicles to gain access.

Aaron Bateman said he just returned from a mission. He said he has seen developments like this and is concerned with the issues that high density housing may bring.

Chris Thomas said he lives directly west of this property. He would like to see the 550 sq. ft. requirement.

Clifford Child said he owns approx. 298 ft north of the proposed property. He would like to see this passed to join the project.

Marv Burnett said he has been a resident since about 1965. He was upset he did not receive a notice in the mail as an adjacent homeowner. He is concerned with the number of levels. He said he is looking to sell his property. He realizes the City is growing and changes are necessary. He likes the idea of the universal concept. He discussed how the property and surrounding properties are located. He said the sidewalk needs to be put in; this development would provide the City the opportunity to make those improvements. He said he would like to sell his property and join onto the development. In the meantime, he would like to see a 6' vinyl fence requirement to keep his privacy.

Mr. Cluff identified that Councilmember Pearson asked that his point of view be passed onto the City Council.

He asked the City Council to follow the guidelines of the Planning Commission. He is concerned with total density. He would like to see a maximum of eight units and would prefer a rezone to R-1-6.

Mayor Adams asked for additional public comment. There was none, therefore he closed the public hearing at 9:00 p.m.

Councilmember Hansen said that the rezone can only be addressed at this time. She questioned if a Developmental Agreement requirement can be placed on a rezone request.

Mr. Vinzant responded yes it is contract rezoning.

Councilmember Stanton questioned the basement.

Ms. Anderson replied there will be an option to have the basement finished. It will be a two level home.

Councilmember Stanton expressed concern about the size of the road and traffic. She asked if the Fire Department has done an inspection. She said she feels that 12 units are too many.

Mr. Vinzant explained that the size of the road will be considered during the site plan review. He clarified that the zone has requirements and the proposed development will need to meet those requirements.

Ms. Anderson clarified she is just presenting an idea for the re-zone. Other requirements will be addressed during the site-plan review.

Councilmember Hansen said she would be in favor approving the re-zone and allowing the Planning Commission to provide the answers to the requirements.

Councilmember Stanton said she is still concerned with high density and may be more in favor of an R-1-6 zone.

Councilmember Bateman said he is concerned about setting a precedent. The reference to the Master Plan is geared to a specific growth rate which has not been reached.

He identified the following concerns as well:

- * Emergency access
- * Duplexes have the potential to become an up keep issue and referred specifically to a Riverdale development.
- * 12 units may not be the best for this area.

He said he conducted a private survey and the average response he got was it was not acceptable. He said the City Council is charged with representing the best interest of all 22,000 residents of Clinton City.

Councilmember Reed said she may go along with single family homes but is not in favor of high density housing. She said she too is concerned about setting a precedent. There are a lot of one acre lots in the City that could request this type of development.

Ms. Anderson said she would consider an R-1-6 zone, but doesn't know how the private drive will affect the development.

Mr. Vinzant said the easiest way to do that is to have one home access 1500 West. He said the benefit to the private lane is the limited access directly onto 1500 West. He clarified there is no longer a private lane in the ordinance. Further research would be necessary.

Mayor Adams asked if an exception could be made with findings.

Mr. Vinzant said with findings, the exception could be made.

Mayor Adams asked

Mr. Vinzant expressed concern about requiring an HOA and future development joining onto the HOA. He said the water main could eventually be an issue as well. Research would need to be done for future impact.

Ms. Anderson asked if the current zone was left, could she be allowed to place six homes with one or two staying as a duplex with the universal design.

Mr. Vinzant replied that it is not possible with the current ordinance. It would have to be added.

He clarified that the ordinance as presented can be amended.

Mr. Cluff suggested tabling the item to allow staff time to research the issue further

Councilmember Reed made a motion to table this item to July 13, 2010 allowing the petitioner to consider bringing back a request for an R-1-6 zone with further input from staff regarding R-1-6 zone requirements. Councilmember Stanton seconded the motion. All those present voted in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Councilmember Stanton made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 25, 2010 City Council Meeting as amended. Councilmember Bateman seconded the motion. All those present voted in favor of the motion.

Councilmember Stanton made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2010 Special City Council Meeting minutes as amended. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion. All those present voted in favor of the motion.

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:

Councilmember Stanton made a motion to pay the bills. Councilmember Bateman seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT:

Mr. Vinzant reported on the June 1, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting as identified in the minutes.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:

- The Heritage Days celebration is coming up and preparations are under way.
- The July 4th Holiday is on a Sunday and the City offices will be closed on Monday July 5th.
- Identified the League of Cities & Towns is considering pursuing a Legislative Issue with potential economic aid ideas.
- Reported the gas tank pump is broke and City Employees are temporarily filling up at Maverick.

MAYOR ADAMS' REPORT:

- West Davis Corridor EIS Study will host three workshops in August and asked that the information be included in the July Newsletter

COUNCIL REPORTS:

Councilmember Stanton Reported:

- The Youth Council swearing in & Awards Ceremony was last Wednesday; they are excited for the new year. Youth Advisor Julie Davis does an excellent job.
- It costs the City \$3200 a year to stock fish pond.

Councilmember Pearson: Excused

Councilmember Reed Reported:

- The June Community Enhancement Class was a success; they will have the Quilt & Photography show in July and will skip August.
- The Community Arts concert will take place on July 13; they are assisting with the Movie in the Park; the Arts show and working on a float.
- She talked with Fire Chief Petersen and May was a normal month for fire calls; State certifications and training is on going. The annual Fire Prevention Fair is September 30.
- Asked the Council to consider being more lenient for signs for service projects.

Councilmember Hansen Reported:

- The Parks Board met and decided the Farmer's Market will begin July 31 – Sept. 25; proceeds will go to the purchase of the Veteran's rock. Some Commercial businesses are asking to have booths.
- The kick off of fund raising for the Veteran's rock will start at Heritage Days – looking for donations from HAFB and Veterans
- Met with Zac Martinez who is over Parks. She was impressed with he and his crew's resourcefulness with the limited funds they have.
- Flowers at cemetery during Memorial Day was an issue; suggested the City Council change the policy to not mow the Thursday before Memorial Day.
Mr. Cluff said that the City staff needs to work out a system.

Councilmember Bateman Reported:

- The CERT Program is run by volunteers; meetings are once a month on the second Wednesday of the month. Asked the City Council to complete their training.

- Concerned there is only one water line coming into Clinton City.
Mr. Cluff said staff is working on a plan.

ADJOURNMENT: *Councilmember Stanton made a motion to adjourn. Councilmember Reed seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:16 p.m.*