



**CLINTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
CITY HALL  
2267 North 1500 W Clinton UT 84015**

**MAYOR  
Brandon Stanger**

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

|   |   |                               |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>Date of Meeting</b>  | <b>August 22, 2023</b>  | <b>Call to Order: 7:00 PM</b> |
| <b>City Council &amp; Staff Present</b>   | City Manager Dennis Cluff, Police Chief Shawn Stoker, Fire Chief David Olsen, Treasurer Steve Hubbard, Community Development Director Peter Matson, IT Specialist Dereck Bauer, JUB Engineer Bryce Wilcox and Lisa Titensor recorded the minutes.   |                               |
| <b>Attendees who signed in</b>  | Paul & Christy Bezzant, Larry Solien, Toni Daniels, LOM Bryson, Crista Daniels, Marie Nerl, Barbara Henstrom, Scott Henstrom, Mike Nerl, Token, J. Moore, J. Horne, Sharon Bingham, MG Williams, W. Hutchins, Garrett Seely, Marv Brumett, Craig Layton, Mickie Layton, J. Adair, Guy Adair, Louise & Gerald Sedlevicius, Evan Nelson, Preston Anderson, Brad Parker, Chris Wilkinson, Ronald Robbins, Amber Robbins, Larry Isaacson, Kirk Humphreys, Jeff Ritchie, Cory Swallow, Richard Higginson, Marilyn Diamond, John Diamond, Eric Engel, Steve Eastes, Brad & Barbara Devereaux, Brandi McFarland, JoDee Baker, David Baker, Chad Anderson, Conrad Anderson, Jolyn Roeseler, Gary Roeseler, Christine Hangman, Shawn Hangman, Judy Criddle, Trent Williams, Danica Smith, Chase Smith, Judy Frandsen, Beth Johnson, Dona Gallegos Mike & Jentri Nielsen, Don & Jan Grow, John Ostler, Mike Petersen, Kaitlyn Blanchard, Eric R. McMurray, Kathy Bagley, Jacob Leder, Keri Millward, James Hansen, Catherine Dunkley, Trevor Michel, Laurie Vincent, Becky Bluemel R. Schulz, Matthew Wuthrick, Tyler Ashby, Casey Hill, Rachel Fernandez |                               |
| <b>Invocation or Thought &amp; Pledge of Allegiance</b>   | Dennis Cluff  |                               |
| <b>Roll Call &amp; Attendance Of City Council</b>   | Mayor Stanger, Councilmember Dougherty attended electronically, Councilmember Searle, Councilmember Stanton and Councilmember Tyler<br><br>Councilmember Stark was excused.   |                               |
| <b>Public Input</b>   | There was none.   |                               |
| <b>A. RENEWAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH WC3, WEST COAST CODE CONSULTANTS, INC. FOR PROFESSIONAL PLAN REVIEW AND INSPECTION SERVICES</b> |   |                               |
| <b>Petitioner</b>   | Dennis Cluff, Peter Matson  |                               |
| <b>Discussion</b>   | <p>WC3 has provided professional services to the City for commercial plan and fire reviews and also building inspections in the past when the City staff needed help. This is a renewal of their previous agreement with a slight increase in their base fees. The fee changes are as follows:</p> <p>Plan Review Engineer – from \$120/hour to \$125/hour<br/>           Fire Plans Examiner – from \$95/hour to \$115/hour<br/>           Building Plans Examiner – from \$95/hour to \$100/hour</p> <p>This engineering group has been outstanding in providing assistance on comprehensive plan reviews of commercial developments and filling in</p>   |                               |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | occasional gaps we have in our City coverage or review time line requirements.  |
| <b>CONCLUSION</b>   | <i>Councilmember Searle moved to approve the City Manager signing the Service Agreement with WC3. Councilmember Stanton seconded the motion. Voting is as follows: Councilmember Dougherty, aye; Councilmember Searle, aye; Councilmember Stanton, aye; Councilmember Tyler, aye.</i>   |
| <b>B. <u>PUBLIC HEARING ORDINANCE 23-06Z</u>: REQUEST FROM MIKE HARDIN FOR APPROX 1.00 ACRES LOCATED AT 652 N 1500 W FROM THE A-1 (AGRICULTURAL) TO THE R-1-6 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE</b>  |   |
| <b>Petitioner</b>   | Petitioners: Mike Hardin on behalf of Marvin and Debra Brumett<br>Submitted by: Peter Matson, Community Development   |
| <b>Discussion</b>   | <p>The rezoning request consists of one parcel totaling approximately 1.00 acres located on the east side of 1500 West at approximately 652 North (Parcel No. 14-065-0017). The subject property includes a single family home situated on the 1500 West frontage with vacant ground on the rear portion of the site.</p> <p>The rezone request is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Map (see map attached to the staff report) recommendation for R-1-6 zoning in this area of the city. Additionally, single family subdivisions in this area have developed in this same zoning district. The R-1-6 zone is present in only a few areas of the city and is an important component in the overall land use scheme of the city contributing to the variety of lot sizes. Smaller single family lots increase the availability of houses in our residential market accessible to a wide group of residents.</p> <p>The rezoning from the A-1 to R-1-6 zone is directly south of the R-1-6 rezone recently approved. The applicant is looking to add the rear portion of this parcel to the property to the north for a potential future of a minor subdivision. The existing home will likely stay and be incorporated into a new subdivision plat in the future. Future development of this property will be subject to city standards for access, lot size and utilities. This R-1-6 rezone represents a reasonable zoning request based on consistency with the land use recommendation of the General Plan.</p> <p>Mayor Stanger opened the public hearing at 7:09 pm.</p> <p>Mary Frederickson commented she is in favor of this rezone.</p> <p>With no further public comment, Mayor Stanger closed the public hearing.</p> |
| <b>CONCLUSION</b>   | <i>Councilmember Tyler moved to adopt Ordinance No. 23-06Z approving the rezone request from Mike Hardin of approximately 1.00 acre located at 652 North 1500 West (Parcel No. 14-065-0017) from the A-1 (Agricultural) Zone to the R-1-6 (Single Family Residential) Zone. Councilmember Searle seconded the motion. Voting is as follows: Councilmember Dougherty, aye; Councilmember Searle, aye; Councilmember Stanton, aye; Councilmember Tyler, aye.</i>  |
| <b>C. <u>PUBLIC HEARING ORD 23-07Z, ORD 23-08Z, RES 19-23 &amp; RES 20-3</u> A REZONE REQUEST BY DEREK TERRY FOR 4.20 ACRES FROM A-1 (AGRICULTURAL) TO PZ (PERFORMANCE) AND APPROX 19.20 ACRES FROM A-1 TO R-M (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL). THE R-M REZONE IS ACCOMPANIED BY A REQUEST TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN FROM A FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF PZ AND R-1-15 TO R-M. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT APPROX 2600 N 2000 W</b> |   |
| <b>Petitioner</b>   | Petitioners: Charles G. Summers Family Trust, Sharon S. Bingham and Doug F. Summers Trustees, Judy Frandsen Trustee, and Ellis F. and Emma Jane Bouwhuis Summers Trustees represented by Garrett Seely and Derek Terry<br><br>Submitted by: Peter Matson, Community Development   |
| <b>Discussion</b>   | <b>DESCRIPTION OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE AREA:</b> The rezone request consists of five parcels totaling approximately 23.40 acres located at approximately 2600 North on the west side of 2000 West. The subject property includes a single family home situated on the southern portion of the 2000 West frontage. The General Plan future land use map recommends the front (east) portion of the site (500' depth from 2000 West) for PZ zoning and the remaining western portion for R-1-15 zoning (see the zoning maps and general plan future land use maps attached to the staff report). The proposed +/-4.20 acres of PZ zoning is consistent with the General Plan   |

recommendation. The proposed +/-19.20 acres of R-M zoning not consistent with the current General Plan recommendation and therefore, the applicant is requesting the General Plan amendment to match the requested R-M rezone.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:** The packet attached to the staff report includes a letter of explanation from the applicant that provides, among other things, a historical perspective from the property owners regarding the challenges they've experienced marketing the land to developers over the years. The isolated section of homes along the north portion of the 2000 West frontage leaves a narrow section of planned PZ zoning to the rear the applicant proposes for R-M zoning (townhomes).

The residential portion shown on the proposed concept plan represents a transition of density from east to west. This is accomplished by situating the townhome portion adjacent to planned PZ zoned area, and situating detached single family homes on the western portion of the site next to existing single family neighborhoods.

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT:** Given the complexity of this request and the fact that the R-M zoning district standards lack sufficient detail for such a project, a development agreement is proposed. The draft development agreement is attached to the staff report which describes what the City agrees to provide (City's Undertakings) and what the owner/developer agrees to complete (Owner's Undertakings and Rights). The draft agreement includes additional sections common in most municipal development agreements including Article VII specifying that the terms of the agreement are binding upon the owners and successors and assignees (future owners and developers). Several details from the applicant's proposed development and design standards letter are included in the draft development agreement.

The more substantive language of the development agreement is found in Article IV, which describes what the Owner, and subsequent developer, agrees to if the General Plan amendment and rezones are approved. More specifically, this portion of the agreement provides guidelines and standards regarding the maximum density of the project, residential site amenities, residential design standards, site development standards, landscaping, fencing, HOA requirements, and public utilities.

These items should be considered conditions upon which a decision is made to amend the General Plan and change the zoning.

Moreover, the development agreement is important because the City's R-M zoning regulations presently are not sufficient with regards to basic development standards, design guidelines and private drive standards. If approved, the development agreement will be recorded against each of the parcels within the subject area, and any future owners or developers will be required to adhere to its standards.

**PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:** The Planning Commission reviewed this proposal during a public hearing on August 15, 2023. Several residents from the neighborhoods to the west and south were present and expressed concerns focusing mostly on the proposed increase in density and the additional traffic they're likely to experience once the 2650 North and 2100 West stub streets are connected to the new development. The Planning Commission voted to recommend to the Council denial of the General Plan amendment and rezone requests based primarily on traffic impacts on surrounding neighborhoods and the proposed increase in density.

Although the proposed concept plan does not show a public street connection to 2000 West, this is an option that can certainly be explored to help distribute traffic from the townhomes and small-lot single family portions of the site. Additional alternatives could be considered to better distribute traffic through the site. If it is determined that the valid planning and engineering issues from the public hearings can be addressed, the Council

should not feel rushed to make a decision regarding this proposal. The applicant is supportive of the Council tabling this item to the next meeting to allow additional time to work on alternatives and to address the concerns of planning and engineering issues and input from public hearings.

Mayor Stanger explained what is being proposed is 12 units per acre of town homes, there are no apartment buildings.

This property is in the pz zone which includes both commercial and residential components. The City does not own the property; they have a responsibility to follow current laws and the general plan when considering the zoning and development.

Mayor Stanger opened the public hearing at 7:17 pm.

Mike Petersen commented the rm zone is not up to date. It is important for the Council to take this into consideration.

There has been a lot of effort to get this property rezoned. It is important to carefully consider the rezone looking down the road for the best interest of the City.

Marilyn Diamond stated she has lived in Clinton for 75 years. This proposed development is good for the community. She feels that this is a good development to provide the new generation with places to live that don't require a lot of maintenance. The location next to the gym and the grocery store is perfect. There is already a road in existence. This will benefit the community in a number of ways.

Preston Anderson stated he lives in the neighborhood that will be most affected by this development. There are a lot of children in this area and their safety will be at risk. Adding 170 units could bring approx. 340 vehicles to the two existing streets which is excessive. There are other properties in the City that could be developed with higher density housing such as this.

Beth Johnson is a member of the Summers family; there are 30 plus family members involved. She understands the concern over traffic but feels this is prime property for higher density which is affordable.

Crista Daniels is the daughter of Joanne Summers Daniels. The family has been trying to sell this property for 10 years. She grew up in the area; it is no longer a farming community. She asked the Council to please consider this rezone.

Judy Franzen is a partial owner. The property has been for sell for the past 10 years. Several proposals have been declined by the City. The master plan from 1985 only identifies 1/3 acre lots. Previous Community Development Directors have been unwilling to forward development proposals to the City. Developers did not want to purchase the entire piece including the commercial. She would like the Council to move forward with this rezone.

Paul Bezzett is opposed to this development. He is concerned about water. The average person uses 3,000 gallons of water per month. His second concern is traffic. There are only two exits for this development. Schools are also an issue as well as the need for police coverage.

Trent Williams is a professional land surveyor. He is in favor of this development. Growth is a benefit to the City. It will also encourage UDOT to help improve the roads. He does have concerns about keeping the commercial.

John Ostler is against higher density in this area. The City does not have the infrastructure to approve this development.

Rachel Fernandez stated the proposed density is too high for this area. The single family lots are too small.

Kaitlyn Blanchard said future growth must not over look the general plan. Two streets is not sufficient for this much traffic; children in the neighborhood will be impacted, safety is a concern. In addition, she feels this development will cause a depreciation of existing home values. It is important to follow the general plan and not to seek alternative or high density housing. She would like the City to deny the zone change.

Louise Sedlevicius is concerned about the speed that vehicles will travel on these roads; if 2650 N is extended, vehicles will not slow down even to stop at the stop signs. There will be potential to speed on 2710 W all the through this new proposed subdivision. She is concerned for the safety and welfare of the children in the community.

Lorie Daniels Bryson stated Clinton needs affordable housing and this is a good plan. It will draw young professionals and commercial into the City. Affordable housing is an issue. The City needs a good plan moving forward. She loves Clinton and feels the commercial corridor is important.

Cory Swallow stated with 170 additional homes, he has researched the impact and predicts 463 vehicles will be added. This is an additional 370 vehicle trips per day on 2650 and an additional 556 vehicle trips per day on 2100. This is not acceptable with only two roads in and out of this area. Increased density compounds issues and puts residents at risk.

Steve Estes explained that 2275 connects to 2650 and speeding is already a huge problem in this area. He does not feel multi-family housing should be a consideration. The developer should not decide how the development should proceed.

Kirk Humphreys lives on 2650 N. He is also concerned with traffic. There are no studies that have been conducted to determine the adverse impact of adding this many homes in this small of an area. He says there already is not adequate storm water drainage, and increasing the density could also negatively affect the homes to the west. This may cause an increase in taxes for residents.

Richard Higginson stated zones like this are needed in cities. The access should be further investigated as well as the availability of water to accommodate this type of growth. He would prefer the City make a plan rather than have the state take over. In this area, he does not feel this amount of high density should be a consideration. People in single family homes don't generally like to live next to a grocery store.

John Diamond said he grew up in Clinton. He is also part of the Summers' family. The area has changed significantly. Traffic already is a problem while trying to farm the ground, water is also an issue. What is being proposed is in line with the master plan. This is a great development that will benefit the City for a long time.

Danica Smith stated the proposal packs in too many homes in this small of an area. There are already problems with overcrowding in schools. She has a child

with special needs who can't get the services they need. Children are being left behind. Although there are two new schools being built, it will not help the situation right now. 170 homes are too many for this area.

Doug Summers works with entrepreneurs as a profession, they won't consider developing in Clinton due to rooftops; restaurants will not come to Clinton. This is a good plan that will benefit the City. This is the time to develop this property with this type of development. He understands the consequences and challenges.

Kathy Bagley is here representing two properties. She loves living in Clinton City. Her concern is the traffic on 2350 W. She loves to see growth and change; however the roads for this development are not sufficient. The City should find other ways to exit. Maybe patio homes could be a consideration.

Larry Isaacson is in favor of the development but he is concerned about the exits and entrances for safety sake. Fire truck and ambulance access will be an issue; there should be a consideration of at least four entrances and exits.

Jody Baker is concerned about water; her father is on the board of the Weber Basin Conservancy District. She has calculated out that over 4,200,000,000 gallons of water will be needed with this development.

Laurie Vincent agrees that development is necessary. She would prefer less density in this area for emergency service reasons. Staff and equipment would be an issue. 2300 N is already a speedway. She has a child in a wheelchair and this is a big concern. The car wash going in on 2300 N is also a concern for water use. Emergency services are backed up already.

Dave Stock is new to Clinton, he is not for or against the proposal but does not feel the design is appropriate for this area. He fears it will become a speed zone. There needs to be more exits. There is currently a bus stop on his street, the bus is already full. The proposed plan is not safe or logical for the space and traffic it will generate.

Owen Pratt has lived in Clinton for 20 plus years. He has heard arguments for other proposals presented for this property and feels that accommodations such as a round a bout could be considered. Road and driveway widths are a lot of what previous conversations have been about.

Katherine Dunkley lives on 2650 N. She does not want the City to put the cart before the horse. The infrastructure is not in place for a development like this. She is ok with developing the property but with less density.

Donna Gallegos asked the Council to postpone the vote and do more research.

Mike Gary stated this plat was originally set up for R-1-15, not for high density. Growth is important but not for this much high density in an area like this.

The Mayor called for a 15 minute break.

At 8:21 pm Mayor Stanger called the meeting back to order. He expressed appreciation for the public's respect for each other in expressing their views. He realizes traffic is a main concern.

Garret Seely explained he is representing the Summers family. He thanked those in attendance for their comments and civility. He also understands that traffic is the main issue and dealing with UDOT will be a challenge. The property to the

south is owned by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and is landlocked. He addressed some of the issues expressed during the public comment. There are separation issues with driveways. There are no traffic signals but an ingress egress. There are currently two schools being built to address growth. The first move in wouldn't happen for at least another year. Over the next three years is when the impact will occur on the schools. Regarding water, new building standards are being incorporated to include low flow and water wise features. The reduced open space and xeriscape will help reduce water use. This plan proposes only public streets, no private streets. The driveways will be private but parking will not be allowed and will be enforced by an HOA. There will be a development agreement that will drive the development. The infrastructure has been signed off on by City officials other than a storm drain. There are plenty of areas within the City to accommodate the commercial depths being proposed.

Mayor Stanger commented on some of the concerns that the citizens brought up:

- Schools are a concern, currently, there is a boundary study going on for this area in Davis County. The City does not make decision for the School District.
- In regards to home prices, unfortunately because they are so high, many of the children of current residents will have to move out of the community.
- Clinton City is in a very good position for water. The water will accommodate any future growth. Prior City leaders have done a good job in being proactive with purchasing water rights in addition to planning for a new well and storage tank. Agriculture actually uses about 80% of the water in the state.
- Traffic will increase; there is a need to conduct traffic counts and evaluate if traffic can be dispersed onto 2000 W or add a third egress. UDOT will be a challenge to work with.
- Parking should not be a concern because the proposed development has two car garages and extra long driveways.
- The General Plan does need to be reviewed. It currently does not include buffer zones which are needed to help break up the commercial and the homes.
- Storm water will be addressed as required by state law.
- Emergency services are important. The City has recently increasing the number of police officers and has created a paramedic program. The goal is one officer per 1,000 residents.
- Development agreements are adhered to and guide development. It identifies setbacks for commercial property and helps balance property rights with the development of the City.

Community Development Director Matson reported on what took place at the Planning Commission public hearing.

The comments from citizens during the Planning Commission meeting open house were similar to the comments and concerns expressed to the City Council. The main issues appear to be traffic, increased density and if the General Plan should be amended. The Planning Commission came to the consensus that the General Plan should not be amended.

For clarification, Mr. Matson explained that with this type of proposal, when a zone change is not consistent or doesn't match the future land use plan map, the Legislature has given cities the ability to enter into development agreements which is recorded against the land. The City code has an RM zoning district. It talks about density and setbacks. The maximum density is 12 units per acre and the setbacks are not conducive to a typical design. The depth of the PZ Zone along the 2000 W Corridor is anticipated to have a 500 foot depth for future development. Sometimes this works and sometimes it doesn't.

Councilmember Dougherty stated she has heard all the comments and appreciates the public's input. She expressed compassion for all parties concerned. She feels this is a serious issue and there is a need to carefully and appropriately balance the concerns of current property owners, nearby neighbors and of the City.

Two issues that do not concern her for this proposal are water and schools.

1. "Water is not an issue in this context for Clinton City right now as the Mayor pointed out. In actuality as much as 90% of culinary water is put back into the system. The real culprit is outdoor water use."

2. "Councilmember Dougherty said she is in favor of some moderate increases in density in select areas."

3. "On the north end of 2000 West, where the proposed development reduces the setback to 250 feet, UDOT will exercise partial takings and leave a 25-foot frontage for the existing homes along that major corridor; she anticipates the residents will most likely want to sell someday to commercial development. If the setback is reduced, she wonders if they will have less ability to sell."

Regarding the schools, she called the Director of Planning for the Davis School District. He cautioned that a City should not base their development plan on concern for school district enrollment. Single family housing is expected to generate approx. 1 student per home, town homes generate approx. 1 student per four units and apartments generate approx. 1 student per every 10 units. The Cranefield subdivision has a lot and is in preparation for a future elementary school. They anticipate that school will be sufficient to address the school needs for the next 40 years.

Councilmember Dougherty said she is in favor of some higher density. The General Plan did not anticipate the housing crisis before us now. Utah has a shortage of 30,000 units of housing statewide. The State and Legislature is forcing the hands of cities to accommodate the problem. The City must choose from specific options. She would like to plan this strategically and carefully.

Traffic is a valid concern; she would encourage the developer to work with staff and the engineer to address this issue.

The sales tax base also needs to be a consideration in looking at the broader aspect and determining setbacks.

Councilmember Searle explained that the City has brought in a consultant to help guide the formulation of the multi-family zone. The goal is to maintain the standard of living while addressing affordable housing. The consultant said the only way for Clinton to bring in affordable housing is to exchange density for developers to provide attainable housing.

The City needs to look at helping to solve the housing crisis. He feels this is a better plan than anything he has seen for some time.

Councilmember Stanton expressed appreciation for all in attendance. She shares the concerns for the traffic and impact to the residents. Two streets are not enough. A traffic study would help provide clarity on this. She needs more information to make a decision.

Affordable housing should not require the City to sacrifice safety. Proper balance



needs to be considered and implemented for future development. She feels the pz zone should be increased on this proposal.

Councilmember Tyler stated it is a pleasure to serve on the Council. He appreciates that the rest of the Council has the best interest of the City in mind. Safety is a concern for the Council and they have increased the number of patrol officers and are committed to continue to do so as the population increases.

The City has hired a consultant to help with the multi-family zone to make sure we do it right. The City is receiving pressure from the State to provide attainable housing.

City leaders are committed to improving the pz zone. He is not too concerned with the setback. He would like the City to figure out the multi-family zone and get it in place.

He likes the town home development because they have public roads at the standard width in addition to the two car garages.

He is very concerned with traffic and is in favor of conducting a traffic study and looking into access from 2000 W. Safety is extremely important.

Mayor Stanger asked the Council for their thoughts on the following:

- to require a traffic study to determine if 2000 W could have an ingress and egress;

All were in agreement that a traffic study would be beneficial.

- 12 units per acre with traffic and commercial setbacks met;

Councilmember Searle stated he could agree with 12 units per acre.

Councilmember Stanton stated she needs more information.

Councilmember Tyler said he feels 12 is a good place to start. He is a proponent of property rights. He realizes a development needs to be feasible and profitable.

Councilmember Dougherty said there are too many variables right now. In general, up to 12 units per acre is a possibility somewhere in Clinton.

Councilmember Searle reminded the Council that the consultant has worked with many cities of different sizes. He was strongly of the opinion that this plan is well thought out.

These decisions are very difficult, he is relying on the experts such as the fire chief, public works and to police to determine if this development meets the guidelines.

Mr. Matson clarified overall this development is 9 units per acre averaged between single family and town homes.

- Depth for the commercial zone.

Councilmember Stanton said she would like to stay at 500.

Councilmember Tyler said he is ok with the proposed 457.

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
|                                   | <p>Councilmember Dougherty replied she is concerned about the setback and protecting the commercial sales tax base. On the north end of 250, UDOT will exercise partial takings and leave a 25 foot frontage; she anticipates the residents will most likely want to sell to commercial development. If the set back is reduced, they will have less ability to sell. She is undecided.</p> <p><i>Councilmember Tyler moved to close the public hearing. Councilmember Searle seconded the motion. Voting is as follows: Councilmember Dougherty, aye; Councilmember Searle, aye; Councilmember Stanton, aye; Councilmember Tyler, aye.</i></p>   |
| <b>CONCLUSION</b>                 | <p><i>Councilmember Searle moved to table Resolution 19-23 a request for a General Plan amendment from a future land use designation of PZ and R-1-15 to R-M; Ordinance 23-07Z the rezone request from A-1 to PZ; and Ordinance 23-08Z the rezone request from A-1 to R-M for property located at approximately 2600 North 2000 West (Parcels 13-490-0028, 13-049-0009, 13-049-0013, 13-049-0014, and 13-049-0015), and, Resolution 20-23 a Development Agreement with the property owners with the public hearing to be continued. Councilmember Tyler seconded the motion. Voting is as follows: Councilmember Dougherty, aye; Councilmember Searle, aye; Councilmember Stanton, aye; Councilmember Tyler, aye.</i></p> |
| <b>Approval of Minutes</b>        | <p><i>Councilmember Stanton moved to approve the minutes of the Aug 7, 2023 City Council Work Session, Aug 8, 2023 City Council Meeting and the Aug 9, 2023 Special City Council Meeting. Councilmember Searle seconded the motion. Voting is as follows: Councilmember Dougherty, aye; Councilmember Searle, aye; Councilmember Stanton, aye; Councilmember Tyler, aye.</i></p>  |
| <b>Accounts Payable</b>           | <p><i>Councilmember Stanton moved to authorize the payments. Councilmember Searle seconded the motion. Council members' Dougherty, Searle, Stanton and Tyler voted in favor of the motion.</i></p>  |
| <b>Planning Commission Report</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Planning Commission will meet next on September 5, 2023.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>City Manager</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Labor Day is September 4, 2023 and the City offices will be closed.</li> <li>• Sept 6 – 8 – Utah League of Cities and Towns conference.</li> <li>• Sept 9 is the 9-11 National Day of Service activity.</li> <li>• The September 26 CC meeting will be cancelled unless something that needs to be addressed comes up.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Staff reports</b>              | <p>Recreation Director Brooke Mitchell reported that Recreation is inviting local businesses to participate in the Halloween Walk. She also reported that vandalism in the parks continues to be an issue.</p>  |
| <b>Councilmember Dougherty</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paint Night is October 15, 2023 at Clinton Recreation</li> <li>• Cowboy Poetry is October 20, 2023 at 7 pm at Clinton Recreation.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Councilmember Searle</b>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing at this time.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Councilmember Stanton</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reported the Sewer District is continuing with their construction projects.</li> <li>• Youth Council interviews will be on Thursday, August 24, 2023.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Councilmember Tyler</b>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing at this time.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Mayor Stanger</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spread the word about the flag ceremony on Sept 9 for the Sept. 11 Remembrance.</li> <li>• Rates are going up January 1 for solid waste dumping fees.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>ADJOURNMENT</b>                | <p><i>Councilmember Stanton moved to adjourn. Councilmember Tyler seconded the motion. Councilmembers Dougherty, Searle, Stanton and Tyler voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 pm.</i></p>  |

-----  
 Lisa Titensor, Clinton City Recorder

