

SMITHFIELD CITY COUNCIL

NOVEMBER 9, 2016

The Smithfield City Council met in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main Street, Smithfield, Utah on Wednesday, November 9, 2016. The meeting began at 6:00 P.M. and Mayor Darrell G. Simmons was in the chair.

The following council members were in attendance: Deon Hunsaker, Barbara Kent, Kris Monson, Jeff Barnes and Curtis Wall.

City Manager Craig Giles, Police Chief Travis Allen, Fire Chief Jay Downs and City Recorder Justin Lewis were also in attendance.

VISITORS: Darek Kimball, Brett Brunson, Bryon Brunson, Ted Miller, Camron Carling, Michael Furgeson, Jonah Larsen, Coby Carling, Richard Jewkes, Matt Hyde, Duane Williams, Todd Davis, Don Patterson

APPROVAL OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 12, 2016.

A motion to approve the city council meeting minutes from October 12, 2016 was made by Jeff, seconded by Kris and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

RESIDENT INPUT

Michael Furgeson stated he is working on his Citizenship in the Community merit badge in scouts and asked what he could do to help the community. Kris suggested Michael and his friends join the local youth council when they turn 14. The youth council does many local city projects and it looks good on a resume for college applications. Mayor Simmons said when someone does service for Michael and his family in turn he should do something nice for someone else to pay it forward. Jeff suggested being a good example and living the scout oath and law. Barbara stated learning about the government while at school from the local, state and national levels would be good. A lot can be done when people participate and are involved. Also, education on the constitution would be appropriate as it would be something you could keep with you and understand the rest of your life.

ANNUAL DISCUSSION ON OPEN AND PUBLIC MEETINGS TRAINING WITH THE COUNCIL AND MAYOR.

Justin informed the council one of the State of Utah compliance issues that the auditors check on a yearly basis is to see if the council and mayor had any training regarding open and public meetings.

Justin reminded the council of the following items:

A quorum of the council is three council members.

A quorum of the council is not two council members and the mayor.

The mayor only votes in the event of a tie and the absence of a council member or if a council member abstains from a vote and the vote is tied. If a council member abstains from a vote or is absent the mayor would not vote if the council vote is 4-0 or 3-1. The mayor only votes if 2-2.

All meetings of the council are to have an audio recording and written meeting minutes.

All meetings of the council must be advertised. The city advertises at the city office building, library, city website, *The Herald Journal* and the Utah Public Notice Website.

Any council member with a conflict of interest needs to announce the conflict before an item is discussed and give the reason for the conflict. The council member is allowed to participate in the discussion and vote if they choose to do so or they can abstain from the discussion and vote.

Any vote of the council requires a yes or no vote from each council member and the vote must be specifically listed in the meeting minutes.

Any vote to approve or amend the budget requires a public hearing.

Any land use change requires a public hearing.

Administrative items do not require a public hearing.

The city council is required to meet at least once per month.

The RDA board is required to meet at least once per year.

Resolutions do not require a public hearing.

Ordinances not pertaining to land use or the budget do not require a public hearing but the city has historically had a public hearing on all ordinances in the past.

Mayor Simmons mentioned the Utah League of Cities and Towns has many presentations online to view and watch regarding training, budgets and lots of information on land use as well.

RECONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ORDINANCE 16-08, A REZONE REQUEST BY DUANE WILLIAMS OF RND PROPERTIES, AGENT FOR BR PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT, LLC TO REZONE PROPERTY FROM A-3 (AGRICULTURAL 3-ACRE) TO GC (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 200 WEST 600 SOUTH, PARCEL# 08-105-0058, 4.92 ACRES.

Craig reminded the council they considered this request at the August council meeting and the request was denied at that time mainly because a purchase agreement was not in place for the parcel to be developed. A purchase agreement has been completed and supplied to the council. A public hearing is not required since there was a public hearing in August on the request.

Jeff asked the main differences between zoning classifications general commercial and light industrial? Craig replied general commercial is broader and gives the developer more options. The city has a use matrix table that is used showing what is allowed. Most general commercial projects require a conditional use permit. Light industrial is limited in what is allowed on a parcel compared to general commercial.

A motion to adopt Ordinance 16-08, an Ordinance rezoning Parcel Number 08-105-0058 from A-3 (Agricultural 3-Acre) to GC (General Commercial) was made by Curtis, seconded by Jeff and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON COMBINING THE PARK IMPACT FEE FUND AND RECREATION FUND INTO THE GENERAL FUND.

Justin informed the council as part of the annual audit the auditors did not understand why the park impact fee fund and recreation center fund were listed outside of the general fund as they are normally part of the general fund. Part of the property tax paid by the residents is a dedicated property tax specifically for the recreation center. The budget would not change for either fund other than the transfer line item would be removed and they would show up in the annual audit report but they would still be listed separately in the financials and have their own budget as in the past. The request was suggested by the auditing firm.

Mayor Simmons asked if the recreation center was listed separately since there is an agreement in place for shared maintenance costs at the rec center? Justin stated that was not an issue or the case.

A motion to combine the park impact fee fund and recreation fund into the general fund was made by Barbara, seconded by Kris and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ORDINANCE 15-01, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMITHFIELD CITY ANIMAL REGULATIONS, TITLE 6: 6.04.010 "DEFINITIONS" AND ZONING REGULATIONS, TITLE 17: 17.04.070 "DEFINITIONS"; 17.32.100 "SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR KENNEL/CATTERY CONDITIONAL USE".

Curtis mentioned the concern of the council when it reviewed the ordinance at a previous council meeting was the use of the word “premise” as there was not a good definition for what it meant. The ordinance was reviewed by the planning commission again and the word “premise” was removed and the rest of the ordinance was left intact.

Jeff stated he liked how the ordinance is written.

A motion to adopt Ordinance 15-01, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Animal Regulations, Title 6: 6.04.010 “Definitions” and Zoning Regulations, Title 17: 17.04.070 “Definitions”; 17.32.100 “Special Provisions for Kennel/Cattery Conditional Use” was made by Jeff, seconded by Deon and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF A NEW ENCROACHMENT PERMIT AND FORM.
--

Craig informed the council the staff had been reviewing the encroachment permit process after some recent concerns were mentioned. A new form has been created that will require the contractor to provide more information to the city. Proof of insurance and a traffic plan will now be mandatory. Inspections will be required and scheduled through the city office staff. Some of the fees for this service will be increased and are proposed as follows:

Permit Fee to work in Park Strip with no concrete interference: \$500 with \$250 refundable upon completion

Permit Fee to work including curb with concrete removal: \$1,000 with \$500 refundable upon completion

Permit Fee to work with asphalt, road surface or beyond curb: \$1500 with \$750 refundable upon completion

Projects must be completed within 120 days of when started.

The date for these projects in the past was allowed year round but UDOT and other organizations set limits of April 1st through October 15th as typically asphalt is available during that period of time. Permits can be approved by the staff out of that period of time if the weather is good and asphalt is still available.

Barbara asked if 120 days is too long to complete a project? Craig stated it is standard as 90 days could be too short for some projects.

Mayor Simmons asked if the permit and form had been reviewed by the city staff? Craig stated the city engineer and public works director both reviewed and approved of the new form and process.

Barbara mentioned she liked the idea of knowing when the project would start and when it should be completed by. Kris concurred and felt this new form was a better option.

Curtis suggested adding to the allowed permit time to include permits can be obtained outside of April 1st through October 15th weather permitting. Craig replied he would make that change.

Jeff stated based on the past this is a good change and well done.

A motion to approve the new Encroachment Permit and Form for the city was made by Kris, seconded by Barbara and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall
No Vote: None

PUBLIC HEARING, NO SOONER THAN 6:30 P.M., TO CONSIDER ORDINANCE 16-09, A REQUEST BY TODD DAVIS OF SUNSPOT PROPERTIES, LLC TO REZONE PROPERTY FROM A-10 (AGRICULTURAL 10-ACRE) TO R-1-12 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL 12,000 SQUARE FEET) LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1150 TO 1300 EAST ON DRY CANYON ROAD (300 SOUTH), PARCEL# 08-121-0002, 29.97 ACRES.

Craig stated the request is to rezone from agricultural to single family residential. The general plan calls for medium density in this area so this request would fit. The parcel located to the west is zoned for R-1-12 like the request is for this parcel. The planning commission has reviewed and approved of the request.

****The public hearing opened at 6:32 P.M.****

Todd Davis: The request fits the use of the area. There is a culinary water line already running through the area. There is room on the south side of the road for homes. Sewer is located on the parcel as well. All of the rest of the utilities are already located on the west edge of the parcel. The planning commission approved the request unanimously and there was not any opposition from those in attendance.

Curtis asked Todd if he was keeping any of the parcel for himself? Todd stated he will be keeping 10 acres on the east side of the parcel to build one home on. The plat proposal will start with 12,000 square foot lots on the west and then transition to 1/3 acre lots going east with one 10 acre parcel to the far east. Not all of the lots will be 12,000 square feet. There will be a variety of sizes.

****The public hearing closed at 6:35 P.M.****

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ORDINANCE 16-09.

Jeff asked if there are power lines on the parcel? Todd stated there are two sets of power lines on the east side of the parcel.

Todd mentioned he will be redoing the approach on the east side of the parcel where access is allowed for neighboring property owners.

Todd hopes to lease some of the property east of his parcel to farm.

Jeff asked how much property is located on the south side of Dry Canyon road? Todd stated the parcel is about 109 feet or so deep on the south side of the road.

Jeff asked if there is a pipeline through the parcel? Todd stated there is a ten inch culinary water line running along the north side of the road.

Jeff asked if storm water was being diverted from up the canyon? Todd stated the storm water used to run down a ditch south of this parcel but it had be diverted down the north side of Dry Canyon Road to get away from the subdivision located to the south and keep it from flooding. The road is washing out in some places and will have to be resolved when the project is developed.

A motion to adopt Ordinance 16-09, an Ordinance rezoning Parcel Number 08-121-0002 from A-10 (Agricultural 10-Acre) to R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 Square Feet) was made by Curtis, seconded by Jeff and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

PUBLIC HEARING, NO SOONER THAN 7:30 P.M., TO CONSIDER APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 16-05, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMITHFIELD CITY SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS, TITLE 16, IN PARTICULAR SECTION 16.12.030 “PREPARATION AND REQUIRED INFORMATION” AND CHAPTER 16.16 “REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL SUBDIVISIONS”.

Craig informed the council the public hearing for this item has been cancelled and moved to a future council meeting as this ordinance has many suggested changes that need time to be reviewed.

The signature block line item has been changed to current standard.

The word “blocks” has now been replaced with “streets”.

The biggest proposed change is to Section 16.16.020 Section “D” which would add 680 North, East of Main Street and Upper Canyon Road to the double frontage lot section of the code which designates where double frontage is not allowed. This means no home could face the road on these roads. Do you want to allow homes to face the road on Upper Canyon Road? The traffic is going to increase significantly on this road as several new developments have been recently approved. Safety could be an issue backing out onto the road. The offset is there is a high probability homes built on this section of road would fence off their backyards so would the residents only want to see fences as they drive up Upper Canyon Road? This ordinance would

make the parcel located directly to the north unbuildable unless a cul-de-sac is formed on the hillside as homes could not face the road.

Mayor Simmons stated this ordinance has safety ramifications as well as aesthetic concerns.

Barbara asked where the trail would be on this proposal? Craig stated it is currently on the brow of the hill but could be moved to the park strip area on Upper Canyon Road if the council preferred that option.

Craig suggested going to 2500 North in North Logan and seeing how fences line the roadway. Mayor Simmons mentioned this particular area is a checkerboard of different types of fences in different conditions.

Jeff expressed concern for so many new homes having driveways onto Upper Canyon Road.

Kris asked if there is enough property to have the homes gather on collector roads before entering onto Upper Canyon Road? Mayor Simmons replied there is not.

Craig asked the council to review the ordinance and drive through the area as the Ordinance will have the public hearing in December.

Jeff asked if gravel had been removed from this parcel? Craig stated it had and was approved by the council.

Jeff asked if a sidewalk would be installed by the developer on Upper Canyon Road if the homes faced the road or did not face the road? Craig stated the sidewalk is mandatory no matter how the homes face.

Barbara asked who would maintain the park strip? Craig stated it is up to the property owner but most likely if the backyard faces the road the property owner will not maintain their section of park strip. Jeff mentioned this area is perfect for xeriscaping in the park strip.

Barbara asked if fences are mandatory in this area? Craig stated they are not but most likely anyone living on such a busy road will install some type of fence for their backyard.

Barbara asked for clarification on the ordinance. As written it would not allow homes to face onto Upper Canyon Road? Craig stated that was correct.

Kris mentioned she understands both concerns and does not know if there is a good answer.

Mayor Simmons asked the council to drive by 1000 East around 600 South by Sunset Park as the backyards of all those homes are against the road.

Barbara mentioned some fences are really nice when installed but turn into eyesores if they are not maintained.

PUBLIC HEARING, NO SOONER THAN 7:00 P.M., TO CONSIDER ORDINANCE 16-07, A REQUEST BY DUANE WILLIAMS OF RND PROPERTIES, AGENT FOR BR PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT, LLC TO REZONE PROPERTY FROM A-3 (AGRICULTURAL 3-ACRE) TO GC (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 200 WEST 500 SOUTH, PARCEL# 08-105-0027, 7.33 ACRES.

Duane Williams stated this parcel is on the north side of the parcel that was rezoned earlier in the meeting. The master plan shows this type of zoning on the parcel. There are already commercial businesses located to the east.

Duane talked to the surrounding neighbors and their preference was commercial zoning over residential zoning. Duane visited with the Chambers family as well as Kelly Winn the owner of Key-Lix to the west. They all prefer commercial over residential. A commercial project will have less impact on the neighbors. The request fits the area and is in line with what the neighbors want to see when the parcel is developed.

The original request for the parcel was residential but after hearing concerns of the neighbors the request was changed to commercial by Duane.

Evolution Design is located to the east and will be building a storage area for their business on the south end of the parcel where the rezone just occurred.

The area will be nicely landscaped when completed like in front of the Evolution Design building.

Home builders had been contacted and they stated the parcel is not good for homes because of the farm and surrounding commercial businesses.

The preliminary plan for the parcel is storage units. There are apartments less than a block away that will need storage units and there is good access from 600 South.

Craig informed the council the request would be for General Commercial zoning and is the same as the parcel on the south end. This request keeps in harmony with the commercial vision for the area. The general plan calls for Light Industrial in this area but General Commercial is a better fit. There is some light industrial in the area already. This zoning would offer a good mix for the area. There are residential homes in the area as well as multi-family housing so this is a good transition point.

****The public hearing opened at 7:00 P.M.****

Matt Hyde: I am a partner on this project. I am a lifelong resident of the city. I live near this property. I want this parcel to look nice and represent the city. It won't be a trash hole. We won't build something anyone is ashamed of. We want to follow the look of the Evolution Design area. We have been in constant communication with the neighboring parcel owners. We want to keep peace and at the same time put something on the parcel that will appease everyone. Storage units are an option for the parcel. They would only require light traffic in the area and

the smell from the dairy would not be an issue. It would have a minor impact on the area. This project won't be rushed. We won't develop something that does not fit the area.

****The public hearing closed at 7:03 P.M.****

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ORDINANCE 16-07.

Deon stated he drove by the area. It did not appear to be prime agricultural land and the request fits the surroundings and the rezone request makes sense.

Barbara commented she liked the current zoning request better than a proposal for homes or multi-family units. The request also fits the general plan.

Kris mentioned she was opposed to homes on the property and feels the current request is better.

Kris was not sure if storage units were appropriate but agreed they would be off of Main Street and not bother the neighboring farm.

Jeff stated the land is good for agricultural purposes and is currently being used as a hayfield. There is irrigation water available on the property. This is a better fit than a request for residential homes on the property.

****A motion to adopt Ordinance 16-07, an Ordinance rezoning Parcel Number 08-105-0027 from A-3 (Agricultural 3-Acre) to GC (General Commercial) was made by Curtis, seconded by Jeff and the vote was unanimous.****

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON RESOLUTION 16-11, A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE PREVAILING FEE SCHEDULE FOR THE CITY.

Craig informed the council the staff had reviewed the prevailing fee schedule and had several proposed changes.

All of the cemetery fees were reviewed and some new line items added.

The cemetery fees were proposed as follows:

	Current	Proposed
Plot Purchase		
Resident	\$350.00	\$450.00
Non-Resident	700	900
Interment Fees		
Weekdays – Resident	350	400

	Current	Proposed	
Weekdays – Non-Resident	510	650	
Weekend/Holiday – Resident	500	600	
Weekend/Holiday – Non-Resident	650	850	
Burials after 4:00 P.M.	75	150	
Resident – Infant (1 Year or younger)		200	*New*
Non-Resident – Infant		400	*New*
Cremation – Resident		300	*New*
Cremation – Non-Resident		600	*New*

Kris asked what the new fees were based on? Craig stated other local cemetery fees in the valley had been reviewed and the proposed fees are not the highest or lowest in the valley.

Mayor Simmons asked for clarification on the extra burial fee after 4:00 P.M. Craig stated on occasion a burial takes place after 4:00 P.M. so the city staff is required to work overtime and this extra fee is added on top of the regular interment fee to cover the overtime cost paid to the employee.

Jeff asked if the city charges a plot transfer fee? Justin stated the city does not. The city does not allow plots to be sold either. Plots can be given to a family member or the city will buy them back.

Deon mentioned he remembered when the plot purchase price was \$150. Jeff mentioned the fees were increased just a couple of years ago. Craig stated the reason for the proposed increases is to help cover costs. The maintenance and repair costs for the cemetery have a budget of approximately \$72,000 and the revenue received from the fees is around \$49,000 so the general fund is covering the difference every year. The increase in fees will not make up the difference but will help to bridge the gap. Road work is needed and a future expansion to the east. There is not any funding set aside for these projects since the general fund has to subsidize the cemetery budget.

Kris mentioned the fees were too cheap in the past and people were buried here only because of the cost.

Barbara mentioned the cemetery is great and needs to be properly maintained.

Jeff asked which other cities fees were reviewed. Craig stated Logan, Richmond who is about the highest, Lewiston, Hyrum and Wellsville as well as couple of others.

Kris asked why Richmond is the highest? Justin explained the Richmond Cemetery Maintenance District is separate from the city. It includes all of Richmond and half of Cove. The district does not have a general fund to subsidize costs so they must meet their budget. They are a separate entity from the city.

Craig informed the council of a few minor requests to increase some fees and decrease some fees at the golf course.

Proposed changes to Golf Course Green Fees:

	Current	Proposed
Juniors		
Holidays – 9 Holes	\$15.00	\$10.00
Holidays – 18 Holes	29	20

Shotgun Tournament per person (Includes cart and green fees)

Friday, Saturday, Sunday & Holidays	48	
Other Days	36	
All Days		43

Club Rentals

18 Holes	30	25
----------	----	----

Sky View High School Tournament

Player	16	20
Coach	26	29

Craig mentioned all of the land use fees had been changed as the intent was to condense the fees into one simple fee not several different fees over a period of time.

Curtis asked what a minor subdivision is considered? Craig stated three or less building lots.

Curtis asked if the proposed fees had been compared to other cities? Craig stated that was correct and the proposed fees are not the highest or the lowest in the valley.

Deon asked what an intrablock development would cost? Craig replied a base fee of \$500 plus \$25 per building lot.

Barbara asked if the current fees are too low? Craig stated that is correct compared to other communities and the amount of time spent by the staff on the requests.

Barbara asked why the costs were not proposed higher? Craig stated the city has to be able to justify the costs that are charged. The proposed fees are in line with what Hyde Park and North Logan are charging.

Kris asked if any of the fees could be taken higher? Mayor Simmons asked why? Kris responded the city is the cheapest in the valley and if a person wants to come here they should come here because they love the city not because the city has the cheapest fees.

Craig asked Kris which fees she would like to increase? Kris responded she was not sure.

Jeff felt the cemetery fees that were proposed were appropriate.

Barbara asked for clarification on the change from lot to unit? Craig replied currently one lot could have one or 100 units on it and pay the same fee. The new fee structure is per unit not per lot so one unit pays one fee and 100 units does not pay the same fee but would pay the fee for 100 units.

Mayor Simmons felt the proposed changes were adequate and the schedule can be modified when needed as it is reviewed several times per year.

Mayor Simmons expressed concern if the fees go too high contractors might start to cut corners to help offset the cost of the higher fees and he did not want to see that happen.

Proposed changes to Office Fees:

	Current	Proposed
Fingerprinting		
Residents	\$0.00	\$0.00
Non-Residents	0	5
Additional Cards	5	5
Research Fees Per Hour	15.10	15.53
Returned Check Fee	20	30

Mayor Simmons asked how often fingerprinting is done for people? Chief Allen stated all the time. People need the service for background checks and jobs. Craig mentioned the city is one of the only places that does not charge non-residents and so everyone comes here because it is free. Chief Allen mentioned dispatch even tells people it is free and to go to Smithfield.

Barbara asked what the research fee is for? Craig stated for GRAMA requests. Justin informed the council state law only allows the amount to be charged equal to the lowest paid employee in the city office.

Craig mentioned the new water dedication section is to include the fees that were approved when a recent ordinance was passed so this is a new section.

Craig mentioned the entire parks and recreation center fee schedule was being changed and condensed. For example, in the past each individual fun run was listed now all fun runs are listed as one item.

Mayor Simmons asked if other departments other than the cemetery are not breaking even? Craig mentioned each department is being reviewed and an impact fee analysis and rate study will be completed after the general plan is adopted.

Deon asked if non-residents pay the same fees as residents for athletic fees? Craig stated that is correct. The city is currently working with Hyde Park to utilize their fields and have their kids be involved in the Smithfield program. Deon expressed concern that the city was transferring money to the recreation center fund to help subsidize programs for people not living in the city. Craig mentioned if all of the non-residents quit coming because they pay a higher fee the city will have to subsidize the rec program even more. Barbara wanted to make sure nobody was turned away from the rec center programs. Craig mentioned the fees charged at the rec center for the facility use are different for residents and non-residents. Deon said the only complaints he has received about the rec program are from non-residents and that frustrated him.

Jeff asked how participation at the rec center would be when the new high school opens? Craig said that is an unknown but the rec center is working with North Logan City to use the new fields for the local programs as there is never enough fields available for all of the teams and sports.

Curtis mentioned the local youth program is the best in the valley and he is aware of volleyball teams that come from Pocatello to participate locally.

Barbara mentioned she was comfortable with all of the proposed changes.

Curtis mentioned the DDD softball league fee could be eliminated as the city had not had this program for about seven to eight years. Craig mentioned Brett had left that fee as there is a chance it might come back.

A motion to adopt Resolution 16-11, a Resolution amending the prevailing fee schedule for Smithfield City Corporation was made by Barbara, seconded by Curtis and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

CITY MANAGER REPORT

Craig informed the council the employee Christmas party will be held on Monday, December 12th at noon at the Birch Creek Clubhouse. The city office will close at noon for the day. All of the full-time and permanent part-time employees are invited as well as the council and mayor.

Currently, the public works department is going around the city looking for tree clearance issues for the snowplow trucks. Letters will be sent to residents at properties where tree trimming is needed.

Mayor Simmons asked if the winter parking ordinance is in effect? Chief Allen stated it goes into effect on November 15th.

Mayor Simmons asked if the weather stays nice with no snow will the ordinance still be enforced? Kris felt it should be no matter how nice the weather is. Chief Allen stated the city ordinance allows for a warning ticket to be issued so a formal citation would not be issued the

first offense. Curtis mentioned a person can easily obtain a parking permit if needed and felt the ordinance should be enforced.

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS

Deon mentioned the city council meeting minutes are read by the residents as he had been contacted about the junk vehicles located on city property on the west side of town. Chief Downs stated two of the vehicles had been hauled away and the third vehicle would be used for training purposes and then hauled away. The vehicles are used for extrication training. The doors are cut off or roof removed with cutting equipment as if someone was trapped in the vehicle.

Deon mentioned at the last council meeting he supported using cones along the side of the road on 600 South where there is not any sidewalk. After seeing cones in the road by the Pumpkin Walk in North Logan, Deon felt this was not a good option. Someone would have to constantly move the cones into and out of the road and the snowplow trucks would destroy the cones. There is not a good solution for the area.

Deon shared a report from the Utah Water Users Association with the council.

Deon informed the council the historical society had relocated the display cases from the maintenance shop to the back of the Civic Center.

Deon read the following from Historical Society President Jeff Gittins:

“Historic Tabernacle/Youth Center Nominated to National Register of Historic Places

On Thursday, October 27, 2016, our community of Smithfield passed the first of two hurdles on the way to the National Register listing of the Historic Smithfield Tabernacle. After reviewing the nomination at their quarterly meeting, the Utah State Board of History has voted unanimously to forward the nomination to the Keeper of the National Register in Washington D.C. The nomination will be reviewed by the Keeper and a final determination made within the next few months.

In making this application, the Smithfield Historical Society wishes to express thanks to the Smithfield City Council for their unanimous support in this matter. The good people of Smithfield can take great pride and joy in this very unique part of our history and heritage.”

Barbara asked where the display cases would be used? Deon said he was not sure as the historical society had many pictures and maps to review to determine exactly what they wanted to display in the cases.

Barbara mentioned the youth council is involved in several projects and the next one is the senior ball. The senior ball will be held on Saturday, November 12th starting at 5:00 P.M. The theme picked by the youth council is “vintage patriotic”. The youth council helped with the Pumpkin

Walk in North Logan as well as the Trick or Treat Street in the city. The Trick or Treat Street activity was well done and the attendance was outstanding. The local fire and police departments participated.

Kris did not have any additional items.

Jeff informed the council the tree inventory for the city will be completed in November. Ben Harris who oversaw the inventory project will be meeting with Jeff and Craig to discuss the report. The tree committee is currently looking for two new members to fill open spots on the board.

Curtis mentioned the local chamber of commerce is doing well and preparing for the annual "Night of Giving". The cost to attend is \$25 per person or \$200 for a table of eight. The event will be held on Saturday, December 3rd at Sky View High School.

Curtis asked if the city could pay a couple of hundred dollars towards the purchase of a new iPad or computer for Stacey Dority for the service she renders to the city? Mayor Simmons asked if the chamber was going to participate in the cost as well? Curtis said he was not sure if Stacey would even accept any assistance but felt it would be appropriate for what she does for the city.

Curtis mentioned he attends each of the planning commission meetings where he is the council member who oversees the commission. If there is any additional information the council wants to see than is provided by the city staff he would be glad to send or report on if someone would just let him know. The planning commission meeting for November had been cancelled because of a lack of business but would be held in December.

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Simmons informed the council he had visited with the school district about the sidewalk issue on 300 South and they have many other areas in the valley with the same situation and they do not participate or offer any type of funding on projects like this one.

Mayor Simmons talked to Bob Saxton who owns the property and he was willing to dedicate the land to the city for the sidewalk but would not be financially contributing to the project. Bob has no interest in developing the parcel at this time.

Mayor Simmons visited with several residents of the area about their concern and there is a concern that a barrier or cones in the road would actually be confusing and dangerous for pedestrians and vehicles. There is not one best or simple answer to the problem. At this time Mayor Simmons had not been able to find any residents of the area willing to financially help pay for the project. There are sidewalk issues in this area on both the north and south sides of the road.

Barbara asked if a crosswalk could be painted on the three-way stop intersection? Craig stated a crosswalk cannot be created that leads to nowhere.

Jeff asked how much money is budgeted per year for sidewalks? Craig replied \$5,000. Jeff stated this area needs to be added to the list for future consideration. Mayor Simmons reminded the council there have been similar requests in the city at other locations and they have all been denied.

Craig mentioned the \$5,000 in the budget is for current sidewalk maintenance and repair; not for new sidewalk. The city has developers pay for new sidewalk not the city.

Barbara mentioned every option but a new sidewalk would also create liability issues.

Curtis mentioned the three-way stop intersection is covered with shade all day long and he understands how a vehicle could slide through the intersection when the road is icy. The city staff needs to make sure and salt this area as soon as possible after a storm.

Mayor Simmons asked how the council wanted to proceed at this point? Curtis mentioned he had spoken with Brian Higginbotham since the council meeting and the residents of the area are hoping something can be done. The issue with doing a trail on the Saxton property is there are trees on the west end that need to be removed or pedestrians will still have to walk on the road to get around them. Mayor Simmons asked Curtis to talk to Brian about the situation and concern of the council.

Curtis suggested the staff look at applying for the grant funding Principal Kathy Toolson had mentioned. Justin replied the program she is referring to is the State of Utah Safe Sidewalks to School program and is only available for projects on State of Utah Roads such as the highway and 100 North. This area would not be eligible. Craig mentioned the grant that was received for sidewalk improvements is on a state road (100 North) and that is why the project is being completed.

Deon mentioned police officers Derek Spence and Adam Roper needed to be recognized for their service to the community as they were just recognized locally for service rendered to members of the community and those outside of the community.

****Kris made a motion to adjourn at 8:00 P.M.****

SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION

Darrell G. Simmons, Mayor

ATTEST:

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION
96 South Main
Smithfield, UT 84335

AGENDA

Public Notice is given that the Smithfield City Council will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah on **Wednesday, November 9, 2016**. The meeting will begin at 6:00 P.M.

Welcome and Opening Ceremonies by Jeff Barnes

1. Approval of the city council meeting minutes from October 12, 2016.
2. Resident Input
3. Annual discussion on open and public meetings training with the council and mayor.
4. Reconsideration and possible vote on Ordinance 16-08, a rezone request by Duane Williams of RND Properties, agent for BR Property Development, LLC to rezone property from A-3 (Agricultural 3-Acre) to GC (General Commercial) for property located at approximately 200 West 600 South, Parcel# 08-105-0058, 4.92 Acres.
5. Public Hearing, no sooner than 6:30 P.M., to consider Ordinance 16-09, a request by Todd Davis of Sunspot Properties, LLC to rezone property from A-10 (Agricultural 10-Acre) to R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 square feet) located at approximately 1150 to 1300 East on Dry Canyon Road (300 South), Parcel# 08-121-0002, 29.97 Acres.
6. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 16-09.
7. Discussion and possible vote on combining the Park Impact Fee Fund and Recreation Fund into the General Fund.
8. Public Hearing, no sooner than 7:00 P.M., to consider Ordinance 16-07, a request by Duane Williams of RND Properties, agent for BR Property Development LLC to rezone property from A-3 (Agricultural 3-Acre) to GC (General Commercial) located at approximately 200 West 500 South, Parcel# 08-105-0027, 7.33 Acres.
9. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 16-07.
10. Continued Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 15-01, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Animal Regulations, Title 6: 6.04.010 "Definitions" and Zoning Regulations, Title 17: 17.04.070 "Definitions"; 17.32.100 "Special Provisions for Kennel/Cattery Conditional Use".

11. Public Hearing, no sooner than 7:30 P.M, to consider approval of Ordinance 16-05, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Subdivision Regulations, Title 16, in particular Section 16.12.030 "Preparation and Required Information" and Chapter 16.16 "Requirements for all Subdivisions".
12. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 16-05.
13. Discussion and possible approval of a new Encroachment Permit and Form.
14. Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 16-11, a Resolution amending the prevailing fee schedule for the city.
15. City Manager Report
16. Council Member Reports
17. Mayor's Report

Adjournment

*****Items on the agenda may be considered earlier than shown on the agenda.*****

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodation for this meeting should contact the City Recorder at (435) 792-7990, at least three (3) days before the date of the meeting.