CLEARWATER CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MAY 28, 2020

1. **Call to Order: 7:00 p.m. via Zoom Web Conference**
   - Mayor Lawrence called the Clearwater City Council to order Thursday, May 28, 2020 at 7:05 p.m. via Zoom Web Conference. Members present were Mayor Lawrence, Council Members Petty, Kruchten, Scott, and Crandall. Also present was Administrator Smythe and several guests.

2. **Public Hearing – Res 2020-32 – Approving TIF Request – Mississippi Ridge**
   - Mayor Lawrence opened the public hearing at 7:06 p.m.
   - Jessica Green from Northland Securities provided an overview of the proposed TIF Plan and District. The requested TIF amount is $600,000 in a Redevelopment District. Based on the financial data and reports provided and certain financial assumptions, it appears that the developer has about $1.2 million of eligible costs which the district could support. Using the $600,000 requested, it appears the TIF Note would be repaid in about 12 years. Ms. Green explained that the proposal is for a pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) district, which means the city only makes payments when tax revenue is received. The split would be 10% retained by the city for administrative costs and 90% paid to the developer. Payments would end the earlier of 15 years or when the Note is paid in full.
   - Members had questions about TIF in general and how it works under statute. Ms. Green answered several questions related to this.
   - Resident Katie Neuman asked what type of housing it would be. Developer Mike Gohman explained that it is a 52-unit apartment building. The intent is for it to be transitional housing for people age 50 and older. Ms. Green noted that this type of TIF district does not have any restrictions on the type of housing.
   - Members had a handful of questions about the site plan, which were addressed by Mr. Gohman.
   - Members had questions about what happens to the TIF if the property was sold. Mr. Gohman explained that he did not have any current plans to sell and that the financials would make it difficult to sell until after the TIF is paid. Ms. Green explained that the developer's costs will be incurred up front, and the TIF reimburses those costs over time, so it would not necessarily make sense for the TIF to follow the property, since the current owner is incurring the costs. Ms. Green also noted that the TIF is needed to cover the debt service on the property to make it a viable project. Mr. Gohman concurred, and further explained that even though rents are lower here than in the metro area, construction costs are similar.
   - Mayor Lawrence closed the public hearing at 8:16 p.m.
   - Member Scott asked when the development agreement would be available. Administrator Smythe stated that they hoped to have it for the next Council meeting.
   - **MOTION** by Crandall to approve Res 2020-32, seconded by Petty, all voted aye. **MOTION CARRIED.**

3. **Res 2020-33 – Site Plan Approval – Andra K Salon & Spa**
   - Member Petty asked if the Planning Commission had any issues. None were noted.
   - Member Scott wanted to know if the building elevation was standard. Smythe believed so, explained that the city engineer had reviewed the plans and provided comments.
   - Member Kruchten noted that the Ash St entrance appears to cross two parcels. Smythe explained that both parcels are owned by one owner, and that an access easement for both parcels is one of the conditions of approval.
   - Smythe explained two changes staff are recommending to the Planning Commission's approved resolution, which are based on the timing of the project. One is to allow issuance of the building

permit while the easement is in progress. The second is to allow issuance of the building permit while application for the sign permit is pending.

- **MOTION** by Petty to approve Res 2020-33 as drafted, including the two staff recommendations, seconded by Crandall, all voted aye. **MOTION CARRIED.**

4. Ord 2020-02 – Animal Ordinance Amendments

- Smythe provided a brief overview of the proposed ordinance. Members had questions about specific provisions which were covered in the proposal. Smythe noted that the Council would need to decide the length of any permits issued and the permit fee if the ordinance is adopted. There was some discussion around these items.
- Members discussed enforcement concerns and whether to add a sunset provision. Guest speaker Katie Neuman, who assisted with the drafting, was concerned that residents would incur significant costs to build enclosures and acquire chickens, only to then have to remove them if the ordinance has a sunset. Member Petty thought we need a sunset so that residents were on notice that the ordinance could be repealed if chickens become a code enforcement problem. Members agreed to a longer sunset to try to address Ms. Neuman's concerns.
- **MOTION** by Petty to approve Ord 2020-02 with the following changes: 1) amend the language in section 10-94(c) to make it clear that free range is allowed within a fenced yard or a chicken enclosure, 2) add a section 10-99 with a sunset provision so that the ordinance sunsets on February 1, 2022, unless extended by the City Council, 3) amend section 10-96 to state that permits will expire February 1, 2022, unless extended by the City Council, and 4) set the chicken permit fee to match the fee for dog licenses, seconded by Crandall. Voting aye: Lawrence, Petty, Crandall, and Kruchten. Voting nay – Scott. **MOTION CARRIED.**

5. Adjournment

- **MOTION** to adjourn by Scott, seconded by Kruchten, all voted aye.
- Meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

ATTEST

Annita M. Smythe, City Administrator

APPROVED

Andrea Lawrence, Mayor