MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING **MAY 16, 2024; 5:31 P.M.**

MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: **MAYOR JOY PETRO, ZACH BLOXHAM, CLINT MORRIS, TYSON ROBERTS, BETTINA SMITH EDMONDSON, AND DAVE THOMAS**

STAFF PRESENT: **ALEX JENSEN, CLINT DRAKE, CHAD WILKINSON, LON CROWELL, DAVID PRICE, KIMBERLY ZYGMANT, KEVIN WARD, DOUG BITTON, ED FRAZIER, AND KIM READ**

The meeting was held in the Council Conference Room of the Layton City Center.

Mayor Petro opened the meeting.

AGENDA:

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Petro provided updates for the following:

- NDSD's (North Davis Sewer District) Hill Field Road project continued to take place and reported it had installed 1,700 feet of pipe and 10 manholes. She mentioned its Staff was consulting with Stephen Jackson, City Engineer, regarding its next project within the City.
- Wasatch Front Regional Council co-sponsored a breakfast with Envision Utah earlier in the day. The topic of discussion centered on types of housing, shortage of housing, etc. A representative from Portland, Oregon had attended and shared its successes in accommodating the demand for housing.
- Positive discussions were happening with Wasatch Integrated Waste Management District and suggested the Council identify a plan to move forward.

COUNCILMEMBER'S REPORT

Councilmember Smith Edmondson provided an update regarding the following:

- She mentioned a Communities That Care Board Meeting was held on Monday, May 13, 2024, and was seeking interested participants willing to serve on smaller committees and indicated it had a good list to pull from in getting interested people involved.
- She indicated the slides from the ULCT (Utah League of Cities and Towns) Conference from April had been available on its website. She specifically mentioned the social media session she attended and indicated she would be emailing the Council those slides. She believed it provided guidance and cautions for members of the Council.
- LPC (Legislative Policy Committee) was scheduled to meet this Monday, May 20, 2024.

Councilmember Thomas announced he had attended a graduation ceremony and mentioned six graduates from the Paramedic Program were employed with the City's Fire Department. He congratulated the graduates and the City's Fire Department for their achievement.

Mayor Petro reported Davis County had until August 15, 2024 to present a plan with how it would address 'Code Blue' this winter. She stated the County would be considering properties it currently owned or were owned by the State of Utah for a long-term solution. She informed the Council she wouldn't be expressing support in a formal capacity until a short list of properties had been provided and a discussion followed.

UPDATE – FIREWORKS RESTRICTIONS

Kevin Ward, Fire Chief, informed the Council State Code required the City to submit a map of its firework restrictions by June 1, 2024. Staff recommended the same restrictions as what had been implemented in the past and mentioned the City had recognized success and compliance by residents.

Doug Bitton, Fire Marshal, shared an illustration identifying the sales and discharge dates approved by the Utah Legislature and reviewed those with the Council. He reported there were approximately 25 permitted fireworks sale sites located within the City and briefly reviewed the requirements for those operators.

Councilmember Bloxham inquired whether the map identifying the restricted areas was required to be posted by fireworks sale vendors. Mr. Bitton shared the interactive map and explained how it could be used by the public and identified the restricted areas for fireworks. He mentioned signage was also placed near the restricted areas. He identified the locations of the two approved City parks designated for the discharge of fireworks.

He also shared a flyer identifying the hot shot cue firing system which allowed the discharge of fireworks electronically from a phone. He informed the Council about a specific vendor which provided a firework display at Sandridge Park.

Councilmember Roberts requested clarification regarding the designated time for the discharge of fireworks on New Year's Eve and Chinese New Year's Eve. Mr. Bitton responded he believed the 11pm reflected for December 31 was an error and would verify with the State Fire Marshal's Office. He ensured the Council the corrected flyer would be distributed.

LAYTON CITY LONG RANGE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN PRELIMINARY DATA PRESENTATION

Lon Crowell, informed the Council, Community and Economic Development Staff had been working on a Long Range Comprehensive Citywide Economic Development Plan (Plan) since January 2024. A consultant team comprised of Better City and Urban Design Associates (UDA) and indicated representatives were present to share an update with the Council. Eric Osth, Urban Design Associates, referenced a visual presentation and announced the project team were approximately half-way through the process and identified the following would be used to complete the Plan:

- Conduct analysis
- Assessments
- Stakeholder outreach
- Identify strategies

He explained the different analysis which would be completed to identify recommendations:

- X-Ray analysis – quantitative data
- Economic analysis
- Stakeholder Input – qualitative data

He shared a map and stated Layton experienced great connectivity within the region. He also identified the Urban Town Centers located throughout the City and mentioned those would be specifically studied and the major roadways were well connected to the urban town centers. A map was also shared reflecting the street hierarchy of the City and explained a disconnected street network created high-traffic corridors.

He shared an illustration which identified the land use portrait of the City pointing out single-family residential was the predominant land use compared to a different illustration identifying multi-family residential. He also mentioned the destination parks and open space within the City.

He also shared an illustration which reflected the job density for the City pointing out the larger employers were clustered around the I-15 interstate; this concluded the majority of commercial use was oriented to I-15. He shared illustrations of precedent cities which were successful with investing strong economic uses and suggested the City had incredible opportunity to grow and change with establishing retail.

He identified strengths and weaknesses of the City and reviewed opportunities and recommendations which should be considered. He shared some possible ‘place types’ which could be integrated into Layton.

He explained the process with moving forward and asked if there were any questions from the Council. The Council requested the inclusion of arterial roads and the City’s trail system in future analysis and maps. A discussion regarding the mall property took place.

RECREATION, ARTS, MUSEUM, AND PARKS (RAMP) COMMISSION RECOMMENDED FUNDING

Bridgit Gerrard, RAMP Commission Vice-Chair, recognized the attendance of the RAMP Commission Chair, Cameron Cross, following his deployment. Ms. Gerrard shared an illustration, which had been previously provided to the Council via email. She expressed appreciation to David Price, Parks and Recreation Director, and Kimberly Zygmant, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director, for their knowledge and assistance. She reported 43 grant applications had been received and 35 received full or partial funding for a total of $1,846,447.06. She reviewed the tiered categories for the requested funding. She reminded the Council how the RAMP Commission was established and pointed out it was mindful and accepted the responsibility for designating tax funding very seriously. She reviewed the factors which were taken into consideration when considering whether to approve the grant funding application. She emphasized the focus was based on whether the project benefitted the public. She asked if there were any questions regarding the Commission’s funding recommendations and pointed out City Staff had offered assistance to organizations submitting grant applications.

Mr. Price reported Staff had initially reviewed the submissions and identified any concerns. After further follow-up, clarification had been identified, the application continued to advance and a discussion followed. Mr. Price emphasized Staff and the Commission had attempted to work with applicants and the discussion continued. Councilmember Morris added one applicant had been invited to personally respond to questions of the Commission for clarification purposes and the project was ultimately funded. Mr. Price reported Staff was considering a new application which might provide better clarification for funding requests.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson suggested moving forward, feedback should be requested from those filling out the applications to better identify RAMP’s purpose since it would be coming before the public for re-election.

The Council expressed appreciation to the RAMP Commission.

The RAMP Commission and representatives from Better City and Urban Design Associates (UDA) left the meeting at 6:33 pm

DISCUSSION – SEBOYA FARMS DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

Chad Wilkinson, Community and Economic Development Director, announced Capital Reef Management, LLC, applicant of the proposed Seboya Farms development on West Gentile had requested time before the Council. He reported the Planning Commission reviewed an application for a General Plan Amendment during a meeting in November 2023, which was withdrawn by the applicant after the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of denial.

Brad Frost, Ovation Homes, expressed appreciation to the Council, and mentioned an email had been sent to the Council regarding the agenda item. He shared a visual presentation and briefly reviewed the history associated with the original concept and design associated with Seboya Farms development. He reported the development had been re-designed and shared what he had learned from neighbors of the proposed development, as well as the City's concerns regarding the request for a General Plan Amendment. He shared a visual presentation which highlighted the following:

- The original proposal compared to the new proposal
    - The decrease in the number of housing units and types of housing
    - The General Plan Amendment for the C-TH zone
- Rear loaded compared to front loaded concept
    - Decrease of open space for active adult living
    - Changes to floor plans
- Connectivity/roads/trails within the development
- Amenities for an active adult community

He requested the Council's input and/or direction for the proposed development and a General Plan Amendment to the C-TH zone for this property, with the inclusion of a development agreement continuing with the intent of the R-1-8 PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development), yet allowing the needed flexibility for an active adult community. He suggested the Council weigh the benefits of an adult community and a discussion took place regarding the following points being clarified by Mr. Frost:

- The tennis facility designated for the top right area of the concept plan.
- The single-family residential development proposed to be located adjacent to the existing single-family residential development to the West.
- The needed flexibility required a General Plan Amendment.

Mr. Wilkinson pointed out the proposed General Plan Amendment had proceeded through the Planning Commission process, which was determined not to be appropriate in this case. He emphasized Staff respected the Planning Commission's role as it related to development within the City, and it determined a General Plan Amendment wasn't appropriate for the property. He clarified the applicant could apply for the General Plan Amendment at any time which would be accepted by Staff. He continued to explain Staff didn't believe this was an appropriate location for the C-TH zone and informed the Council the current General Plan had designated hundreds of acres which had the potential for this zone. He briefly reviewed those locations and explained they were close to town centers and mixed-use corridors, near transit routes, and other high density developments.

Mr. Wilkinson also addressed the design issue for the rear load standard and stated Staff would be open to discussions; however, the City would be deliberate about that requirement change. He pointed out the reasons why the rear load standards had been implemented: planning, engineering, and utility reasons. He also mentioned those encompassed snow removal, trash cans, and others. He concluded the General Plan Amendment also wouldn't allow for this particular proposed development. He continued to address PRUD code which required more of a comprehensive change and reminded the Council many discussions had taken place regarding what constituted 'open space'.

Mr. Wilkinson clarified it would be premature for Staff to dedicate time and effort to determine whether the development occur without the approval of a General Plan Amendment. A discussion took place regarding Staff's support of the original plan, after issues were mitigated by the developer. Mr. Wilkinson responded Staff respected the Planning Commission's recommendation, which didn't believe a General Plan Amendment would be appropriate for the property and clarified its findings reflected in the minutes indicated it favored a development consistent with the current General Plan.

The Council continued to discuss the role of the Planning Commission making recommendations to the City Council. The Council also mentioned the lengthy process used by the City when it recently updated the General Plan and Councilmember Morris believed there should be a compelling reason to change it. Councilmember Thomas pointed out there could be unintended consequences about a possible General Plan Amendment for this development and how it could potentially impact the City as a whole.

AMEND TITLE 2, CHAPTER 8, MAYORAL APPOINTMENTS AND REMOVAL OF APPOINTED OFFICERS – ORDINANCE 24-13

This item wasn't addressed by the Council.

The Work Meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.
The Work Meeting resumed at 7:59 p.m.

Alex Jensen, City Manager, provided an update regarding Utah Retirement System's (URS) contribution rate for Public Safety Employees based on a complicated formula. He explained the Tier 2 Hybrid Public Safety Employee's contribution rate would increase. After discussions with Human Resource Staff he recommended, and requested the Council, verbally consent to the City covering the increased contribution rate in lieu of the Public Safety Employee making that contribution. He continued to explain how that would take place at Layton City to be equitable and consistent with all employees. Following a discussion, the Council expressed agreement with Mr. Jensen's recommendation that the City would continue covering the Public Safety Employee's retirement contribution increase.

CLOSED SESSION TO DISCUSS THE CHARACTER AND/OR COMPETENCY OF AN INDIVIDUAL(S), PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION, PURCHASE, SALE, EXCHANGE OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY, WATER RIGHTS OR SHARES, AND/OR DEPLOYMENT OF SECURITY PERSONNEL, DEVICES, OR SYSTEMS AS PERMITTED UNDER UTAH CODE §52-4-205

CLOSED MEETING:

MOTION: Councilmember Bloxham moved to adjourn the meeting and convene in a closed meeting at 8:06 p.m. to discuss Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation. Councilmember Roberts seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

MOTION: Councilmember Bloxham moved to open the meeting at 9:36 p.m. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

____
Kimberly S Read, City Recorder