

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL WORK MEETING**

JULY 18, 2024; 5:40 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, TRACY PROBERT, STEPHEN JACKSON, DAVID PRICE, JOELLEN GRANDY, ALLEN SWANSON, WENDY BRIMHALL, MINDY HUNSAKER, KARL KUEHN, AND TORI CAMPBELL

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 reported North Davis Sewer District (NDSD) would be considering a possible a \$2 increase beginning July 2025 alternating years. She stated the Board would complete an assessment to determine whether the increase was needed prior to each implementation. She provided an update on the Hill Field Road project and stated it was on schedule for completion. The grand opening/ribbon cutting for its new pump station was scheduled for Wednesday, August 21, 2024 from 1:00-3:00 PM.

The Homeless Task Force was required to submit the County's plan by Thursday, August 1, 2024. The suggested plan, agreed by the task force members would be a mobile plan; therefore, not impacting one city. She explained if the plan was approved, portable tents large enough to accommodate 15-20 cots would be used. Additionally, it had been proposed to use a large bus which could be converted with numerous bunks and personal belongings could be stored in compartments under the bus. She emphasized this was a result of Code Blue and nothing had yet been finalized.

COUNCILMEMBER'S REPORT

Councilmember Smith Edmondson announced a free movie screening, 'Screenagers' was planned for Thursday, August 22, 2024, 7:00 PM at the Kenley Amphitheater. She explained the movie addressed the effects of vaping and the use of drugs and alcohol in young people in the digital age. She described the film as a documentary with youth participants. She mentioned there would be gift card raffles and students would have the opportunity to receive citizen credit recovery at the free event.

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

David Price, Parks and Recreation Director, expressed appreciation to Staff for past efforts in contributing to the City's Active Transportation Plan. Staff desired to compile and update its bike and trail plans found in separate plan elements into one overarching document to be known as the Layton City Active Transportation Plan. This new plan element would supplement other General Plan elements to identify community opportunities and define goals and policies.

JoEllen Grandy, Parks Planner, announced the Plan was initiated in 2021-2022 and also thanked Staff who contributed with finalizing the Plan and presented it to the Council highlighting the following:

- Goals and objectives of the Plan
- Planning process
- Existing conditions analysis
- Public involvement
- Recommendations
- Implementation strategies

Ms. Grandy mentioned the contribution on behalf of Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and emphasized the Plan was intended to serve as a guide to Staff when prioritizing projects and allocating funds. She mentioned the participants of the Steering Committee and reviewed the six goals pointing out the following objectives:

- Useful connections
- Support local economy
- Promote health and safety
- Serve a wide variety of people
- Provide a quality user experience
- Foster community support

She identified and reviewed the Planning Process associated with the updated Transportation Plan and also reviewed existing active transportation facilities. She reported the analysis concluded the critical need for the Plan to create connectivity and purposeful connections.

She reviewed the public involvement portion of the process identifying those participating individuals on the steering committee and reported on the public outreach open houses.

She reported the recommendations and referenced illustrations which reflected a variety of infrastructure treatments and explained the definitions of each. She also explained 'spot' improvements included with the infrastructure treatments. These improvements included 99 miles of newly proposed bikeways and trails. The trails needed to provide connectivity to be more useful to residents or individuals using them. She also mentioned the Plan included non-infrastructure treatments and identified the policies, programs, and initiatives which made it easier to implement active transportation infrastructure and encourage more active transportation use.

She briefly referenced the project prioritization illustration and explained how the prioritization was determined and identified the top 10 projects moving forward. Connectivity to schools, transit, and higher traffic areas were considerations for the long-term high-value projects.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired about the safety of bike lanes and Ms. Grandy responded only a small amount were designated to have a 'buffer' and mentioned those were targeted to be located around town centers. Mr. Price also mentioned oftentimes the capability for the 'buffer' wasn't always available.

Ms. Grandy reported the consultants had provided cost estimates within the implementation strategies as well as potential funding sources such as available grants to help offset costs. Facility design best practices was included as a reference. She asked if there were any questions and a discussion followed regarding specific projects and which infrastructure treatment would be appropriate. The Council expressed agreement regarding the preconceived sense of security associated with bike lanes. A discussion took place regarding the increased use of e-bikes, small motorcycles, and e-scooters within the City.

The Council expressed appreciation for Staffs' work on the Plan.

ACCEPT A PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND SOUTH WEBER CITY FOR THE PROVISION OF DISPATCH SERVICES – RESOLUTION 24-24

Allen Swanson, Police Chief, and Karl Kuehn, Communications Manager, presented the Interlocal Agreement between Layton City and South Weber City for dispatch services. Chief Swanson reminded the Council the City recently began providing dispatch services for Clearfield City and North Davis Fire District (NDFD). He reported other entities had inquired as to whether Layton City could also provide these same services to them and reported the City currently didn't have the capability for these larger cities; however, South Weber City was small enough that the City could meet the request.

Mr. Kuehn announced the proposed contract with South Weber was similar to those with Clearfield and NDFD, including figures specific to the current fiscal year and minus the language specific to the Clearfield consolidation. He reported South Weber averaged approximately one call per day and he didn't anticipate any measurable impact to Layton City. He pointed out this would be one more step toward consolidation for the northern area of the County and added the Davis County Sheriff's Department would continue to provide law enforcement services.

He asked if there were any questions and a discussion followed regarding dispatch consolidation for entities to the south of Layton City. Mr. Kuehn mentioned there wasn't a designated boundary used to determine whether services would be provided by Bountiful or Layton City and explained how Kaysville and Farmington had decided to join with Bountiful as of January 1, 2025. He also explained the legality of having contiguous geographical boundaries in order to provide dispatch services pointing out Clinton City couldn't request Bountiful provide its dispatch services because of the other cities in between to illustrate the point. The discussion continued regarding dispatch consolidation and construction timeline for the City's new facility.

Alex Jensen, City Manager, emphasized Layton City would continue providing the best dispatch services for its residents in addition to those which it was contractually agreed to. He continued to emphasize the City wouldn't get involved in a bidding war or provide any type of incentive to persuade an entity to enter into contract with Layton City.

Mr. Kuehn pointed out these current contracts reflected replacement dates of December 2026 for new documents. He stated once the rate structure formula was established it would be simple to update annually for each entity. He also mentioned there would be no representation from South Weber on the Oversight Board at this time.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LAYTON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 19 ZONING, CHAPTER 19.06 LAND USE REGULATIONS, TO ALLOW UP TO TWO HIGH-IMPACT HOME OCCUPATIONS OUT OF THE SAME RESIDENCE

Chad Wilkinson, Community and Economic Development Director, informed the Council this agenda item was initiated via citizen's request to accommodate a home occupation business. He reminded the Council the City had amended its Home Occupation Ordinance in 2020. As part of that process, Staff attempted to create a balance between use of the home as a home occupation at the same time anticipating there could be impacts to adjacent neighbors. As a compromise the ordinance currently allowed two home occupations; a low-impact home occupation in which clients rarely came to the home, more of a home office scenario and neighbors wouldn't know there was a business. A high-impact home occupation would be a situation in which clients regularly visited the home, had employees, and/or equipment and materials were stored. These types of businesses tend to have direct impacts to neighbors.

Mr. Wilkinson informed the Council in this particular instance the request was to allow two high-impact home occupations at the same residence: the current dog grooming business and a proposed contractor type use. The City denied the request made by the applicant on January 17, 2024, and the applicant

subsequently requested changes to the code, which would require a text amendment to the Municipal Code.

The request came before the Planning Commission during its meeting on Tuesday, May 28, 2024, held a public hearing to review the proposed amendment and reported there had been considerable discussion on the issue. He pointed out the significant challenge with drafting a home occupation ordinance which could be universally, equally, and fairly applied throughout the City; not just with this particular request or scenario. He clarified the classification of high impact home occupation had been created for contractor use because they had a high tendency to expand beyond the initial application.

He announced Staff agreed with the Planning Commission's recommendation of denial for the request. He recalled one of the questions posed during the Planning Commission Meeting was how many of these similar requests had the City previously denied. Mr. Wilkinson responded four over the previous four years and in every case except this one, alternate business models had been identified which allowed them to comply with City ordinances, which he believed justified a change to the Code was not needed.

Additionally, the applicant had suggested re-classifying regulations regarding trailers kept on lots and Staff was concerned about interpretation and where that could lead specifically how that could also be universally, equally, and fairly applied throughout the City

Staff recommended denial of the request and asked if there were any questions. A discussion followed.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT – MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING PLAN ADDENDUM – ORDINANCE 24-23

Mr. Wilkinson stated the General Plan Amendment was in response to the City's reporting requirements to the State in relation to the Moderate-Income Housing Plan. He explained the State had requested the City be more specific about its goals and policies, to provide specific timeframes, identified in the last report. As the City advanced through this year's process, the State had directed the City to be less specific; not reflecting a date, but using 'being done an annual basis' language so as to not have to amend the General Plan every year.

He also reported the addendum included minor edits and the removal of Strategy 3.2, which stated the City would assist in administering the Weatherization Program and indicated the City had never previously been involved with this particular program. He identified this was handled through the Department of Workforce Services, Housing Department.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE REQUEST – MU-TOD (MIXED-USE TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT) TO C-H (PLANNED HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL) – ORDINANCE 24-19 AND ORDINANCE 24-20 – 282 NORTH MAIN STREET

Mr. Wilkinson explained the request for a General Plan Amendment and Rezone was submitted by the Young Automotive Group, property owner, to facilitate expansion of their presence within the City. He identified the location of the parcel on a visual illustration. He also pointed out the parcel was on the border of the MU-TOD Zoning designation and vehicle dealerships weren't permitted within this zoning designation. He continued to explain the predominant reason for the General Plan amendment was that UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) was requiring drive access for the development correspondent with roadway 301 North.

He reminded the Council requests to amend the General Plan were carefully considered and not taken lightly; however, there were some factors related to the property which justified the consideration of the amendment and identified the following:

- The State recently adopted requirements for a Station Area Plan; areas within a one-half mile radius of a fixed-rail transit station. Mr. Wilkinson clarified the property stopped just short of this

- designation and concluded it wasn't within the area for a higher density use in a TOD (Transit Oriented Development).
- Constraints on the property didn't allow for it to be a good candidate for Mixed-Use development given the proximity of an existing cell phone tower. He also spoke to the unique size of the parcel which would be more suitable for a different use.

He reported the request had been reviewed by the Planning Commission during its meeting on Tuesday, June 11, 2024, and it forwarded an approval recommendation with one dissenting vote based on the principal that amendments to the General Plan shouldn't be taken lightly.

He asked if there were any questions and members of the Council also expressed concern about setting precedent with this request to amend the General Plan and rezone, that other requests could follow. Mr. Wilkinson responded each request would be carefully considered on an individual basis and reminded the Council there were solid findings and situational factors associated with the property which wouldn't be applicable to other parcels and a discussion followed.

Mr. Wilkinson reported Staff had communicated any further expansions within that area wouldn't be considered by the City because it needed to be consistent with State Law regarding the density requirements within the half-mile radius.

Councilmember Bloxham inquired whether the property had been recently acquired by the Young Automotive Group and Mr. Wilkinson responded Young had been negotiating the purchase for some time. Councilmember Bloxham clarified the property was purchased with the knowledge and understanding of its current zoning and the discussion continued.

The meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

Tori Campbell, Deputy City Recorder