

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL WORK MEETING**

OCTOBER 16, 2025; 5:31 P.M.

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS
PRESENT:**

**MAYOR JOY PETRO, CLINT MORRIS, TYSON
ROBERTS, BETTINA SMITH EDMONDSON, AND
DAVE THOMAS**

PARTICIPATING ELECTRONICALLY

ZACH BLOXHAM

STAFF PRESENT:

**ALEX JENSEN, JADYN APPLONIE, STEPHEN
JACKSON, WESTON APPLONIE, BRAD
MCILRATH, JEFFREY MONTAGUE, TRACY
PROBERT, ED FRAZIER, AND TORI CAMPBELL**

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

Mayor Petro opened the meeting at 5:31 p.m.

AGENDA:

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Petro expressed appreciation to those which had attended the myHometown Layton open house. She mentioned it experienced a great turnout with approximately 300 people in attending. She stated myHometown organizers were seeking volunteers and distributed small cards reflecting a QR code for those interested in volunteering for the upcoming service project scheduled for Saturday, November 1, 2025. The designated project for that day would be clearing leaves from storm drains in the Camelot, Vae View, and Chapel Street neighborhoods and announced door hangers would be distributed to front doors informing residents about the service project.

She informed the Council Thursday, October 15, 2025, officially started the 'Code Blue' season for counties within the State. She announced the County was in the process of purchasing a building in Clearfield to house the homeless on designated 'Code Blue' nights. The shifts for the Code Blue warming center would be broken up into three shifts each night which would require approximately 500 volunteers on these designated nights. She pointed out the importance of publicizing the location of the facility, 22 East 200 South, Clearfield, the old 'Bogey's' bar, and recruiting volunteers. She expressed her opinion the facility was in a great location, near a bus stop. She mentioned other challenges associated with the warming center and believed there were still a number of unanswered questions which would need to be addressed.

She announced Ryan Steinbeigle, Davis County Community Services Manager, in conjunction with a Utah County and Juab County Commissioner, had received the 'Outstanding Leader Award for Homeless Services' recognizing their efforts for leading out on homeless services. Mr. Steinbeigle's recognition was specific in establishing the Davis County warming center.

She mentioned she had the last Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) Active Transportation Meeting scheduled for this year and informed the Council it was in the process of completing a Transportation Plan. The Council should have received an invitation to attend a meeting at Clearfield City Hall on Wednesday, October 22, 2025, and requested the Council's attendance and participation.

COUNCILMEMBER'S REPORTS

Councilmember Thomas reported on the Youth Council changes: the new leaders for this coming year were Sirena Heninger and Debra King. The participating youth were actively involved and would be helpful with what needed to be accomplished and expressed his opinion it would be a smooth transition.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson mentioned she, Mayor Petro, and Councilmember Roberts had attended the Youth Court Awards Ceremony and learned the youth participating on the City's Youth Court had been recognized for their number of volunteer hours; however, due to budget cuts the program which funded the medals was no longer available. She suggested this would be an opportunity for the Council to recognize the City's Youth Court volunteers. A discussion followed and Mayor Petro suggested that the City create its own medal which could be presented to each participant, as well as Youth Council participants. Councilmember Thomas inquired whether criteria be identified to determine when service and volunteer hours had been met by participants to receive the award. Councilmember Smith Edmondson stated she would follow up to identify the number of involved youth.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson shared a report from Communities That Care (CTC) and announced she had learned if a youth had interaction with at least three non-parent adults really made a difference in a child's life: significantly contributing to them feeling connected to their community, preventing them from choosing to participate in risky behaviors.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson reported on some areas within the Kayscreek area where sidewalks still needed to be repaired and stated she would forward the information to Steve Jackson, Public Works Director. She indicated there had been some additional incidents in the crosswalk near Sunburst Elementary School off of Layton Parkway. She stated the involved parents which had previously addressed the City Council requesting a school crosswalk would be reaching out to the school to see what more could be done to provide safety for the students walking to school. There had been a police presence in the area enforcing the speed limit and wondered if there was anything more the City could do.

Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, requested Councilmember Smith Edmondson clarify the situation. Councilmember Smith Edmondson responded the specific area was 2200 West/Layton Parkway. She mentioned they were just outside of the boundary to be bused and had to walk to school. She stated the school's Community Council would be discussing the issue. Mr. Jackson reported additional signage had recently been installed in that area. He indicated the flashing lights on the stop signs weren't new.

Mayor Petro announced Councilmember Bloxham was participating in the meeting electronically.

DISCUSSION REGARDING GENERAL PLAN WATER ELEMENT – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF UTAH STATE CODE 10-9A-403(2)(a)(iv)

Weston Applonie, Community and Economic Development Director, introduced Brad McIlrath, City Planner and Jeffrey Montague, Planner, and informed the Council, the State required cities adopt a new Water Use and Preservation Element to the City's General Plan. He mentioned Staff in the Public Works and Engineering Departments had also worked with the state to identify what was required.

Mr. McIlrath shared a visual presentation and stated the additional Water Element to the General Plan needed to be adopted and implemented by Wednesday, December 31, 2025, and was required to address certain objectives outlined in state code. He reported state code required coordination with the Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality, Division of Agriculture, the City's Public Works Staff (the City's water provider) and Weber Basin Water. He stated a Public Hearing with the Planning Commission would be scheduled on Tuesday, October 28, 2025, followed by a City Council Public Hearing on Thursday, November 20, 2025.

Mr. McIlrath reviewed the five objectives in state code:

1. Determine the effect of permitted development or development patterns on water demand and water infrastructure.
2. Identify methods of reducing water demand and per capita water use for existing development.
3. Identify methods of reducing water demand and per capita water use for future development.
4. Identify opportunities for the City to modify its operations to reduce and eliminate wasteful water practices.
5. Consider the impact of the City's water use on the Great Salt Lake and ways to support the survival on the Great Salt Lake and its resources.

He identified Water Conservation Efforts already implemented within the City and identified the following:

- Water Conservation Plan updated in 2022
- Water Master Plan from 2017; however, it was actively being updated.
- Water-wise Landscaping Ordinance adopted in 2021
- City Staff participating in the Growing Water Smart Workshop (2022)

He explained the background of the City's Water Profile and reminded the Council the City's water supply was culinary, provided by City-owned water rights and water purchased from Weber Basin Water Conservancy District; with secondary water provided by Kays Creek Irrigation, Holmes Creek Irrigation, Davis and Weber County Canal Company, and Weber Basin Conservancy District. He stated the current population of the City was 88,000+ with projected population of 110,000 by 2045. He mentioned the City experienced its highest population growth between 2010 and 2020, followed by Syracuse, Farmington, Kaysville, and North Salt Lake. He pointed out it was important to identify those other growing entities because of shared water resources between communities.

He shared an illustration provided by the Utah Rivers Council which identified Utah Water Use comparing agriculture water use to municipal water use. The illustration concluded outdoor water use could be more efficient. He continued to review water use by land use over a five year span and shared a graph illustration.

He informed the Council the City's Layton Forward General Plan supported growth in centers and, in some areas, planned residential developments on smaller lots. The indicated preliminary data associated with the Water Master Plan update reflected a greater use of outdoor water compared to indoor use and pointed out the greatest water efficiency was in mixed use and transit-oriented developments.

He reviewed the identified Water Use Considerations, as opposed to 'recommendations', included in the Plan:

1. Diversity of housing options for new development
2. Water intensive amenities in new residential development
3. Turf grass restrictions and Water-wise landscaping for all single-family development
 - Turf grass limited to 35% of landscaping lot
 - No turf grass in areas less than 8' wide
 - Currently only applicable to PRUD's (Planned Residential Unit Development)
4. Water-wise landscaping for existing development
 - Updated or deteriorated landscaping
 - Education for existing landowners

A discussion followed regarding whether these recommendations were applicable to residential and Mr. McIlrath clarified this would be mostly applicable to non-residential uses. Mr. Applonie mentioned some businesses hadn't appropriately maintained the landscaping of the property and once notified by Code Compliance, the business would need to comply to this new proposed water efficient statute.

Councilmember Thomas requested clarification about different types of grass and whether there were varieties which were better for water conservation. Mr. McIlrath responded in the affirmative and pointed out Kentucky Blue grass was a sturdy grass; however, it gets overwatered which contributed to shallow roots as opposed to encouraging deeper roots for stronger turf. He added Weber Basin Water Conservancy

District provided resources on effective watering and the flip your strip replacement program, and mentioned residents were referred to that agency and a discussion followed.

Mr. McIlrath continued to review the Water Use Considerations:

5. Pool cover requirements
 - Pool covers reduce evaporation by up to 90%
 - Require installation with new permit
 - Verify at time of inspection
6. Size of pools on single-family residential lots
 - Maximum pool size limits equal recurring water savings
 - Example of 600-square foot pool limitation. Most pools were generally 700-800 square feet in size based on building permits between January 2024 and July 2025
7. Water-intensive land uses such as data centers
 - Not currently addressed by Municipal Code
 - Highly water intensive
 - Significant water was required to cool the servers

Mr. McIlrath continued to review Water Quality Considerations:

1. Parking lot pollution abatement
 - Bioswales (vegetated drainage)
 - Reduced stormwater runoff and pollution
2. Water Quality in Riparian Corridors
 - Setbacks along creeks
 - Buffers decrease stormwater runoff and pollution

He continued reviewing City operations associated with the Plan and emphasized all were currently included and implemented in the Conservation Plan.

He reviewed the Consideration for the Great Salt Lake which reflected changes to the Lake from 1987, 2008, 2012, and 2022. He identified the following specifics:

- Lake levels decreasing due to evaporation and human use
 - Exposed lake bed impacted air quality via toxic dust
 - Degraded wildlife habitats damaging local populations
- Reduced consumption equaled greater ground water storage which increased stream flow
- Conservation alone would not be enough
 - Water must be tracked and shepherded to the Great Salt Lake

Councilmember Roberts pointed out agriculture also recharged groundwater and Mr. McIlrath expressed agreement. He also suggested phragmites impeded the distribution of water funneled to The Great Salt Lake and believed control of that nuisance should be addressed. Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, mentioned Davis County Flood Control had made efforts in keeping those in check because they did impact the flow rates from local streams.

Alex Jensen, City Manager, announced this item would come before the Council for adoption during the next City Council Meeting scheduled for Thursday, November 6, 2025.

DISCUSSION REGARDING NEIGHBORHOOD TOWN CENTER ZONE (TC-1) – ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT

Mr. Applonie informed the Council the Neighborhood Town Center Zone (TC-1) was specifically written for the Gordon/Highway 89 Town Center. He clarified the proposed code would be very in depth; however, it would facilitate the changes coming to the City which included other areas within the City designated for the West Layton Town Center, Business Park in the western portion of the City, including commercial and residential standards throughout the City.

Mr. McIlrath mentioned significant work had previously been completed to the General Plan, as well as the Gordon/89 Town Center Master Plan which was used as the basis for this new code. The Neighborhood Town Center (TC-1) zone was intended to implement vision of the General Plan and the Town Center Master Plan. It was a Form-Based Code style which aligned with principles of both plans. Specific architectural design elements of the Master Plan had been included. This would be used as a starting point for the West Layton Town Center.

Mr. McIlrath indicated the proposed code had been drafted in three separate sections:

- Introduction which identified the purpose, intent, and objectives of TC-1 Zone.
- Development Agreement would be required with a rezoning.
- Items still being considered:
 - Minimum Project Area
 - Development Plan
 - Order of Construction –commercial would be in line with residential construction, including the anchor tenant
- Zoning Sub-districts; he shared an illustration which reflected an example of various uses:
 - Commercial
 - Mixed-Use
 - Town Residential
 - Neighborhood Residential
 - Detached Residential
 - Open Space

He referenced an illustration of the Gordon Town Center and spoke to the various zoning proposed for the Town Center development and reviewed each explaining how they each complemented and/or benefitted one another. He continued to speak to the general design standards which would be required in order to ensure the town center would be a ‘place’, a walkable center to attract the public.

He stated the building standards was the largest section of the proposed code and indicated it was very detail oriented which identified building types by sub-district. He mentioned specifics such as: setbacks, higher density, transparency and glazing for storefront businesses, amenities for both Residential Mixed-Use and Townhome Developments, and developers would be required to select from a menu of building features, to ensure amenities since there would be no private outdoor spaces for these types of homes, and reviewed the variety of amenities to choose from.

He shared the table examples for the building types and pointed out the designated Zoning Sub-districts for the Town Center and other images of potential various types of housing. He continued to review general design standards for the development and specifically spoke to the roof style and permitted awning materials. He emphasized the Town Center Master Plan had identified four specific architectural styles and reviewed each pointing out the Mountain Modern would be the main architectural style for the Town Center and would be required for the commercial and mixed-used structures. He also reviewed the landscaping standards, especially the parking areas, to include trees and landscaping which would contribute to the beauty of the area. He continued to explain the streetscape standards pointing out the importance of the sidewalk width.

Mayor Petro inquired about designated areas to accommodate for the use of electric scooters and/or bikes, and the placement of the bicycle lands as well as the parking for these modes of transportation. Mr. McIlrath referenced the illustration specific to the parking standards, and also mentioned various roadways within the development and explained how those would be accommodated. He pointed out the parking standards were aligned with existing code. He mentioned significant work had been completed prior to implementing sign standards for the MU (Mixed –Use) and MU-TOD (Mixed-Use Transit-oriented Development) areas could also be applicable to the Town Center.

Councilmember Thomas requested clarification regarding dying trees within the development and Mr. Applonie responded Municipal Code already addressed that issue.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification about the implementation of a development agreement for the Town Center and Mr. Applonie indicated the City was still in conversations with UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation). Councilmember Morris expressed appreciation to Staff for the amount of preparation and work regarding the proposed Town Center.

Mr. Jensen requested Staff provide the presentation to the Council.

DISCUSSION REGARDING PROPOSED TAX INCREASE BY THE DAVIS COUNTY MOSQUITO ABATEMENT DISTRICT

Councilmember Roberts distributed the notice of the proposed tax increase for the Mosquito Abatement District-Davis. He briefly reviewed the specifics associated with the proposed increase and explained the need for a new building in order to accommodate chemicals and pesticides required for West Nile Virus. He pointed out residents were continuing to move in the western portion of the county where mosquito habitat was prevalent and services were expanding. He announced a public hearing was scheduled for Thursday, December 11, 2025, at 7:00 PM at 85 North 600 West, in Kaysville. He also mentioned the need to purchase an additional drone to cover more area. He mentioned the District was the smallest entity which received property tax revenue.

DISCUSSION REGARDING STATE OF UTAH PROPOSED IMPOSITION OF WATER QUALITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE FEES

Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, and Tracy Probert, Finance Director, were present to discuss the proposed imposition of water quality and infrastructure fees, due to recent legislation. He shared a visual presentation regarding a proposed water system fee applicable to drinking water systems and stated a 64% decrease in the 2026 federal budget for drinking water programs. He referenced an illustration of forecasted revenues and reviewed the Administration Revenue Shortfall Projection which reflected a loss of approximately \$5.6 million. He identified the internal cutting of costs and pointed out the need for more stable funding. He announced the Division of Drinking Water (DDW) believed imposition of a consumption fee, based on population, would make up the shortfall, \$116,000 per year for Layton City. He explained this fee would cover operations and ongoing support of its programs. He indicated five of the largest systems within the State would be providing over 25% of the funding if the proposal was approved as described. He shared some illustrations. A discussion followed and Mr. Jackson believed a more equitable approach should be considered since the City provided significant services to its residents compared to what was being provided to smaller water companies.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification on what the City would be asked to contribute compared to the benefit it would receive. Mr. Jackson expressed his opinion the proposal was not equitable to all entities and pointed out the City was currently providing water to its citizens and did not rely on the State. He expressed concern the City was being asked to pay the State a significant amount of public funds and receive nothing in return.

Mr. Jackson informed the Council of HB280 which formed the Water Development Coordinating Council (WDCC) which was tasked with creating the Utah Unified Water Infrastructure Plan (UWIP) in order to provide water project funding prioritization. He explained how it identified infrastructure project funding and the criteria used to determine funding.

He informed the Council that the median adjusted gross income of the City's residents would be used to determine how much residents would be paying to the State on an annual basis. He indicated Layton City was the third largest water division within the State; therefore, the City would need to raise rates over \$1,029 per year, per household, which would go directly to the State fund. If the City didn't increase its rates, it would lose funding or be denied future grant funding requests.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification about the bill that was recently passed by the legislature. Councilmember Roberts believed the bill that was passed in 2024 and was specific to authorizing the study. The bill passed by the legislature in 2025 approved the departments to implement the fees and the discussion continued.

Mr. Probert said the \$16.32 per connection per month would significantly increase a resident's culinary water bill and suggested this increase would be unreasonable.

Mr. Jackson stated he would forward the presentation to the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder