

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY  
COUNCIL JOINT PLANNING  
COMMISSION WORK MEETING**

**OCTOBER 16, 2014; 5:32 P.M.**

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS  
PRESENT:**

**MAYOR BOB STEVENSON, JOYCE BROWN,  
TOM DAY, JORY FRANCIS, SCOTT FREITAG  
AND JOY PETRO**

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**GERALD GILBERT, WYNN HANSEN, BRETT  
NILSSON, DAVE WEAVER, L.T. WEESE AND  
BRIAN BODILY**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

**ALEX JENSEN, GARY CRANE, JAMES (WOODY)  
WOODRUFF, BILL WRIGHT, KENT ANDERSEN,  
PETER MATSON AND THIEDA WELLMAN**

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

Mayor Stevenson opened the meeting and indicated that the first item on the agenda was a closed door meeting.

**AGENDA:**

**CLOSED DOOR:**

**MOTION:** Councilmember Freitag moved to close the meeting at 5:32 p.m. to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, including any form of a water right or water shares. Councilmember Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Petro moved to open the meeting at 5:51 p.m. Councilmember Day seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**DISCUSSION – ANNEXATION AND ZONING REQUEST FOR PHEASANT VIEW ASSISTED  
LIVING CENTER – 1242 EAST PHEASANT VIEW DRIVE**

Bill Wright, Community and Economic Development Director, said this was an annexation and rezone request from Eric Martz, owner of the Pheasant View Assisted Living Center, located at 1242 East Pheasant View Drive. Bill said the property was a landlocked piece of property that abutted the Kaysville border. He said the proposal was to expand the assisted living facility. Bill introduced Mr. Eric Martz.

Bill said the annexation petition was accepted by the Council on September 19th. He said on closer review, there were a couple of issues with approving the facility expansion as proposed. Bill said these facilities were limited to 12 units and the expansion would put the facility over that number.

Mr. Eric Martz explained their clientele and the services they provided.

Bill said the addition would involve memory care units. He said they considered separating the building and limiting the number of units to 12, but it was not feasible. Bill said changes were made to the Municipal Code after the original facility was built that allowed for only 12 total units. He said the proposed expansion would be for 15 net additional units.

Bill said the method this could be approved under was to approve it as an expansion of a non-conforming building. He said the Code allowed for that to be done administratively through routine and uncontested variances, and the Code indicated that there could not be an increase of dwelling units. Bill said these units did not qualify as dwelling units because they did not contain kitchens or eating areas. He said under the Fair Housing Law, there was a provision for local and state governments to make reasonable accommodations for these types of facilities. Bill said the reasonable accommodation would be to allow the building to be attached rather than detached, which would allow for a better operation and method for the people with memory care needs. He said if this was not approved, there would be no need for the annexation.

Commissioner Nilsson asked why the number of units was limited to 12 in the Code.

Bill said it mostly had to do with the size of the building so that there wouldn't be a facility like Legacy Village in the middle of a residential neighborhood. He said this facility would be residential in scale, similar to a church.

Councilmember Brown said she hadn't heard any complaints from anyone in the neighborhood; this was something that was needed in Layton. She said she didn't think it would be a big impact on neighbors.

Councilmember Francis said this was a good neighbor to have.

Commissioner Nilsson asked if there was sufficient parking.

Bill said yes; he explained the conceptual layout of the facility including parking.

Commissioner Hansen asked if there were any beds lost in the existing facility due to the expansion.

Mr. Martz indicated that they would lose two existing units; the expansion was for 17 rooms, but it was a net 15 increase.

Commissioner Weaver asked about emergency access to the new units.

Bill displayed the proposed site plan and explained access.

Mr. Martz said this was a Type 1 construction, which required that the facility be covered by fire sprinklers.

Consensus was to proceed with the annexation.

### **CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF 2200 WEST AND 2700 WEST CORRIDORS**

Alex Jensen, City Manager, introduced Randy Jeffries with UDOT; and indicated that Mr. Jeffries was the Project Manager of the West Davis Corridor.

Alex said Staff had tried to make a presentation this evening that was quite analytical. He said Staff's intention was not to suggest one thing or another, but rather to provide facts. Alex said Staff would be presenting a lot of quantitative analysis. He said Staff reviewed minutes of previous meetings and tried to pull out all the comments that were made by the Planning Commission Members and Councilmembers to make sure they were being addressed. Alex said Staff would like to talk about the important connection between transportation improvements and land use. He said Staff would show examples in recent history of how that connection was really important and valid. Alex said Staff would also like to talk about the history of planning for the West Davis Corridor and for the Master Street Plan. He said the purpose was not to suggest that that couldn't be changed; plans were made to be changed; but Staff's view was that it was important to understand the past and what was done and why it was done, by previous elected

officials, to know what should be done going forward.

Alex said Staff had spent a lot of time preparing this information. He said Staff tried to look at four different scenarios; two at 2200 West and two at 2700 West, based on the Corridor's alignment, and then they had tried to compare those according to objective criteria. Alex said based on previous discussions, Staff had identified different criteria and would compare each of the scenarios, in an objective manner, based on the criteria. He said Staff had made some best-guess assumptions drawing on UDOT experience and Horrocks Engineering experience, and had tried to be very quantitative. Alex said Staff didn't reach a conclusion as to what was best; there were pros and cons associated with both options.

Alex expressed appreciation to the Council and Planning Commission for the care and concern they were taking for this. He said Staff felt that this was a very significant decision and they respected the fact that the Council and Planning Commission wanted to look at every possible angle.

Bill Wright discussed the important connection between land use and transportation. He reviewed the history of development and roads in the City over the last 20 years. Bill reviewed various maps that showed the progression of development and infrastructure over the years, particularly along Woodland Park Drive, Antelope Drive, West Hill Field Road, and Layton Parkway. He mentioned the commercial node and business research park area that were identified in the West Layton General Plan. Bill identified various commercial nodes throughout the City.

Bill displayed a map and explained the preferred alignment of the West Davis Corridor and the impact wetlands may have on that alignment near 2200 West. He said since 2001 the City had been trying to protect that corridor from development. Bill said in 2010 the City became a participating agency in the West Davis Corridor project and participated in several public meetings. He displayed maps that identified available land for a research business park at 2200 West and 2700 West. Bill indicated that if the interchange was at 2200 West with the preferred alignment, within a half mile of the interchange location there were approximately 144 acres available for a business park, with an additional 8 acres for a retail center. He said this would have a possibility of creating 6,000 new jobs.

Councilmember Freitag asked if the General Plan had preservation of open space.

Bill said in some areas it identified where there were needs for parks.

Peter Matson, City Planner, explained the Parks and Recreation element of the General Plan and the targeted standard of neighborhood parks per a certain number of residences.

Councilmember Freitag said outside of parks, it didn't identify open space.

Bill said no.

Councilmember Freitag asked if the numbers being given were maximum numbers.

Bill said yes. He said it didn't mean that the entire 144 acres would be developed into a business park; all of the property would have to go through a rezoning process.

Bill displayed a map that showed the West Davis Corridor alignment shifted to the north. He said if the wetlands played a part in the alignment, what was being called the eastern alignment, which was actually to the north, would drop the available acreage for a business park at 2200 West to approximately 117 acres, or 5,000 jobs. Bill said with this alignment, the interchange would move closer to Layton Parkway. He identified a proposed park and ride lot in the area.

Councilmember Day asked if the width of the corridor was the same all the way to the west.

Bill said yes.

Bill said Staff completed the same exercise if the interchange was located at 2700 West. He said there would be approximately 190 acres of land available for a business park, which would equate to the number of jobs being higher; close to 8,000. Bill said if the corridor shifted north, there would be approximately 179 acres available for a business park, or 7,500 jobs.

Bill reviewed traffic numbers based on the interchange location. He said the understanding was that if the interchange were to be located at 2200 West, the road would go to five lanes.

Bill reviewed information about the costs of acquiring property and widening the roads based on the location of the interchange. He said if the interchange was at 2200 West, and the road right of way was widened to 88 feet from the West Davis Corridor to Hill Field Road, 17 homes would be impacted and the cost would be 18.1 million dollars for the right of way and for construction of the road. Bill said if the road went to 100 feet wide for this section of the road it would impact 20 homes and cost 23.3 million dollars.

Bill said with the interchange at 2200 West, widening the northern section of 2200 West from Hill Field Road to Antelope Drive to 80 feet would impact 22 homes and cost approximately 16 million dollars. He mentioned a railroad crossing bridge that Horrocks Engineering believed would be wise given the widening of the road and the amount of traffic that would be on it, which would cost an additional 16.8 million dollars. Bill said an 88 foot width would cost approximately 19.9 million dollars for the northern section, and 26.5 million dollars and 37 homes for a 100 foot right of way. He said the entire widening project, with the interchange at 2200 West, from the West Davis Corridor to Antelope Drive, would impact 57 homes and cost 66.6 million dollars for a width of 100 feet, 54.8 million dollars and 39 homes for a width of 88 feet, and 51.6 million dollars and 39 homes for a width of 88 feet on the lower section, and 80 feet on the northern section.

Councilmember Freitag asked what the length of the road would be.

Bill said about 2 ½ miles.

Councilmember Freitag asked Alex what the cost per mile was for Layton Parkway.

Alex said about 4.2 million dollars per mile.

Bill said the estimated costs came from Horrocks Engineering and they used a UDOT costing model, which Staff believed was high, but this wouldn't be happening for several years into the future.

Councilmember Freitag said this would cost 15 to 20 million dollars per mile.

Councilmember Brown said the big difference was because Layton Parkway was constructed on raw ground.

Alex said this was more expensive because of the homes involved. He said Staff felt that this would cost about 2 to 3 times more than the Parkway.

Bill said the same exercise was done for 2700 West. He said from the interchange up to Hill Field Road with an 88 foot right way, it would cost 11.8 million dollars and impact 1 home. He said with a 100 foot right of way the cost would be 18.1 million dollars and impact 1 home. Bill said the northern end from Hill Field Road to Antelope Drive was partially built with a 66 foot right of way and there was a development agreement in place for construction of the balance of the road.

Councilmember Freitag asked why the cost difference between 88 feet and 100 feet was so much more on 2700 West than it was on 2200 West for a shorter distance.

Bill said that was because of purchasing the right of way. He said on 2200 West there was already a 66 foot right of way; the City would only be purchasing the edges. Bill said on 2700 West the entire width would have to be purchased.

Bill displayed comparative information between the two interchange locations, including available land for a business park and jobs created.

Mayor Stevenson said whether it was 144 acres available at 2200 West or 194 acres available at 2700 West for a business park, would the City be setting aside that much property for a business park.

Bill gave some examples of business parks in other areas, including the Kaysville business park, which had 130 acres and had developed with a variety of industrial uses and offices. He said the adopted General Plan from 2001 identified a business park center in this area. Bill said it was a lot of area, but the key option now would be to preserve the area. He said none of this would happen without the West Davis Corridor and an interchange; it would not be feasible without a corridor and an interchange.

Mayor Stevenson asked if there was an advantage or disadvantage, relative to economic development, by having a major road separating the business park area property.

Bill said the Economic Development Corporation of Utah indicated that there was definitely an advantage with having 100 acres or more intact.

Councilmember Freitag asked if the current General Plan identified a certain number of acres for the business park.

Bill said no.

Commissioner Gilbert asked if a property owner would make more money with the business park zoning or residential zoning.

Bill said generally it would be the business park; something of a commercial nature. He said that all depended on the market at the time the property became available.

Commissioner Gilbert asked if the City knew how many property owners this involved and who they were.

Bill said yes.

Councilmember Day said there was at least 6 or 8 different property owners involved.

Commissioner Gilbert said from previous meetings he felt that most residents in west Layton felt that the area should remain as residential as possible. He said he liked the idea of a business park near the interchange because there needed to be facilities in the area to service the residential areas.

Bill said as Councilmember Freitag pointed out, these were maximum numbers. It would be a factor if there was a strong preservation effort for some of the land. He said Staff felt that the best way to be comparable was to use the same basic model for both locations and not try to second guess how much property a future Council would want to put into a business park. Bill said it would involve a lot of detailed planning moving forward.

Councilmember Freitag asked Mr. Jeffries, as he had been involved with other communities that had interchanges proposed, was he seeing similar types of developments at those interchanges.

Mr. Jeffries said the feedback from almost all the cities that had interchanges was that they were looking at commercial uses around the interchanges. He said there wasn't room at any of the other interchanges for this large of a project.

Bill displayed comparative information for both locations with the northern alignment of the corridor.

Councilmember Freitag asked Mr. Jeffries when the study would be completed.

Mr. Jeffries said the final EIS report would be done by spring, with the final decision by next summer.

Councilmember Freitag said the Council had seen a northern and a southern alignment option for the corridor. He asked Mr. Jeffries where he thought the corridor alignment would be.

Mr. Jeffries said he wouldn't even try to guess, but he would give an example. He said UDOT's preference was not the northern alignment because of impacts to existing homes. Mr. Jeffries said comments from the Army Corp of Engineers, the EPA, and other agencies, were that they wanted UDOT to look at another alternative to avoid the wetlands. He said they did not say it couldn't be in the wetlands, but they wanted UDOT to look at another alternative. Mr. Jeffries said UDOT would be studying another alternative. He said some of the challenges in Farmington involved a ½ acre difference in wetlands versus 10 homes. Mr. Jeffries said UDOT had to receive a permit from the Army Corp of Engineers or there would be no project; if they were struggling in Farmington over ½ acre of wetlands versus 10 homes, and in Layton it was only 6 homes, it would make you think that the northern alignment would be a good possibility.

Councilmember Day asked about the timeline on the new option.

Mr. Jeffries said they should have an answer in the next couple of months.

Councilmember Freitag asked if that advanced, what would it do to the project.

Mr. Jeffries said it would add another year to the process.

Alex said under either interchange location, Staff felt that it would preserve and provide great flexibility of where the retail center at 2200 West and Hill Field Road took place. He said Staff recognized that there were some existing entitlements in place on the north side of Hill Field Road, but Staff felt that either alignment allowed that node to be shifted west or east to the intersection.

Mayor Stevenson said Windom Square was 20 to 25 acres. He said where 2700 West turned to 2550 West at the commercial node, south of that was where the big controversy was a couple of years ago.

Bill said that was correct.

Mayor Stevenson asked what that property was zoned right now.

Bill said on the north side at the corner of 2550 West and Hill Field Road, the property was zoned CP-1, with a development agreement in place that expected that there would be a grocery store at that location.

Councilmember Day asked if that was only on the east side of 2550 West, or if it included the west side of 2550 West.

Bill said some of the CP-1 went on the west side of 2550 West, but the idea was that the grocery store would be on the east side. He said there was some business park zoning in the area with some P-B near the residential areas. Bill said the corner of 2200 West and Hill Field Road was zoned CP-1 and had been purchased by America First Credit Union.

Peter said the CP-1 zoning had restrictions on it through the development agreement that restricted some of the uses and size.

Mayor Stevenson asked how much property was on the north side of Hill Field Road.

Bill said it was approximately 31 acres; the retail area was about 12 acres.

Mayor Stevenson said it wasn't big enough to do something like at Windom Square.

Bill said from a retail standpoint it wouldn't be.

Mayor Stevenson said to him the most logical place for commercial development in west Layton would be on the south side of Hill Field Road between 2550 West and 2200 West. He said whether the interchange was at 2200 West or 2700 West, he didn't see the interchange location being the most logical place for a commercial node at this time.

Bill said the commercial component didn't have to be tied to the interchange location decision.

Councilmember Francis said if the interchange was at 2200 West and the commercial node was pushed to the east to 2200 West, the traffic would be crushing in that area. He said that would cause 2200 West to be widened without a question.

Councilmember Brown said from what had been shown this evening, 2200 West was going to have to be widened north of Gordon Avenue, whether it was 88 feet or 100 feet. She said that cost would be there one way or the other.

Councilmembers Day and Petro agreed.

Councilmember Brown said when she looked at public money, and the number of homes involved, 2700 West would be a lot less expensive and would only take out one home, which made a big difference to her.

Councilmember Francis said he saw 2700 West as a diffuser. He said instead of everyone crushing onto 2200 West traffic, would be diffused, which was a huge benefit.

Councilmember Brown said the curve in 2700 West to 2550 West would also be calming to slow traffic. She said whenever there was a straight shot traffic moved faster and was heavier.

Councilmember Francis said 2700 West would be a diffuser, fewer homes would be impacted, it would be less expensive because it was raw ground, and it had been in the General Plan for so long that the expectation had been set. He said one of the lessons he learned with West Layton Village was that you should stick with the General Plan if at all possible.

Councilmember Brown said whether the City built out every possible acre into a business park, which was a question that would come later, the bigger piece of land in one place was more marketable than the various pieces at 2200 West.

Bill suggested a field trip to the area so that the Council and Planning Commission could see what the two areas looked like.

Commissioner Bodily asked if UDOT had a preference of 2200 West or 2700 West for the location of the interchange.

Mr. Jefferies said there would be an interchange at 200 North in Kaysville. He said they liked to keep interchanges at about 1 mile spacing. Mr. Jeffries said with the interchange at 2700 West they were very comfortable with a spacing of approximately 1.8 miles; at 2200 West it would be 1.2 miles. Mr. Jefferies said at 2200 West the interchange would be a little closer to Layton Parkway. He said neither of these were fatal flaws from a transportation standpoint, but he didn't think an interchange could be located at 2200 West and avoid the six homes in that immediate area. Mr. Jefferies said an interchange located at 2200 West with the current EIS alignment would impact those six homes, and what would likely happen then was that there would not be any reason for UDOT to impact the wetlands. Right now UDOT could say that homes would be impacted with the northern alignment, but if the homes were impacted because of the interchange, there would be no argument against the northern alignment.

Mr. Jefferies said if the final EIS came out with the interchange at 2200 West, based on feedback they had received from residents already, there would be a lot more concerns from residents about traffic in front of their homes.

Councilmember Brown asked if there would be more Kaysville traffic if the intersection was at 2200 West.

Mr. Jefferies said the studies didn't show that, but there would be a lot more traffic from the north using 2200 West. He said their traffic numbers showed less than 2,000 additional cars on 2200 West with the interchange at 2700 West, but with the interchange at 2200 West that would probably go over 10,000. Mr. Jefferies said from a transportation standpoint UDOT probably didn't have much of a preference, but from an impact standpoint they believed that 2700 West would be less impactful to the homes in the area.

Councilmember Freitag asked what the spacing was between 2700 West and the next Syracuse interchange.

Mr. Jefferies said it was approximately 1.5 miles; 2700 West was about half way between the Syracuse and Kaysville interchanges. He said from a transportation standpoint, 2700 West was a little bit better location, but 2200 West would not be a fatal flaw. Mr. Jefferies said from a scheduling standpoint, it would be good if the City could reach a decision on the interchange location by the end of November.

Mayor Stevenson said best case scenario, how far in the future would it be before either of the interchanges would be built.

Mr. Jefferies said best case scenario would be construction underway by 2017.

Mayor Stevenson said if the interchange was at 2700 West and construction began in 2017, was the City prepared to spend the money to put the road up to at least Gentile Street, and tie in the Parkway.

Bill said the Parkway could be the road that would bring traffic to the interchange immediately.

Mayor Stevenson said once the door was open, there would be a lot more traffic. He said the City better be prepared.

Councilmember Brown said the same thing could be said about 2200 West; was the City prepared to immediately widen that road.

Mayor Stevenson said the road was already there, it would only need to be widened.

Councilmember Brown said the people that lived on 2200 West would be heavily impacted.



Mayor Stevenson mentioned the impact to the homes on Gordon Avenue when it was widened.

Commissioner Hansen said the focus had to be moving traffic south. He said Staff did a fantastic job in their analysis of whether the interchange should be at 2200 West or 2700 West, but regardless of where the interchange was located, both roads would have to prepare to handle additional traffic. Commissioner Hansen said if the preference was 2700 West, he didn't think 2200 West could be ignored with bringing traffic south to the Parkway.

Mayor Stevenson asked for input on the size of the business park.

Councilmember Brown said based on Councilmember Freitag's question about what other communities around Layton could do, Layton had a great opportunity to have something other cities wouldn't have. She said she would not want to limit the number of acres; it could provide jobs and draw people to the City.

Commissioner Hansen said he could see the advantage of a business park at 2700 West. He said in his view you couldn't give that high consideration without immediately considering commercial services where those people could get gas or go to lunch. Commissioner Hansen said those two decisions had to go hand in hand. If 2200 West and Hill Field Road was the commercial node, there had to be commercial services at that location.

Councilmember Day said he felt that the people in west Layton would not be expecting this size of a business park.

Mayor Stevenson said the General Plan for west Layton probably leaned a lot more toward residential development than a large business park. He asked if the West Davis Corridor and an interchange figured into the General Plan.

Peter said yes.

Mayor Stevenson asked if the size was ever mentioned in the General Plan.

Peter said no, but there were examples in an appendix.

Councilmember Day said he didn't think people in west Layton would be surprised by a business park in the area, but this size would be a surprise to them. He said it was a surprise to him. Councilmember Day said he had always known that a business node had been designated, but not to the extent that was being discussed here.

Councilmember Freitag said it would be helpful to come up with a realistic size for the business park instead of a maximum amount of acreage.

Alex said that was a great point. He said Staff was not suggesting that this was what it should be, except to try and look at it objectively and determine what a reasonable amount would be in order for a business park to function adjacent to an interchange; a half mile radius was fairly logical, but it could be a little less than that or it could be a little more.

Councilmember Freitag asked if there was any room along the Legacy Parkway corridor for any development.

Bill said at the 500 South exit in Woods Cross they had established a CDA district to try and encourage some development there. He said the off ramp in Centerville was sandwiched between Legacy Parkway and I-15, which had the Mega Plex Theatre, an office complex and apartments. Bill said years ago no one envisioned that type of development west of I-15.

Mayor Stevenson asked Staff to put the field trip together.

Alex said Staff would recommend holding a Strategic Planning meeting next Thursday with the Planning Commission to review the previous discussion about housing and the analysis the Council asked Staff to undertake to look at higher density housing.

Consensus was to hold the meeting at 5:00 p.m. next Thursday.

Councilmember Day asked if Staff was ready for public input on the transportation issue. He said he thought it would be wise to have some public input.

Bill said part of what was driving the process with the Transportation Master Plan was trying to determine what should be presented to the public in an open house relative to the entire Master Plan. He said one option would be to present both interchange options; the thought early on was that the Council and Planning Commission would narrow the options, but that was up to the Council.

Councilmember Day said he felt that both options were to the point where the public could weigh in on them.

Bill said he didn't think the City could have a decision for UDOT by November.

Mayor Stevenson said this decision would impact the City for many years.

Councilmember Freitag asked Mr. Jefferies what he would like from the City.

Mr. Jefferies said if the shared solution alternative was not advanced, to release the EIS in the spring, in December they would need to start calculating the impacts to acres of wetlands and other things. He said they would have to hold that process up until they had a decision from the City.

Mayor Stevenson said the Council was trying to take in all the information and decide what would be best. He said one of the factors was that if the EIS showed the alignment to the south and going through the wetlands, the City wouldn't have to worry about the houses being taken out near 2200 West, which would impact the City's decision toward the 2700 West location. Mayor Stevenson said a big part of the City's decision would be based on the alignment of the corridor.

Mr. Jeffries said the City's best resource for that would not be UDOT, it would be the Army Corp of Engineers. He suggested that the City meet with them; UDOT was at their mercy. Mr. Jeffries said because it was not time for the Army Corp of Engineers to make a decision, they wouldn't come out and say what their decision would be.

Mayor Stevenson asked when that decision would be made.

Mr. Jeffries said they wouldn't make a decision until UDOT made their decision, which was kind of hard.

Mayor Stevenson said if the City decided to stick with the current location of 2700 West, and the decision came out in the spring, and the alignment came out to the north, what kind of impact would there be if at that time the City decided to move the interchange to 2200 West since the alignment was to the north and the houses were already being impacted, because the original decision for 2700 West was based on the southern alignment. He asked if that would be feasible.

Mr. Jeffries said that it would be. He said some adjustments could be made after the final decision.

**CLOSED DOOR:**

**MOTION:** Councilmember Freitag moved to close the meeting at 7:45 p.m. to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual. Councilmember Day seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Day moved to open the meeting at 9:51 p.m. Councilmember Freitag seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**The meeting adjourned at 9:51 p.m.**

---

Thieda Wellman, City Recorder

**SWORN STATEMENT**

The undersigned hereby swears and affirms, pursuant to Section 52-4-205(1) of the Utah Code Annotated, that the sole purpose for the closed meetings of the Layton City Council on the **16th day of October 2014**, was to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, including any form of a water right or water shares; and the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual.

Dated this 20th day of November, 2014.

ATTEST:

---

ROBERT J STEVENSON, Mayor

---

THIEDA WELLMAN, City Recorder