

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY  
COUNCIL MEETING**

**MARCH 21, 2024; 7:09 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, WESTON APPOLONIE, ZACH KADIN,  
STEPHEN JACKSON, ALLEN SWANSON, AND  
KIM READ**

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

Mayor Petro opened the meeting and welcomed the public. Councilmember Smith Edmondson offered the invocation and Youth Councilmember Tytan Ott led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Petro requested Youth Councilmember Tytan Ott introduce himself.

**MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Councilmember Roberts moved and Councilmember Smith Edmondson seconded to approve the minutes of:

**Layton City Council Meeting – February 1, 2024.**

The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes as written.

**MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Councilmember Roberts announced the following:

- Layton Family Recreation Activity ‘Night at the Library’ was scheduled for Friday, March 22, 2024, from 6:30-8:00 PM at the Layton branch of the Davis County Library. The free activity would include games, book readings, and activities for kids.
- Easter Egg Dive would take place on Saturday, March 23, 2024, at Surf’n Swim from 10:00 AM-12:00 PM. He mentioned registration for younger children was full; however, spots were still available for older kids to register.

Mayor Petro announced Vietnam Veterans Recognition Day would be Friday, March 29, 2024. She mentioned a program was scheduled beginning at 11:11 AM at the Vietnam Memorial Wall Replica in Constitution Circle. She mentioned the wall was 83% scale of the Vietnam Memorial Wall in Washington D.C.

**PRESENTATIONS:**

There were no presentations.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS:**

Andy Casper, 1282 North 3125 East, requested speed limit signage be placed in his neighborhood.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

**FEDERAL AID SUPPLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR THE PARTICIPATION IN THE COST FOR A PEDESTRIAN SAFETY PROJECT – RESOLUTION 24-11 – ALONG GENTILE STREET BETWEEN APPROXIMATELY 2475 WEST AND 3200 WEST**

Stephen Jackson, City Engineer, announced the agenda item explaining the City entered into an agreement with Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) in August 2023 for Federal Aid to complete a sidewalk pedestrian project along Gentile Street from approximately 3475 West and 3200 West. Project costs had exceeded the original estimate and allotted budget and Staff had requested additional funding to complete the project. He reported UDOT agreed to participate in the additional costs with the City agreeing to participate with an additional \$30,000 contribution for the project. He indicated the new estimated cost of the project to be approximately \$450,000, with the City contributing approximately \$43,250. He mentioned the additional portion from the City could be recognized by using the contingency associated with the project; therefore, Staff wasn't requesting any additional funding. He asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired of the amount of funding originally required to be contributed toward the project on behalf of the City. Mr. Jackson responded the City's original contribution was \$12,300 and clarified the additional funding was approximately \$30,000.

Mayor Petro expressed appreciation to Staff for seeking grant funding to complete needed projects.

**ACCEPT A PROPOSAL FOR AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND HOGAN & ASSOCIATES CONSTRUCTION FOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT/GENERAL CONTRACTOR SERVICES FOR A NEW 9-1-1 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS – RESOLUTION 24-10**

Allen Swanson, Police Chief, introduced the agenda item. He explained a Request for Proposal (RFP) for construction management/general contractor services for the new building was issued on Tuesday, February 6, 2024 with responses due by Tuesday, March 5, 2024. Included in the RFP was a scope of work including pre-construction services, cost estimates, schedule, fees, and management approach. The RFP was advertised on the City's website, the Utah Public Notice website, and Utah's "U3P" public procurement website, and QuestCDN, in accordance with City practice. Six companies submitted proposals.

The proposals were evaluated by eight City employees using a pre-determined, weighted scoring criteria. Galloway, the City's contracted architectural and engineering firm, assisted in the selection process through its experiences with the candidate firms. The technical proposal was evaluated in five categories that were reviewed. Three companies were selected to participate in a follow-up interview on Wednesday, March 13, 2024, with Hogan & Associates Construction receiving the highest overall rating and was recommended by the selection team. Staff also recommended accepting the proposal with Hogan & Associates Construction and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Bloxham inquired about the estimated costs associated with the project submitted by Hogan & Associates Construction. Chief Swanson responded the proposal was approximately \$13.5 million.

Councilmember Bloxham requested Chief Swanson further explain the need for the building. Chief Swanson explained the City had ongoing discussions with Davis County and other city administrators, police chiefs, and fire chiefs since early 2021 about the county wide provision of dispatch services. It was determined that the best system design was two dispatch centers, one in Bountiful, and one serving the north end of the County. Upon further discussion, Layton was selected as the agency to provide dispatch services for the agencies located in the northern portion of the County. To accommodate this need, plans were developed for a new building. The new building included a 9-1-1 Emergency Communications Center (ECC), as well as dispatch operations, training center, and an evidence storage capable of meeting the City's future needs.

Mayor Petro requested the Chief speak to the funding source for the facility. Chief Swanson mentioned approximately \$9 million was received via ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds from the Federal Government, with the remainder from Layton City.

Councilmember Bloxham believed this project would serve the City for generations and the Council believed this would be an appropriate use of the ARPA funding. Chief Swanson reminded the Council Layton City had merged its dispatching services with Clearfield City.

Councilmember Morris added the Police Department had outgrown its current facility, which was leased from Davis County, and believed this project was a great way for the City to use the federal funding source to benefit the public.

**ANNEXATION REQUEST – LAYTON CITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PLAN AREA (EDA) PROPERTIES ANNEXATION – ACCEPTANCE AND CERTIFICATION OF THE PETITION – RESOLUTION 24-02 AND RESOLUTION 24-06 – APPROXIMATELY 3925 NORTH FAIRFIELD ROAD AND 3945 NORTH FAIRFIELD ROAD**

Chad Wilkinson, Community and Economic Development Director, explained the City recently purchased properties located outside of the City boundary. He shared a visual illustration, identified the location of the properties, and oriented the Council. He identified the process associated with annexing the properties, which included a public hearing, and clarified the petition to annex would be initiated by the City. Staff recommended approval and he asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Morris clarified the properties would become part of the East Gate Economic Development Area (EDA) and Mr. Wilkinson responded in the affirmative. He added the annexation would provide for the extension of Fairfield Road and also additional property to economic development purposes in the East Gate EDA.

**FINAL PLAT – ADAMS OAK HILLS SUBDIVISION – 2201 EAST 350 NORTH**

Mr. Wilkinson shared a visual illustration, identified the location of the parcel and oriented the Council. He pointed out the proposed subdivision was located within a designated Sensitive Lands area of the City, which required geological hazard studies to be completed on the property. The applicant had submitted the required reports which included mitigation measures for construction on the property. These reports had been reviewed and proposed mitigations accepted by Staff and approved by the Commission and Council as part of the preliminary plat approval for the subdivision. The plat consisted of two single-family lots. He indicated this would be the final step for approval of the subdivision and because it was located within a designated Sensitive Lands area, required approval of the City Council. He emphasized the Planning Commission had forwarded a recommendation of approval and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson requested clarification whether all items identified in the Staff Report by City Engineering Staff had been satisfactorily completed and responded to. Mr. Wilkinson responded all of the concerns applicable to this stage of the process had been addressed; however, some mitigation would be required as development occurred.

Councilmember Roberts requested clarification if the ‘hatched’ areas of both lots reflected on the illustration were buildable with mitigation. Mr. Wilkinson responded in the affirmative. He indicated the parcels were very large and Staff believed Lot 1 could accommodate the construction of a home without mitigation measures. He mentioned mitigation for Lot 2 would need to be appropriate for the size of the home taking into account the amount of the encroachment.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Smith Edmondson moved to accept and approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Councilmember Morris seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **PUBLIC HEARING:**

### **GORDON AVENUE AND HIGHWAY 89 TOWN CENTER MASTER PLAN, AMENDING AND UPDATING THE GENERAL PLAN – ORDINANCE 24-06**

Mr. Wilkinson reminded the Council, Staff had been working on this small area plan for the Gordon/Highway 89 Town Center, a Master Planned project, for approximately one year. When the General Plan was originally adopted the Town Center area was identified with land uses and specific details to be determined at a later date. He emphasized Staff's approach for this Town Center was based on direction from the General Plan and not whether a Town Center should be developed at this location, but rather, what the Town Center would resemble.

He reported various opportunities in the form of open houses and public hearings to receive public input and comment on how the Town Center should be developed which included the following:

- Open house in July 2023 at Fire Station 54
- Online survey to collect feedback
- Planning Commission Public Hearing on Tuesday, November 14, 2023
- Planning Commission Public Hearing on Tuesday, January 30, 2023

He continued to explain Staff took careful notes from comments expressed during the November public hearing and provided responses and answers to questions during the meeting on January 30. He mentioned during those intervening weeks Staff also met with numerous citizens and all comments or suggestions from the public had been considered and those which were appropriate, had been accommodated. He reported the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the Town Center plan to the City Council during its meeting on January 30, 2024.

Mr. Wilkinson recognized Weston Applonie, City Planner, Zachary Kadin, Planner, and acknowledged Stephen Jackson, City Engineer, and his Staff which had been instrumental in reviewing the traffic components to ensure the City was putting forth the best plan possible for the Town Center. He also acknowledged Psomas, LRB, and Wall Consultant Group (WCG), consultants, which contributed information to better understand market demand and traffic impacts associated with the proposed development.

Mr. Applonie shared an artist's rendering of what the Town Center could look like and reviewed the proposed plan pointing its purpose was based on the direction established by the General Plan. He stated the Town Center was included in the Wasatch Choice 2040 Planning Model, a regional planning model intended to manage growth along the Wasatch Front. He emphasized the purpose and intent of the Town Center was to provide distinct neighborhoods, consisting of convenient services, a variety of housing choices, employment centers, and access to public transportation all within a short distance. He reported the majority of residents that participated in the General Plan process were in support of the Town Center Development. Additionally, the market study, commissioned as part of this planning process, identified a service hole for commercial and related services in this area of the City. He mentioned multiple public meetings and open houses took place which allowed survey results and reviewed those.

He reviewed the Town Center Concept Plan identifying the location of the commercial components and various residential components proposed for the development:

- Anchor grocery store
- Gas station associated with the grocery store
- Retail and commercial services
- Mixed use with retail/commercial on ground level and residential above
- Townhomes
- Mansion style housing with twin homes or triplexes
- Attached single family units
- Pedestrian underpass
- Other mixed-use to accommodate multi-family/office or other combination
- Other attached townhome units

He also identified the location of a proposed pedestrian underpass along Gordon Avenue. He identified the Sow Canyon Creek which drained into a detention pond and indicated this would be considered an amenity to the development. He identified the building height of the proposed housing elements, as well as the other pedestrian paths and walkways. He continued to review additional images provided by the consultant emphasizing the illustrations were merely conceptual renderings and specific elevations would be required during future meetings.

He announced the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council for approval and asked if there were any questions.

Mayor Petro inquired if the Council had any questions.

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification whether changes had been made to the proposed Plan since approval by the Planning Commission. Mr. Wilkinson responded no substantive changes had been made to the Plan since its meeting on January 30, 2024. He clarified all changes to the Plan were made between November 14, 2023 and January 30, 2024.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification about the public transportation component in conjunction with the Plan and inquired whether conversations had taken place with UTA (Utah Transit Authority) specific to East/West connectivity. Mr. Wilkinson indicated that issue had been discussed and it was anticipated a transit stop, at the very least, would be located near the Town Center and expressed agreement an East/West connection would be beneficial.

Councilmember Bloxham requested Mr. Wilkinson speak to this specific General Plan amendment. Mr. Wilkinson explained the parcel was owned by one property owner, UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation), which the City had always envisioned as a town center, and as part of the Highway 89 project, this process was anticipated to determine the land uses associated with the town center. He clarified the General Plan process had identified the framework this parcel would result in a town center due to the characteristics it possessed: good transportation connections (Gordon Avenue – arterial street, Highway 89, access to transit, nearby school, great recreation opportunities to both the east and west). He mentioned although a town center was identified for this location, it also identified the City would need to determine what the Town Center would resemble and what zoning should be designated and included. He emphasized this was a refinement process to establish the feasibility and density of specific uses. He clarified the next steps would be to review development plans which would identify zoning and entitle development to move forward. He pointed out this differed in that the request wasn't whether or not the General Plan should allow the Town Center; this had been previously called out in the General Plan.

Councilmember Thomas expressed his desire appropriate trees be included in the development to provide adequate shade to be an amenity to the development. Mr. Wilkinson responded Staff had requested the consultant team provide trees which would contribute to the development for a variety reasons and would be designated in the Development Agreement.

Councilmember Bloxham requested Mr. Wilkinson speak to why a town center, with the additional housing component, was preferred over a traditional commercial development which could be successful given there was a gap of commercial services in this geographical area of the City. Mr. Wilkinson mentioned this Town Center concept aligned with the 2040 Regional Plan which addressed why the town center concept was the preferred type of development; it provided a variety of housing types which decreased impacts to road infrastructure. He reported the Regional Plan, completed by transportation organizations, recommend placing these developments consisting of a variety of housing within close proximity to services in areas which made sense.

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification whether the inclusion of the housing component was to put more consumers on site or if the commercial component could exist and be successful without the housing. Mr. Wilkinson explained housing was definitely a component of town centers but it also contributed to creating

a sense of ‘place’, in addition to identifying an appropriate location for a variety of additional housing units in the City close to services.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson requested clarification a commercial center would be more conducive to more vehicular traffic, whereas a town center contributed toward a pedestrian or walkable development. She requested Mr. Wilkinson speak to the walkability component or trail connections in the area. Mr. Wilkinson responded Envision Utah had identified the types of communities where people want to live and reported overwhelmingly walkable communities consisting of easy access to amenities and services. He referenced an illustration which identified the pedestrian circulation proposed for the development.

Councilmember Morris inquired about the advantage of having one property owner for the proposed development. Mr. Wilkinson emphasized the owner was vested in providing a successful development and specifically mentioned the traffic study completed by UDOT identified the success of the highway in conjunction with the proposed development.

Councilmember Roberts requested clarification regarding the trail connections or walkways beyond this general area would be available in conjunction with the development and Mr. Wilkinson identified the wider sidewalk along Gordon Avenue would be a trail connection to Adams Pond. He also identified the trail system to the east which connected to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and other canyon trails, in addition to the intention of the pedestrian pathways within the proposed development. He also called out the open space associated with the Highway 89 project.

Councilmember Roberts inquired whether the completed traffic study had identified locations of potential increased traffic associated with the proposed development. He mentioned Gordon Avenue in the western portion of the City was two lanes and inquired whether there were future plans for widening it to four lanes.

Mr. Jackson responded although Gordon Avenue was currently a two lane road, it had the capacity to become a 5-lane road and indicated this would be determined in the future based on traffic counts and modeling. He briefly identified the proposed locations for traffic signals and indicated the current model didn’t reflect the need at this time. He addressed the question of potential ‘hot spots’ associated with the town center reporting the traffic impact study reflected 60% of all traffic would be between the intersection west of Highway 89 and the Highway 89 interchange. He concluded it was anticipated that the majority of traffic would be those exiting the freeway to access the town center area, then getting back on the roadway. He added 15% of the traffic would be traveling from the west to the east on Gordon. He anticipated another 10% would be coming from the south from neighboring subdivisions visiting the development.

Mr. Wilkinson expressed his desire to address the town center concept and reported that both the Layton Forward and Envision Layton process, which took place over a significant amount of time, allowed the participation of Layton residents to identify and determine how the City should accommodate for future growth. This specific question was asked and these participating citizens had overwhelmingly expressed the preference of walkable developments, which led to deliberate discussions of potential scenarios which ultimately directed Staff to this concept during the General Plan process

Councilmember Smith Edmondson asked whether the number provided by Staff of survey information by participating residents was specific to this particular Town Center or whether those figures were from the General Plan process in 2019 and Mr. Wilkinson responded it was a combination. He indicated thousands of responses had been received in conjunction with the General Plan process and suggested a high number of responses had been received associated with this process.

### **Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 8:13 p.m.**

Mayor Petro identified the expectation for those participating in the public hearing. She called for public comment.

Karen Smith, 1553 North 2850 East, acknowledged the length of time the Town Center had been discussed and expressed appreciation to City Staff for making time to address issues with interested individuals who would be affected by the proposed development. Although many residents within the area would like the property to remain vacant, expressed understanding the single property owner, UDOT, desired to sell it at market value and the purchaser would want to recognize a return on its investment; therefore, residents shifted efforts in creating a positive development. She highlighted efforts of area residents to illustrate that point. She mentioned the need for a strong development agreement and requested the following be included:

- Commercial development should be in place before housing.
- No buildings over three stories in height.
- Detached single family residential should be located adjacent to existing detached single family dwellings on the west side.
- The total number of housing units should not exceed the maximum ranges on the March 11, 2024 town center Master Plan.
- All apartments would be located above office or retail space with secure, interior access.
- The apartments would be Mixed-Use residential housing and office housing not to exceed three stories in height.

She continued the following had been previously mentioned and believed should also be incorporated:

- Limited drive thru options such as a pharmacy or coffee shop.
- Gas pumps associated with the grocery store.
- All town homes would include a two-car garage.
- 50% covered parking for apartments.
- The 10ft wide multi-use path around the detention pond would connect with the Gordon trail.
- Other amenities previously discussed such as a playground and pavilion.

Any impacts to schools, traffic, and water associated with the town center had already been discussed and addressed. She indicated the public could endorse the project as long as the identified conditions were in place.

Natalie Poll, 1716 North 2675 East, read a statement from resident Nancy Roberts, 2684 East 1650 North, which spoke to her personal experience of living in another state which had similar developments. She called out the changes which had been requested during a previous public hearing and expressed appreciation to City Staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council, for listening to the requests of the public.

Francois Harvey, 2301 East 1100 N, expressed concern the retail/commercial component alone would most definitely result with increased vehicular traffic, notwithstanding incorporating housing units. He expressed his opinion he would rather have the retail/commercial development component without the inclusion of housing. He didn't believe Gordon Avenue could be widened in that area to accommodate for any additional traffic.

Rachel Black, 1663 North 2800 East, provided statistics associated with the zip code of 84040 read from the Gordon Avenue Town Center Concept Plan which spoke specifically to views of the mountains and lakes, pedestrian uses, off-street parking shielded from streetscapes and plaza areas, small boutique retail and restaurants. She also spoke to this location being the gateway to a number of beautiful amenities in the area and expressed her desire the development would provide a sense of community.

Thomas Kano, 2627 East Cherry Lane, expressed appreciation to the Council, Planning Commission, and Staff for the discussions he had with some of those individuals. He suggested intersections designated within the development were already planned to fail and inquired about the thoughtfulness and mitigation efforts to ensure the development was successful. He specifically spoke to the townhomes proposed for the northern portion of the development specifically to the anticipation of the vacant parcel to the north. He read from the General Plan which reflected these homes should be of similar lot size and building height, which he believed was contrary to what was being proposed. He also expressed concern regarding the proposed two through-streets intended to connect when development occurred and reported that adjacent property owner wasn't in favor of those.

Kent Smedley, 2354 East 1100 North, asked about the timeline or timetable for the proposed project and expressed a desire for a smaller, similar project of Farmington Station, which he believed didn't incorporate a housing component.

Scott Temby, 2278 East 1100 North, announced he was new to the City of Layton; however, he had read the process associated with the approved General Plan, reviewed those materials, reviewed the steps taken to obtain community input, and was impressed by the number of those within the community which provided opinions and input. He announced he was a former member of a Planning Commission in Utah County and was familiar with these processes. He was also impressed by the data revealed by the different studies and the efforts to create appropriate buffer zones, to accommodate traffic in a reasonable manner, and to address safety concerns of the community. He announced due to those efforts, he was generally supportive of the proposed zoning changes to the General Plan which would provide an attractive eastern gateway to Layton City.

Rod Charlesworth, 2597 East Gentile, expressed his opinion the City hadn't planned for the number of vehicles the housing would need to accommodate. He expressed concern about the increased vehicular traffic and the need for road improvements on Gentile Street. He believed some road improvements would have been completed in conjunction with the Highway 89 improvements and continued to suggest the need for road improvements. He continued to speak of other construction issues within his neighborhood.

Gordon Smith, 2826 County Oaks Drive, mentioned he had been in attendance during the last meeting and requested clarification regarding traffic, specifically the anticipated number of vehicular trips. He also inquired whether East Layton Elementary could accommodate any future students the housing component of the town center would bring.

Anna Recksiek, 1850 North Valley View, expressed concern for both the pedestrian and bicycle traffic along Valley View Drive and the frontage road in the area combined with the potential increase in traffic resulting from the proposed town center. She inquired whether there was a plan to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic near the development and how those connections would be implemented. She suggested releasing the name of the anchor grocery store would generate excitement associated with the proposed development.

Sharon Wiggins, 1262 North 2575 East, informed the Council the proposed development would be adjacent to her backyard. She expressed her opinion the standards reflective of the development were of a high caliber and was appreciative of Community Development Staff throughout the Planning Commission meetings. She believed Staff had implemented suggestions and encouraged the Council to uphold the recommendation specific to the single-family housing component on the western portion of the development. She pointed out vehicular traffic had increased along 2575 as the through street to access Gordon Avenue from Cherry Lane, as opposed to the use of the frontage road. She continued, the added traffic combined with speed had recently been an issue and was appreciative of tools used by the Police Department to help with that.

Dennis Long, 1703 North Hobbs Creek, inquired where he could locate the presentation shared during the meeting and/or the latest rendering of the proposed town center. He stated he also enjoyed visiting Farmington Station and would like to see a similar development. He expressed his opinion this town center wouldn't be a destination point and also didn't believe this would be conducive to pedestrians. He pointed out the proposal had concentrated the parking to the center of the development surrounded by strip malls located on perimeters.

Paul Larsen, 1889 North 2750 East, suggested there could be unintended consequences with the town center and expressed concern regarding the potential illumination from the parking lot lights and other lighting which could negatively impact adjacent property owners.

Patty Brown, 2632 Oak Forest Drive, inquired how many residential units were proposed within the town center development and the potential increased traffic they could bring to Gordon Avenue. She expressed her understanding that all along throughout the process this development would resemble a mini Farmington Station and now believed the current proposal didn't resemble that at all. She pointed out if this particular area was designated as a 'drought' area for commercial opportunities, whatever was proposed should succeed without the need for additional housing of various types.

She also expressed appreciation to City Staff for listening to resident's concerns throughout this lengthy process.

Mr. Wilkinson responded to and addressed questions asked during the public hearing:

- The City had no plans to widen Gordon Avenue at this location and indicated the road had been constructed to accommodate this type of development.
- He could not provide dates specific to a timeline; however, he spoke to the process. UDOT acquired the property in conjunction with the Highway 89 project and was the current owner. That agency had expressed a strong desire for the process to proceed quickly in order to surplus the property to a developer.
- He clarified 17,000 vehicles were anticipated in conjunction with the proposed development and reviewed the calculation.
- City Staff had communicated with Davis School District regarding any impact associated with the proposed development and indicated it employed its own planners to identify potential student growth based on the City's General Plan. He reported the District was specifically made aware of this proposed development and it had indicated enrollment was trending downward for the younger grades. Mr. Applonie reported the District's anticipated number of proposed students wasn't concerning and indicated the schools wouldn't exceed capacity, with the exception of Layton High, which was actively in the process of an expansion which could accommodate this growth.
- Mr. Applonie also explained and identified how copies of the most recent Plan could be located.
- Mr. Wilkinson believed this probably wouldn't be the final and last version. He continued to address the timeline and process moving forward:
  - Entitlement process concerning zone districts and executing a Development Agreement which would create a framework speaking to implementation of this Plan.
  - City Staff would continue to work with UDOT until it transferred ownership of the property to a developer.
  - The advice and consultation with those having expertise for these types of developments to identify what would be realistic and successful.
  - Continue working with UDOT to identify how the entitlement would take place such as proceeding through a Request for Proposal (RFP). He mentioned the importance of having entitlements in place prior to the sale of the property to ensure the developer was aware of expectations associated with the development.
  - He reported tremendous interest had been expressed from within the development community for the property.
- He provided the number range (220-270) of housing units proposed for the development which he didn't believe would significantly change due to parking.
- The impact of the parking lot lights with the least amount of impact was also desired of City Staff and explained how that would be mitigated.
- He mentioned the traffic study proposed mitigation measures which included signalization and re-striping of lanes which reflected the intersections would function at a high level of service.
- He identified the location of the one intersection which could possibly fail and explained the specific challenges.

Mr. Jackson spoke to the improvements for East Gentile Street. He reported there was both a water line and sewer line project which needed to be completed within the road prior to completing the road improvements. He indicated the City was actively seeking possible grant funds from Davis County which could be appropriated toward the project. He also addressed the Valley View Drive concern and indicated the City was prepared to complete a water line project and mentioned there were plans to widen the pavement section of that road in an attempt to make it a safer shoulder. He emphasized it wouldn't include full improvements.

Mr. Wilkinson spoke to the pedestrian circulation associated with the proposed development. He reviewed illustrations which identified areas designated for outdoor seating creating areas which would create a place to spend some time. He continued the development was designed in this way to encourage pedestrian pathways going both east/west and north/south. He spoke to how the pedestrian underpass at Gordon would contribute

toward the success of the development. He mentioned the opportunity to partner with UDOT provided an opportunity to create a Transportation Reinvestment Zone (TRZ) and reviewed the benefits.

Mr. Jackson addressed concerns specific to the amount of retail compared to the housing and traffic counts. He explained the process used for the traffic study and reported the highest trip generating categories were retail/commercial developments; creating significantly higher vehicular trips than compared to the residential component. He reported raw figures identified approximately 17,000 trips/cars per day in this area and provided figures from traffic studies for several roads within the area which reflected they were functioning very well to provide a positive level of service. He expressed confidence Gordon Avenue had been designed to meet the standards and expectations of the traffic in the area in addition to accommodating any anticipated growth. Mr. Wilkinson also clarified the grading for the term 'level of service' specific to roads.

Mayor Petro expressed appreciation to the residents for their participation in this process associated with the proposed development. She also believed the location for the proposed development would be a beautiful gateway to the City. She addressed the concern of speeding vehicular traffic and reported this had repeatedly been a concern expressed to her throughout her tenure as Mayor. She clarified the request of the Council was to approve an update to the General Plan.

Councilmember Roberts requested clarification regarding the location for the apartments. Mr. Wilkinson responded it was anticipated there would be some shared parking with the commercial uses within the development and indicated some covered parking for the apartments was required via City Code. He mentioned the shared parking in mixed-use settings could be compatible with one another.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson requested Mr. Wilkinson clarify the zoning of the vacant property to the north of the proposed development. He responded the current zone was R-S (Residential Suburban) and clarified the General Plan reflected Community Residential, which allowed for higher densities than the R-S allowed and reviewed what that resembled.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Thomas moved to close the public hearing at 9:20 PM and approve the Gordon Avenue and Highway 89 Town Center Master Plan, Amending and Updating the General Plan as presented, Ordinance 24-06. Councilmember Smith Edmondson seconded the motion. Mayor Petro called for discussion.

The Council expressed appreciation to the public for its participation with the process in adopting the General Plan and other Plans used by the City to guide development. Appreciation was expressed to Staff for being receptive to concerns shared during the Planning Commission's public hearings and implementing changes which mitigated concerns associated with the Town Center development. Concerns regarding specifics associated with landscaping could be addressed in association with approval of the Development Agreement.

The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Thomas, Smith Edmondson, Morris. Voting NO – Councilmember Bloxham. Voting AYE – Councilmember Roberts.**

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

There was no unfinished business.

**The meeting adjourned at 9:31 p.m.**

---

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder