

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY  
COUNCIL MEETING**

**JUNE 19, 2025; 7:07 P.M.**

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS  
PRESENT:**

**MAYOR JOY PETRO, ZACH BLOXHAM, CLINT MORRIS, BETTINA SMITH EDMONDSON, AND DAVE THOMAS**

**EXCUSED:**

**TYSON ROBERTS**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

**ALEX JENSEN, CLINT DRAKE, TRACY PROBERT, WESTON APPLONIE, DAVID PRICE, JOELLEN GRANDY, 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. Mayor Petro offered the invocation and Devuan Doyle, Youth Council, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**MINUTES:**

There were no minutes for approval.

**MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Mayor Petro encouraged participation in the City's July 4th events highlighting the following:

- 5k Fun Run and More Fun, Less Run
- Rotary Club would be serving breakfast in the amphitheater plaza for \$7 per person
- Flag raising ceremony at 8:30 AM
- Kids' bike parade would begin at 10:15 AM
- Parade would begin at 10:30 AM
- Surf 'n Swim would open at 12 noon
- Events in Commons Park
- Free evening concert beginning at 8:00 PM in the Kenley Amphitheater would feature Utah Broadway Stars presenting "The Spirit of Freedom"
- Fireworks display would begin at 10:00 PM

She also mentioned the City Council would be recognizing Hometown Heroes during a free concert on Sunday, June 29, 2025, at 7:00 PM.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson mentioned the All-Star Baseball game was scheduled for Thursday, July 3, 2025 at Ellison Park, in conjunction with the City's 4<sup>th</sup> of July events.

Mayor Petro also announced Layton F.E.S.T. (Farmers, Entertainment, Shopping, and Trucks – food) would begin on Friday, July 11, 2025, in Commons Park.

**PRESENTATIONS:**

There were no presentations.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS:**

Jennifer Bazanno, resident, expressed appreciation to the Council for their service to the City. She shared comments regarding the dog park presentation which was shared during the previously held work session. She expressed her opinion benefits of a dog park were greater than just 'dog socialization' and shared some of

those which included a possible decrease in barking dog complaints received by Davis County Animal Control. She believed the City had a responsibility to provide an off-leash dog park to its residents. She believed dogs should be allowed on the trail system and suggested residents which might be put-off by encountering dogs on the trail had many other options for outdoor activities; however, dog owners didn't have other options. She requested the Council genuinely consider the options.

Jean Medberry, resident, stated she was shocked to learn Layton City didn't have a dog park after she moved here and shared examples of dog parks in Colorado, where she previously lived. She shared some benefits to the community of having a dog park and pointed out she wasn't a current a dog owner. She distributed a handout for the Council.

Megan Smock, resident, expressed agreement with the other comments and expressed her opinion the City wasn't meeting the needs of its residents by not having a dog park amenity. She believed there were many more benefits for having a dog park than what had been mentioned in the presentation. She suggested the benefits of a dog park far outweighed the challenges and risks. She believed Layton had the room to accommodate a dog park and it also had the responsibility to provide this to its residents.

Jennifer Garner, resident, stated although she was a dog owner; she didn't believe it was the City's responsibility to provide a dog park for her. She requested any decision to implement a dog park within the City should wait until data can be collected specific to liability. She complimented Layton City for its fiscal conservativeness on being debt free. She mentioned the Executive Order by Governor Cox taking over some of the planning for municipalities and expressed concern with this declaration. She suggested the City rely on collected data when determining need for its future growth needs.

Orlando, resident, informed the Council of challenges experienced at Central Davis Junior High and Crestview Elementary fields from residents using these areas for their dogs. He believed a dog park was needed to provide an acceptable environment for responsible dog owners to have a nice place for their dogs to play.

#### **CONSENT AGENDA:**

#### **AMEND SEWER RATES AND OTHER FEES LISTED IN TITLE 3, CHAPTER 3.15, SECTION 3.15.010 OF THE LAYTON MUNICIPAL CODE – CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE – ORDINANCE 25-15**

Tracy Probert, Finance Director, briefly reviewed the proposed changes to the Consolidated Fee Schedule. He recommended approval and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification specific to fire costs for unincorporated areas of Davis County and Mr. Probert responded Davis County requested the City, through an Interlocal Agreement, provide these services for a fee.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired about other entities renting the City's fire training tower and Mr. Probert responded in the affirmative and mentioned Layton was the only city within Davis County with a training facility.

#### **ANNEXATION REQUEST – LOVE'S VALLEY VIEW – CERTIFICATION OF THE PETITION – RESOLUTION 25-14 – APPROXIMATELY 940 NORTH EAST SIDE DRIVE**

Weston Applonie, Community and Economic Development Director, shared a visual illustration and identified the location of the parcel proposed for annexation. He explained, that if accepted, the annexation would facilitate a residential development subdivision.

Staff recommended approval and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Morris clarified the parcel was located within a Sensitive Lands designated area and Mr. Applonie responded in the affirmative and indicated it could be a while before additional approvals would come before the Council.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Smith Edmondson moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Councilmember Morris seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. **Councilmember Roberts was not present for the vote.**

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **AMEND THE ADOPTED BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2024-2025 – ORDINANCE 25-14**

Mr. Probert announced the agenda item and reviewed the summarized dollar amount of General Fund amendments. He directed the Council to the summary which identified amendments to other City funds.

He asked if there were any questions regarding any of the amendments.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson clarified the circumstances which required a budget amendment and requested clarification where excess unanticipated funds would be appropriated. Mr. Probert explained that revenue would be appropriated to the General Fund and also shared some examples to illustrate the circumstances in which the City might be reimbursed for various activities, fronted by the City, as needed from time to time.

Councilmember Morris requested Mr. Probert speak to the amount allowed in the Unreserved Fund Balance. Mr. Probert responded he would address that later in the meeting during the discussion related to adoption of the Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Budget.

**Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 7:47 p.m.**

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

There were no public comments.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Bloxham moved to approve the budget amendments to the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Budget as presented, Ordinance 25-14. Councilmember Morris seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Thomas, Smith Edmondson, Morris, and Bloxham. Voting NO – None.** Councilmember Roberts was not present for the vote.

### **ADOPT THE PROPOSED BUDGET, PROPERTY TAX RATE, AND COMPENSATION SCHEDULE FOR ELECTIVE, STATUTORY, AND EXECUTIVE MUNICIPAL OFFICERS OF LAYTON CITY FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 2025, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2026 – ORDINANCE 25-13**

Mr. Probert addressed Councilmember Smith Edmondson's request regarding parameters associated with the unreserved fund balance, also known as the 'rainy day fund'. He stated the City was allowed to set aside anywhere from 5% - 35% of revenues and pointed out Layton City generally kept its reserves at around 15%. He continued to explain the City's philosophy of maintaining an adequate amount in reserves and not retaining significant tax revenue of Layton City residents. He mentioned this philosophy was different from some cities within the State which maintained their respective unreserved fund balance at the maximum of 35%.

He shared a brief overview of the 2025-2026 Fiscal Year proposed budget pointing out the following:

- No property tax increase
- General Fund Budget was just over \$48,987,206
- Total City-Wide budget was just over \$129,806,897

- Market, cost of living and merit adjustments for officers and employees
- \$2,943,581 in capital equipment
- \$23,629,902 in capital projects (utilities, streets, parks, dispatch, etc.)
- Sewer rate increase by North Davis Sewer District (\$2.50) and the City's increase of (\$2.64)

Major projects included:

- Emergency communications dispatch center – intergovernmental funding
- Swimming pool dome
- Parks projects – RAMP funded
- Street maintenance
- Utility projects

He shared illustrations which identified revenue sources and expenditures and reviewed those with the Council. He pointed out summary statements could be located on page 2 of the budget document which could be accessed from the City's website. He asked if there were any questions and there were none.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson pointed out this had also been reviewed during the Council Meeting of June 5, 2025.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

There were no public comments.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Thomas moved to approve the Proposed Budget, Property Tax Rate, and Compensation Schedule for Elective, Statutory, and Executive Municipal Officers for Fiscal Year July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2026, as presented, Ordinance 25-13. Councilmember Bloxham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bloxham, Morris, Smith Edmondson, and Thomas. Voting NO – None.** Councilmember Roberts was not present for the vote.

**EASEMENT VACATION – PARCEL 11-050-0108 AND LOT 1 TEZAK SUBDIVISION (CREEK BEND ESTATES) – ORDINANCE 25-17 - 876 AND 942 EAST ROSEWOOD LANE**

Weston Applonie, Community and Economic Development Director, stated Staff had received an application from Mr. Phil Holland, representing HG Rosewood LLC, requesting the vacation of four public utility and drainage easements on properties located at 876 and 942 East Rosewood Lane. He shared a visual illustration and explained the request had been received in order to facilitate construction of a new subdivision. He shared an illustration of the proposed subdivision and identified the different easements. Staff recommended approval and he asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired about the length of the process for the six lot subdivision, assuming this agenda item was approved by the Council. Mr. Applonie responded as soon as the developer was ready for it to be recorded at Davis County.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

Catherine Martinez, resident, stated her home was located directly south of the proposed subdivision and shared the unique circumstances regarding her property in conjunction with the proposed subdivision in relation to access to Holmes Creek required for maintenance. She expressed concern how the vacation of the easements could affect her access, as well as the other four houses, to the creek adjacent to her property. She emphasized the four houses utilized that easement. She indicated she wasn't opposed to the proposed development and expressed a desire to reach a mutual agreement or understanding for continued access and described circumstances associated with the creek bed. She requested the Council pause on approving the easement vacation until further review and consideration.

Councilmember Thomas inquired whether Staff could address Ms. Martinez's concerns. Mr. Applonie responded the proposed subdivision had proceeded through the subdivision review process and this action would only be to vacate the current easements allowing for new easements to be put in place.

Clint Drake, City Attorney, clarified the difference between any private easement and public utility easements and emphasized the request was to vacate the current easements which would allow for new public utility easements to be put in place with the new development.

Mr. Applonie shared a visual illustration which identified the easements and a discussion followed. Mayor Petro requested clarification regarding the access point for Ms. Martinez to access the rear of her property. Mr. Drake inquired whether Staff was familiar with the Ms. Martinez's property and described circumstances associated with the easements and access. Mr. Applonie responded he was not. Ms. Martinez referenced an illustration displayed by Mr. Applonie and explained how the creek crossed her property and continued to explain how she had utilized the easement to access her property. Mr. Drake suggested this item be tabled until further investigation regarding access could be completed by Staff.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Smith Edmondson moved to continue the public hearing to a future meeting to take place at a later date and table approval of the Easement Vacation – Parcel 11-050-0108 and Lot 1 Tezak Subdivision (Creek Bend Estates) – 876 and 942 East Rosewood Lane, as presented, Ordinance 25-17. Councilmember Morris seconded the motion which passed unanimously. **Councilmember Roberts was not present for the vote.**

**EASEMENT VACATION – LOT 7 AND LOT 8 EAST LAYTON HILLS NO. 6 SUBDIVISION – ORDINANCE 25-18 - 2025 AND 2033 EAST DAN DRIVE**

Mr. Applonie shared a visual illustration and identified the location of the parcel. He stated the applicant, Keith Bennett, the owner of Lot 8, and representing the property owner of Lot 7, was requesting realignment of the property line between the shared properties, which required relocation of the existing public utility and drainage easement. He referred to the illustration and explained how the easement alignment would take place. He continued to explain the easement relocation would facilitate an addition to the existing home located at 2033 East Dan Drive. He clarified the easement vacation would also adjust the property line for both lots.

Staff recommended approval and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired whether both lots were owned by the same individual and Mr. Applonie responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

There were no public comments.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Bloxham moved to approve the Easement Vacation – Lot 7 and Lot 8, East Layton Hills No. 6 Subdivision – 2025 and 2033 East Dan Drive, as presented, Ordinance 25-18. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Morris, Smith Edmondson, Thomas, and Bloxham. Voting NO – None.** Councilmember Roberts was not present for the vote.

**EASEMENT VACATION – LOT 68 LAYTON INDUSTRIAL PARK AMENDMENT NO. 2 SUBDIVISION – ORDINANCE 25-16 - 820 NORTH MARSHALL WAY**

Mr. Applonie shared a visual illustration and identified the location of the parcel. He explained the applicant, Blake Madsen, representing Liberty Rentals Inc., was requesting the vacation of three public utility and drainage easements on the property located at 820 North Marshall Way, also known as Lot 68 of the Layton Industrial Park Amendment No. 2 Subdivision. He referred to the illustration and identified those easements which would be vacated and stated the easement vacation would accommodate construction of new buildings

and would also meet compliance with the City's requirements specific to public utility easements on commercial properties. He pointed out the remaining storm drain easement would remain.

Staff recommended approval and asked if there were any questions.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

There were no public comments.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Morris moved to approve the Easement Vacation – Lot 68 Layton Industrial Park Amendment No. 2 Subdivision – 820 North Marshall Way, as presented, Ordinance 25-16. Councilmember Smith Edmondson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Smith Edmondson, Morris, Thomas, and Bloxham. Voting NO – None.** Councilmember Roberts was not present for the vote.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Smith Edmondson moved to close the public hearings at 8:14 PM for Ordinances 25-14, 25-13, 25-18, and 25-16; and continue the public hearing for Ordinance 25-17, as previously stated. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously. **Councilmember Roberts was not present for the vote.**

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Mayor Petro suggested canceling the City Council Meeting on Thursday, July 3, 2025, due to a lack of agenda items at this time. She mentioned the need for assistance getting ready for the parade on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July and the popsicle distribution. The Council expressed agreement with that decision.

**The meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.**

---

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder