

**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF LAYTON, UTAH**

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the City Council of Layton, Utah, will hold a public meeting in the Council Chambers of the City Center Building, 437 North Wasatch Drive, Layton, Utah, commencing at **7:00 PM on August 7, 2025.**

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE, OPENING CEREMONY, RECOGNITION, APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- A. Minutes of Layton City Council Budget Work Meeting - March 25, 2025
- B. Minutes of Layton City Council Special Meeting - April 10, 2025

2. MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:

3. VERBAL PETITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

- A. Recognition of Community Members for Fire Prevention Efforts
- B. Presentation – Years of Service Awards

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS:

5. CONSENT ITEMS: (These items are considered by the City Council to be routine and will be enacted by a single motion. If discussion is desired on any particular consent item, that item may be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately.)

- A. Final Plats – Eastridge Park PRUD Phases 5D and 5E – Approximately 1900 North Emerald Drive

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- A. Proposed Amendments to Layton City Municipal Code, Title 19 Zoning, Chapter 19.02 Definitions, and Chapter 19.13 Development Plan Requirement for New Construction of a Single or Two-Family Dwelling in Layton City to Establish a Definition and Design Standards for Orientation of the Front Façade and Location of a Front Door – Ordinance 25-19

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

ADJOURN:

Notice is hereby given that:

- A Work Meeting will be held at 5:30 PM to discuss miscellaneous matters.
- This meeting will also be live streamed via laytoncitylive.com and facebook.com/Laytoncity
- In the event of an absence of a full quorum, agenda items will be continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting.
- This meeting may involve the use of electronic communications for some of the members of this public body. Elected Officials at remote locations may be connected to the meeting electronically.
- By motion of the Layton City Council, pursuant to Title 52, Chapter 4 of the Utah Code, the City Council may vote to hold a closed meeting for any of the purposes identified in that chapter.

Date: _____ By: _____
Kimberly S Read, City Recorder

This public notice is posted on the Utah Public Notice website www.utah.gov/pmn/, the Layton City website www.laytoncity.org, and at the Layton City Center.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons in need of special accommodations or services to participate in this meeting shall notify the City at least 48 hours in advance at 801-336-3826 or 801-336-3820.

D R A F T

MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY COUNCIL BUDGET WORK MEETING

MARCH 25, 2025; 8:05 A.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, KEVIN WARD, DAVID PRICE, JAMIE SENNINGER, ALLEN SWANSON, STEPHEN JACKSON, WESTON APPLONIE, TRACY PROBERT, AND KIM READ

The meeting was held at Fire Station 51, 530 North 2200 West, Layton, Utah.

Mayor Petro opened the meeting.

AGENDA:

Alex Jensen, City Manager, announced this was the Council's opportunity to review the proposed budget and to discuss all things important to the Council. He stated Staff appreciated the opportunity to work with the Council for the residents and would be willing to accept direction from the Council. He emphasized Staff respected the Council and he expressed his confidence with Staff and believed each was an expert in their respective fields. He informed the Council revenues for this year hadn't been recognized as anticipated and announced the proposed budget would continue with the City maintaining a healthy fund balance and reported many requests had been eliminated.

BUDGET REVIEW – FISCAL YEAR 2025-2026

Tracy Probert, Finance Director, shared a visual presentation specific to the proposed budget. He shared the agenda for the meeting and reviewed the budget calendar with the Council. He announced the Tentative Budget would be adopted the first meeting in May with adoption of the Final Budget June 19, 2025. Public Hearings associated with the proposed budget were proposed to take place during the June 5, 2025 City Council Meeting.

He shared and reviewed the following:

- Interest rate history and outlook
- Sales Tax history and projection

D R A F T

He shared an overview of the General Fund Budget pointing out the following:

- Personnel costs including proposed COLA and Merit adjustment
- Health Insurance proposed premium increase
- Personnel requests
- Personnel salary survey adjustment
- Operation costs
- Capital equipment replacement and purchases
- Emergency medical services
- Swimming Pool fund
- Victim Services fund
- UTOPIA debt service

He pointed out the proposed budget reflected the included expenditures and would exceed revenues; therefore, the budget included the use of excess revenue fund balance of approximately \$6.1 million and a discussion followed.

Mr. Probert reviewed General Fund expenditures. Allen Swanson, Police Chief, and David Price, Parks and Recreation Director, explained the two personnel requests respective to their departments. Mr. Probert reviewed the Health Plan Reserve Analysis with the Council. He also reviewed the General Fund Operational Expenses highlighting the following:

- Election expenses
- IT/software expenses
- Trolley circulator

He reviewed the General Fund Revenue highlighting the following:

- Budget to actual from FY22-FY26
- Sales Tax
- Property Tax

A discussion took place regarding Property Tax rates compared to Sales Tax rates and whether there was the possibility of increasing the Sales Tax rate as opposed to Property Tax rates. Mr. Jensen didn't believe municipalities had the ability to change that rate and believed that was determined by the legislature and a discussion followed.

Mr. Probert continued to review various other revenue sources.

D R A F T

He reviewed proposed Capital Projects with the Council and the respective department heads provided explanations to specific projects and personnel requests.

The Council took a break at 9:40 AM.

The meeting reconvened at 9:50 AM.

Mr. Probert reviewed the Capital Improvement Plan Summary and discussions took place regarding the following:

- Reconfiguration of the front counters for Utility Billing and the Building Division in Community Development
- Police Dispatch Center
- Street Maintenance Project(s)
- Angel Street Extension (Sugar Street Realignment)
- Signal at 2700 West and West Hill Field Road
- Sidewalk Repair/Replacement
- West Davis Corridor Landscaping
- Davis-Weber Canal Secondary Water Metering Project
- Metering at Secondary Water Reservoirs
- Antelope/1950 E (pedestrian crossing and residential light project)
- Sewer Slip Line Project
- Ambulance Remounts
- Fire Station 52 Remodel
- Fire Engine Replacement
- Zoll Auto-pulse

He reviewed an illustration which reflected previous water rate increases for Weber Basin Water. He also reviewed the proposed rate increase(s) for North Davis Sewer District.

Mr. Probert reviewed Special Revenue Funds and discussions took place regarding some of the funds:

- Victims Services
- Alcohol Enforcement Fund
- E911 Fund
- Metro Strike Force

D R A F T

- RDA
- EDA
- Impact Fee Fund
- Class C Road Fund
- Prop 1 Transportation Fund
- RAMP (Recreation, Arts, Museum, and Parks) Fund
- Building Services Fund
- Debt Service Fund

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 11:12 AM.

The meeting resumed at 1:27 PM.

Mr. Probert shared a presentation and provided an update specific to the Finance Department.

Kevin Ward, Fire Chief, shared an update and reviewed statistics specific to the Fire Department. He shared some concept drawings for the proposed fire station; the relocation of Fire Station #3 to property near the Layton Intermountain Hospital and a discussion followed. He shared the City's rating designated by ISO.

David Price, Parks and Recreation Director, shared a presentation specific to Parks and Recreation and reviewed statistics regarding participants in the 2025 Baseball/Softball programming. He informed the Council the All-Stars post-season play would continue this year and the Council expressed its appreciation to Staff with that decision. He distributed a handout reflecting RAMP (Recreation, Arts, Museum, and Parks) funding requests which identified programming which hadn't been approved to receive funding. He announced the RAMP Chair would be addressing the Council during a future meeting specific to the requests. Councilmember Morris mentioned the three requests denied by the Commission and explained its reasoning and a discussion followed. Mr. Price reviewed how the City planned to move forward with placing the RAMP opinion question on the General Election Ballot. He reviewed the following priorities specific to the Parks and Recreation Department:

- Improvement to bubble anchor system
- Improvements to existing park facilities
 - Chapel Park Field improvements
 - Commons Park Wendall/Starkey Ball Field improvements

D R A F T

- Trail improvements and construction
 - Kay's Creek Trail extension to the West Davis Corridor
 - Hobb's Trail
- New Projects:
 - Freedom's Memorial Plaza
 - Eastridge Nature Park Phase II, trail construction

A discussion followed and the Council requested a discussion specific to a dog park within the City during a future meeting and suggested it might be a higher priority than the Memorial Plaza and the discussion continued.

Jamie Senninger, Management Services, provided a department update and highlighted the following:

- Pay range market study
- Employee benefits
- Various significant risk incidents
- Passport processing
- Communications

The Council took a break at 2:55 PM.

The meeting resumed at 3:00 PM.

Allen Swanson, Police Chief, shared an update highlighting the Police Department and shared examples of police calls for service which illustrated how police officers were trained to respond and deal with the various crisis'.

Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, shared a visual presentation regarding the Public Works Department and directed the Council to page 9 of the Annual Report for statistics. He shared the following highlights:

- Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) for water system
- Secondary Water Metering
 - Kays Creek Irrigation Area
 - Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company Area
- Gordon Avenue Secondary Water Trunk Line (Phase 1 completed) – Phase 2 anticipated to begin

D R A F T

in June 2025 with Phase 3 anticipated to begin Spring 2026

- Wastewater Master Plan
- Transportation Master Plan
- Water Master Plan update
- Storm Drain Master Plan update

Weston Applonie, Community and Economic Development Director, shared a visual presentation with the Council and highlighted the following:

- East Gate Business Park
- Station Area Plan

Future Developments:

- Stevenson Properties
- Jenkins and Motta Properties

Code Updates:

- Gordon Avenue and Highway 89 Town Center
- Sensitive Lands Code Update
- West Layton Business Park
- West Layton Town Center
- Strengthen Business Licensing Requirements for Massage Businesses

A discussion followed regarding the Gordon Avenue and Highway 89 Town Center and the TRZ (Transportation Reinvestment Zone).

Clint Drake, City Attorney, shared an update and highlighted the following:

- Personnel
- Prosecution statistics
- Victim's Advocate Program

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Petro inquired whether the Council had any comments and the Council expressed appreciation to the Staff for the information provided during the meeting.

D R A F T

Councilmember Smith Edmondson expressed concern regarding the public's perception the Council's discussions and deliberations weren't taking place in the public; although Work Meetings were public meetings.

Mayor Petro mentioned further discussion regarding the Hobbs Creek PRUD was scheduled for the first meeting in April, which happened to be Spring Break, and expressed concern about that timing. Mr. Drake pointed out the developer had the right to have its request heard in a timely fashion and indicated the applicant had the right to place it timely on an agenda. A discussion followed.

Mayor Petro announced a youth from HAFB (Hill Air Force Base) had been designated and was currently participating in the Youth Council. She expressed her desire for a HAFB representative to be placed on the Youth Court.

She inquired about the flag raising ceremony in conjunction with the Fourth of July (Liberty Days) celebration.

Councilmember Bloxham requested Staff put forth a statement regarding Wasatch Integrated Waste Management District. Mr. Drake responded Staff was working on this and a discussion followed.

Mr. Jensen provided an update regarding the sidewalk repair project in Kayscreek Estates. He mentioned some residents had indicated their intent to remove their own trees. He reported City employees had experienced harassment by residents and stated that would be addressed moving forward. He indicated residents had also expressed support for the project. The discussion continued.

The meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder

D R A F T

MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING

APRIL 10, 2025; 7:02 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, JADYN APPLONIE, WESTON APPLONIE, TRACY PROBERT, STEPHEN JACKSON, DAVID PRICE, AND TORI CAMPBELL

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 Amaris Edmondson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES:

MOTION: Councilmember Roberts moved and Councilmember Bloxham seconded to approve the minutes of:

Layton City Council Work Meeting – January 16, 2025.

The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes as written.

MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilmember Roberts announced the Easter Egg Dive at Surf ‘n Swim for those 14 years old and younger. He directed the public to visit the City’s website for registration information.

PRESENTATIONS:

PROCLAMATION – FINANCIAL LITERACY

Mayor Petro read the proclamation for financial literacy.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

D R A F T

Jennifer Shepherd, resident, petitioned the City Council for a dog park within Layton City. She informed the Council a representative had attended the Parks and Recreation Commission meetings for the past nine months and had been repeatedly told a dog park was not a priority. She suggested the City Council could shift the priorities for Layton City and reviewed the history regarding implementation of a dog park. She mentioned the number of website requests for a dog park and reiterated the need for an off-leash dog park for Layton residents.

Megan Smock, Farmington City, informed the Council she was a professional pet sitter/dog walker which served Layton residents. She pointed out with the increase of housing without yards these dog-owner residents need a location for their dogs to exercise and socialize. She expressed agreement with the need to have leash laws, but believed an off-leash dog park could also promote safety and suggested the benefits out-weighed the risks.

Michael Christensen, resident, suggested the City consider the large areas of land under power lines for a dog park. He provided his personal example of participating in the City's recycling program and suggested more residents would participate in recycling if a high level of service continued. He expressed his understanding of Wasatch Integrated Waste Management's District's proposed recycling program which he believed would encourage residents to surrender their second garbage can to begin using the mandated recycling can, which he also believed would result in a lower fee.

Mayor Petro requested the Councilmembers express their individual opinion's regarding Wasatch Integrated Waste Management District's (WIWMD) recycling decision.

Councilmember Bloxham believed there was miscommunication and misunderstanding within the community regarding WIWMD. He emphasized Layton City was still a participant with WIWMD and the City was following the legal process which would allow the City to be released. He clarified the intent of the letter sent to the County Commission and to WIWMD was the first step of many while the Council completed due diligence in determining what would be best for Layton City. He continued, the additional literature distributed with a copy of the letter to City residents by WIWMD wasn't authored by Layton City; but WIWMD. He assured the public the issue would be fully vetted in a public forum in an effort to promote transparency. He pointed out Layton City was one of 15 members of the WIWMD and every City had one vote no matter the population and Layton City created most of the District's revenue. He concluded the disproportionate share of the voting rights related to garbage/recycling rates established by WIWMD put Layton City residents at a disadvantage because the Council couldn't protect the residents from being taken advantage of. He emphasized the issue with WIWMD wasn't entirely about recycling; rather, there were other issues which caused the

D R A F T

leadership of the City to question whether the residents' best interests were being considered.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson expressed agreement with Councilmember Bloxham's remarks. She announced she currently participated in the City's recycling program and expressed assurance this wasn't about Layton City not wanting to participate in a recycling program. She stated her concern was with WIWMD mandating a recycling program for all Layton City residents without the City's input. She reiterated Councilmember Bloxham's comments that a citywide program should be the decision of the Mayor and City Council. She stated it was surprising to learn from Facebook, emails, and television news that WIWMD had been distributing a FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) along with the City's letter sent to the District, making it appear as it came from the City. She emphasized the City hadn't entered into any agreements, hadn't made any decisions, and assured the public the City couldn't leave the District without a formalized public process. She also assured the residents the Council wouldn't unfairly raise rates specific to garbage and/or recycling. She explained since Layton was the largest city within the County, it proportionally contributed more than other entities, and if not for Layton City, WIWMD wouldn't be able to offer the rates it was offering to the other participating cities within the District. She encouraged those interested in the topic seek out the truth and not feed into misinformation.

Councilmember Morris echoed the comments expressed by both Councilmembers Bloxham and Smith Edmondson and assured the public the Council was united in its efforts to not require mandated recycling for a forced fee. He announced the Council signed a resolution expressing its disagreement with WIWMD's decision in an effort to facilitate an open dialogue regarding the topic. He reminded the residents the City currently had three different contractors offering recycling on a voluntary basis. The City's voluntary recycling program had more participants than the entire population of some smaller communities participating in WIWMD. He explained the Council had many questions of Staff regarding its participation in WIWMD and after further research, the City learned it could potentially recognize a savings somewhere between \$700,000 and \$1,000,000 per year of not participating with the District. He emphasized it was the Council's intention to do what was right for the residents of Layton City, which didn't include a recycling mandate. He also pointed out just because acceptable product was placed in a recycle container, didn't always equate to that product being recycled and explained that was market driven. He reiterated it was the Council's desire to do what was in the best interest of City residents for the lowest cost.

Mayor Petro referenced a quote from her in the newspaper which she believed was misrepresented. She continued to express her opinion WIWMD's decision on mandatory recycling was rushed. She further clarified the City presented its resolution requesting the District rescind its action and at that time, did not take any action specific to the City's request. She reported, as the City's representative on the WIWMD Board, the

D R A F T

City's position with the Board on mandatory recycling, and following that discussion proposed an incentivized recycling program. She clarified nothing had changed with WIWMD regarding current operations for residents of the City. She expressed her desire City Staff will be able to negotiate a beneficial resolution to all parties involved.

Councilmember Roberts pointed out the City Council was made up of citizens. He mentioned he used the landfill approximately five to six times per year and would also have to abide by any decision made by the Council. He also expressed support for recycling and actively participated with the City's current recycle program and emphasized the issue with WIWMD wasn't about recycling. He reported he had responded to every email, phone call, and had an in person conversation to provide a better understanding of the facts. He pointed out the literature distributed by the District identified all services it provided to residents as participating in the District. He shared a quote from Ronald Reagan and concluded if the Council wasn't doing what it believed was best for its residents, the Council wasn't doing its job.

Councilmember Thomas stated he didn't like recycling and certainly wouldn't want to be told he had to recycle; however, he respected those who choose to recycle.

Luze Torres, resident, suggested owners (veterans or those with special needs) of service animals needed a dog park and requested the Council consider that implementation.

Councilmember Bloxham mentioned dog park discussion had been requested from the Council during its recently held all-day budget meeting. He assured the residents this was an issue the Council was aware of. He thanked Mr. Torres for his service.

Ryann Zentmeyer, resident, expressed concern regarding the Kayscreek Estates sidewalk project and indicated although many residents might not attend meetings, the neighborhood was united. She believed the trees were a vital part of the neighborhood's identity and suggested their removal had left a visible scar. She reminded the Council, the City had approved the PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development), which she believed included the plans for the trees, whether or not there was an approved tree list at that time. She suggested the City was responsible for the approval at that time and currently remained responsible. She reported on a discussion she had with workers from Page's Tree Service that the project had more than what they bargained for. She believed the City had the responsibility to cover all costs associated with the project including the replacement of any tree which had been removed. She continued, the residents deserved leadership which prioritized long-term sustainability over short-term fixes.

D R A F T

Henry Simpson, resident, stated he was surprised to learn about possible changes between the City and WIWMD and sent emails to the elected body. He reported he was pleased to receive a response from Councilmember Roberts which clarified the City's position and answered questions. He reviewed the number of services he had taken advantage of over the years and indicated he delivered his cardboard, plastic, and glass refuse to the landfill and expressed concern whether this would continue to be available to him should the City end its participation. He inquired whether WIWMD meetings were public and indicated he would like to attend those and was shocked to learn about the City's representation on that Board. He continued to express concern about the possibility of not being allowed to dispose of yard waste at the facility and believed a reasonable, cost effective option wouldn't be available to residents. He would also like to know how the City came to the conclusion with the proposed savings of \$700,000 to \$1,000,000.

Kelsey Brown, resident, stated she was deeply concerned with the City's decision to consider withdrawing from WIWMD. She expressed concern the public hadn't been informed before the change was set in motion and when the issue made headlines none of the elected body spoke publicly about it and believed this reflected a lack of transparency. She grew up in Salt Lake County which mandated recycling and agreed with a recycling program. She requested the Council reconsider this decision.

Justin Anderson, resident, expressed appreciation to the Mayor and Council for taking the time to respond to the issues with WIWMD. He thanked Mayor Petro for personally visiting with him and providing answers to his questions. He suggested the anxiety experienced by residents was due to the messaging specific to the issue. He believed he had an understanding of tonnage and agreed the City should have more representation from Layton City. He stated WIWMD had the best machinery specific to recycling and also believed an opt-in option would be better than an opt-out. He cautioned the Council on accepting a lower cost initially and consider whether that would be sustainable for the long-term. He informed the Council the significant amount of trash that regularly accumulated along Highway 89 and State Road 193 from haulers to the WIWMD facility.

Dan Harward, expressed appreciation to the Mayor and Council for tonight's meeting. He indicated he owned a grounds maintenance company and relied heavily on the landfill; the location was convenient and the cost to use the facility. He suggested the Council consider the many benefits offered to residents by the landfill and expressed concern that although this was just the beginning of the process, there was still an active attempt to leave the District. He requested the Council proceed with caution and mentioned he might need to move his business elsewhere in order to be profitable due to the location, convenience, and cost to use the current facility.

Louise Brown, resident, appreciated the information she had learned during the meeting. She was pleased to

D R A F T

hear the Mayor and Council had been talking about this for months. She mentioned the phrase in the letter from the Mayor and Council to WIWMD which indicated the City's intent to withdraw and suggested the language indicated the Council had already come to that conclusion. She continued to express concern with the language that any comments should be addressed to Alex Jensen, Layton City Manager, who was not an elected official, instead of the Mayor and City Council.

Clint Drake, City Attorney, expressed a desire to clarify the process the City was required to follow in an attempt to dispel the miscommunication. He stated the wording of the letter, and the letter itself, was part of a legal process which had been addressed and directed to the County Commission, which had the authority to consider the City's request. He emphasized the City had always planned to allow public discussions and input from the residents. The City followed the identified process in an attempt to be respectful of WIWMD and the County Commission; the City initially met with the Director of WIWMD, and its attorney, informing them of the City's intent and reasons why. A similar meeting would take place with the County Commission, followed by discussions with the public. He pointed out the importance of following the process because the County Commission had the ability to withdraw the City from the District and didn't want that body to feel disrespected by engaging a political maneuver of circumventing the process, engaging public clamor resulting in the Commission having to make a decision under public pressure. He pointed out someone outside of Layton City and outside of WIWMD released this to the press. He clarified the purpose and order was out of respect for the organizations the City worked with. He stated the Council was anxious to have these conversations with the public months ago and emphasized this was not poorly messaged and reported it had taken Staff many hours to complete the analysis.

Dennis Scuffy, resident, lived near the landfill and believed everyone should have realized the landfill would fill up at some point. He mentioned the state of Utah was a desert and everyone needed to reduce water usage; however, he believed the City created more uses of water. He suggested the City needed to change its way of thinking and plan ahead by thinking of viable alternatives.

Mayor Petro believed everyone was aware the landfill was filling up and new thinking had taken place resulting in new action by transferring trash to another location in order to preserve the life of the landfill. She mentioned all of the options would come with a cost.

Shilo Kestel, resident, believed tax dollars were already being used to remove recyclable material from residential trash and asked why a recycle program would result with a cost increase to its residents.

Mayor Petro explained WIWMD did sort recyclable material from trash which was considered a 'dirty

D R A F T

recycle’. The District was trying to accomplish a cleaner recyclable product and explained the process of how the operation at the District worked and pointed out individuals didn’t actually remove the recyclable material, this was now completed by a machine.

CONSENT AGENDA:

AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND PARKRIDGE, INC. ENTITLED IMPROVEMENTS PAYBACK AGREEMENT – RESOLUTION 25-20 – RIDGEVIEW EAST SUBDIVISION APPROXIMATELY 974 EAST GORDON AVENUE

Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, introduced the agenda item and explained Parkridge, Inc. had installed certain improvements, including sewer, water line, and storm drain infrastructure in conjunction with the Ridgeview East Subdivision. As part of the Development Agreement, it had been allowed to request a payback agreement that would benefit other properties outside of the Development. The total cost of the reimbursement would be up to \$21,705.06. He identified the location of the benefitted properties for the respective improvements. He pointed out no payback would be required from the property owners until connections were made.

Staff recommended approval and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson clarified if the property remained undeveloped, no money would be collected and Mr. Jackson responded in the affirmative.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY, AND KAYS CREEK IRRIGATION COMPANY FOR THE REALIGNMENT OF IRRIGATION WATER – RESOLUTION 25-21 – APPROXIMATELY 1825 WEST WEAVER LANE

David Price, Parks and Recreation Director, announced the resolution would approve the agreement between Layton City, The Nature Conservancy, and Kays Creek Irrigation Company for the realignment of irrigation water located at approximately 1825 West Weaver Lane. The Nature Conservancy had historically used the Kays Creek Irrigation Company’s irrigation ditch for transporting water to its property. This irrigation ditch branched off from Kays Creek, located in Layton near Angel Street, and then traveled through a prescriptive easement along the Kaysville northern border, along the northern property of the present Kaysville Westgate Estates Subdivision, where it emptied into a drainage culvert and traveled underneath the newly established UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) West Davis Corridor, onto The Nature Conservancy’s property.

D R A F T

He explained The Nature Conservancy and Kays Creek Irrigation Company, had both approached the City to find an alternate way to route the secondary water to The Nature Conservancy's property through the City's future park property (Kayscreek Estates Park). The Nature Conservancy's access was very limited to service the present alignment of the irrigation company's prescriptive easement, which would eventually be abandoned.

City Staff had met with representatives of The Nature Conservancy and Kays Creek Irrigation Company to discuss possible benefits for each party. All parties propose an agreement, with terms, for an exchange of water shares and the alignment of an easement to house an irrigation pipe, owned and maintained The Nature Conservancy, within the City's park property (Kayscreek Estates Park). He shared an illustration which identified the location of the connection and spoke to the pathway the irrigation pipe would follow.

The agreement also required The Nature Conservancy to apply for a 404 Permit with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which, if approved, would provide for a new point of diversion on the west side of the West Davis Corridor, allowing The Nature Conservancy to divert and distribute the irrigation water across its property from their property. The agreement also included the abandonment of the existing Kays Creek Irrigation prescriptive easement and exchanging secondary water shares to further the City's interest in providing pressurized secondary water throughout the City.

Staff recommended adoption and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Roberts requested clarification whether the new irrigation pipe to be owned and maintained by The Nature Conservancy would be after the point of diversion from Kays Creek. Mr. Price responded in the affirmative. Councilmember Roberts requested clarification regarding liability on behalf of Kays Creek Irrigation and the liability to The Nature Conservancy for the pipe. Mayor Petro also inquired about the liability of the pipe under the West Davis Corridor.

Mr. Jackson responded the agreement transferred ownership of the diversion structure over Kays Creek and all of the pipe from the diversion structure through the trail area, through the future city park, to The Nature Conservancy. He indicated The Nature Conservancy would have full ownership. He believed the pipe under the West Davis Corridor was owned by UDOT until it reached the other side of the right of way, then owned by The Nature Conservancy.

Councilmember Roberts believed it was a good agreement which benefitted all three parties and also

D R A F T

eliminated an open ditch. He expressed appreciation to Staff.

ACCEPT BID AWARD – CACHE VALLEY ELECTRIC CO. FOR CONSTITUTION CIRCLE PEDESTRIAN LIGHTING, PROJECT 24-02 – RESOLUTION 25-22 – 403 NORTH WASATCH DRIVE

Mr. Price explained the resolution would authorize the execution of an agreement between Layton City and Cache Valley Electric for the Constitution Circle Pedestrian Lighting Project 24-02. He identified the scope of the project and referenced an illustration of the proposed light poles. Following a bid process, the City received four bids with Cache Valley Electric submitting the lowest responsive, responsible bid in the amount of \$182,650.

He reviewed the bids with the Council and justified Staff's decision to exclude the apparent submitted low bid from Salmon Electric.

Staff recommended adoption of Resolution 25-22 and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Thomas asked if the lights would have receptacles at the base to be used for the Christmas light display and Mr. Price responded the electrical outlet would be toward the lower portion of the pole allowing light connections for summer festival events as well as the Christmas lighting.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification whether this project had been eliminated from last year's budget. Mr. Price believed the project was from two years ago and removed due to funding difficulties.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson expressed appreciation to Staff providing details regarding why the lowest bidder had not been selected.

PLAT AMENDMENT – TENNIS ACADEMY OF UTAH SUBDIVISION – 1ST AMENDMENT – 1248 WEST GENTILE STREET

Weston Applonie, Community and Economic Development Director, stated the applicant, Brad Frost, had requested an amendment to the Tennis Academy of Utah Subdivision and oriented the Council to its location and surrounding uses. He indicated the initial subdivision had been recorded in November 2024 as a single lot subdivision. He explained the proposed amendment would increase the lot by one acre in size, totaling 3.3 acres, by incorporating an additional acre of adjacent vacant property. He reported the Planning Commission

D R A F T

reviewed approval of a Conditional Use Permit during its meeting on Tuesday, February 25, 2025, for outdoor tennis and pickleball courts and unanimously recommended approval. He added it also reviewed this item during its meeting on Tuesday, March 11, 2025, and unanimously recommended approval of the amended plat for the 1st Amendment to the Tennis Academy of Utah Subdivision.

Staff supported the Planning Commission's recommendation and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Roberts clarified the vacant acre of property hadn't been included in the development to the north recently approved by the Council. Mr. Applonie responded the parcel hadn't been included.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson asked if any discussion had taken place whether these outdoor amenities would be used in conjunction with the adjacent property development recently approved by the Council. Mr. Applonie indicated the developer should respond to that question; however, he believed it was the intent of the developer to allow those residents access to the courts in conjunction with housing development.

MOTION: Councilmember Bloxham moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Councilmember Morris seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

REZONE REQUEST WITH CONCEPT PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT – DAVIS BEHAVIORAL HEALTH, INC. – REZONE FROM C-H (PLANNED HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL) TO MU (MIXED-USE) – RESOLUTION 25-17 AND ORDINANCE 25-09 – APPROXIMATELY 850 SOUTH MAIN STREET

Mr. Applonie identified the location of the property and oriented the Council to the location and stated the property was currently zoned C-H (Planned Highway Commercial). He identified adjacent uses to the parcel and announced the applicant, Sam Ball, representing Davis Behavioral Health, was requesting a rezone to M-U (Mixed-Use). The proposed concept plan included 180 apartments and a commercial/maintenance building which fronted Main Street. He reported the General Plan identified the property was located within the Mixed-Use Corridor, Main Street, and Interstate 15. He mentioned some of the strategies outlined in the General Plan for the area called for Mixed-Use, encouraged redevelopment and reinvestment, providing convenient access to transit services.

He reported Staff had worked with the developer to create a Mixed-Use development requiring the commercial

D R A F T

building in the front. The proposed development included amenities such as a sports court, community gardens, plaza/patio area for gathering space. Phase 1 proposed three apartment buildings on the campus site, which included 60 unit apartment complex towards Main Street with Phase 1B being the commercial/maintenance building. He pointed out a Development Agreement was included with the rezone. He reported the Planning Commission reviewed the request during its meeting on Tuesday, March 11, 2025, and unanimously forwarded a recommendation to the City Council.

Staff supported the Planning Commission's recommendation and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Morris inquired whether the proposed development included a medical detox center and Mr. Applonie stated it did not.

Councilmember Roberts inquired about parking and whether all parking for the apartments would be on site or if there would be shared parking with the existing Davis Behavioral Health building. Mr. Applonie responded the intent was for all parking to be on site; however, the property would connect to the existing Davis Behavioral Health building. Councilmember Roberts continued to express concern about residents using the existing parking lot to access Main Street.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson pointed out the Development Agreement stated the units would be 'studio' units and inquired how the development would aid or serve the work of Davis Behavioral Health and the services it provided to its clients. Mr. Applonie stated he didn't have those details and suggested that would be a fair question directed to the applicant.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 8:55 p.m.

Sam Ball, Architect, Assist Community Design Center, responded Davis Behavioral Health desired to expand the impact for the northern Davis County community. It believed creating a centralized campus, including classrooms and offices would support mental health and the housing would be available for its clients. He indicated its clients could live there if they followed certain guidelines, would be staffed full-time, 24-hours with case managers, and would provide supportive services. He believed most residents would use transit services. He mentioned the development would focus on a connection with nature and the creek supported that effort. This was a conceptual phased plan consisting of three phases which would come to fruition as needed. He indicated this would be a first for Davis Behavioral Health with creating a housing complex. He mentioned the first and second phase included all parking and at the time the third phase came to fruition, would determine whether more parking would be needed with the shared parking of the existing facility.

D R A F T

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification whether Davis Behavioral Health intended to retain ownership of the residential multi-family development and expressed curiosity about the request for the Mixed-Use zoning classification for what appeared to be a regular apartment complex and questioned whether a similar request for another location within the City would even be considered.

Mr. Ball responded the term ‘permanent supportive housing’ designated the difference between ‘transitional housing’ and pointed out Davis Behavioral Health had recognized the majority of its vulnerable clients had difficulty finding stable, affordable, and supportive housing. He continued this development was intended to assist those individuals advancing through the rehabilitation process and the supportive services in the building would provide needed resources on a frequent basis and a discussion followed.

Councilmember Bloxham inquired about the conditions which would be placed upon the residents housed within the development. Mr. Ball responded Davis Behavioral would require the client to abide by established rules and regulations seeking to get better by progressing and checking in with their respective case managers.

Councilmember Bloxham expressed concern whether the proposed development had the potential to disproportionately require more from the City’s Police Department. Mr. Ball reiterated permanent supportive housing would only be available to clients which had already received services beyond the ‘crisis’ stage and currently progressing through some type of counseling program and had met criteria and could benefit by a more permanent housing situation.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson requested clarification whether the 24-hour staff at the facility had the resources and expertise should a mental health crisis happen at the housing development. Mr. Ball cautioned the Council in believing the development would be considered an ‘institutional facility’. He emphasized these were apartments where individuals would pay a flat rate to Davis Behavioral Health for living in the development. He indicated the Staff would have the ability to assist with medication and case management services, which included employment services. He suggested the additional office space would provide additional office space available for other community partners to offer services to residents/clients.

Councilmember Roberts expressed appreciation to Mr. Ball for the unique purpose in providing services to individuals needing these services. Mayor Petro also expressed appreciation to Mr. Ball.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

D R A F T

There were no public comments.

MOTION: Councilmember Roberts moved to approve the Rezone Request with Concept Plan and Development Agreement – Davis Behavioral Health, Inc. as presented, Resolution 25-17 and Ordinance 25-09. Councilmember Smith Edmondson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Roberts, Bloxham, Morris, Smith Edmondson, and Thomas. Voting NO – None.**

REZONE REQUEST WITH CONCEPT PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT – HOBBS CREEK VILLAS PRUD – REZONE FROM R-S (RESIDENTIAL SUBURBAN) TO R-1-10 PRUD (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, PLANNED RESIDENTIAL UNIT DEVELOPMENT) – RESOLUTION 25-16 AND ORDINANCE 25-08 – APPROXIMATELY 3265 NORTH HOBBS CREEK DRIVE

Mr. Applonie explained the proposed development consisted of 13.38 acres and was located within a Sensitive Lands Area located west of Highway 89, at approximately 3265 North and had a small amount of frontage along Hobbs Creek Drive. The proposed development was currently zoned R-S, Residential Suburban, and the applicant, Adam Anderson, Goldcrest Homes, was requesting a rezone to a PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development) to accommodate 27 single-family residential units; eight of those townhomes. He reported the City had been working with the applicant regarding the geological and geotechnical aspects of the subject property, Concept Plan, and Development Agreement. He emphasized the final layout of the Concept Plan was designed to address and mitigate the geotechnical issues identified on the subject property.

He indicated the General Plan identified the property as a neighborhood residential designation allowed for the R-1-10 zone with a PRUD overlay. It also identified the designation as an applicable zone for that area. He read from the General Plan regarding PRUD overlays which were encouraged to provide creative community design with open space amenities, flexibility, and lot size, diversity of housing types, and use for clustering developments to protect Sensitive Land Areas and other desirable open space features. He stated the PRUD was highly applicable to this area due to the fact it was within a Sensitive Lands which allowed for flexibility in placement of the homes.

He shared a visual illustration of analysis reflecting the existing zoning and the respective permitted densities and reviewed it with the Council. He explained how Staff determined the allowable density bonus allowed with the PRUD.

D R A F T

He stated both the PRUD and Sensitive Lands Use Ordinances required a Concept Plan be submitted with the application. The Concept Plan consisted of 19 single-family detached building pads and eight attached single-family building pads. Each home would be constructed on a building pad, commonly known as patio homes, with the location surveyed on the Final Plan. He mentioned the homeowner would own the footprint of the home and the property surrounding the home would be recorded as 'common area', which would be maintained by a Homeowner's Association (HOA). This design was a direct result of the geological and geotechnical work already completed on behalf of the developer. He spoke to the streets within the PRUD and clarified which roadways within the development would be public and private. He also commented on the slope.

The proposed PRUD development would consist of 28.25% of usable open space for the residents; the minimum requirement would be 12%. He reported there were areas within the development which would have undevelopable and unusable open space, which would be required to remain in its natural state with native plants. This equaled 51.46% of the subject property and would not count toward the 12% open space and included slopes over 10% in the western and northern portions of the development which had geological and technical features, including slopes over 30%.

The usable open space would contain private amenities including pickleball courts, a pavilion, seating and gathering areas, a walking trail, and creative connections to each amenity. The applicants had been working with the City's Parks Department to include a future public trail through the PRUD development to provide an important connection to the Kays Creek Trail and identified that location on an illustration. He also identified the route of the trail and identified where it would connect with Hobbs Creek proceeding under Highway 89 to eventually connect with the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

He continued to explain the participation and involvement with geotechnical engineers to identify and mitigate geotechnical and geological issues on the property. The items explored as part of the studies included a fault scarp location, slope stability, unstable soils, groundwater and liquefaction, which resulted in certain points being identified as 'unbuildable' and identified those on illustrations. He emphasized the Concept Plan reflected the building pads were located outside of the 30% slope area. Additionally only water wise landscaping would be implemented in the common areas surrounding the building pads, and other common areas, in order to lessen the impact of irrigation water and any potential impact on adjacent slope areas. The landscape common areas which would require greater irrigation would be located away from slopes and closer to Hobbs Creek Drive where the property was flat.

He reported the Final Plans would include language stating foundation drains were required for all below-grade basements and additional notes would reference geotechnical and geologic hazard studies for both the

D R A F T

applicant's engineer, as well as the City's third party engineer. A Development Agreement was included with the rezone request and included a few significant issues which were part of the development and reviewed those.

He reported the Planning Commission reviewed this item during its meeting on Tuesday, March 11, 2025 and forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council by a vote of 3-2. He pointed out the two commissioners had stated their respective reasoning for the dissenting votes.

He announced Staff supported the Planning Commission's recommendation and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Thomas pointed out patio homes didn't require excavation for basements; however, Mr. Applonie mentioned the developer had indicated radon testing would take place during that excavation process. Mr. Applonie suggested the developer would need to make that clarification.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson referenced the elevation exhibits within the agenda packet which didn't appear to be one-level or patio homes. Mr. Applonie responded a patio home could be a two-story unit. Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired how many homes would be allowed under the current zoning designation compared to the R-1-10 zoning designation, minus the PRUD. Mr. Applonie explained the difficulty in providing an exact number due to the designation of unbuildable area because of the slope, but rough figures estimated approximately 30-35 homes and a discussion centered around how the densities were calculated followed. Councilmember Smith Edmondson requested clarification regarding the location of amenities and concluded they weren't centralized to the location of the homes. Mr. Applonie clarified the pavilion would only be available for use by the residents within the proposed development. He also indicated the amenities were in designated areas based upon the geotechnical landscape and emphasized those locations still met the City's PRUD requirements of being within 900 feet of all homes.

Mayor Petro asked Mr. Applonie if he had reviewed the geotechnical report to identify whether it met the City's standards and he responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Thomas restated testing for radon would take place and Mr. Applonie responded in the affirmative. Councilmember Thomas expressed concern regarding the possibility of the six or seven homes which could be impacted by possible water flow affecting the stability of the slope. Mr. Applonie believed that would be mitigated by eliminating the amount of flowing water on the properties and explained the open space area would be managed by the HOA.

D R A F T

Councilmember Bloxham expressed concern PRUD development requests had become an entitlement or the rule by developers and requested Mr. Applonie explain Staff's position when in reviewing these requests. Mr. Applonie agreed City Staff had received many PRUD requests and suggested there were a lot reasons for that; PRUD developments were a tool, to both the City and a developer, which could be used in providing more affordable housing. This particular type of area was one of those areas in which a PRUD request facilitated a positive development: sensitive lands and delicate areas which needed protection, could be uniquely developed to accommodate housing. The PRUD allowed these choices and flexibility. This tool should be utilized to regulate development in moderate ways and he explained the deed restrictions would call out the development was in the Sensitive Lands Area. He pointed out the City's intent to make all homebuyers aware of this fact, not just the first homebuyer and the deed restriction was intended to accomplish this.

Councilmember Roberts expressed concern with the potential of additional ground water in this area should the state experience a significant winter similar to what happened two years ago. He inquired if there was any speculation where the water from significant spring runoff would go in relation to the property. Mr. Applonie responded he wasn't an engineer and couldn't speak to that; however, the City desired to ensure the structures were placed in a safe location and added this was in the concept stage for development.

Councilmember Roberts asked about future processes coming before the Council and Mr. Applonie stated it would come before the Council at Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plat approval. Councilmember Roberts also inquired whether there were any mitigation efforts which could be implemented to improve the stability or drainage of 50% of the property with the 30% grade. Mr. Applonie believed that would have been addressed in the geotechnical reports. Councilmember Roberts indicated he would like to see that addressed.

Mayor Petro expressed concern regarding the location of the public trail coming out of the Hobbs Pond area. She indicated she had read the comments expressed by the City's Park's Planner regarding the preservation of the existing trees and suggested Staff work with the developer to possibly shift to the north. She continued, although the intent for the proposed location would be critical to connect to the Highway 89 underpass for a future to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail; this connection wouldn't be completed in the near future. Mr. Applonie responded it would be more appropriate for JoEllen Grandy, Parks Planner, to respond; however, he was aware this location had been in the City's General Plan for quite some time. He expressed his opinion because it had been previously determined by the City; the request would need to be presented to the applicant.

Mayor Petro also expressed concern one of the illustrations led her to believe a home had already been constructed on the fault line. Mr. Applonie responded the illustration was part of the geotechnical report. Mayor

D R A F T

Petro continued to express concern with potential impact of water run-off and erosion on the south side of the development.

Councilmember Morris referenced the City's Sensitive Lands Area ordinance and pointed out various processes associated with developing in a designated Sensitive Lands Area and requested clarification whether the rules outlined by the City had been followed. Mr. Applonie responded in the affirmative and pointed out more work would need to be completed since this development was still in the conceptual phase and reiterated the City's ordinance had been followed. Councilmember Morris inquired about the geotechnical and geological reports and Mr. Applonie explained those reports were received together with the geotechnical identifying issues on the property, like the fault line, and the geological would be related to soil conditions. Councilmember Morris suggested Staff and the Council should trust experts and expressed appreciation to Staff for following the ordinance and identified procedures.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson also expressed concern regarding the homes toward the backside of the development and inquired about the possibility of relocating the trail so the existing trees could be maintained. She wondered how viable the development would be without the six or seven lots to the back or rear of the property and requested the developer provide a response. Although, the proposed development met all City requirements, she suggested this could potentially ease some of the uneasiness specific to the slope. She continued to express concern with the homes being constructed on building pads and the limited amount of property for each proposed home site. She also requested the developer speak to its desired number of homes proposed for the development.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 9:55 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

Adam Anderson, applicant and developer, stated he was prepared to respond to questions expressed by the Council and appreciated working with Staff to arrive with this concept plan over the past two years. He assured the Council, Staff had diligently required he follow the established ordinances and City Code and had consulted with three geotechnical engineers, a geologist, and civil engineers. Comments and questions had been expressed regarding liability and indicated he, the developer, would be liable. He understood the challenges with the parcel and the surface water infiltration issues associated with it. He mentioned two separate geotechnical engineers identified the challenges with slope stability issues and shared an example. He continued to explain the proposed development of R-10 concept had been revised in order to mitigate water filtration and slope stability issues by clustering homes. He clarified the homes would be constructed on

D R A F T

foundations which contributed toward slope stability and provided the following:

- Controlled surface water
- Foundations deep in the native soil
- Engineered rock walls to provide additional stability

He stated the consulted experts, a geologist, geotechnical, and civil engineers, considered conditions in the ground and provided the setback requirements to be used to identify a site plan which could be accommodated on the property. He explained the purpose of requesting the PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development) would provide the needed flexibility for the location and clustering of the homes and the consolidation of open spaces and read from the City's PRUD ordinance.

He mentioned radon testing was being completed in another development of his. He added City Staff identified where the trail would be required in conjunction with the development and certain restrictions specific to the width and slope were implemented.

Justin Anderson, resident, assured the Council the adjacent neighborhood wasn't opposed to new neighbors; however, he expressed his opinion the proposed development didn't align with what had historically been developed in East Layton. He distributed a handout and identified six points he believe should be considered:

1. Residents of the existing neighborhood were deeply invested in the community. The developer knew the property was zoned different when it was purchased and pursued the project knowing it would require a significant rezone.
2. The property was located in a Sensitive Lands Area – and was geologically active and shared a photo illustration reflecting a land slide near the proposed development and suggested development of the parcel would be risky.
3. He didn't believe the development followed the City's General Plan. It identified the parcel as a Low Density Residential R-1-10 zone and a PRUD could only increase density when there was a benefit, such as clustering and connectivity.
4. The proposed PRUD design failed on fundamentals as the PRUD clustered the homes along the eastern edge, not clustered around a central open space. He also expressed concern with development being an HOA (Homeowner's Association) managed community, which wasn't consistent with surrounding neighborhoods.
5. Road design and traffic were unaddressed issues and expressed concern with the location of the proposed trail adjacent to his property and the proposed public street through the development didn't align with the existing stubbed road at 2885 East.
6. The developer acknowledged a better option of developing the parcel to be compliant with the R-1-10

D R A F T

zone which could accommodate approximately 40 homes by removing existing trees.

He requested the Council protect the integrity of the City's General Plan and respect the geological risks associated with the property and stand with the residents already invested in their homes. He expressed his opinion the proposed PRUD development didn't meet that standard and urged the Council to vote against the rezone.

Mayor Petro acknowledged Mr. Anderson had spoken on behalf of several neighbors.

Daniella Harding, resident, announced she was present to speak regarding the Sensitive Lands issue and mentioned she lived near the area. She reminded the Council she had been a member of the Planning Commission in 2015, and was involved with the Eastridge rezone which took over seven years. Additionally, she mentioned the two years referred to by the developer and suggested other developments had taken much longer to advance through an approval process. She requested the Council table the item. She didn't believe there had been enough communication with the residents and shared the following reasons why she was against the rezone:

- Land sensitivity issues
- 30% grade
- Would French drains be required in conjunction with development
- Would residents be allowed to review the geotechnical reports

She believed given the history associated with six homes identified near the area since 2000, and encouraged the Council to table the item for further discussion.

Ted Lewis, resident, identified the property he owned south of Heritage Crest Subdivision and informed the Council he had attempted to subdivide the eight and a half acres, but had been unsuccessful because he couldn't meet all ordinances and believed he understood the Sensitive Lands requirements. He questioned whether the easements for the proposed trail had been met and shared his personal example. He informed the Council the photo of the landslide provided by Mr. Anderson was on his property with no constructions and no water leaks which could have contributed to the slide. He cautioned the Council about approving the request without additional investigation. He expressed agreement with previous comments about the PRUD use within the City and believed it should be an exception and not the rule. He also expressed agreement with Mr. Anderson's comments. He continued to express his opinion the proposed homes were not of the same standards of the existing subdivision and suggested the redevelopment of Highway 89 had already compromised the property values and believed the proposed development would also decrease property values.

D R A F T

Steve Stout, resident, expressed concern geotechnical issues associated with the homes proposed to be constructed close to the edge slope and shared his personal experience with buying a home on Sunset Drive and reminded the Council that home was eventually condemned, the neighboring home was lost to the landslide, and he was sued by the purchaser of his home. This developer/builder had followed all ordinances and guidelines. He informed the Council the City, nor the developer, were sued, and the developer walked away free and clear from any ramifications; and he, alone, paid tens of thousands of dollars to defend himself. He expressed concern for the potential future homebuyers.

Claudette Massey, seller of the property, informed the Council she grew up on the property, which at the time was Agriculture. She informed the Council during the time her family owned the property the hillside had not experienced any sliding or movement because of the natural vegetation. She mentioned the developer had completed his due diligence in completing the studies required by the City which resulted in mitigation efforts to avoid any potential sliding or movement. She inquired whether any consideration had been given to how far away from the slope the homes would be constructed. She stated this project had been in the works for approximately seven years in identifying a developer willing to engineer a concept to develop the property. She mentioned the other residents were allowed to construct homes where they chose, which happened to be at the very edge of the slope, which was different from what this developer was proposing. She stated growth would continue to take place and requested the Council approve the rezone.

John Hill, resident, considered what would be in the best interest for the property and reviewed those hypotheticals. He suggested the rezone decision would be based on establishing a trailhead for the least amount of cost to the City, but at a cost to other residents, might not be the best decision long term. He informed the Council his home was experiencing geotechnical issues because of improper mitigation associated with Heritage Crest subdivision. He also inquired whether the vibrations from Highway 89 had been considered in the geotechnical study. He shared specifics associated with his home which he believed illustrated this was an active geological situation. The City was not liable; the developer was only liable to the original homeowner and believed the unrepresented party were the future potential homeowners. He believed the elected body had a responsibility to not only look out for current residents, but future residents as well, and suggested the item be tabled for further consideration of expressed concerns.

Kris Odekirk, resident, informed the Council she lived behind the landslide and mentioned the stubbed road planned by the City to accommodate future development and she was aware of and excited for new neighbors. She indicated she had read the provisions for what was required for a PRUD and specifically mentioned the following finding: the proposed development created no detriment to the adjacent property nor to the general

D R A F T

area for which it would be located, and would be in substantial harmony with the character of the existing development. She pointed out the lack of sidewalks identified in the proposed development and requested the Council not approve the rezone.

Cody Lougy, resident, indicated he wanted the current property owners the opportunity to sell their property and was aware they had been working on this for a long time. He mentioned the existing open ditch at the rear of his property and indicated he had been working with Staff toward getting it piped to Hobbs Reservoir. He expressed concern the proposed development would divert more water to the ditch and added Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, had assured him the proposed development would provide access to finally construct an appropriate fix. He wasn't against the development; he just wanted it done properly with the homes consistent with existing neighborhood.

Jeff Hart, resident, pointed out the developer indicated he would control the water; however, it would eventually be the HOA's responsibility to control the water, and that would change from time to time since the residents would be voting/determining who that would be. He expressed concern with how the HOA would mitigate the use of trail users attempting to access the pickleball courts, gazebo, etc. He expressed concern the designation of the HOA would be segregating the two communities.

Carla Barton, resident, expressed concern with the traffic and informed the Council she hadn't been able to sell her home due the noise and proximity to Highway 89.

Wendy Jensen, resident, informed the Council she often walked the trail at the bottom of the private property and expressed concern with how the proposed parking lot and trail access would affect existing residents. She also expressed concern with the perception of the private property associated with the PRUD adjacent to the public neighborhood.

Beverly Lotito, resident, inquired if City Staff knew why the sound wall wasn't installed near her home. She also expressed concern about the location of the trail and it providing open access to the homes on the north side of the road by trail users and asked if a privacy wall had been considered.

Michael Christensen, resident, mentioned the current housing crisis in the State and believed the number one reason was because existing residents were opposed to change near their home or neighborhood. He expressed agreement with the concerns expressed regarding safety. He suggested new development should have a 10-year geotechnical insurance policy, pre-paid by the developer before permitted and sold. He suggested the developer could add 3-story townhomes against the southeast corner to accommodate two dozen homes. He

D R A F T

also pointed out this wouldn't be considered a low-income housing project.

Mayor Petro requested Mr. Anderson, applicant and developer, respond to questions and concerns expressed by residents during the public hearing:

- Storm water – the ground saturation was natural and believed the proposed development, based on the geotechnical report and studies, the hardscaped roads and rooftops would be diverted via storm drain and empty along the bottom of Hobbs Creek trail in order to not infiltrate the natural landscape
- Exterior products intended to be used on the homes were expensive and high-end and assured the public the homes would be spacious and unique
- Housing component would not be 'low income'

Mayor Petro expressed concerned about the public streets not including sidewalks on both sides. Mr. Applonie responded this situation was a hillside standard and was allowed by City code. He mentioned there were other subdivisions which had been allowed to be developed/constructed with this allowance.

The Council continued to discuss the issue and Mr. Applonie provided additional clarification regarding the buildable space on the property in relation to the slope.

Councilmember Bloxham asked Mr. Drake if a denial of the rezone would cause the developer to wait a year before bringing something back to the Council and Mr. Drake responded in the affirmative. He added the Council would need to identify reasonable reasons for denial. The discussion continued regarding the location of the homes near the slope.

Councilmember Roberts asked whether there had been an instance in which the engineer, which had performed the geotechnical study, had ever addressed the Council. Mr. Applonie didn't recall that ever taking place regarding an issue in a designated Sensitive Lands Area within the past 10 years; however, Staff would follow direction from the Council.

Councilmember Roberts expressed his opinion this was a suitable place and use for the PRUD because of its uniqueness and the development would preserve the Sensitive Lands; however, he requested the opportunity to discuss the issue with the geotechnical engineer during a future work meeting. Councilmember Smith Edmondson expressed support in meeting with the author of geotechnical study to express concerns not only of the Council, but those posed by the public.

Alex Jensen, City Manager, clarified prior to the City hiring an independent third party reviewer (Geostrata),

D R A F T

and as part of the proposal process, the developer would have its geotechnical engineer address the Council and speak to these issues.

MOTION: Councilmember Roberts moved to table the agenda item until Thursday, May 1, 2025, allowing Geostrata to attend and explain geotechnical data. The motion failed for the lack of a second.

Mr. Drake suggested the Council identify any other issues Staff needed to research and/or be prepared to respond to or provide additional information at that meeting. Mayor Petro requested Staff be prepared to explain the location of the proposed trail and other options for consideration.

Councilmember Thomas pointed out nothing in any of the geotechnical reports or studies suggested ‘don’t build’ at this location and suggested the City consider other issues which could be mitigated, such as isolating the Anderson residence and the discussion continued.

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification what the Council was expecting to learn or gain from the City’s third party, Geostrata, explaining its recommendation and the discussion continued. Mr. Applonie clarified Geostrata only reviewed what the developer’s geotechnical engineer submitted; Geostrata didn’t actually complete any report.

MOTION: Councilmember Roberts moved to close the public hearing at 11:31 p.m. and table the agenda item until Thursday, May 1, 2025, requesting Geostrata attend and explain geotechnical data; buildable area for homes close to the slope, if the trail could be relocated in a different location, and become better education about water movement throughout the subdivision, throughout the development, and in the Sensitive Lands Area. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Thomas, Smith Edmondson, Morris, Bloxham, and Roberts. Voting NO – None.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

There was no unfinished business.

The meeting adjourned at 11:33 p.m.

Kimberly S. Read, City Recorder

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 3.A.

Subject:

Recognition of Community Members for Fire Prevention Efforts

Background:

Fire Marshal, Doug Bitton, will acknowledge four Layton citizens for their prompt and effective response to an illegal fireworks incident involving two juveniles. The individuals took immediate action by notifying nearby residents in the potential line of a vegetation fire, contacting emergency responders, and providing both video evidence and detailed descriptions of the suspects. Their efforts were instrumental in preventing the fire from growing and assisting fire and police officials in identifying and apprehending those responsible.

Alternatives:

N/A

Recommendation:

N/A

Honorable Mayor Petro and Members of the City Council,

I extend my sincere gratitude for allowing time on this evening's full agenda to formally recognize four exceptional members of our community who rendered critical assistance to the Layton City Fire Department during a significant fire incident on June 20, 2025, at approximately 4:00 PM near the Kay's Creek Trail.

On that day, a Red Flag Warning had been issued, prompted by strong winds and critically dry environmental conditions that significantly heightened the risk of wildfire. The Kay's Creek Trail, celebrated for its scenic value and its location adjacent to neighborhoods along the ridgelines, remains particularly susceptible under such circumstances. Unfortunately, these conditions culminated in an incident wherein fireworks, ignited by two juvenile individuals, sparked a swiftly advancing vegetation fire at the public access point off Canyon View Drive. Surrounded by residential properties on both its eastern and western boundaries, the area was acutely at risk. The fire advanced rapidly, resulting in property damage, including the destruction of vinyl fencing, and posed an immediate threat to nearby homes.

Ms. Jayden Critchley, who was hiking in the area at the time, observed the two minors fleeing the scene on e-bikes and quickly recognized the severity of the growing fire. Demonstrating remarkable composure, she contacted 911 to report the incident and immediately enlisted the assistance of two nearby individuals, Mr. Aiden Jones and Mr. Zachary Newbould. These young men promptly began alerting residents along Canyon View Drive, ensuring that homeowners were aware and could take appropriate safety precautions. According to one impacted resident, Ms. Cynthia Benson, home security footage captured Mr. Jones and Mr. Newbould actively attempting to warn those inside. Ms. Critchley continued her support after the incident by providing a detailed witness statement, including an accurate description of the suspects and their actions.

Their prompt and decisive actions were instrumental in protecting life and property. We commend Ms. Critchley, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Newbould for their bravery, presence of mind, and sense of civic duty.

In addition, I wish to recognize Mr. Chris Crowder of Layton Christian Life Center for his vital contribution to the investigation. Upon request from Fire Marshal Doug Bitton, Mr. Crowder, though out of town at the time, immediately committed to reviewing the church's security footage. Over the weekend, he successfully retrieved and delivered high-quality video and images that proved pivotal in identifying the two suspects. Fire Inspector Quinn Pfeifer was able to use the footage to locate the minors on Fairfield Road. Working in coordination, Inspector Pfeifer and Fire Marshal Bitton stopped the individuals and, with the involvement of law enforcement and the minors' parents, obtained confessions, one of whom admitted to lighting the firework that caused the blaze.

We are deeply appreciative of Mr. Crowder's technical support, responsiveness, and collaborative spirit in helping bring this matter to a swift and just resolution.

This evening, it is our privilege to honor the efforts of these four individuals, whose actions exemplify community leadership, courage, and service. On behalf of the Layton City Fire Department, I respectfully present:

- **Ms. Jayden Critchley**
- **Mr. Aiden Jones**
- **Mr. Zachary Newbould**
- **Mr. Chris Crowder**

Each will receive a small token of appreciation in recognition of their contributions, and we invite them to be greeted by Mayor Petro and the esteemed members of the City Council.

Thank you for your attention and for joining us in recognizing these exemplary citizens.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 3.B.

Subject:

Presentation – Years of Service Awards

Background:

The following employees with 20 years of service or more will be recognized at Council Meeting. Employees with 15 years or less will be recognized in their department staff meetings.

Finance

10 - Janalynn Fawson

30 - Douglas Pierce

Fire

5 - Makaiah Hemsley

Parks & Recreation

5 - Daniel Bringham

5 - Jonathan Hamblin

10 - JoEllen Grandy

25 - Matthew Wright

30 - Jay Bell

Public Works

5 - Dakota Case

5 - Grant Caton

5 - Christopher Hatch

5 - Hunter Williamson

10 - Dena Hyatt

20 - Douglas O'Brien

25 - Edpidio Eureste

25 - Brian King

25 - Joshua Steed

Police

5 - Nicholas Gomm

15 - Travis Rapp

15 - Aspen Schenck

30 - Shawn Lewis

Alternatives:

N/A

Recommendation:

N/A

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 5.A.

Subject:

Final Plats – Eastridge Park PRUD Phases 5D and 5E – Approximately 1900 North Emerald Drive

Background:

The applicant, Adams Property LLC, is requesting final plat approval for the last two phases of the Eastridge Park PRUD development with a total of 8.18 acres. The two phases are single-family lots, similar to the single-family lots being developed to the northeast and south in previous phases of Eastridge Park. The North Fork of Kays Creek is to the west, which includes the 20-foot-wide Kays Creek Trail easement.

The applicant/developer received preliminary plat approval from the Council on May 7, 2015. Since this approval, the developer has constructed the majority of the development, which includes townhomes, cottage homes, and detached single-family homes on typical single-family lots. The current proposal for Phases 5D and 5E includes 21 single-family homes within the two phases.

As part of the mass grading for these two phases, the developer is implementing certain conditions that were approved with the preliminary plat by the Council. These conditions are outlined in the staff report and consist of waiving the land drain system and plat notices.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to: 1) Grant final plat approval to Eastridge Park PRUD Phases 5D and 5E, subject to meeting all Staff requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums; or 2) Deny final plat approval to Eastridge Park PRUD Phases 5D and 5E.

Recommendation:

On July 8, 2025, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended the Council grant final plat approval to Eastridge Park PRUD Phases 5D and 5E, subject to meeting all City requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums.

Staff supports the recommendation of the Planning Commission.



**COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION**

STAFF REPORT

TO: City Council

FROM: Kem Weaver, Planner II

DATE: August 7, 2025

RE: Final Plats for Eastridge Park PRUD Phases 5D and 5E

LOCATION: Approximately 1900 North Emerald Drive

CURRENT ZONING: R-1-10 PRUD (Single Family Residential, Planned Residential Unit Development)

DESCRIPTION

On May 7, 2015, the City Council unanimously approved the preliminary plat for Eastridge Park PRUD subject to a number of conditions that are required to be addressed at final plat approval and which are outlined below. The applicant, Adams Property LLC, represented by Cliff Allen, is requesting final plat approval for the final two phases of the development, as described in this report. Phases 5D and 5E are in the center and western edge of the single-family lots.

Surrounding these proposed phases are Phases 1G, 3B, and 5C, which consist of single-family residential homes that have been constructed to the north, east and south with the North Fork of Kays Creek to the west. The surrounding residential land uses have a density range of 2 to 4 units per acre.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND STAFF REVIEW

The preliminary plat was approved subject to the following conditions to be addressed by the developer. A few of the items from preliminary plat approval relate to the initial seven phases of the subdivision (townhomes) only and are not included in this report. The two items below address mass grading and are to be noted on the final plat.

➤ *Waiver of Land Drain System.*

As with subsequent phases in the Eastridge Park PRUD development, this phase has received a waiver from the typical requirement of installing a land drain system. Section

18.40.020 of the City's Subdivision ordinance states that a waiver of the land drain system can be given as an exception. A drainage system is not required when a geotechnical engineer, currently licensed to practice by the State of Utah, expressly affirms in a geotechnical report, the following:

1. Soil Classification - The soil classification, as outlined in Table R405.1 of the International Residential Code, has been studied, and a drainage system is not required to achieve soil stabilization or address the possibility of future flooding; and,
2. Groundwater - The property's groundwater condition has been studied and a drainage system is not required to achieve soil stabilization or address the possibility of flooding.

A "Notice to All Lot Owners" has been placed on the plats stating the waiver and giving direction to a prospective home buyer who may want to review the geotechnical engineer's waiver report.

➤ *Notices on plats.*

The City has required the developer to place notes on the phased plats for the development. The note gives notice to prospective home buyers that this property is regulated as "Sensitive Lands" by Layton City ordinance and about the geotechnical and geological reports and studies that have been completed on the property. The notice will reference the geotechnical company, Intermountain GeoEnvironmental Services, Inc. (IGES), and where the reports and studies can be accessed, such as Layton City and IGES' offices.

In addition, a Notice of Disclosure will be recorded on each lot giving notice of the geotechnical and geological reports and where they can be viewed. This statement will show on the title of the individual lot. When a lot is sold in the future, this Notice of Disclosure appears in a title report for future home buyers.

Final Plats

The following phases of the development have been reviewed by Staff since preliminary plat approval was given by the City Council, as described below:

Phase 5D – This 3.20 acre phase is located to the north of Phases 5B and 5C. The phase consists of 10 single-family lots fronting a public street. The lot sizes range from 6,800 to 20,300 square feet.

Phase 5E – This 4.98 acre phase is located adjacent to Phase 5D with Phases 1G, 3B and 5C located to the north, east and south respectively. The 20-foot wide Kays Creek Trail easement is located on the west or rear portion of Lots 551 to 553, which requires these lots to be identified as restricted lots on the plat. The phase consists of 11 single-family lots fronting a public street. The lot sizes range from 6,700 to 17,100 square feet.

The City is requiring the plat to include easements where retaining walls are required to assist in slope stability. The easements will protect the required retaining walls from being removed or changed/shifted by builders and future homeowners.

Sensitive Land Ordinance

The Sensitive Land Ordinance requires compliance with the following items.

➤ *Average Slope Chart*

This chart refers to the average slope of the development site with regard to the required lot size and width. Because the average slope of the development is 14% or less, the lot sizes and widths are determined by the zoning and PRUD ordinance allowances. The plat is compliant with this requirement.

➤ *Qualified Geotechnical Engineer on Site*

The applicant has contracted with a consulting geotechnical engineer from IGES to be on-site to study daily compaction reports and vibration monitoring. These reports are submitted to the City. Once the street and utility improvements of the development begin to be installed, the geotechnical engineer will be required to submit letters stating that all improvements have been installed as required. The letters will need to be provided to the City five working days from the completion of the improvements.

➤ *Restrictive Covenants*

The developer has submitted master covenants and sub-covenants with the previous phases of the PRUD development. Supplementary covenants are to be submitted and reviewed for these phases of the subdivision. The supplementary covenants refer to the master covenants and sub-covenants that have already been recorded. The master covenants give references to all geotechnical reports from IGES and reviews by Golder Associates. The covenants also give a complete description of the geological condition of the property. The covenants give restrictions regarding structures, grading, retaining walls, and vegetation. This will alert homeowners about their responsibilities for not modifying the grade, retaining walls, and vegetation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

On July 8, 2025, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend the Council approve Eastridge Park PRUD Phases 5D and 5E subject to meeting all City requirements.

Staff supports the recommendation of the Planning Commission



Attention Engineers & Developers: Please do not resubmit plans until you have received comments from Layton City Fire Department, Parks Department, Engineering Division and Planning Division. You may expect to receive comments within 15 business days of a preliminary submittal and within 20 business days of a resubmittal. Thank you.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cliff Allen; callen@hawkingshomes.net

CC: Planning Department; Fire Marshal; Legal Department

FROM: Shannon Hansen, Assistant City Engineer - Development

DATE: June 26, 2025

SUBJECT: Eastridge Park Phase 5A-E Construction Drawings
Eastridge Park Phase 5D Dedication Plat
Approximately 1900 North Emerald Drive

I have reviewed the dedication plat for Eastridge Park Phase 5D received in Engineering on June 26, 2025. The plans have been stamped "Approved as Corrected." A preconstruction meeting will not be held because the previous contractor is remaining in place for the construction of Phases 5D and 5E. Any items from other City departments will also need to be addressed.

Street Lighting – One SL-02 street light will be required with the development of Phase 5D. The fee amount of \$12,235.00 for the lights and installation has been paid.

Water Exaction – The water exaction requirement of 2.2 acre feet for Phase 5D has been addressed

Bonding – A letter-in-lieu is in place for construction costs.

General Notes

1. An approval letter from Weber Basin for the secondary waterlines has been submitted. A copy of the receipt for payment of any required fees for this phase will need to be submitted prior to issuance of a construction permit.

Construction Drawings – These items have been red-lined on the drawings.

Sheet C-001 – General Notes

1. The sanitary sewer/culinary water-crossing table has been crossed out. The table is labeled for Phase 1G to 1J.

Sheet C-101 – Overall Site Plan

1. The street lights are anticipated to be at the shared lot line of lots 548/549 and lots 558/559. The street lights at the shared lot lines of 547/528, 554/555, and 560/561 have been crossed out.

Sheet C-301 – Overall Utility

1. The temporary flushing hydrant at the end of Amaryllis Way in Phase 5B has been red-lined to be removed with the construction of Phase 5D.
2. The sewer lateral for lot 546 was installed with Phase 5B. This was noted on the plans.

Sheets C302, C304, C305, C306 were constructed with Phases 5A and 5B and were removed from this plan set.



Community • Prosperity • Choice

Mayor • Joy Petro
City Manager • Alex R. Jensen
Asst. City Manager • Steve Garside

• Fire Department •
Kevin Ward • Fire Chief
Telephone: (801) 336-3940
Fax: (801) 546-0901

Attention Engineers & Developers: Please do not resubmit plans until you have received comments from Layton City Fire Department, Parks Department, Engineering Division and Planning Division. You may expect to receive comments within 7-10 business days of a submittal and within 7 business days of a resubmittal. Thank you.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Community Development

FROM: Gavin Moffat, Deputy Fire Marshal 

RE: Eastridge Park PRUD 5D

CC: 1) Engineering
2) Cliff Allen, callen@hawkinshomes.net

DATE: April 17, 2025

I have reviewed the site plan and plat submitted on March 19, 2025 for the above referenced project. The Fire Prevention Division of this department has the following comments/concerns.

1. Prior to beginning construction of any buildings, a fire flow test of the new hydrants shall be conducted to verify the actual fire flow available for this project. The Fire Prevention Division of this department shall witness this test and shall be notified a minimum of 48 hours prior to the test.

These plans have been reviewed for Fire Department requirements only. Other departments must review these plans and will have their requirements. This review by the Fire Department must not be construed as final approval from Layton City.

CFV#1 subdivision site plan:sh
Plan #S25-046 District #22
Project Tracker #LAY2503193434
ERS #12709



Memorandum

To: Cliff Allen
CC: Community Development, Fire, & Engineering
From: JoEllen Grandy, City Landscape Architect – Parks & Recreation
Date: March 25, 2025
Re: Eastridge Park PRUD PH 5D, Final Approval – 1900 N. Emerald Dr
Review: Review 1

Eastridge Park PRUD Phase 5D located at approximately 1900 North Emerald Drive is within the future service area of South Fork Park Open Space.

The Parks and Recreation Department has reviewed the plans submitted on March 17th and has the following comments:

- Label the Trail Easement on the Plat to say the following instead:
 - “20’ WIDE PUBLIC TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT DEDICATED TO LAYTON CITY”

Provided the notes are acknowledged above, the Parks and Recreation Department has no other comments or concerns regarding Eastridge Park PRUD PH 5D.

Attention Engineers & Developers: Please do not resubmit plans until you have received comments from Layton City Fire Department, Parks Department, Engineering Division and Planning Division. You may expect to receive comments within 15 business days of a preliminary submittal and within 20 business days of a final submittal. Thank you





Attention Engineers & Developers: Please do not resubmit plans until you have received comments from Layton City Fire Department, Parks Department, Engineering Division and Planning Division. You may expect to receive comments within 15 business days of a preliminary submittal and within 20 business days of a final submittal. Thank you.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cliff Allen; callen@hawkingshomes.net

CC: Planning Department; Fire Marshal; Legal Department

FROM: Shannon Hansen, Assistant City Engineer - Development

DATE: June 26, 2025

SUBJECT: Eastridge Park Phase 5E Dedication Plat
Approximately 1900 North Emerald Drive

I have reviewed the dedication plat for Eastridge Park Phase 5E received in Engineering on June 24, 2025. The plans have been stamped "Approved as Corrected." The following comments will need to be addressed on the final mylar submitted for City signatures and recording. A preconstruction meeting will not be held because the previous contractor is remaining in place for the construction of Phases 5D and 5E. Any items from other City departments will also need to be addressed.

Street Lighting – One SL-02 street light will be required with the development of Phase 5E. The fee amount of \$11,635.00 for the lights and installation has been paid.

Water Exaction – The water exaction requirement of 4 acre feet for Phase 5E has been addressed.

Bonding – A letter-in-lieu in is place for construction cost.

General Notes

1. An approval letter from Weber Basin for the secondary waterlines has been submitted. A copy of the receipt for payment of any required fees for this phase will need to be submitted prior to issuance of a construction permit.

Dedication Plat – Phase 5E

1. The Owner's dedication will also need to include the subdivision into "Common Area".
2. The length of the common area from point 21 to point 23 will need to be labeled.
3. All delinquent taxes will need to be paid prior to recording the dedication plat.

Construction Drawings – See Review memo for Eastridge Park Phase 5D



Community • Prosperity • Choice

Mayor • Joy Petro
City Manager • Alex R. Jensen
Asst. City Manager • Steve Garside

• Fire Department •
Kevin Ward • Fire Chief
Telephone: (801) 336-3940
Fax: (801) 546-0901

Attention Engineers & Developers: Please do not resubmit plans until you have received comments from Layton City Fire Department, Parks Department, Engineering Division and Planning Division. You may expect to receive comments within 7-10 business days of a submittal and within 7 business days of a resubmittal. Thank you.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Community Development

FROM: Gavin Moffat, Deputy Fire Marshal 

RE: Eastridge Park PRUD 5E @ 1900 Emerald Drive

CC: 1) Engineering
2) Cliff Allen, callen@hawkinshomes.net

DATE: April 17, 2025

I have reviewed the plat submitted on March 19, 2025 for the above referenced project. The Fire Prevention Division of this department has the following comments/concerns.

1. Prior to beginning construction of any buildings, a fire flow test of the new hydrants shall be conducted to verify the actual fire flow available for this project. The Fire Prevention Division of this department shall witness this test and shall be notified a minimum of 48 hours prior to the test.

These plans have been reviewed for Fire Department requirements only. Other departments must review these plans and will have their requirements. This review by the Fire Department must not be construed as final approval from Layton City.

GM\#1 subdivision site plan:sh
Plan #S25-047 District #22
Project Tracker #LAY2503193435
ERS #12709




Memorandum

To: Cliff Allen
CC: Community Development, Fire, & Engineering
From: JoEllen Grandy, City Landscape Architect – Parks & Recreation
Date: March 25, 2025
Re: Eastridge Park PRUD PH 5E, Final Approval – 1900 N. Emerald Dr
Review: Review 1

Eastridge Park PRUD Phase 5E located at approximately 1900 North Emerald Drive is within the future service area of South Fork Park Open Space.

The Parks and Recreation Department has reviewed the plans submitted on March 17th and has the following comments:

- Label the Trail Easements on the Plat to say the following instead:
 - “15’ WIDE PUBLIC TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT DEDICATED TO LAYTON CITY”
 - “20’ WIDE PUBLIC TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT DEDICATED TO LAYTON CITY”
- Maintain 15’ through the area. The area shown in red below also needs to be included as part of the easement:



Provided the notes are acknowledged above, the Parks and Recreation Department has no other comments or concerns regarding Eastridge Park PRUD PH 5E.

Attention Engineers & Developers: Please do not resubmit plans until you have received comments from Layton City Fire Department, Parks Department, Engineering Division and Planning Division. You may expect to receive comments within 15 business days of a preliminary submittal and within 20 business days of a final submittal. Thank you



EASTRIDGE
PARK PRUD
PHASES 5D AND 5E

APPROXIMATELY
1900 NORTH
EMERALD DRIVE

FINAL PLATS


Legend

-  City Boundary
-  Rail Lines
-  APZ
-  Interstate 15
-  Lakes
-  Streams

 - Project Site



Map 1





EASTRIDGE PARK PRUD PHASES 5D AND 5E

APPROXIMATELY
1900 NORTH
EMERALD DRIVE

FINAL PLATS


Legend

-  Interstate Highways
-  City Boundary
-  Lakes
-  Streams

 - Project Area



Map 2





**EASTRIDGE
PARK PRUD
PHASES 5D AND 5E**

**APPROXIMATELY
1900 NORTH
EMERALD DRIVE**

FINAL PLATS


Legend

-  Interstate Highways
-  City Boundary
-  Highways
-  Lakes
-  Streams

 - Project Area



Map 3



BYOR, AND THAT I HOLD
ITAH. I FURTHER CERTIFY
IF LAND SHOWN ON THIS
JTO LOTS AND STREETS,

JND AS SHOWN ON THIS

FR (N 1/4) OF SECTION
ALONG THE EAST LINE
EST 1254.99 FEET;
WESTERLY SUBDIVISION
8709 AT PAGE 70 ON
THE SOUTH CORNER OF

COURSES; (1) SOUTH
2'38'48" WEST 30.87
FEET; (6) SOUTH
50'01" WEST 29.71
TRIDGE PARK PRUD
THE DAVIS COUNTY,
IND ALONG THE
SES; (1) NORTH
1.63 FEET ALONG SAID
CHORD BEARS SOUTH
ON THE EASTERLY
NERSHIP- ET AL,
THE FOLLOWING TWO (2)
2.09 FEET TO THE WEST
SAID EASTERLY
PERTY AND ALONG SAID
3'36" EAST 144.33 FEET
HAVING A RADIUS OF
3" WEST 5.09 FEET; (3)

EAST QUARTER (NE 1/4)
AN.
)

OWNER OF THE ABOVE
NTO LOTS AND PUBLIC
PRUD PHASE 5D

ALSO, THE OWNERS
S A PERPETUAL
IS SHOWN ON THIS
E AND OPERATION OF
A PUBLIC TRAIL AND

A.D. 2025.

✓ APPEARED BEFORE ME,
E STATE OF UTAH, WHO
I.C. A LIMITED LIABILITY
FOR AND IN BEHALF OF

RY PUBLIC
COUNTY

"TON CITY'S SENSITIVE
IC HAZARDS MAP DATED
SUBDIVISION
DUCTED AND PREPARED
TION WITH THE LAYTON
PURCHASER IS
IPLETED BY
SPONSIBLE FOR ANY
JY DAMAGE CAUSED TO
LIC FACILITIES IN THE
HALL BE REPAIRED BY
OR WILL BE REQUIRED
OF GEOTECHNICAL

ENTIRE DEVELOPMENT
LOCATED IN

OA. OFF-SITE

LOTS, ARE TO BE

SUBDIVISION TO
TS OF SECTION
IT IS AVAILABLE FOR
VT DEPARTMENTS.


TED LANDSCAPE AREA
AND THAT 2/3 OF THE
NTED IN LOW WATER
; INEFFICIENT DESIGN
SULT IN HOMEOWNER
G SHUT OFF.

IE OPERATION IN WHICH
PRIORITY USE STATUS.
OR IN THE FUTURE BE
PERATION IS BEING
INED ON ACCEPTANCE
GRICULTURAL USES

NTS HEREBY GRANTED
Y ROCKERY WALLS. EACH
WALLS SHALL REMAIN

EASTRIDGE PARK PRUD PHASE 5D

LYING WITHIN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW 1/4)
SECTION 15, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN
LAYTON CITY, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH



VICINITY MAP
NOT TO SCALE

BEECHER DAN ADAMS
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL
10-001-0062

20' WIDE PUBLIC TRAIL &
ACCESS EASEMENT HEREBY
GRANTED TO LAYTON CITY

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)

20.0' TRAIL & ACCESS EASEMENT

5.0' PU&DE (TYP)

10.0' PU&DE (TYP)


20.0' TRAIL &

LINE TABLE		
LINE #	BEARING	DIST.
L1	N89°04'25"W	10.00'
L2	S00°55'35"W	50.00'
L3	S89°04'25"E	11.65'
L4	S88°52'07"W	22.29'
L5	S84°28'55"W	55.89'
L6	S82°08'22"W	3.32'
L7	S75°16'52"W	52.37'
L8	S68°56'55"W	30.70'
L9	S64°24'25"W	24.86'
L10	S58°09'27"W	55.43'
L11	N89°04'25"W	82.47'
L12	N89°04'25"W	31.77'
L13	N36°09'17"W	50.00'
L14	S89°04'25"E	61.89'
L15	S89°04'25"E	52.35'
L16	N88°58'59"W	64.00'
L17	N88°58'59"W	41.44'
L18	S66°24'47"E	60.42'
L19	S89°04'25"E	33.95'
L20	S47°54'53"W	52.06'
L21	N87°28'38"E	58.77'

LINE TABLE		
LINE #	BEARING	DIST.
L22	N87°28'38"E	92.61'
L23	N66°24'47"W	34.68'
L24	S47°51'58"E	2.60'
L25	S47°51'58"E	1.36'
L26	S60°40'31"E	2.89'
L27	S29°19'29"W	37.00'
L28	N60°40'31"W	9.50'
L29	S34°11'49"W	87.96'
L30	N29°33'33"W	51.61'
L31	N42°06'21"E	234.60'
L32	N45°04'50"E	120.84'
L33	S45°04'46"W	120.06'
L34	S42°06'21"W	232.56'
L35	S29°33'33"W	50.57'
L36	S34°11'49"W	94.34'
L37	S87°28'38"W	114.99'
L38	S87°28'38"W	43.55'
L39	S36°46'50"W	69.05'
L40	S36°46'50"W	65.61'
L41	S47°54'53"W	25.00'
L42	S62°16'57"W	20.07'

CURVE TABLE					
CURVE #	LENGTH	RADIUS	DELTA	CHORD BRG	CHORD LENGTH
C1	5.09'	505.00	0°34'41"	N54°08'03"E	5.09'
C2	60.28'	505.00	6°50'21"	S87°30'25"W	60.24'
C3	86.59'	505.00	9°49'26"	S79°10'31"W	86.48'
C4	88.34'	505.00	10°01'20"	S69°15'08"W	88.22'
C5	86.53'	505.00	9°49'04"	S59°19'56"W	86.43'
C6	73.02'	455.00	9°11'44"	S58°26'35"W	72.95'
C7	73.02'	455.00	9°11'44"	S67°38'19"W	72.95'
C8	73.02'	455.00	9°11'44"	S76°50'04"W	72.95'
C9	73.02'	455.00	9°11'44"	S86°01'48"W	72.95'
C10	2.37'	455.00	0°17'55"	S89°13'23"E	2.37'

TYPICAL MIDDLE
SETBACK, PU&DE DETAIL
UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED



LINES 37-42 DEFINE THE
RETAINING WALL EASEMENT
AND SETBACK LINE FOR
THE RESTRICTED LOTS

POINT TABLE		
POINT	NORTHING	EASTING
1	192766.23	102385.18
2	192730.14	99717.03
3	191798.86	99175.74
4	191699.01	99165.87
5	191699.17	99155.88
6	191649.17	99155.07
7	191648.99	99166.72
8	191543.87	99165.02
9	191545.74	99059.60
10	191545.30	99037.31
11	191539.92	98981.68
12	191539.47	98978.40
13	191526.16	98927.74
14	191515.13	98899.09
15	191504.40	98876.67
16	191475.15	98829.58
17	191563.46	98765.05
18	191603.83	98735.55


POINT TABLE		
POINT	NORTHING	EASTING
19	191606.82	98739.68
20	191725.44	98657.46
21	191840.19	98784.52
22	191846.85	98935.75
23	192029.30	98993.92
24	192056.50	98981.58
25	192114.21	99069.40
26	192186.57	99145.16
27	192265.12	99210.91
28	192390.72	99279.95
29	192391.02	99473.14
30	192443.38	99476.49
31	192443.40	99486.51
32	192378.40	99482.35
33	192332.34	99406.22
34	192231.96	99302.49
35	192230.36	99300.44
36	192213.82	99282.97

POINT TABLE		
POINT	NORTHING	EASTING
37	192204.57	99293.20
38	192146.44	99240.61
39	192144.69	99242.54
40	192117.25	99217.72
41	192116.34	99218.73
42	192043.78	99153.08
43	192055.96	99136.21
44	192016.88	99100.53
45	191978.38	99078.91
46	191976.97	99081.42
47	191944.71	99063.30
48	191949.36	99055.02
49	191825.22	98985.29
50	191801.04	99040.66

NOTE
COORDINATES LISTED
IN THE POINT TABLE
ARE MODIFIED STATE
PLANE COORDINATES.

DETENTION BASIN EASEMENT

THE DETENTION BASIN, AS CONSTRUCTED, IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE SUBDIVISION INFRASTRUCTURE. THE DETENTION BASIN IS PROTECTED BY A PERPETUAL EASEMENT HEREBY GRANTED TO LAYTON CITY TO ENSURE IT IS NOT REMOVED OR MODIFIED.



EASTRIDGE PARK PRUD PHASE

LYING WITHIN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW 1/4)
SECTION 15, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN
LAYTON CITY, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 6.A.

Subject:

Proposed Amendments to Layton City Municipal Code, Title 19 Zoning, Chapter 19.02 Definitions, and Chapter 19.13 Development Plan Requirement for New Construction of a Single or Two-Family Dwelling in Layton City to Establish a Definition and Design Standards for Orientation of the Front Façade and Location of a Front Door – Ordinance 25-19

Background:

Staff has prepared a draft amendment to codify the orientation of single and two-family homes as well as the location of the front door of those homes. The purpose of this amendment is to require that the front façade and front doors of homes are oriented towards the front property line and not towards the side or rear lot lines of a property. The intent is to provide for a consistent orientation of homes throughout the City and greater ease of access to the front door of a home from the nearest public or private sidewalk in a development.

There are certain circumstances wherein a property owner may want to orient the front of the home to the side or rear of a property. These circumstances usually present themselves with infill lots within existing subdivisions or flag lots. By orienting the front of a home to the side or rear of a property, even in these limited circumstances, the home becomes inconsistent with the development pattern and character of the existing neighborhoods. A general unified and cohesive character for single and two-family dwellings is desirable to promote the livability and character of the community. The draft amendment would require that the front façade of a home faces the street and that a front door is required along the front façade. These requirements will assist in promoting the uniformity and common character of residential areas within the City.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to: 1) Adopt Ordinance 25-19 to amend Title 19 "Zoning", Chapter 19.02 "Definitions", and Chapter 19.13 "Development Plan Requirement for New Construction of a Single or Two-Family Dwelling in Layton City"; 2) Adopt Ordinance 25-19 with modifications; or 3) Not adopt Ordinance 25-19 and deny the proposed amendments.

Recommendation:

On July 8, 2025, the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of denial to the City Council for the proposed amendments to Title 19 "Zoning", Chapter 19.02 "Definitions", and Chapter 19.13 "Development Plan Requirement for New Construction of Single or Two-Family Dwellings in Layton City" as proposed. The Planning Commission determined that the text amendment was not necessary because major developers had already complied with the proposed regulations, but it would create an unreasonable burden on independent and small-scale home builders.

Staff recommends the City Council approve the proposed amendment as drafted.

Layton City
ORDINANCE 25-19

**ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEFINITION AND DESIGN STANDARDS FOR FRONT
DOORS FOR SINGLE AND TWO-FAMILY DWELLINGS**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 19 ZONING, CHAPTER 19.02 DEFINITIONS
AND CHAPTER 19.13 DEVELOPMENT PLAN REQUIREMENT FOR NEW
CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE OR TWO-FAMILY DWELLING IN LAYTON
CITY**

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the City to add terminologies and clarification to the Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, definitions for a front facade aid in the orientation and identification of the front of single and two-family dwellings; and

WHEREAS, there is a desire by Layton City to provide for a uniform character and orientation of single and two-family dwellings; and

WHEREAS, the requirements for front doors along the front facade of a home will aid in emergency response and safety; and

WHEREAS, providing a wider and clearly identifiable sidewalk to the front entrance of a home will create greater accessibility to a home; and

WHEREAS, the Council has reviewed the Planning Commission's recommendation and has received pertinent information in the public hearing regarding the proposal; and

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the public hearing and upon making the necessary reviews, the Council of Layton City finds it to be in the best interest of the health, safety, and welfare of its citizens to make the proposed amendments to Layton Municipal Code Title 19.

NOW THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Layton City, UT as follows:

SECTION 1: Repealer. If any provisions of the municipal code previously adopted are inconsistent herewith they are hereby repealed.

SECTION 2: Amendment. Section "19.02.020 " is hereby amended as follows.

...

"Elderly Apartment": Multi-family dwelling ... residents and their guests.

"Elderly Person": A person ... of age or older.

"Façade, Front" : Means the building façade that is parallel or nearly parallel (including slightly skewed orientations) to the street from which the building derives its primary access. The front façade of a building may face a common open space or passage-way as part of a master planned development.

"Family": Any number of ... doing their own cooking.

"Family Food Production": The ... included in this definition.

...

"Yard": A space on ... provided in this Title.

"Yard, Corner Side": On ... line. (See Diagram A-2).

"Yard, Front": Any yard between the front lot line and the setback line of a main building and extending for the full width of the lot or parcel. (See Diagram A-2).

"Yard, Front Area": The ... dwelling (See Diagram A-2).

"Yard, Rear": A yard ... (See Diagrams A-2, A-3.)

...

SECTION 3: Amendment. Section "19.13.050 " is hereby amended as follows.

...

v. front yard landscaping ... the certificate of occupancy.

g. single family residential ... dwelling (see section 19.12.110).

~~h. each dwelling must be provided with 400 cubic feet of storage space.~~ h. each dwelling unit shall have a primary pedestrian entrance door (front door) located along the front façade. The front door shall provide direct access into habitable space of the home. Garage doors, and/or doors located inside a garage shall not be considered a primary pedestrian entrance.

i. there shall be a clear pathway at least four feet wide extending from the front door to the nearest public or private walkway or right-of-way. If no sidewalk exists, the driveway may function as a portion of the pathway.

j. each dwelling must be provided with 400 cubic feet of storage space. Said space may be added to the minimum dimension of the garage or located as a separate space to the rear of the home.

~~ik.~~ final grading of individual lots shall be performed in such a way that excess water shall be contained entirely on the site or directed to an improved street or directed to an approved drainage inlet, drainage channel, or drainage easement. Excess water shall not be allowed to drain onto adjacent private property unless approved as part of an overall system, as reflected in the subdivision approval or otherwise. Residents shall cooperate to ensure that drainage water is properly channeled to and through the proper easements. Rain gutters, in addition to those required by the building code, may be required.

~~jl.~~ in order to allow double driveways, and to allow hard-surface access to the rear yard, up to, but not more than, 40% of a front yard may be hard surfaced.

~~k~~m. all dwellings shall meet any additional state or federal requirements to be classified and taxed as real property.

~~h~~n. all single family detached dwellings shall have a minimum area of 900 square feet on the main floor, or floors. A basement shall not be considered as a main floor. Measurements to determine the minimum area of a dwelling shall be taken from the outside of foundation walls.

~~m~~o. the site plan shall reflect all easements on the property.

~~n~~p. in hillside areas, site plans shall reflect the finish grading with contours at an interval of not more than two feet, and shall indicate the location of any retaining structures.

HISTORY

...

SECTION 4: Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this amendment is declared invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, said portion shall be severed and such declaration shall not affect the validity of the remainder of this amendment.

SECTION 5: Effective Date. This ordinance being necessary for the peace, health, and safety of Layton City, shall go into effect at the expiration of the 20th day after publication or posting or the 30th day after final passage as noted below or whichever of said days is the more remote from the date of passage thereof.

****Signatures On Next Page****

PASSED AND ADOPTED by Layton City Council this _____.

JOY PETRO, Mayor
Layton City

Attest:

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder
Layton City



JADYN APPLONIE, Assistant City Attorney
Layton City



WESTON APPLONIE, Community Development Director
Layton City

City Council Vote as Recorded:	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Zach Bloxham	_____	_____	_____	_____
Clint Morris	_____	_____	_____	_____
Tyson Roberts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Bettina Smith Edmondson	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dave Thomas	_____	_____	_____	_____

RECORDED this _____.
PUBLISHED OR POSTED this _____.

CERTIFICATE OF PASSAGE AND PUBLICATION OR POSTING

In accordance with Utah Code Annotated §10-3-713, 1953 as amended, I, the City Recorder of Layton City, hereby certifies that the foregoing Amendment was duly passed and published or posted at:

- 1. Layton City Center
- 2. Surf 'n Swim Bulletin Board
- 3. Davis County Library - Layton Branch

on the above referenced dates.

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder
Layton City

19.02.020 Definitions

"Yard, Front": Any yard between the front lot line and the setback line of a main building and extending for the full width of the lot or parcel. (See Diagram A-2).

"Façade, Front": means the building façade that is parallel or nearly parallel (including slightly skewed orientations) to the street from which the building derives its primary access. The front facade of a building may face a common open space or passageway as part of a master planned development.

19.13.050 Development Plan Requirements For New Construction Of A Single Or Two-Family Dwelling In Layton City

Applications for new construction of a single-family or two-family dwelling in Layton City shall be accompanied by and shall comply with the following:

1. Appropriate application form and fees.
2. One copy of the development plan shall be required, which plan shall include a site plan and an architectural plan with appropriate drawings of adequate scale showing building materials, exterior elevations, and floor plans of all proposed structures.
3. The following design criteria shall be required:
 - a. both the exterior building design and the exterior building materials of all buildings shall be of sufficient quality, durability, and resistance to the elements to satisfy the purpose of this Chapter. Exterior siding materials may include, but shall not be limited to, brick, concrete, glass, metal lap, vinyl lap, tile, stone, stucco, and/or wood. All exterior materials shall be installed in a professional workmanlike manner and be guaranteed to be maintenance-free for at least ten years. Finishes upon exterior materials shall be guaranteed maintenance-free for a minimum of five years. Materials or finishes without such guarantees shall not be permitted. Guarantees shall be in writing from the manufacturer.
 - b. each dwelling shall have a site built concrete or masonry foundation around the entire perimeter with interior supports capable of supporting all design loads including wind, seismic, and roof loads as required by the current design provisions. The dwelling shall be permanently tied to the foundation system in accordance with approved, engineered specifications.
 - c. the roof of each dwelling shall have a minimum pitch of 2.5":12". At non-gable ends of the roof, there shall be an overhang at the eaves of not less than 12" inclusive of rain gutters. For homes with cantilevered rooms, 60% of the eaves length shall have a 12" eave. The roof overhang shall be measured perpendicular to the vertical side of the dwelling. Unfinished galvanized steel or aluminum

roofing shall not be permitted. These pitch and overhang provisions shall not apply to porch covers, bay windows, or similar appendages.

- d. each dwelling shall be not less than 20' in depth at the narrowest point. The depth shall be considered to be the lesser of the two primary dimensions of the dwelling exclusive of attached garages, bay windows, room additions, or other similar appendages.
- e. any previously occupied dwelling which is to be moved from an existing location to a lot within Layton City shall be inspected by the Building Official of Layton City, or a designated representative, prior to the move to ensure that it meets applicable building codes.
- f. landscaping on residential lots shall comply with the following:
 - i. landscaping shall be installed in front yards between the front line of the house and the sidewalk on the entire width of the lot excluding the driveway. On corner lots, landscaping shall be installed in all areas between the sidewalk and the side of the house between the front property line and the rear property line which are visible from the public right-of-way.
 - ii. landscaping shall include at least one tree and a combination of lawn, shrubs, or groundcover. Groundcover may include vegetative vines, low-spreading shrubs, or annual or perennial flowering or foliage plants. Groundcover may also include mineral or nonliving organic permeable material or nonliving organic permeable material in not more than 50% of the net landscaped area. Mineral groundcover may include such materials as rocks, boulders, gravel, or brick over sand. Species, size, and placement of landscape elements shall be determined by the homeowner.
 - iii. where secondary water is not available, at the time the water supply line to a house is installed, the builder shall furnish and install a stop-and-waste valve with an access sleeve and capped mainline to the surface to facilitate future sprinkler system installation. The stop-and-waste valve may also be located inside the home with a mainline extended to the exterior of the foundation wall and capped.
 - iv. on lots over one-half acre in size, the landscaping shall only be required on 80' of street frontage to the depth of the front yard setback. On corner one-half acre lots, 80' of frontage shall be landscaped on each street. The 80' frontage may include customary access drives.
 - v. front yard landscaping shall be installed within 18 months after the issuance of the certificate of occupancy.
- g. single family residential dwellings shall be provided with a two-car garage having a minimum interior width of 20' and constructed concurrently with the dwelling (see section 19.12.110).
- h. Each dwelling unit shall have a primary pedestrian entrance door (front door) located along the front façade. The front door shall provide direct access into

habitable space of the home. Garage doors, and/or doors located inside or along the exterior wall of a garage shall not be considered a primary pedestrian entrance.

~~g~~.i. There shall be a clear pathway at least 4' wide extending from the front door to the nearest public or private sidewalk, walkway or right-of-way if no sidewalk exists, an approved driveway may function as a portion of the pathway.

~~h~~.j. each dwelling must be provided with 400 cubic feet of storage space. Said space may be added to the minimum dimension of the garage or located as a separate space to the rear of the home.

~~i~~.k. final grading of individual lots shall be performed in such a way that excess water shall be contained entirely on the site or directed to an improved street or directed to an approved drainage inlet, drainage channel, or drainage easement. Excess water shall not be allowed to drain onto adjacent private property unless approved as part of an overall system, as reflected in the subdivision approval or otherwise. Residents shall cooperate to ensure that drainage water is properly channeled to and through the proper easements. Rain gutters, in addition to those required by the building code, may be required.

~~j~~.l. in order to allow double driveways, and to allow hard-surface access to the rear yard, up to, but not more than, 40% of a front yard may be hard surfaced.

~~k~~.m. all dwellings shall meet any additional state or federal requirements to be classified and taxed as real property.

~~l~~.n. all single family detached dwellings shall have a minimum area of 900 square feet on the main floor, or floors. A basement shall not be considered as a main floor. Measurements to determine the minimum area of a dwelling shall be taken from the outside of foundation walls.

~~m~~.o. the site plan shall reflect all easements on the property.

~~n~~.p. in hillside areas, site plans shall reflect the finish grading with contours at an interval of not more than two feet, and shall indicate the location of any retaining structures.

Diagram A-2

Existing

Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage

Front Yard Area: 50%

Minimum Rear Yard Setback:

25% Accessory Structures

50% Impervious Surfaces

Entire Property:


60% Impervious Surfaces

- Public Utility & Drainage Easement (PU&DE)
- Front Yard Area

Interior Lot

Structures over 200 square feet, footings, or foundation shall not be located within the PU&DE

Corner Lot



Street Frontage

Street Frontage

Diagram A-2

Proposed

Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage

Front Yard Area: 50%

Minimum Rear Yard Setback:

25% Accessory Structures

50% Impervious Surfaces

Entire Property:


60% Impervious Surfaces

Public Utility & Drainage Easement (PU&DE)
Front Yard Area

Interior Lot

Structures over 200 square feet, footings, or foundation shall not be located within the PU&DE

Corner Lot



Street Frontage

Street Frontage

ADDITIONAL

PACKET

ATTACHMENTS

August 7, 2025

City Council Meeting

5A. Eastridge Park PRUD Phases 5D & 5E

Final Plat

EASTRIDGE
PARK PRUD
PHASES 5D AND 5E

APPROXIMATELY
1900 NORTH
EMERALD DRIVE

FINAL PLATS


Legend

-  City Boundary
-  Rail Lines
-  APZ
-  Interstate 15
-  Lakes
-  Streams

 - Project Site



Map 1





**EASTRIDGE
PARK PRUD
PHASES 5D AND 5E**

**APPROXIMATELY
1900 NORTH
EMERALD DRIVE**

FINAL PLATS


Legend

-  Interstate Highways
-  City Boundary
-  Lakes
-  Streams

 - Project Area



Map 2





**EASTRIDGE
PARK PRUD
PHASES 5D AND 5E**

**APPROXIMATELY
1900 NORTH
EMERALD DRIVE**

FINAL PLATS

Legend

-  Interstate Highways
-  City Boundary
-  Highways
-  Lakes
-  Streams

 - Project Area



Map 3



LYING WITHIN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW 1/4)
SECTION 15, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN
LAYTON CITY, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH



DAVIS COUNTY RECORDER

ENTRY NO. _____ FEE PAID _____
FILED FOR RECORD AND RECORDED THIS _____ DAY OF _____ 2025
AT _____ IN BOOK _____ OF OFFICIAL RECORDS PAGE _____

DAWS COUNTY RECORDER
BY: DEPUTY RECORDER

EASTRIDGE PARK PRUD PHASE 5E
LYING WITHIN THE (NW 1/4)
OF SECTION 15
RANGE 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, S1

EDCON, INC.
AND SURVEYORS
MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
PRVILLE, UTAH 84014
401 FAX (801) 298-2024



JOB NUMBER
419017

DWG: 439017 P
DATE: 02/25/20

SHEET 2 OF 2

[illegible]


AY OF
RDS PAGE

6A. Front Façade and Front Door Standards


Text Amendment

Ordinance 25-19

Side Orientation



Front Door Opens to Garage




Summary of Changes

- Definition for “Façade, Front”
 - Parallel or nearly parallel to street or common open space or passageway if within a master planned development.
 - Updates to Diagram A-2
- Front Door along front façade with direct access into habitable space of home.
 - Garage doors or side doors do not qualify.
- Require a pathway from front door to nearest public or private sidewalk.
 - Approved driveway may function as a portion of pathway.


Existing

Diagram A-2




Proposed


Diagram A-2



Standard Subdivision



Master Planned Development



Slightly Skewed Orientations

