

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL MEETING**

JUNE 4, 2026; 7:00 P.M.

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS
PRESENT:**

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

STAFF PRESENT:

**ALEX JENSEN, CLINT DRAKE, WESTON
APPLONIE, PAUL BAUER, DAVID PRICE,
JOELLEN GRANDY, PAUL APPLONIE, ALLEN
SWANSON, SCOTT MAUGHAN, AND KIM READ**

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

Mayor Petro opened the meeting and welcomed the public. Councilmember Thomas offered the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Petro acknowledged Oliver Poll, Layton Youth Council, for attending and participating in the meeting. Mr. Poll mentioned he enjoyed being part of the Youth Council and learning about local government.

MINUTES:

No minutes came before the Council for approval.

MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilmember Thomas announced the following events:

- Saturday, June 6, 2026, Surf 'n Swim would be hosting Pre-Summer Bash with \$3 admission. Surf 'n Swim would open at 12:00 noon.
- Liberty Days/America 250 Celebration:
 - Residents/businesses were encouraged to decorate their homes red, white, and blue. A contest would be held and prizes would be awarded.
 - 'Voices of Liberty' concert was scheduled for Sunday, June 28, 2026, 7:00 PM, at the Kenley Amphitheater. Hometown Heroes would also be announced prior to the concert.
 - Monday, June 29, 2026 'Threads of Honor', a patriotic concert, would also be presented at the Amphitheater beginning at 7:00 PM.
 - Friday, July 3, 2026, Activities:
 - Surf 'n Swim Splash Bash would begin at 5:00 PM
 - All-Star Showcase for all Little League All-Stars at Ellison Park beginning at 5:30 PM
 - Free puppet show in the amphitheater would begin at 5:30 PM
 - Saturday, July 4, 2026, Activities:
 - Flag-raising ceremony would begin at 8:30 AM. \$2 discount for the Rotary Club breakfast would be provided to attendees.
 - Rotary Club breakfast at the Kenley Plaza from 7:00 – 10:00 AM

Councilmember Smith Edmondson announced the Safe Kids event scheduled for Saturday, June 6, 2026, at Northridge High School from 10:00 AM-1:00 PM. She encouraged participation and believed free safety gear would be available at the event. She also mentioned Davis School District would be providing free summer lunch for children under the age of 18 until Thursday, July 23, 2026, with the exception of Monday, June 15 and Monday, July 5, 2026. She indicated lunch would be served Monday through Thursdays from 11:30 AM until 12:30 PM at Lincoln and Whitesides Elementary Schools.

Mayor Petro announced the State of Utah would recognize Juneteenth on Friday, June 19, 2026, and mentioned the landfill would be closed in recognition of that.

PRESENTATIONS:

There were no Presentations.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

DISCUSSION – EASTRIDGE DOG PARK

Mayor Petro read a statement regarding Freedom of Speech and expressed appreciation to citizens for participating in the process of conducting City business. She explained this would allow the City Council to have a discussion regarding the Eastridge Dog Park. She summarized the various concerns expressed by residents living near the Eastridge Nature Park and assured the public these comments had been heard. She pointed out other residents within the City had advocated for an off-leash dog park within the City and believed it had demonstrated the City was large enough to provide a safe, designated space for dogs and their owners. The Council was committed to listening and hearing the perspectives of all residents, and unfortunately there will be some residents which won't be happy with the Council's decision.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson referenced statements expressed during the Citizen Comment portion from the City Council Meeting on Thursday, May 21, 2026, which alluded that the decision specific to the location of a dog park facility had taken place with a lack of transparency. She shared a brief history of her participation as a Councilmember regarding this issue. She expressed concern about that perception, as all discussions had taken place during public meetings, which could be attended by the public, and which were also live streamed. She specifically mentioned the meeting of November 2025 during which Parks and Recreation had shared a presentation for the off-leash dog park in the Eastridge Nature area. She mentioned certain aspects, details, and particulars of the dog facility had not yet been discussed. She believed a dog park facility was needed within the City. She suggested even if another under-utilized park facility was designated with a fenced off-leash dog facility, the Eastridge Trail area would not be off the table. She stated she was prepared to move forward with the decision already concluded by the Council.

Councilmember Bloxham pointed out Layton City was the largest City in Davis County and the Council had to address many priorities. He mentioned a dog park facility had been discussed over the past seven years and it had been a priority for this Council. He stated RAMP (Recreation, Arts, Museum, and Parks) funding had been appropriated by the City Council for this purpose, but pointed out significant discussions hadn't taken place. He believed the off-leash dog facility would not be a free-for-all for dog owners. He wasn't in favor of designating a portion of the Eastridge area as a facility for dogs, but was also not in favor of delaying or moving forward with a designated dog facility. He believed it would be beneficial for the Council to determine what it would like to see at Eastridge and whether there was consensus of the Council to reconsider this particular location and consider alternative locations. He was appreciative of the emails he received specific to the dog park topic within the City.

Councilmember Thomas indicated he wasn't a proponent of a dog park and definitely not such a facility in the Eastridge area. He was only one vote out of five and indicated if three councilmembers expressed a yes vote, he would move forward with that decision to develop the very best dog park possible. He expressed concern about dogs being unleashed.

Councilmember Morris recalled previous meetings in which hot-button issues had been discussed and how the limited funds available to the Council had been appropriated for various activities which benefited the City. He mentioned residents had advocated for a dog park within the City for the past two years and shared his personal example of being a dog owner and/or walker and visiting various dog park facilities. He wouldn't be in favor of delaying development of a dog park facility within the City and mentioned Andy Adams Park might be a better suitable location for this use. He pointed out the RAMP Fund appropriation had been fast-tracked in order to complete the park and trail at Eastridge with the intent of allowing dog use. He reminded the

residents Eastridge would be a City facility for everyone and dogs would be allowed on the trail. He wasn't sure whether it was the best area for a dog facility and suggested Andy Adams might be a more suitable location.

Councilmember Kolendrianos stated he recently had the opportunity to visit with Parks and Recreation Staff regarding this issue and shared his personal example of allowing dogs to roam on his open farm acreage. He shared the various things he had learned from visiting with Staff regarding dog park facilities, various priorities, and how the proposed facility at the Eastridge Nature area could accommodate a dog park facility. He stated he would have to become more educated before making a final determination.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson would like to hear more from Parks and Recreation Staff and requested clarification about the timeline due to moving forward with RAMP Fund appropriation.

David Price, Parks and Recreation Director, confirmed funding had been appropriated to complete the design and construction of the Eastridge Nature Park in the proposed FY 2026-2027 budget. He believed this would take approximately one year. The allowance of an off-leash dog facility at that location had not yet been determined.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired about the soonest completion date for an off-leash dog area or shared use space because she had been in favor of appropriated RAMP funding for completion of the Eastridge space with the intent that realization of an off-leash dog facility would occur sooner than a year.

Mr. Price responded significant infrastructure was needed at Eastridge and would take time and believed the fastest way to complete a dog facility would be to move forward with the lower area at Andy Adams Park due to the hard elements and infrastructure already in place.

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification whether the RAMP Fund appropriation had been to complete the Eastridge Nature Park infrastructure and not necessarily an off-leash dog facility; rather, the off-leash dog facility would be designated as an amenity. Mr. Price responded Staff believed it had received direction from the Council to move in creating the Eastridge Nature area with the intention of allowing dogs off leash. He emphasized specific details of, how and when, had not been discussed or determined. A discussion regarding funding appropriation followed.

Councilmember Kolendrianos believed there was consensus to move forward with directing Staff to proceed with developing a dog park at Andy Adams Park.

Mayor Petro directed Staff to provide some cost estimates and possibilities with how Andy Adams area could accommodate a dog facility.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson suggested if funding was needed in order to consider the Andy Adams area as a dog facility, the RAMP funding previously appropriated for this purpose for the Eastridge facility, should be reappropriated. She emphasized she would also like some trail space at Eastridge to be designated as off-leash space with some guardrails.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Shaurie Wade, resident, stated she was in favor of a dog park and believed Andy Adams would be a perfect location and believed the Eastridge area was not, due to the wildlife and horses which access the area. She referenced a section from Utah Code.

Michelle Hicks, Davis County Animal Care Director, stated she would be happy to provide facts and statistics regarding off-leash dog facilities. She pointed out all dogs, whether on or off leash would fight. She expressed her desire to be a resource of information about what could make a successful dog park.

Ian Bowles, resident, expressed support for the creation of an off-leash dog area within Layton and requested the Council make this a priority in the right location. He lived near the Eastridge area and would like to be able to use that as an off-leash facility for his dogs. He described the challenge he experienced with trying to obtain information from official City sources regarding this topic.

Roger Lambert, resident, expressed disappointment with obtaining information from the City's website. He shared his personal background which he believed illustrated his involvement in civic issues and stated he wasn't aware of this Layton City issue. He had regular contact with the City's Parks and Recreation Staff regarding completion of the Eastridge Trail behind his home and the first he had heard about the dog facility designation was two weeks ago. He expressed appreciation for the Council's discussion during the meeting and also appreciated the acknowledgement of Juneteenth.

Landon Bickley, resident, expressed objection to Councilmember Smith Edmondson's belief that off-leash dogs would remain on the trail. He pointed out residents hadn't yet seen a plan for the Eastridge Trail expansion and referenced comments expressed by Michelle Hicks. He requested clarification whether the off-leash dog trail had been taken off the table. Mayor Petro emphasized the Council had a discussion.

Johnny, resident, stated he represented children in Layton City and read a statement in opposition to an off-leash dog park facility in the Eastridge area.

Linda Lartigue, resident, informed the Council she had submitted a web feedback comment a few months ago about creating a wall displaying photos of the City's previous Mayors. She had seen similar displays in other cities and believed it would contribute to the historical nature of the City. Additionally, she expressed concern the Council had previously made a decision for the location of a dog park and changed direction due to public clamor and suggested residents near the newly identified park space could also be opposed to a dog park.

Michael Hales, resident, suggested the Council remember the property was donated to the City with the intent it would remain a nature trail and the donors were not aware of the proposed off-leash dog facility. He added the adjacent residents were not informed about a designated off-leash dog park facility until recently. He continued to express concern about the environmental impact off-leash dogs would have in this area. He didn't believe residents were opposed to a dog facility; rather, it was the designated location they were opposed to.

Mayor Petro stated the Council would accept comments pertaining to a different topic than the dog park facility as it had accepted numerous comments, both for and against the dog park, and believed the Council's discussion had illustrated its position on the issue.

Brian Christiansen, resident, suggested language on the agenda could have been worded to better explain the dog park discussion.

Scott Sweeten, resident, stated he was opposed to the off-leash dog facility at the Eastridge area and although there were responsible dog owners, he regularly came across unleashed dogs while running on the Kays Creek Trail. He inquired how the City was enforcing the existing rules for unleashed dogs within the City and if there were no enforcement and consequences of dog owners' bad behavior, unleashed dogs within public spaces would continue.

CONSENT AGENDA:

APPROVE THE INTERLOCAL COOPERATION MASTER AGREEMENT REGARDING REGIONAL DISPATCH SERVICES – RESOLUTION 26-29

Allen Swanson, Police Chief, introduced the agenda item and explained the City operated an Emergency Communications Center (ECC) capable of receiving 9-1-1 calls, non-emergency calls, and dispatching public safety resources. As regional demand for consolidated dispatch services grows, establishing a master framework allows for the efficient onboarding of additional municipal, county, and special service district agencies. This Master Agreement would establish a standardized structure under which participating agencies

receive dispatch services from Layton City, either through signing this Master Agreement or Addendum A at a later date. He identified the following key elements of the Master Agreement that protected Layton City's interests and would establish equitable partnerships:

- Operational control and ownership – Layton City would retain sole authority over the management, staffing, supervision, training, and day-to-day operations of the ECC. All real and personal property, infrastructure, software, and equipment acquired or maintained by the ECC would remain the sole and exclusive property of Layton City.
- Governance structure – The Agreement created User, Member, and Budget Advisory Groups to provide input and recommendations on policies, service levels, and budgets. These groups function as an advisory capacity, with final budget approval remaining with the Layton City Council.

Staff recommended approval and asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Bloxham commented this had been an important component of previous discussions and requested Chief Swanson explain how the regional dispatch agreement would not only benefit the northern area of Davis County, but Layton City.

Chief Swanson shared a brief history of past discussions regarding the consolidation of dispatch services and explained implementation of the consolidation and subsequent agreement would allow Layton City to provide services to adjacent cities which were currently being served by the County. He explained Layton City had successfully provided dispatch services for Clearfield City, South Weber, and North Davis Fire District for a few years and had dispatched over 32,000 calls. This consolidation would increase that figure to approximately 140,000 calls per year. He emphasized Layton City would not be subsidizing any other entity and every entity would fairly be assessed its respective share of costs.

BID AWARD – RJT EXCAVATING, INC. – VARIOUS SANITARY SEWER REPAIRS, PROJECT 25-41 – RESOLUTION 26-33 – VARIOUS LOCATIONS THROUGHOUT THE CITY

Paul Applonie, Public Works Assistant Director, introduced the agenda item and explained that following a bid process, RJT Excavating submitted the lowest responsive, responsible bid in the amount of \$359,482.94. The engineer's estimate for the project was \$450,000.

Staff recommended approval and he asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Morris inquired about the current project being completed by RJT on Church Street and Paul. Applonie responded it was completing the irrigation pipeline extension connecting the reservoirs. He mentioned the road would be resurfaced next construction season.

INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN DAVIS COUNTY CITIES AND DAVIS COUNTY FOR UTAH POLLUTANT ELIMINATION SYSTEM (UPDES) GENERAL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS – RESOLUTION 26-32

Paul Applonie introduced the agenda item and explained the previous Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with Davis County would expire in September 2026. Layton City jointly participated with Davis County to satisfy the requirements of the Storm Water Management Program and adhere to the Environmental Protection Agency's Storm Water Phase II Rule.

Staff recommended adoption and he asked if there were any questions.

There were no questions.

TEXT AMENDMENT – AMEND TITLE 15, CHAPTER 15.02, SECTIONS 15.02.010, 15.02.110, 15.02.130, 15.02.150, 15.02.155, 15.02.165, 15.02.170, 15.02.180, 18.02.190, ENACT 15.02.185, AND REPEAL 15.02.195 OF THE LAYTON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE BY ADOPTING THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE, 2024 EDITION, THE INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE 2024 EDITION, THE INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE, 2021 EDITION, THE INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE, 2024 EDITION, THE INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE, 2024 EDITION, THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE, 2023 EDITION, THE INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE, 2024 EDITION, AND THE INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE, 2024 EDITION – ORDINANCE 26-12

Weston Applonie, Community and Economic Development Director, announced the ordinance would update multiple sections of Title 15 of the City Code. He explained the City was required to comply with code standards adopted by the State of Utah and this amendment would update City Code to be consistent with the State's construction code additions and indicated approval of the resolution would include the following:

- International Building Code 2024
- International Mechanical Code 2024
- International Residential Code 2021
- International Fuel Gas Code 2024
- International Plumbing Code 2024
- International Existing Building Code 2024
- International Energy Conservation Code 2024
- National Electrical Code 2023

Weston Applonie clarified the various organizations published code updates every three years and it takes the State a few years to review them prior to adopting them via State ordinance. This proposed update would allow the City Code to match the State Code.

Staff recommended approval and he asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE CITY BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-2027

Tracy Probert, Finance Director, reminded the Council it adopted the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2026-2027, and set a public hearing for tonight's meeting, during its meeting on Thursday, May 7, 2026. The Fiscal year would begin on Wednesday, July 1, 2026, and Statute required adoption no later than Tuesday, June 30, 2026. A Property Tax rate was required to be set no later than June 22nd of each year. The Council would accept public comment regarding the budget and continue the public hearing until its next meeting on Thursday, June 18, 2026. At that time the Council would discuss any changes it desired to the budget based on public comments during this meeting, and adopt the budget.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 8:36 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

No public comments were expressed regarding the public hearing.

MOTION: Councilmember Bloxham moved to continue the public hearing to June 18, 2026, Councilmember Smith Edmondson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Morris, Kolendrianos, Smith Edmondson, and Thomas, and Bloxham. Voting NO – None.**

ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT ON CHANGES IN COMPENSATION FOR EXECUTIVE MUNICIPAL OFFICERS AS PROPOSED IN THE CITY BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-2027

Mr. Probert informed the Council that as part of the budget process, State statute required the City to hold a separate public hearing for changes in compensation for Executive Municipal Officers. He reviewed the process used to determine appropriate compensation for various positions within the City. The Mayor and Council were included in this study and in previous years the Council had foregone compensation increases. He pointed out no increases for the Mayor or Council had been programmed within the proposed budget. He referenced the previous discussion regarding this item which had taken place during the Work Meeting.

He suggested the public hearing be continued until the City Council Meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 18, 2026, to allow further discussion or possible changes with the direction of the Council.

He further explained the budget proposed the Executive Municipal Officers, excluding the Mayor and Council, would receive a one percent COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment) and a three percent merit increase. He mentioned those had already been included in the proposed budget.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 8:41 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

There were no public comments.

MOTION: Councilmember Bloxham moved to continue the public hearing until June 18, 2026. Councilmember Smith Edmondson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bloxham, Thomas, Smith Edmondson, Kolendrianos, Morris, Voting NO – None.**

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT – APPROXIMATELY 790 EAST ANTELOPE DRIVE – FROM AGRICULTURE TO INSTITUTIONAL USE AND REZONE REQUEST WITH DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT – APPROXIMATELY 790 EAST ANTELOPE DRIVE AND 1867 NORTH FAIRFIELD ROAD – FROM A (AGRICULTURE) TO PB (PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS) – ORDINANCES 26-10, 26-11, AND RESOLUTION 26-26

Weston Applonie introduced the agenda item and explained the vacant property consisted of approximately 1.52 acres. He pointed out due to its location within the APZ (Accident Potential Zone) it had a designation of Agriculture Zone in the City's General Plan. The applicant was requesting the General Plan designation for this property be amended to Institutional Use. The applicant was also requesting a rezone of the property, and the adjacent property, 1867 North Fairfield Road, also be rezoned from Agriculture to PB (Professional Business). Both properties combined totaled approximately 26.12 acres.

He referenced an illustration which identified an area outlined in red, indicating the property owned by Lindquist Mortuary and the area highlighted in blue was the portion applicable to the General Plan Amendment. The area outlined in red would be applicable to the rezone.

He pointed out the applications were intended to address existing lot and zoning issues and to accommodate the owner's desires to keep the mortuary and cemetery under separate ownership, He referred to the same illustration which reflected the mortuary property outlined in white, indicating it had separate ownership. The current parcel configuration does not meet frontage or width requirements of the Agriculture Zone and a

mortuary is not permitted as a standalone use in that zone. The proposed PB zoning district would allow the uses to be on separate parcels and enable a commercial subdivision, addressing frontage, width, and ownership concerns while allowing for expansion of cemetery supportive operations on the Antelope Drive property. A Development Agreement accompanied the rezone request to limit and clearly define the permitted uses on the property ensuring future development remained consistent with the intended cemetery and mortuary operations that currently exist on the property.

The Planning Commission reviewed this item during its meeting on Tuesday, May 12, 2026 , and unanimously recommended approval of the General Plan Amendment, the rezone request, and approving the Development Agreement. Staff supported the recommendations.

He asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Thomas requested further clarification about the vacant parcel.

Councilmember Bloxham expressed appreciation to Staff for facilitating a solution which accomplishes the property/business owner's needs.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 8:48 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

Leanna Roadhouse, resident, stated she owned the home directly east of the vacant property on Antelope Drive. She inquired what was planned for the property. She specially inquired about required fencing, the size of any allowed structure(s), any required setbacks, and whether there would be a driveway access to Antelope Drive.

Robert Lindquist Jr. (Bobby Lindquist), Lindquist Family Organization, stated the cemetery was in need of a maintenance shop for the purpose of storing equipment needed to operate the cemetery. Construction of such a facility would allow for redevelopment/expansion of the current mortuary. He indicated the maintenance building would be a modest structure, and wouldn't be occupied by a large number of staff, and no manufacturing would take place; it would strictly operate as a storage facility. He mentioned fencing was being required by Layton City and couldn't recall those specifics. He expressed Lindquist's appreciation for the mutual respect and support with Layton City.

Weston Applonie added a landscape buffer would be required in addition to six-foot solid fencing. Additionally, the structure would be required to have a 40-foot setback from the right-of-way. The drive approach would be off center of the vacant lot and referenced an illustration which reflected the proposed location of the drive approach in relation to the structure.

Councilmember Morris inquired about lighting at the building and Mr. Applonie responded the applicant would be required to submit a lighting plan and the light could not be distributed beyond the property boundaries.

Councilmember Bloxham clarified the egress would be directly related to access to the storage facility and not for the public or patrons of the mortuary.

MOTION: Councilmember Kolendrianos moved to close the public hearing at 8:56 PM and approve the General Plan Amendment, Approximately 790 East Antelope Drive from A (Agriculture) to Institutional Use and Rezone Request with Development Agreement as presented, Ordinances 26-10, 26-11, and Resolution 26-26. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Smith Edmondson, Thomas, Morris, Bloxham, and Kolendrianos, Voting NO – None.**

TEXT AMENDMENT – WATER-WISE STANDARDS FOR SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS – AMENDING TITLE 19 ZONING, CHAPTER 19.02 DEFINITIONS; AND CHAPTER 19.16 LANDSCAPING, FENCING, AND CLEAR VIEW – ORDINANCE 26-16

Weston Applonie introduced the agenda item and explained the Council had adopted significant changes to the City's landscaping standards in 2023 in an effort to promote and encourage water-efficient landscaping. A key component of the proposed ordinance language was to limit turf grass to be no greater than 35% of the front and side yard areas for single-family residential properties. At this time the code language was adopted to strongly encourage that limitation for all single-family developments and properties to not have it be a requirement except for single-family homes within a PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development).

He announced this proposed text amendment would modify the ordinance and make the following changes:

1. Limit turf grass to no more than 35% for front and side yard areas for new single-family homes
2. No turf grass in new residential park strips of single-family homes and landscaped areas less than eight-feet wide
3. Allowance to use the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District plant list as well as other lists or resources used for plant selection in the Great Basin region
4. Minor clarifications and formatting changes related to these proposed changes

He pointed out adoption of the ordinance would allow Layton City residents to qualify for the \$2.50 Weber Basin Water Conservancy District (WBWCD) turf buy-back rebate, as opposed to the \$1.25 rebate. The proposed ordinance had been reviewed by WBWCD and it had indicated it would be compliant with State requirements.

He announced the Planning Commission reviewed the proposed ordinance during its meeting on Tuesday, June 26, 2026, and forwarded a vote of support to approve Ordinance 26-16, approving Water-wise Standards for single-family homes. Staff supported the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification how this ordinance would be effective to the builder or new homeowner of the new qualifications. Weston Applonie responded those individuals would be made aware of the ordinance when application to proceed through the subdivision process began. He continued to explain the ordinance would be applicable to any submissions accepted after the approval date

Councilmember Thomas requested clarification about the ordinance's applicability to a PRUD and Weston Applonie responded PRUD's were currently required to comply with this standard.

Councilmember Bloxham referenced the discussion from the previously held work meeting regarding the allowance of turf grass in the park strip and requested clarification how the motion would need to be stated. Mr. Applonie indicated a statement could be included that turf grass wouldn't be allowed within any park strip.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson clarified language within the ordinance would still allow Layton City residents to benefit from the WBWCD landscape reimbursement, without the addition of the commercial component referenced by Councilmember Bloxham. Weston Applonie responded in the affirmative and believed the drafted proposed ordinance still met WBWCD standards for new construction. He indicated the Council could add additional language in the motion if it so desired.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson inquired about the dissenting vote from the Planning Commission. Weston Applonie believed the Commission member took issue with the portion of the ordinance that called out the size of rock, bark, and/or mulch to be less than a minimum sorting size of one inch. The Commission member expressed concern and suggested bark/mulch shouldn't be classified in that manner. He pointed out the distinction was understood; however, it hadn't been called out in the motion. Councilmember Kolendrianos believed Weston Applonie accurately described the discussion that the commissioner didn't want the bark/mulch to be included in the one inch or larger category.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 9:06 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

Roger Lambert, resident, spoke to the Eastridge Development and inquired how this ordinance would impact multiple-phased developments and whether the City had the authority to direct HOA's (Homeowners' Associations) on what they could restrict with regard to landscaping. Weston Applonie explained when an application was made for a subdivision, and although there could be multiple phases, the determination of what would be allowed would revert back to the application date. He mentioned Eastridge would be one of those which would be required to follow the ordinance at the time of application, most likely the previous landscaping ordinance.

Mayor Petro emphasized the City had no authority or jurisdiction over HOA's and the HOA was governed by its local HOA Board. Clinton Drake, City Attorney, clarified an HOA Board could not trump City ordinance regarding landscaping and anything moving forward would be required to comply with this ordinance, should it be adopted.

MOTION: Councilmember Smith Edmondson moved to close the public hearing at 9:09 PM and approve the Text Amendment – Water-Wise Standards for Single-Family Dwellings – Amending Title 19, Zoning, Chapter 19.02 Definitions; and Chapter 19.16 Landscaping, Fencing, and Clear View – Ordinance 26-16, as presented.

MOTION: Councilmember Kolendrianos moved to amend the motion to include language to eliminate all turf in park strips and clarify the designated size, one-inch minus, only be applicable to rock products. Councilmember Smith Edmondson accepted the amended motion.

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification about the language including the size of the rock product and requested Staff's opinion specific to the one inch minus size called out in the ordinance. Mr. Applonie read the portion of the language which addressed the size of mulch/bark, or rock products allowed to be used in park strips in the proposed ordinance. He added the language had been functioning appropriately and hadn't been difficult for residents to understand and no issues had been experienced regarding enforcement and expressed his opinion the definition wasn't a bad clarification and provided sufficient direction.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification regarding the terminology of a one-inch minus and Mr. Applonie responded this was a measurement applicable to the size of gravel in that although the pieces weren't the same, they generally were identified as one inch or minus, or smaller than one inch.

Mr. Drake clarified the motion: A discussion during the Planning Commission meeting had taken place regarding the size of bark/mulch during which a Commission member had expressed concern. The motion didn't address that concern and the Planning Commission's recommendation supported the ordinance as it was presented to the City Council. The motion before the City Council would approve the landscaping ordinance as proposed with additional language addressing the one Planning Commission member's concern. He requested clarification the Council understood the motion before them. Councilmember Kolendrianos expressed agreement with Mr. Drake's summation, in addition to eliminating turf grass in the park strip.

Mayor Petro called for a second to the amended motion. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion. The amended motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Kolendrianos, Smith Edmondson, Thomas, Bloxham, and Morris. Voting NO – None.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:16 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder