

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL MEETING**

JUNE 18, 2026; 7:07 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, LON CROWELL,
TRACY PROBERT, STEPHEN JACKSON, DAVID
PRICE, JOELLEN GRANDY, AND KIM READ**

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

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

MINUTES:

No minutes came before the Council for approval.

MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilmember Thomas announced the following Fourth of July events:

- Sunday, June 28, 2026, Voices of Liberty patriotic concert would begin at 7:00 PM. Hometown Heroes would also be recognized and mentioned those would be Layton youth.
- Monday, June 29, 2026, 'Threads of Honor' would be presented at the Kenley Amphitheater. Gates would open at 7:15 PM.
- Friday, July 3, 2026, at 5:00 PM 'Star Spangled Splash' pool party at Surf 'n Swim, \$2 admission if purchased before the event or \$5 at the door.
- Friday, July 3, 2026, 5:30 PM, America's 250th Birthday, free puppet show performance at the Amphitheater.
- Friday, July 3, 2026, All-star games at Ellison Park beginning at 5:30 PM.
- Saturday, July 4th events would begin at 6:30 AM, a special treat along the parade would be distributed beginning at 10:15 AM, followed by the parade at 10:30 AM. Firework display at 10:00 PM.
- Saturday, July 18, 2026, from 8:00 AM – 12:00 noon, 'Pancakes and Patriotism' event at Layton Commons Park, \$5 per person or \$20 per family.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson encouraged parents of youth in Davis County to participate in the Davis Community online survey. She explained data from the survey would be used for CTC (Communities That Care) programming. She mentioned there was a QR Code and provided the URL address to complete the survey.

PRESENTATIONS:

PROCLAMATION – FAMILY STRENGTHENING MONTH

Mayor Petro mentioned June had been designated as ‘Family Strengthening Month’. She read a proclamation and presented it to Davis County representatives.

Debbie Comstock, Davis Behavioral Health CTC, commented the proclamation represented a number of coalitions within Davis County and expressed appreciation to the City.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Shauri Wade, resident, reiterated previous comments she had shared in opposition for a proposed dog park in the Eastridge Nature facility; although, she was in favor of a dog park facility. She expressed concern about the amount of time stated for development of a dog park facility within the City. She pointed out the amenities associated with Andy Adams Park and would like to see a dog park established at this facility within the next year.

Jennifer Shepherd, resident, reminded the Council of previous discussions in June 2025 and November 2025 during which discussions for an off leash dog area be developed in conjunction with the nature trail at Eastridge Nature Park. She recalled comments expressed during the meeting last week by each Councilmember regarding the establishment of a dog facility. She also reported on comments expressed during the City Council Meeting in March 2026, followed by an update by Mr. Price which indicated RAMP funding had been requested for this purpose and construction would begin this year, and dog owners would have a facility by next summer.

Irene Hill, resident, requested further clarification regarding the proposed rate increases included in the Consolidated Fee Schedule. She pointed out she didn’t use her allotted amount of water every month yet was required to pay the same amount for water.

CONSENT AGENDA:

STORM DRAIN AGREEMENT AND LAND PURCHASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND 840ELM RE, LLC FOR THE MIDTOWN CROSSING DETENTION BASIN FACILITY – RESOLUTION 26-34 – APPROXIMATELY 1328 NORTH MAIN STREET

Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, introduced the agenda item and shared an illustration which identified the parcel. He explained the parcel currently owned by Layton City held a detention basin which was created in association with the Midtown Crossing by UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) and given to Layton City to own and maintain. He reported 840ELM RE, LLC, had approached the City with interest in purchasing the property to convert the detention basin into an underground facility and use the property for parking for its current business operations. As part of the agreement, the purchase price would be \$205,000 and costs associated with development would be incurred by 840ELM RE. The City’s property was encumbered with an easement for storm water and utilities, which prohibited construction of any structures on the parcel. Because of that, it wasn’t considered an ‘insignificant parcel’ of real property under City Code and State Statute. For that reason, the parcel could be sold to the adjacent property for the conversion of an underground system with parking on top.

The detention basin would maintain a minimum of 1.87 acre-feet of capacity which would allow all storm water currently draining on the property to continue going to the property. The City would maintain all storm drainage in the street (1400 North) and Midtown Crossing rights of way. Private property owners currently draining into the basin would maintain the systems on their respective parcels. UDOT would continue to own and maintain the storm drain system under I-15, as was currently in place.

He reviewed 840ELM RE, LLC undertakings included in the agreement:

- Maintain cross access easement for the roadway and private storm drain easement
- Acknowledge and accept the obligation to receive storm drainage from the current users of the storm drainage system in perpetuity
- Ownership and maintenance of storm drain system and underground detention facility
- Post \$25,000 surety bond for repair and maintenance
- Maintain liability insurance for underground facility
- Meet requirements of Long-Term Storm Water Maintenance Agreement and Long-Term Storm Water Maintenance Plan

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

Councilmember Smith Edmondson pointed out since the Council had previously determined the property as an ‘insignificant parcel’ the City wasn’t required to publicly offer the property on the open market to receive bids; rather, the City was able to entertain the offer directly from 840ELM RE.

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification this would remain a separate parcel from the adjacent parcel currently owned by the purchaser, and any new purchaser would be required to meet the obligations identified in this contract. Clint Drake, City Attorney, responded in the affirmative and indicated the agreement would be recorded against the property for that purpose.

AMEND TITLE 3, CHAPTER 3.15, SECTION 3.15.010 REGARDING SEWER, GARBAGE RECYCLING, AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS RATES AND FEES IN THE LAYTON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE – ORDINANCE 26-20

Tracy Probert, Finance Director, introduced the agenda item and explained the ordinance referenced the Consolidated Fee Schedule and the adjustment of several fees and rates respective to the City. He mentioned the proposed ordinance included an increase to sewer, garbage, and recycling rates. He announced the sewer rate increase was set based on a Master Plan and Rate Study. The City was obligated to provide a system, adequately maintain the system, and also improve it as needed. He pointed out the City also partnered with North Davis Sewer District (NDSD) for the treatment of waste transported through the system and previous increases to the sewer rate were directly related to NDSD. He stated this year’s rate increase was directly related to the City’s need to increase its rate.

He explained the garbage and recycling rate was based on adjustments proposed by Waste Management. He pointed out the City hadn’t implemented an increase to the garbage rate last year, although there had been an increase to the City, because a number of other rate increases were implemented. He pointed out the City only increased its rates when needed and those increases weren’t based on rates from neighboring entities.

He addressed the comment expressed earlier in the meeting specific to the amount of water used compared to the billed amount. He explained the base rate assessed for water was the City’s cost to provide the home/property with water with a small usage component included.

He identified the other fees included in the proposed Consolidated Fee Schedule:

- Fire inspections
- Plan reviews
- Use of the City’s Fire Training Facility
- Civil penalties for non-compliance of Fire Inspection recommendations
- Water meter costs when purchased by a contractor
- Streetlights when required to be purchased by a contractor

He asked if the Council had specific questions regarding proposed fees identified in the Consolidated Fee Schedule.

Councilmember Kolendrianos requested clarification regarding the proposed fee respective to the Water Exaction Fee. Mr. Probert responded the fee had previously been applicable to meter size and explained this new proposed fee, would be associated with development in the circumstance in which water couldn't be identified and accessed. In the event a developer was unable to locate water shares, the City would assess the fee and in turn it would purchase the water shares, typically from Weber Basin.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson suggested the consolidation of verbiage specific to businesses which required the annual fire inspection, and indicated she intended to include that language in her motion.

MOTION: Councilmember Smith Edmondson moved to approve the Consent Agenda, with the following corrections to Ordinance 26-20, Changes to the Consolidated Fee Schedule: page 4 – itemized special occupancy for businesses requiring annual fire inspections, list in parenthesis with commas (Day Cares, Group Homes, Assisted Living Facility, Skilled Nursing Facility, Health Care Facility/Hospital, etc.) to ensure any other business requiring an annual fire inspection would be included. Also remove the reference, 'Effective July 1, 2024' on Page 10, as the effective date was outdated and the current effective date was listed on the updated Consolidated Fee Schedule. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

TEXT AMENDMENT – AMEND LAYTON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 19 ZONING, CHAPTER 19.21 TEMPORARY AND SEASONAL USES, SECTION 19.21.070 SEASONAL OUTDOOR VENDORS – ORDINANCE 26-15

Lon Crowell, Community Development Deputy Director, introduced the agenda item and explained this would remove the 6' temporary fencing requirement for pumpkin patch seasonal vendors and Christmas tree lots. The applicant had indicated the cost to acquire and provide the fencing would be cost-prohibitive to the vendor. He reported the original purpose was intended to reduce theft and vandalism, essentially to protect the vendor. The City's Police Department hadn't received any reports for theft and vandalism respective to this use. Staff also reached out to determine which other entities within the County required such fencing and learned only Clinton and Layton Cities had such an ordinance. He clarified fencing would still be allowed if the vendor so desired; however, it would not be required via City ordinance if this ordinance was adopted.

He reported the Planning Commission reviewed this item during its meeting on Tuesday, May 26, 2026, and it recommended approval. Staff also recommended approval of Ordinance 26-15.

He asked if there were any questions and there were none.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

Tyson Roberts, resident, expressed appreciation to Staff and the Council for considering and hearing the request. He believed local farmers provided a service to the residents of Layton and pointed out the costs associated with the required fencing for a very short selling season of pumpkins. He mentioned there was a very low profit margin for pumpkin vendors.

MOTION: Councilmember Thomas moved to close the public hearing at 7:48 PM and approve the Text Amendment to Title 19 Zoning, Chapter 19.21 Temporary and Seasonal Uses, Section 19.21.070 Seasonal Outdoor Vendors as presented, Ordinance 26-15. Councilmember Smith Edmondson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Kolendrianos, Morris, Bloxham, Thomas, and Smith Edmondson. 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 announced a public hearing took place during the City Council Meeting on Tuesday, June 4, 2026, related to changes in compensation for Executive Municipal Officers. At that time, no public comments were expressed; rather, a discussion took place regarding potential changes. As part of this public hearing, Staff presented the proposed changes which included a 1% Cost of Living (COLA) and 3% Merit Increase, for all Executive Municipal Officers, with the exception of Mayor and City Council. This increase would be equal to the increase proposed for all other Municipal Employees. The proposed increase specific to the Mayor, \$37 increase per pay period; City Council, \$247 increase per pay period.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 7:51 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

Tyson Roberts, resident, expressed appreciation to the Council for considering the compensation increase for councilmembers. He applauded those Councilmembers currently serving who had indicated during the previously held Work Meeting they didn't choose to serve due to the compensation; he also didn't serve as a councilmember based on the compensation. He expressed his opinion it would be a disservice to potential public servants if the compensation didn't fairly compensate for their time away from family and employment. He complimented the members of the Council which previously commented they didn't serve the residents for the compensation and suggested the increase could be donated toward the City's Sub-For-Santa Program.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification whether the compensation increase for Executive Municipal Officers (City Employees) could be voted on separately from that of the Mayor and City Council. Mr. Probert responded this was a separate public hearing associated with the approval of the Budget. He suggested any contrary votes would be applicable to the adoption of the Budget.

Councilmember Bloxham believed Councilmember Morris desired the separation of the Executive Municipal Officers from that of the Elected Officials and Councilmember Morris expressed agreement with that summation.

Clint Drake, City Attorney, clarified no action of the Council was required on this agenda item. Recent legislation required the City to accept public comment on the proposed rate increases. He clarified the proposed increases would be adopted with the Budget.

Councilmember Smith Edmondson informed the public significant discussions had taken place during work meetings. She mentioned it had been suggested to implement a 1% COLA for elected officials, the same as the increase for City Staff, and not consider an increase based on an annual Market Study, and asked how that could be included in the motion.

Mayor Petro pointed out the small increase would probably only compensate for gas used to attend required events by members of the Council.

Councilmember Bloxham requested clarification whether the proposed increase included in the Budget reflected the proposed increase based on the Market Study. Mr. Probert clarified when he presented the next agenda item, considering approval of the Budget, it didn't include any increases for the Mayor and City Council. He stated language would need to be included in the motion expressed either yes or no specific to the inclusion of any increase.

Councilmember Bloxham then clarified a discussion could then take place during the initial budget meeting during which compensation increases were identified for City Staff with a line item specific to the Elected Officials. Mr. Probert added that would allow Council to identify the amount based on the COLA percentage.

Councilmember Morris expressed disagreement with the increase and didn't believe the lack of a compensation increase would discourage future candidates from running for City Council. He expressed his desire to make sure the City operated efficiently and that City employees were fairly and justly compensated.

ADOPT THE BUDGET, PROPERTY TAX RATE, AND COMPENSATION SCHEDULE FOR ELECTIVE AND EXECUTIVE MUNICIPAL OFFICERS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026-2027 – ORDINANCE 26-19

Mr. Probert reviewed the proposed 2027 Budget pointing out the following:

- General Fund just over \$49,824,768
- Total City-Wide budget just over \$140,510,568
- Market, Cost of Living and Merit adjustments for officers and employees
- \$3,391,825 in Capital Equipment
- \$26,090,516 in Capital Projects (utilities, streets, parks, dispatch, etc.)
- Sales Tax Revenue was anticipated to be slightly higher than previous years

He continued to review the major projects included in the Budget:

- Fire Ladder Truck – partial funding
- Ambulance
- Parks projects – City and RAMP (Recreation, Arts, Museum, and Parks) funded
- Street maintenance and projects
- Utility projects, including secondary waterline projects which were partially grant funded

He identified revenue sources for the General Fund and also General Fund expenditures pointing out the Police and Fire Departments made up most of those expenditures.

He pointed out the Council had decided to adopt the Certified Tax Rate; therefore, a Property Tax Rate increase hadn't been proposed.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 8:04 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

There were no public comments.

MOTION: Councilmember Bloxham moved to close the public hearing at 8:05 PM and adopt the Budget, Property Tax Rate, and Compensation Schedule for Elective and Executive Municipal Officers for Fiscal Year 2026-2027, as presented and previously discussed, Ordinance 26-19. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion.

Councilmember Bloxham stated although he might not have agreed with every appropriation in previous budgets, he believed the disagreement didn't outweigh the need to approve the budget in order to operate the City and provide necessary services. He expressed appreciation to Staff for providing documentation which assisted the Council in making decisions and for residents which shared concerns.

The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bloxham, Thomas, Smith Edmondson, Kolendrianos, and Morris. Voting NO – None.**

AMEND BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025-2026 – ORDINANCE 26-18

Mr. Probert shared a summary of the proposed budget amendments. He explained the line item respective to SWAT for \$100,644 – the transfer of funding to the Capital Projects Fund would need to be corrected. It should reflect transfer of funding from the General Fund, Police Administration and Patrol to the SWAT Fund and provided further explanation of how this error occurred: funds from Police Administration and Patrol had been

used to set up the SWAT Fund, earmarked for these types of activities, and assessments to participating entities had also been implemented. This allowed the City to account for assessments from other cities, as well as Layton City's contribution to these activities in one place to identify the actual cost for SWAT activities.

He continued to review the other identified amendments highlighting the following:

- myHometown
- personnel costs associated with the Facilities Department
- remodel project in the basement at City Hall for Davis Arts Council
- First responder mental health fund
- Wildland Fire and Police and Fire Special Services
- Fire Academy
- miscellaneous donations
- unanticipated grant revenue

Mr. Probert continued to review other items identified in the summary:

- Davis Metro Narcotics Strike Force
- 9-1-1 Dispatch Center
- RAMP (Recreation, Arts, Museum, and Parks) funding
- Capital Projects
- Water – applicable to Weber Basin
- Storm Water Master Plan
- Emergency Medical – Wildland Fire, State Medicaid assessment adjustments, Ambulance

He asked if there were any questions and there were none.

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

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

Shauri Wade, resident, requested clarification if Mr. Probert indicated there was an overage from the RAMP Funding for this year.

Mr. Probert responded there was a project identified on the original project list; however, hadn't been included in the budget and clarified this amendment merely reflected in the budget. He pointed out the project had been completed.

Ms. Wade emphasized her point that if there was excess RAMP Funding, she would like it to be appropriated to a dog park.

MOTION: Councilmember Kolendrianos moved to close the public hearing at 8:15 PM and approve the amendments to the 2025-2026 budget as presented, Ordinance 26-18. Councilmember Morris seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Morris, Kolendrianos, Smith Edmondson, Thomas, and Bloxham. Voting NO – None.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Mayor Petro inquired whether the Council would like to meet and hold a meeting scheduled for Thursday, July 2, 2026. She mentioned there was one item which didn't require immediate action on behalf of the Council that evening. She informed the Council she had taken it upon herself to check with other entities that met on the same schedule and reported they had canceled their City Council Meetings that week. A discussion followed and Mayor Petro concluded a meeting would take place on Thursday, July 2, 2026.

The meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder