

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL MEETING**

SEPTEMBER 17, 2026; 7:00 P.M.

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS
PRESENT:**

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

EXCUSED:

BETTINA SMITH EDMONDSON

STAFF PRESENT:

**ALEX JENSEN, CLINT DRAKE, WESTON
APPLONIE, STEPHEN JACKSON, 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. She announced Councilmember Smith Edmondson had requested she be excused from the meeting and reported she was being honored and recognized as one of the Inaugural Women to Know in Utah.

Councilmember Kolendrianos announced Jason Wilde, Open Doors, would offer the invocation and Alex Doyle, Youth Council, would lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES:

MOTION: Councilmember Morris moved and Councilmember Thomas seconded to approve the minutes of:

**Layton City Council Work Meeting – June 4, 2026;
Layton City Council Meeting – June 4, 2026;
Layton City Council Work Meeting – August 6, 2026; and
Layton City Council Work Meeting – August 20, 2026.**

The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes as written. **Councilmember Smith Edmondson was not present for the vote.**

MUNICIPAL EVENT ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilmember Thomas announced the following events:

- ‘Thriller’ would be performed at the Kenley Amphitheater in October
- Halloween Bash was scheduled to take place in Commons Park on Friday, October 30, 2026

Mayor Petro announced Davis Arts Council would be presenting ‘Whispers in the Dark’ in October and directed the public to the City’s event calendar on its website or the Davis Arts Council to learn of the many scheduled activities or for more information.

Mayor Petro expressed appreciation to those residents which had participated in the myHometown service projects over the summer months. She reviewed the myHometown philosophy and identified the location of the resource centers within the City. She announced myHometown was seeking volunteers within the community willing to read with elementary school children and directed those to the myHometown Layton website.

PRESENTATIONS:

LAYTON CITY YOUTH COUNCIL SWEARING IN

Sirena Heninger, Youth Council Advisor, shared highlights of the Council from the past year which included 15 service projects and attending the Utah Youth Council Leadership Convention. She continued to share future leadership opportunities for the Youth Council's participation for this next year and recognized specific individuals from within the community which had provided in-kind and financial donations toward future leadership opportunities for the Youth Council. She reviewed the duties of the Youth Council members which included commitment on their behalf. She presented the new members of the Youth Council.

Kim Read, City Recorder, administered the Oath of Office to members of the Youth Council.

Councilmember Thomas expressed appreciation to the Youth Council for their engagement and expressed confidence in their capabilities for doing great things in the future and stated he was impressed by their actions.

Councilmember Morris pointed out the Oath of Office administered to the Youth Council was the same as what was administered to the Mayor and Councilmembers. He pointed out September 17 was designated 'Constitution Day' and reviewed some of the language in the Oath. He challenged the Youth Council members to continue to serve.

Councilmember Kolendrianos mentioned he had accepted the Oath this past January and encouraged them to continue serving the community.

Councilmember Bloxham expressed appreciation to not only the members of the Youth Council, but the advisors and was grateful to them for serving the community with intent, which successfully contributed to the great things it had accomplished.

Mayor Petro also expressed her pride and appreciation to the youth and advisors for growing the Youth Council Program and expressed appreciation for their efforts in serving the community. She encouraged the parents to be proud of their Youth Council participant.

The Youth Council was excused from the meeting at 7:21 PM.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Jason Wilde, resident and Open Doors Executive Director, was honored at the privilege to offer the invocation during the meeting. He expressed appreciation for Layton City's financial support of Open Doors via CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) Funding for several years. He reported 60% of the families served by Open Doors were residents of Layton City and briefly reviewed some of the services it provided. He expressed his desire to inform the public about the drop-in nursery and childcare services, Imagination Station, offered by Open Doors and reviewed a few specifics. He announced Open Doors' new location, 438 East 700 South, Clearfield.

Irene Hill, resident, expressed appreciation for the work of Mayor Petro and the City Council. She expressed her opinion the use of Flock cameras was against Fourth Amendment Rights of citizens and requested Layton City not implement the use of these.

Kathleen Woolfe, resident, informed the Council of the Self-sufficiency Program offered by Open Doors and shared her personal experience of participating in the Program. She implored the Council to continue funding Open Doors to support and provide resources for others within the community.

CONSENT AGENDA:

INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR HIGHWAYS OR PUBLIC TRANSIT PROJECT REIMBURSEMENT, BETWEEN LAYTON CITY AND DAVIS COUNTY FOR THE 2200 WEST RAILROAD CROSSING ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE – RESOLUTION 26-41 – 2200 WEST RAILROAD CROSSING

Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, introduced the agenda item and reminded the Council of the previous discussion regarding the project and reviewed its background:

- A Feasibility Study and Alternatives Analysis was completed in 2023
- Alternatives Overview
 - At-Grade Pedestrian Crossing
 - Pedestrian Overpass
 - Full Grade Separated Crossing
 - Close Crossing
- Recommendation – Pedestrian Overpass Across 2200 N at Railroad Crossing

He shared an illustration of a concept layout used in requesting grant funding for the project and reviewed the proposed scope of the project while referencing a concept rendering.

- 265 ft main span with steel truss spanning railroad right-of-way and UTA future track
- Ramps tying into existing sidewalks
- Retaining walls supporting ramp ends to limit structure cost
- 780 ft of sidewalk to ensure connectivity

He reported City Staff had worked diligently toward receiving grant funding and reported the City had received grant funding from the United States Department of Transportation – Safe Streets for All Grant worth \$9,908,000 in December of 2025. This grant funding required a 20% local match for \$2,477,000. He identified the stipulations associated with the grant funding:

- Grant agreement must be executed within 12 months of award. He indicated this had been submitted to the federal agencies in charge and was currently being reviewed. The City was anxious to proceed once received by the City.
- Project must be completed within 5 years of executing the grant agreement.

He informed the Council, City Staff had submitted a grant request to Davis County to assist with the local match and had been awarded \$1,730,000 for that purpose. The Agreement before the Council for approval included a project completion date of ‘prior to December 31, 2030’. The projected timeframe once all grant agreements were executed would be within a three-year window. He reviewed the funding breakdown with the Council:

- Total estimated project cost: \$12,385,000
- Safe Streets for All Grant Award: \$9,908,000
- Davis County Grant Award: \$1,730,000
- Layton City local match: \$747,000

Staff recommended approval of the resolution authorizing the agreement between Layton City and Davis County. He asked if there were any questions.

Mayor Petro expressed gratitude and appreciation to Mr. Jackson and his Staff for seeking out the grant funding needed to complete the project.

Councilmember Thomas inquired whether the walkway would be covered and Mr. Jackson responded although that wasn’t reflected in the illustration, it could be accommodated.

Councilmember Morris requested clarification when the City would have to provide its match. Mr. Jackson responded the City would be required to provide the 20% match as the project progressed. Councilmember

Morris inquired whether there was any concern in obtaining permits needed over the railroad tracks. Mr. Jackson indicated that was a large portion of the scope of the project, and once the design was completed, it would be forwarded to the railroad for review and approvals. Councilmember Morris asked whether Clearfield City had been approached regarding funding toward the project. Mr. Jackson mentioned conversations had taken place during which it had expressed support for the project; however, it hadn't committed to providing any funding. He pointed out although the bridge would benefit Clearfield City, the entire bridge itself would be within Layton City's right-of-way.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

TEXT AMENDMENT – ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT STANDARDS – AMENDING TITLE 19 ZONING, CHAPTER 19.02 DEFINITIONS; AND SECTION 19.06.300 ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT STANDARDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH UTAH STATE CODE §10-21-304 – ORDINANCE 26-27

Weston Applonie, Community and Economic Development Director, announced recent legislation required to adopt new standards for detached accessory dwelling units (DADU's). He stated some minor modifications were needed to the City's ordinance and reviewed those:

- The City could no longer require similar building materials, colors, and architectural characters as the primary dwelling
- The City could no longer require window type and location requirements
- The City could no longer require roof materials and minimum pitch
- The City could no longer identify requirements for door and entrance locations

The following additional components needed to be included in the text amendment to be compliant with the new requirements:

- Definition of DADU (Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit) was being provided
- Outline a process for converting an existing accessory structure to a DADU

Staff also recommended an update to the ADU Standards Table which reflected setbacks, height, and where the DADU structures could be located. Mr. Applonie shared an example of the new table which reflected a simpler and clearer resource for residents.

Mr. Applonie announced the Planning Commission reviewed the item during its meeting on Tuesday, August 25, 2026, and unanimously recommended approval. Staff supported the recommendation and he asked if there were any questions.

There were no questions from the Council.

Mr. Applonie responded to the Council's question posed during the previously held Work Meeting regarding the number of approved ADU's and reported the City had approved 102 ADU's as of today. He shared an illustration reflecting approved ADU's by year.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 7:41 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

There were no public comments.

MOTION: Councilmember Bloxham moved to adopt the Text Amendment – Accessory Dwelling Unit Standards – Amending Title 19 Zoning, Chapter 19.02 Definitions; and Section 19.06.300 Accessory Dwelling

Unit Standards in accordance with Utah State Code §10-21-304, as presented, Ordinance 26-27. Councilmember Kolendrianos seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bloxham, Thomas, Kolendrianos, and Morris. Voting NO – None.** Councilmember Smith Edmondson was not present for the vote.

REZONE REQUEST – APPROXIMATELY 1242 EAST PHEASANT VIEW DRIVE – REZONE FROM R-1-6 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) AND R-S (RESIDENTIAL SUBURBAN) TO R-2 (SINGLE AND TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL)

Mr. Applonie introduced the agenda item and shared a visual illustration which identified the location of the property. He explained the purpose of the rezone would be to allow expansion of the current facility and shared an illustration of the proposed expansion.

He shared a brief history associated with the parcel pointing out it had originally been approved by a Conditional Use process in 2009 as a residential facility for elderly and disabled persons. In 2011, the zoning ordinance was identified as non-compliant with federal housing guidelines and requirements, subsequently, the City code for residential facilities for persons with disabilities was updated, which designated the uses into two categories: a small residential facility and a large residential facility. The small residential facility would allow for 12 or fewer persons and a large facility would accommodate 13 or more. The update identified the small facility would function and operate in single-family residential zones and the large facility would operate within more intense zones such as multi-family zones or areas along arterial corridors. A previous owner acquired additional property in 2014 and requested an expansion from the City, and at that time was out of compliance and wouldn't be allowed to expand. That expansion occurred through a development agreement which allowed the expansion for a total of 36 units; 21 original units and 15 new units. Following construction there were actually 17 new units constructed, and the development agreement was then updated to include the additional two units. Currently the facility operated with the 38 units.

The applicant, Zach Reynolds, was requesting the R-2 zoning designation to bring the facility into compliance with the zone and pointed out the surrounding properties were R-1-6. In order to bring the property into compliance new zoning would be required, which would allow for a large residential facility, given the number of residential units.

The General Plan designated that the subject property was currently operating with a community residential zoning designation, which was intended for traditional single-family residential neighborhoods which served as a transition or buffer between low intensity residential uses and more intensive uses. Mr. Applonie explained Staff considered the scale, density, and intensity of the uses in the surrounding areas when considering compliance to the General Plan, which was reflected in the Municipal Code by allowance of both the small and large residential facilities. Small facilities inherently functioned at a neighborhood scale identifying its respective footprint, traffic generation, parking demands, and overall daily intensity on a smaller scale. Large facilities represented a higher land use intensity due to increased needs for staffing, visitor traffic, emergency vehicle access, delivery needs, and the larger footprint. Larger facilities were intended for areas where higher levels of activity were anticipated and the General Plan identified these areas as traditional residential and Mixed-use areas along arterial corridors and collector roads.

Mr. Applonie stated the proposed expansion would also need to address issues related to parking, fire access, fire turnaround, stormwater runoff, and landscaping. While one or two of these standards might be able to be met, Staff had concerns whether all requirements could be met, even with the proposed property expansion. He shared an illustration provided by the applicant which identified property currently owned by the adjacent single-family zoned properties, which the applicant intended to purchase for a parking lot. The property currently being used for parking would allow for the expansion of 10 additional residential units.

Mr. Applonie stated there was currently some detention in the area; however, there were still concerns related to fire access and emergency services which needed to be addressed. Fire Department Staff had indicated the need for a fire turnaround area and believed it would be difficult to accommodate, in addition to managing the detention. He concluded those were substantial obstacles for the applicant to overcome.

On Tuesday, August 25, 2026, the Planning Commission reviewed the request and voted to recommend denial of the proposed rezone request based on findings described in the Staff report and requirements outlined in accompanying Staff memorandum. Staff supported the Planning Commission's recommendation of the denial.

He asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Thomas requested clarification whether the shared illustration, the development plan, had been submitted to the City by the applicant. Mr. Applonie responded the request at this time was only for the rezone, and the applicant wasn't required to submit a site plan; however, one was submitted in order to provide an idea of the proposed expansion. Councilmember Thomas clarified the plan didn't address concerns expressed by Fire Staff and Mr. Applonie responded in the affirmative. He continued to explain that wouldn't be reviewed in conjunction with the rezone request; rather, it was a general concern which couldn't be accommodated. He informed the Council the applicant had stated more parking would be created with the expansion than what was currently available on site.

Mr. Applonie stated it wasn't a question as to whether the use was appropriate at this location, it was more about the intensity and whether the requested use would be compliant with the General Plan.

Mayor Petro opened the public hearing at 7:52 p.m.

Mayor Petro called for public comment.

Zach Reynolds, applicant and property owner, expressed a desire to address concerns. He reported the image had not previously been presented and he understood the concerns specific to the storm drain and other concerns expressed by Fire Staff. After visiting with other City Staff, he believed answers and resolutions to all questions could be resolved. He explained the storm drain would be underground under the parking lot. He reported the expansion would provide more parking stalls than what was currently available and would be compliant with City code. He also believed the fire access and turnaround could be accommodated and referenced the illustration. He believed all other building code requirements were sufficient. In addressing the intensity of use, the expansion would only require one additional staff member, didn't believe the intensity would be significant, and expressed his opinion the adjacent residential neighborhood wouldn't even be aware of the expansion. He pointed out the need for these types of facilities.

Mayor Petro inquired whether Mr. Reynolds had secured the properties from the adjacent properties/homeowners and Mr. Reynolds responded they had both expressed a willingness to sell, but the purchase had not been finalized pending the City's approval.

Mayor Petro asked if the Council had any questions for the applicant.

Councilmember Bloxham expressed agreement about the necessity of these types of facilities and environments for the aging demographic. He clarified the plan would be to add an additional 10 units which would only require one additional Staff member. He inquired whether discussions had taken place with Staff specific to changes to the development agreement. Mr. Reynolds responded he intended to also amend the development agreement from 38 to 48 units.

Mayor Petro called for other public comment.

Kayden Grenko, Fruit Heights, stated both his 90 year old grandparents currently reside at Pheasant View Senior Living and shared his personal experience with locating this facility for them. He believed the care they receive at Pheasant View to be exceptional with fair and honest pricing, compared to other locations. He stated this option was different from other facilities which he had identified within the industry. He recommended consideration for the expansion.

Mayor Petro asked if there was any further discussion.

Councilmember Morris mentioned the City had adopted a General Plan and hired professional Staff for good reason to determine what development within the City should resemble. The applicant's comments during the public hearing indicated he believed all concerns had been addressed; however, Staff continued to support denial of the request and requested Mr. Applonie respond to his observation.

Mr. Applonie stated storm water detention had not been analyzed or reviewed at this stage and there were concerns on behalf of Engineering Staff that substantial effort would be needed to facilitate that remedy. He added the illustration was at this point, the most detail provided; however, no storm water calculations or detention had determined the issue could be resolved.

Mr. Applonie expressed agreement the City's Fire Staff hadn't been able to address the concerns right away; however, he did have an email from the Fire Marshal expressing his concerns with the fire access and fire turnaround, previously mentioned during this meeting. He emphasized both of those issues had not been resolved. The broader concern beyond these issues was that this facility, while a good facility providing services needed within the community, there was a scale and scope for them and the more the City increased this type of facility, it would have a larger impact to single-family neighborhoods. He believed approval of the request would set precedent throughout other aspects of the City and recommended the Council follow the General Plan recognizing the guidelines outlined in the General Plan ensured specific zoning and densities to align with the surrounding community. Staff was supporting the recommendation due to the intensity, which wasn't compliant with the General Plan at this location, and not necessarily about the use itself.

Councilmember Kolendrianos requested Mr. Applonie address why Staff suggested the applicant move forward with submission of a rezone request, similar to what he explained during the Planning Commission Meeting on August 25, 2026. Mr. Applonie responded, in addition to the rezone, there was a current development agreement, specific to the property which also needed Council's approval, and a General Plan amendment would also be needed. Because Staff was recommending denial, this was the simplest way for the request to come before the Council.

Councilmember Bloxham asked what a proposed General Plan amendment would resemble for this particular request. Mr. Applonie responded it would carve out the property and put it into 'Transitional Residential' which would allow the R-2 zone designation. Councilmember Bloxham referenced the previous expressed concern regarding precedent; however, he believed this would be specific to this property only. Mr. Applonie clarified the precedent would be the carving out a certain section of the General Plan; essentially concluding the General Plan didn't need to be followed in this specific area. He explained the reasons the City would propose amending the General Plan: once an error or mistake was identified, information has changed and the City recognized the requirement no longer worked or would be effective in an area. He emphasized the current zoning and General Plan was sufficient for this area. Councilmember Bloxham mentioned the current zoning and allowance had been previously brought about via development agreement to allow for more units on an existing parcel of property. He understood the reasoning of getting it before the Council; however, approval of a General Plan amendment and development agreement would also be needed and wasn't sure whether enough information had been provided to him to make a decision. He would like to have everything provided in order to understand the full context of what was being requested for Council's approval.

Mr. Applonie responded Staff's assessment would not change. Staff attempted to provide a detailed explanation of what would come before the Council, what was reflected in the General Plan, and Staff's assessment of the General Plan. While those other applications could be provided, it would only result in the applicant having to submit additional applications and fees.

Councilmember Bloxham referenced the previous approval via the development agreement and inquired whether it would be Staff's assessment the current development agreement had expanded beyond what had originally been allowed, and additional expansion would result in a more intense use. Mr. Applonie responded the current facility would not be allowed under the current Municipal Code; the smaller facilities were

successful in neighborhoods and this particular one had done well, but it definitely had exceeded what was allowed. Staff was holding the position of the Municipal Code and the General Plan to stay within those parameters.

Mayor Petro inquired whether the applicant should consider a lesser number of units and Mr. Applonie responded it had already exceeded the total number of allowable units, prior to any request for expansion. He pointed out it was currently considered legal non-conforming at this time and if the rezone was granted it would be legal conforming.

Councilmember Morris pointed out the Council had approved the General Plan and ordinances.

Zach Reynolds pointed out the development was in compliance when it was originally approved and the zoning rules changed, making it non-compliant. He believed as rules change, exceptions should be accommodated by the City Council.

Rob Reynolds, emphasized, as previously mentioned, the facility was originally constructed in compliance, and since that period of time the zone changed, making it a legal non-compliant. He desired the opportunity to provide service at a high level of care and the current rooms per attendant created challenges. The need for additional rooms was needed to maintain the property, and additional parking would be adequate. He explained the challenge associated with the request was due to the definition change of what was allowed within the zone, minus that challenge, the development agreement would only need to be amended. He believed he had the experience to ensure the standards associated with the storm drain could be met.

Councilmember Kolendrianos inquired whether there was a mechanism already included in the development agreement which allowed for expansion of the current facility and Mr. Applonie responded it did not provide for additional expansion opportunities. He pointed out it was capped at an additional 15 units, and then modified for the extra 2, to be capped at the 38 total units.

Clint Drake, City Attorney, stated as a matter of public policy, it generally wasn't a good idea to amend General Plan and/or Zoning through a Development Agreement, it subverted identified zoning.

Councilmember Bloxham concluded this provided additional explanation as to why Staff directed the applicant to proceed through the rezone process.

MOTION: Councilmember Kolendrianos moved to close the public hearing at 8:20 PM and deny approval of the Rezone Request – Approximately 1242 East Pheasant View Drive – Rezone from R-1-6 (Single Family Residential) and R-S (Residential Suburban) to R-2 (Single and Two Family Residential). Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote: **Voting AYE – Councilmembers Morris, Thomas, and Kolendrianos. Voting NO – None. ABSTAIN – Councilmember Bloxham – stated he would need more information prior to making any decision.** Councilmember Smith Edmondson was not present for the vote.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

There was no unfinished business.

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder