### WORK MEETING AGENDA OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF LAYTON, UTAH May 16, 2013 – 5:30 PM

#### Item:

		Page
1.	Presentation – Communities That Care	1
2.	Discussion – Vote by Mail Election Option	2
3.	Amend the Consolidated Fee Schedule – Ordinance 13-15	3
4.	General Plan Amendment and Rezone Request (Taylor/Hawkes-Kays Creek Villas) – Low Density	

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 the public body. The anchor location for the meeting shall be the Layton City Council Chambers, 437 North Wasatch Drive, Layton City. Members at remote locations may be connected to the meeting telephonically.

Notice is hereby given that 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.

# LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

**Item Number:** 1

**Subject:** Presentation – Communities That Care

**Background:** Representatives from Communities that Care have asked for time on the agenda to provide the Council with a ten-minute update on the program.

**Alternatives:** N/A

**Recommendation:** N/A

# LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

**Item Number:** 2

**Subject:** Discussion – Vote by Mail Election Option

**Background:** Staff will review information with the Council about the possibility of holding an entirely by mail municipal election.

**Alternatives:** N/A

**Recommendation:** N/A

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

**Item Number:** 3

**Subject:** Amend the Consolidated Fee Schedule – Ordinance 13-15

**Background:** The City has consolidated most fees and charges into one place within the Municipal Code, which is adopted and amended by ordinance. The following changes are being proposed.

#### **Street Light Installation Fee**

The Public Works Department is proposing establishment of fees for street light and street light equipment installation by the City contractor. Installation fees are proposed to be set according to the following schedule:

DESCRIPTION		Cost Per Unit
Install Layton City provided SL-02 street light poles & fixtures	Each	\$650.00
Install Layton City provided SL-04 street light poles & fixtures	Each	\$1,180.00
Install Layton City provided SL-01 street light poles & fixtures	Each	\$1,250.00
Install Layton City provided SL-03 street light poles & fixtures	Each	\$840.00
Furnish & install schedule 40 PVC conduit and #6 TC direct burial copper cable	LF	\$18.00
Furnish & install splice box	Each	\$310.00
Furnish & install stainless steel meter housing	Each	\$2,450.00

### **Credit Card Surcharge Fee**

The Finance Department has performed a review of the cost of allowing customers to pay for City services using credit cards. The analysis determined that the City is paying over 2% on each credit card transaction. Settlement provisions of a class action law suit with VISA last summer allow for merchants to charge customers a surcharge to cover the cost of the transaction fees. The Finance Department proposes that a surcharge of 2% be implemented on all credit card transactions over \$75. This surcharge does not affect those that use a debit card. The purpose of the \$75 limit is recommended so that citizens are not discouraged from participating in recreational activities that generally cost less than \$75 per participant. It is also intended that individuals registering multiple participants for recreational activities in one transaction should not be required to pay the surcharge.

#### **Hotel Sanitary Sewer Fees**

The Engineering division of the City performed a review of the fees that are charged per room to hotels/motels for sanitary sewer services. Currently, the City charges 70% of the full residential rate per hotel/motel room. The purpose of the review was to determine the equivalent residential usage of a hotel room as compared to a single family residence. A single family residence is the standard generally used by utilities to establish an equivalent residential unit (ERU) by which to measure all other users of utility systems. The detailed review studied water usage patterns at four local hotels over the past 10 years. The review found that a hotel room uses approximately 40% of the water of a single family residence. The 40% rate is in line with the State of Utah and the North Davis Sewer District standards for charging hotel/motel rooms or units. It is the recommendation of the Engineering division of the City that hotel/motel rooms be charged 40% of the standard residential rate or \$6.38 per month per unit (room).

#### **Fire Training Tower Rental Fees**

The Fire Department recommends that fees be established for rental and usage of the fire training tower facility by outside agencies. The recommended fees are as follows:

- Training without "Live Fire"
  - o One Instructor from Layton City Fire Department
  - Use of the Tower and theater smoke machine
  - Generator use

Cost: \$ 75.00 per hour

- Training with "Live Fire"
  - o Use of the burn rooms
  - Use of theater smoke and smoke machine
  - o Use of generator
  - o Requires a minimum of three "Live Fire" Instructors from Layton City Fire Department
  - o Pallets and burn materials will be provided by the department using the facility

Cost: \$1,000.00 per 4 hour session

**Alternatives:** Alternatives are to 1) Adopt Ordinance 13-15 amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule; 2) Adopt Ordinance 13-15 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Ordinance 13-15 and remand to Staff with directions.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Council adopt Ordinance 13-15 amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule.

### LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

**Item Number:** 4

**Subject:** General Plan Amendment and Rezone Request (Taylor/Hawkes-Kays Creek Villas) – Low Density Residential to High Density Residential Over 16 Units per Acre and B-RP (Business and Research Park) to R-H PRUD (High Density Residential-Planned Residential Unit Development) Ordinance 13-12 and Ordinance 13-13 – Approximately 312 West Gentile Street

**Background:** The property proposed for a General Plan Amendment and rezone from B-RP to R-H PRUD contains 5.10 acres located on the north side of Gentile Street at approximately 312 West. The request for the R-H PRUD zoning is accompanied by a conceptual plan for a 168-unit luxury senior housing project called Kays Creek Villas. Single family detached residential is located to the west and northwest in the Cook Subdivision, which is zoned R-1-8. Also located in the R-1-8 zone are Layton Elementary located across Gentile Street to the south and the single family home directly to the east. The Union Pacific/UTA railroad right-of-way borders a large portion of the east property line. Beyond the rail lines to the east are two mobile home parks (R-MH zone) and a variety of downtown commercial uses in the MU-TOD zone.

The applicant, Jeff Hawkes of Hawks Development, is representing three individual property owners of five separate properties totaling 5.10 acres. All 5.10 acres are presently zoned B-RP and the applicant is proposing a zoning of R-H PRUD. The rezone application is accompanied by a request to amend the General Plan to high density residential. The General Plan Amendment and R-H PRUD zoning is requested to accommodate a proposed 168-unit luxury senior housing community. Mr. Hawkes has presented a concept plan for the proposed senior housing community consisting of two 3-story apartment buildings, two 4-story apartment buildings, and a 2-story community center building.

**Alternatives to the Fist Motion:** Alternatives are to 1) Not Adopt Ordinance 13-12 denying the General Plan Amendment from low density residential to high density residential over 16 units per acre; or 2) Adopt Ordinance 13-12 approving the General Plan Amendment from low density residential to high density residential over 16 units per acre.

**Alternatives to the Second Motion:** Alternatives are to 1) Not Adopt Ordinance 13-13 denying the rezone from B-RP to R-H PRUD; or 2) Remand to Staff to prepare a Development Agreement and a resolution for Council consideration prior to adopting Ordinance 13-13; or 3) Adopt Ordinance 13-13 approving the rezone from B-RP to R-H PRUD.

**Recommendation:** The Planning Commission unanimously recommended that the Council not approve the General Plan Amendment from low density residential to high density residential and deny the rezone from B-RP to R-H PRUD. The Planning Commission's recommendation is based on their determination that the existing B-RP zoning, with the accompanying Development Agreement, continues to provide for a reasonable and rational use of the subject property. The existing B-RP zoning is compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhoods and is consistent with a long-standing General Plan recommendation for a transitional land use along an arterial street. The high density nature of the proposed R-H PRUD zoning is not in keeping with the low density nature of this area of the City.

Staff supports the recommendation of the Planning Commission.