

KAYSVILLE CITY COUNCIL  
January 23, 2020

Minutes of a regular Kaysville City Council meeting held on January 23, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the Business Resource Center of the Davis Technical College at 450 South Simmons Way, Kaysville, Utah.

Council Members present: Mayor Katie Witt, Council Member John Swan Adams, Council Member Michelle Barber, Council Member Andre Lortz, Council Member Tamara Tran, and Council Member Mike Blackham

Others Present: City Manager Shayne Scott, City Attorney Nic Mills, City Recorder Annemarie Plaizier, Community Development Director Lyle Gibson, Information Systems Manager Ryan Judd, Police Chief Sol Oberg, Assistant Police Chief Seth Ellington, Parks and Recreation Director Cole Stephens, Public Works Director Josh Belnap, Lieutenant Shawn McKinnon, Officer Bret Bateman, Officer Dustin Ballard, Michael Romero, Phil Holland, David Cook, Brittany Bateman, Kim Ballard, Rick Smith, Derek Moss, Tom Gill, Kathy Gill, Devin Gardner, Kristi Gardner, Bekki Argyle, Jon Argyle, Carole Walker, Ramona Porter, Fawn Morgan, Melinda Maw, John Bunch, Russell Smith, Randy Douglas, Adam Hughes, Josh King, Matt Gertge

**OPENING**

Council Member Lortz opened the meeting.

**RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

**SWEARING-IN OF NEW KAYSVILLE POLICE OFFICERS BRET BATEMAN AND DUSTIN BALLARD**

Chief Sol Oberg stated that the Police Department has recently hired two new officers with their department: Officer Bret Bateman and Officer Dustin Ballard.

Mayor Witt administered the Oath of Office to the new Kaysville Police Officers.

**DECLARATION OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

No conflicts were disclosed.

**CONSENT ITEMS**

Council Member Lortz made a motion to accept the following consent items:

- a. Approval of the Minutes of the December 5, 2019 meeting.
- b. Approval of the Minutes of the January 9, 2020 meeting.
- c. Approval of Substation Transformer and Regulator Testing – Kaysville Power Department.

The motion was seconded by Council Member Barber.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Adams, yea  
Council Member Barber, yea  
Council Member Lortz, yea  
Council Member Tran, yea  
Council Member Blackham, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **AN ORDINANCE CREATING CHAPTER 12-5, PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD, OF TITLE 12, PARKS, PUBLIC PROPERTY**

Parks and Recreation Director Cole Stephens explained that city Staff has been considering the creation of a Parks and Recreation advisory board for years and have recently compiled a draft ordinance. The Parks and Recreation advisory board would be similar to other advisory boards that the city currently has. This item was discussed at the Council Meeting on January 9, 2020, and has been revised since to reflect the discussion of having seven committee members. The members would be comprised of a diverse background of city residents. The board would have no power to bind or obligate the city to anything.

Council Member Adams made a motion to approve an Ordinance creating 12-5, Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, of Title 12, Parks, Public Property. The motion was seconded by Council Member Lortz.

Council Member Barber commented that this board will be able to review and make recommendations to the Parks and Recreation Department as well as the Council. It is likely that this ordinance will continue to be reviewed and altered based on the city's needs.

Council Member Tran asked about compensation for the members.

Cole Stephens responded that compensation will be defined by resolution so the Council can address it during the budget if they would like to see the members compensated in the future.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Barber, yea  
Council Member Lortz, yea  
Council Member Tran, yea  
Council Member Blackham, yea  
Council Member Adams, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE BOYNTON CORNER SUBDIVISION AT APPROXIMATELY 711 NORTH FAIRFIELD ROAD – DAVIS AND WEBER COUNTIES CANAL COMPANY

Community Development Director Lyle Gibson explained that the Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company is seeking approval for a lot split for a utility substation at the corner of Boynton Road and Fairfield Road. The existing lot is zoned R-A and is 0.82 acres in size. The proposed subdivision will keep the existing home on one lot measuring at 0.51 acres, and the new lot would measure at 0.31 acres which would be used for the substation. This subdivision complies with the size and frontage requirements for the lot which will maintain the home, but creates a lot that is smaller than the standard allowance of the R-A zone. However, Chapter 17-31-15 allows for deviation in typical lot requirements for public utility substations, and therefore this subdivision is in compliance. The Planning Commission recommended approval for the preliminary plat as proposed, and has also approved a conditional use permit for a public utility substation at this location.

Council Member Adams said that there are many adjacent neighbors that are concerned that this new substation will negatively affect the water pressure in this area, and that it will be an eyesore.

Rick Smith, with Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company, said that current the water is supplied from a substation near Church Street in Layton and has to travel several miles to get to this area. By building this substation it will help to boost the water flow coming from the Kaysville Irrigation Reservoir, which they will now be able to utilize as a resource, and will also maintain a constant flow of water down Fairfield Road. There are trees and a slatted fence on the property and they are going to try to keep those in place. Once they are able to close on the property they will be able to have a detailed design down showing the architectural look of the substation.

Council Member Blackham made a motion to approve the preliminary plat for the Boynton Corner Subdivision at approximately 711 North Fairfield Road for Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company, seconded by Council Member Tran.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Lortz, yea  
Council Member Tran, yea  
Council Member Blackham, yea  
Council Member Adams, yea  
Council Member Barber, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

REZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 1.5 ACRES OF PROPERTY AT 191 SOUTH FLINT STREET FROM R-1-20 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) TO R-1-10 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) TO INCLUDE THE PRUD (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL UNIT DEVELOPMENT) OVERLAY ZONE – PHIL HOLLAND

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE ELMS ON FLINT AT 191 SOUTH FLINT STREET – PHIL HOLLAND

Lyle Gibson explained that this property located at 191 South Flint Street was previously approved for a three-lot private street subdivision in 2008 and the previous developer began installation of improvements, but it was never completed and recorded. The original approval was under an old cluster subdivision ordinance. The property has remained in its current state for nearly a decade with a berm and fencing along Flint Street and the private street. Phil Holland, the applicant, is looking to utilize the existing private street and is proposing a five-lot subdivision. To accommodate the number of proposed lots, the applicant is requesting a rezone to the R-1-10 zoning district which allows for lots as small as 10,000 square feet in size. The requested PRUD overlay zone is necessary for a private street subdivision. The developer will also be requesting that the side yard setbacks be reduced from an eight foot minimum to a five foot minimum to better fit homes onto the properties. The property is surrounded by R-1-20 zoning on all sides and has frontage onto Flint Street. The Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the requested rezone with the PRUD overlay being subject to approval of an acceptable final plat. They also recommended approval of the preliminary plat for The Elms on Flint Subdivision with a development agreement that limits the development to five single family lots, and that the developer come with a proposal for the fence along the southern property line at the time of final plat.

Phil Holland commented that he lives near this property and drives by it many times a day. He was recently involved in the Tyler Meadows Subdivision project and it was received well by the market. He would like to develop this property as an attachment to that subdivision with a similar development plan. There is a large demand for custom to semi-custom lots, because most lots are controlled by builders now. This property has been sitting vacant for several years, and with the recent adjustments made to the General Plan he felt that it seemed like a good opportunity to allow for a medium-density type of development on this arterial road. These homes would start at \$600k, which is where the market within Kaysville is at right now. Those who live around here want to see something done with this property, instead of seeing it continue to be vandalized and overgrown by weeds. Mr. Holland said that it's important to him to see that this development succeed and be a quality development. If this property is left to other competitors it might become a high density housing development.

Mayor Witt asked for public comment.

Tom Gill said that he had emailed the City Council previous to the meeting and appreciated the responses he had received. He lives south of this development on Lot 9 of the Quail Hollow Subdivision and several years ago when this property was first considered for development the neighborhood was asked to work with the developer at the time to see if they could come up with a compromise. That compromise was that some of the neighbors abutting the property to the south would sell a small portion of the property to the developer in order for there to only be three lots on the property. The neighbors don't necessarily like the road running along the back of their properties, but they would like to see the property developed as it has become an eyesore. The original compromise of only allowing three lots should be upheld.

Kathy Gill added that she also would love to see the property developed, but has concerns about there being five homes allowed on the property. Their family moved here because they liked the

look and feel of the area. Allowing five homes with only a five foot side yard setback on the lots will not fit with the feel of the neighborhood. There is also concern about the traffic on that private lane, as well as the type of fencing. Currently there is vinyl fencing along the back of their properties, where many have playgrounds and courts for their kids to play. Also, most homes nowadays have at least three cars each and there doesn't seem to be enough space to allow for any parking at these homes or any along the private road.

Kristi Gardner said that before tonight's meeting she had read portions of Title 17, including the areas discussing the PRUD overlay zone. In the code it discusses that there should be avoidance of any disrupting element in the neighborhood and that impacts on adjacent properties should be evaluated. The road will impact the adjacent properties, and their privacy will be invaded. Most of the homes abutting this property have children, and there will be multiple cars traveling on the private road. It is very narrow and there is no place for cars to park along it. Adding more homes will add to the number of cars, and will add congestion to the area. We should be trying to reduce the density in the area rather than try to increase it. The city needs to help to protect those who are already here, and this development should be similar to what already exists here. The proposed development will change the feel of the neighborhood. Ms. Gardner added that while she wants to see this property developed, adding five more homes here is intrusive.

Bekki Argyle said that the surrounding homes here have similar zoning and setbacks for the homes. Reducing the setbacks will make a very big difference on this area. Adding five lots to this property, as well as the reduced side setback will change the feel of the area. This developer builds beautiful homes, but five homes is too many for this lot.

There were no comments or questions from the public. Mayor Witt closed public comment for this item.

Phil Holland said that this property had already been improved with utilities, curb and gutter, and a private street, which they are having to work around with the design of the subdivision. Land is tremendously scarce nowadays. As a developer, his is trying to figure out what the best and highest use of a piece of land is. There is an existing berm on the property that will be cleaned up. The fencing is falling down and needs to be replaced. There is no longer the grading that was originally done on the property. Today's buyer is different than what it was from years past. People want larger homes with a small yard. Desired properties have shifted from buyers wanting acre lots to wanting smaller lots. With the recent adjustments to the General Plan, it gives us more opportunities to consider developing medium density housing.

Council Member Adams asked about the size of the lots.

Lyle Gibson that the lots would be about 10,000 square feet in size, but the buildable area is smaller because the lots also include a portion of the private road.

Council Member Lortz asked about the width of the street.

Lyle Gibson responded that it would be about twenty-four feet, which is allowed under the PRUD overlay zone. If more than three lots are approved, the developer will have to stub in for more utilities to accommodate the other homes.

Council Member Blackham made a motion to deny the request to rezone approximately 1.5 acres of property at 191 South Flint Street from R-1-20 (Single Family Residential) to R-1-10 (Single Family Residential) to include the PRUD (Planned Residential Unit Development) overlay zone for Phil Holland, seconded by Council Member Adams.

Council Member Blackham said that he is familiar with the history of the property and it was originally a remnant piece left from before the Quail Hollow subdivision was built. Many people who lived here thought this piece of property would be developed as one lot. Then some developers looked at possibly developing the property as a flag lot. A private lane was then proposed, and the developer and neighbors were asked by the city to work together to try to negotiate a compromise. Not all the neighbors liked the idea, but they agreed to sell the property if only three lots were developed. After the improvements were installed the economy crashed and the lots never sold. To ask for five lots now is asking the neighbors to compromise on their agreement.

Council Member Adams said that the neighbors gave up a portion of their property in order to come to a compromise with the previous developer. Three homes being built here will fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. The General Plan was changed in order to help create areas for more affordable housing, which this would not qualify for. The utilities are already there for three homes and that's what should be constructed.

Council Member Tran asked if a fourth lot would be allowed under the current zone.

Lyle Gibson responded that only three lots would fit here under the current zoning.

Council Member Tran commented that she lives off of Sunset Drive and drives by this property very often. This property needs to be developed, and respect needs to be given the agreement made with the previous developer, however she also supports the rights of property owners being able to develop their land. Five homes seems like a lot to fit here, and only allowing a five foot setback creates more of a feeling of confinement. Council Member Tran said that she feels that four lots would be more appropriate than five.

Council Member Barber said that the city has been discussing the revisions to the General Plan and reviewing them for over a year now. There is a need for diverse housing in the city, but that doesn't mean that it should go everywhere and there is no guarantee where it would be developed. Each proposal would be reviewed to ensure it would be appropriate in the proposed location.

Council Member Lortz said that these neighbors were given an expectation and then the economy changed things. This property needs to be developed in a way that it's acceptable to everyone. Council Member Lortz added that he feels that a five foot side yard setback is too small.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Tran, yea  
Council Member Blackham, yea  
Council Member Adams, yea  
Council Member Barber, yea  
Council Member Lortz, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

Council Member Lortz made a motion to deny preliminary plat approval for The Elms on Flint Subdivision at 191 South Flint Street for Phil Holland, seconded by Council Member Barber.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Blackham, yea  
Council Member Adams, yea  
Council Member Barber, yea  
Council Member Lortz, yea  
Council Member Tran, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR DESERET LANDING SUBDIVISION AT APPROXIMATELY 700 SOUTH DESERET DRIVE – PHIL HOLLAND

Lyle Gibson explained that recently the developer went into a development agreement with the city for this property at approximately 700 South Deseret Drive where residential development on the south end of the property would be allowed so long as it did not exceed 66 units, or 5.5 units per acre, while requiring that a minimum of 13 acres of property be used for commercial purposes. In December the Planning Commission approved conditional use permits to allow for the function of a BigShots driving range facility on the northeast portion of the property on Lot 1. There is an additional 6.4 acres of commercial property along Deseret Drive on a second lot, for a total of 16.87 acres of commercial development. The proposed plat includes residential component which is being looked at independently as a Common Open Space. The residential subdivision contains private streets and open space along Deseret Drive and I-15. The plat also includes 42 units on 8.13 acres at just over 5 units per acre. Larger lots abut the existing residential development to the south, with a minimum frontage of 80 feet. All lots are for single family detached homes with frontage of 50 feet, and a minimum lot size of 4,500 square feet. The existing development agreement has previously allowed for a 20 foot front yard, 5 foot side yard, and 15 foot rear yard setbacks. The amount of open space provided has been confirmed to meet the minimum required for a Common Open Space Subdivision. This subdivision plat defines which properties will be used for commercial development and which will be residential. The residential and commercial sections can be looked at as phases. The residential will be back with a final plat specific to that component. It is likely that Commercial Lot 1 will have a separate final plat indicating the details of the street access. Commercial Lot 2 will also require a final plat that may or may not add any private or public streets, but likely will just formalize the lot. While under review with the Planning Commission, there were concerns expressed regarding the singular access into the residential neighborhood. Upon further review by city Staff, a secondary access into the residential neighborhood would be necessary based on the number of lots and the distance from Deseret Drive to the furthest lot. With the information given, the Council may either approve the preliminary plat subject to a second access being provided to the residential neighborhood to be verified by the Planning Commission with the final plat review, or table a decision on the preliminary plat until one is presented to the Council that they find acceptable.

Phil Holland said that while designing the subdivision they wanted to try to keep the commercial use separate from the residential. Access for the commercial lots will be north of the residential area. Recently Dominion Energy installed a new line along the frontage of the property which has caused them some constraints because they will have to build these access roads overtop of the line. They feel that having three full access points for this property might not be the best option, and instead of having two access points for the residential use creating an emergency crash gate as a second option if it's a concern with public safety.

Council Member Tran asked about the location of the crash gate.

Phil Holland responded that it could possibly be installed between Lots 24 and 25. Some might suggest that it be put where Lot 13 is. North of the residential properties will likely be a road or parking areas, and a crash gate road could potentially take access off of that road. They could also see if they could make the one residential access point wider to see if that would suffice.

Council Member Adams asked why two outlets are being requested.

Lyle Gibson responded that it's primarily a public safety reason because the fire department doesn't want to see the residents of these homes not being able to get out if their access is cut off in an emergency. For that reason a crash gate would be practical for public safety reasons. The fire chief will need to approve the final plans, whatever is presented. Staff is not recommending the location for a second access, but rather is leaving that up to the developer.

Mayor Witt said that the Council doesn't need to decide where a secondary access should be, but rather should say that we are uncomfortable only having one access road for these residential homes and let the developer decide how to address that in a way that meets the fire chief's approval.

Council Member Blackham commented that from his experience in firefighting, public safety doesn't prefer having crash gate access because in an emergency they might not have a key or code to get in, or the road might be blocked by someone parking their vehicle or trailer there. Oftentimes it's not maintained and could be blocked by snow. From a public safety standpoint we would rather see two access points so that there are two ways in and out of an area. If an accident or other emergency occurs at this one access road there would be no way for people to get in or out of the subdivision.

Phil Holland said that the commercial user of Lot 1 will have a full sixty-six foot wide access on their property. That user has said that they would prefer to not have residential access onto their property for their own public safety.

Council Member Tran suggested a round-a-bout being installed.

Phil Holland said that it would still only be considered one access point.

Council Member Barber made a motion to approve the preliminary plat for Deseret Landing Subdivision at approximately 700 South Deseret Drive for Phil Holland subject to the road design on the plat being approved by the fire chief, seconded by Council Member Tran.

Council Member Barber commented that this development creates a nice buffer to the existing

neighborhood and is excited that more commercial is going in than what is being required.

Council Member Blackham said that this is a good development for this area and this is a good example of what we want to see within our city as part of our General Plan.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Adams, yea  
Council Member Barber, yea  
Council Member Lortz, yea  
Council Member Tran, yea  
Council Member Blackham, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

## **WORK ITEMS**

### **UDOT DRAINAGE BASIN DISCUSSION**

Josh Belnap explained that as part of the Highway 89 expansion project, UDOT has approached Kaysville City about installing a detention basin for storm water run-off on city-owned property. The city-owned parcel is the only parcel large enough and vacant in this area that could accommodate infrastructure of this size. Several uses for this parcel have been discussed over the years, but with difficult access, no changes or plans have been made. Of the water flowing into the proposed basin, roughly forty-five percent would come from UDOT, twenty percent would come from Kaysville, and thirty-four percent would come from Fruit Heights. Under UDOT's proposal, the Highway 89 project would cover the design, construction and restoration costs of the basin. The City would agree to maintain the basin, keep it functioning properly and provide a guaranteed minimum storage volume to UDOT. In return, UDOT would provide the City with an amount of \$710k to compensate for permanent effects to the property; determined by applying a dollar amount per square foot to the disturbed area, and deducting from that to factor in potential benefits to the city from the basin. The city would see some benefit, but would also accept maintenance and other responsibilities for the new basin. It is unknown what could be done with the parcel otherwise, but the basin could eliminate many potential uses for the property. The City Water System has planned and budgeted over \$300k for several water quality "betterments" that would be installed by the Highway 89 project, and these funds could be used to offset those costs.

Council Member Blackham commented that there could be a lot of maintenance involved once this is turned into a detention basin. The city might have to hire more people and equipment to take care of it and that will come at a cost. Has UDOT considered purchasing the property from the city? If we keep the property, can we bill UDOT for the maintenance of it? There's a need for these kinds of facilities, but it's not best to keep ownership because of the ongoing maintenance of the property. The money given to us by UDOT will be gone eventually and if anything goes wrong in the future then it will be at the city's expense to fix it.

Michael Romero, a representative with UDOT, added that the compensation from UDOT is to help offset the cost of maintenance on the property. The city will not be responsible for the design or construction of the basin. Typically UDOT prefers to work together in a joint system with the

cities, and will go in and spend the capital up front for the land. UDOT tries to work with cities to help to capture the water coming off of their roads to get it into a system that is new and built to standard. In exchange for them helping to work with cities and cover the cost, they are asking that the city keep and maintain it.

Mayor Witt said that there are some liability concerns as well by owning this property. However, in some ways it would benefit us to keep the property so that we would have control of the property and help be able to take care of those who live downstream.

Council Member Lortz asked if Fruit Heights would be participating in this agreement in any way.

Josh Belnap responded that typically all of Fruit Heights systems run through Kaysville's conveyance systems.

Russell Smith, a representative with UDOT, said that there is a lot of benefit to the community continuing to own the parcel because then they have control of the project if there are any concerns that come up. It also helps moving forward as more development occurs in the area they can modify it if needed to still meet the needs of the city.

Council Member Lortz asked about the tributary areas and where the water would get routed.

Josh Sundloff responded that they will require on-site retention, and any runoff will go into a storm drainage system.

Council Member Adams asked if the neighboring property owners were notified of this. It would be nice to hear from the neighbors about what they think.

Josh Sundloff responded that letters had not been sent, but that is something they could do.

Council Member Adams asked if UDOT would exercise eminent domain for the property if the city were uncooperative.

Michael Romero commented that there are no properties available to the north that could be used for a drainage basin because they have residential homes on them, and there is not enough property on the east side of Highway 89. They need an open area where it won't impact homes and this is an ideal location for that. UDOT has the ability to use eminent domain on a piece of property but they prefer to work with the city because it can benefit both sides.

Council Member Blackham asked if the city currently has the equipment needed to maintain the drainage basin.

Parks and Recreation Director Cole Stephens responded that they likely do not have the equipment that they would need. It would depend on how steep the side embankment of the basin will be. Their department is already short staffed as it is, and therefore they would have to hire more staff to help maintain this property as well.

Council Member Blackham asked if the property would be fenced.

Michael Romero said that it would be.

Council Member Blackham asked if the basin could be used for public access.

Cole Stephens responded that the typography of the property is limiting and is one of reasons why this property hasn't been utilized by the city yet. It is unlikely that it would be available for public access, unless it was part of a trail network.

Michael Romero stated that UDOT would be willing to work with the city to make the landscaping more maintenance-friendly.

Council Member Adams made a motion to move this item to an action item, with the direction to Staff to consider what fencing and landscaping they would like to see here, and that the neighbors be notified of this project. The motion was seconded by Council Member Blackham.

Council Member Blackham commented that the city needs to ensure that there is also good access to the property in order to maintain it. If any of the outlets were to get plugged that could create considerable problems.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Barber, yea  
Council Member Lortz, yea  
Council Member Tran, yea  
Council Member Blackham, yea  
Council Member Adams, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

#### BIGSHOTS GOLF INCENTIVE DISCUSSION

Lyle Gibson explained that the Kaysville City Planning Commission has recently given the necessary conditional use approvals for the use of roughly ten acres of property south of Boondocks along I-15 for a golf driving range type of facility. The owner of the business, BigShots, is still working through their due diligence in pursuit of the property and has expressed interest in discussing and learning about potential city participation to help the project make financial sense. Generally speaking, cities often utilize incentives of different types to promote development that they prefer to see in their city or development that will provide a long-term financial benefit to the city. If the Council desires to further consider incentives of any fashion, they may motion to move this discussion to an action item with direction for further information on options that appeal most to the Council.

Randy Douglas, representing BigShots, gave the City Council a presentation introducing their company and their plans for building in Kaysville. Mr. Douglas said that they are excited about this opportunity and hope to be able to start building this spring and open in 2021.

Council Member Barber said that she feels this is the perfect place for this destination attraction and it will benefit the city. The city should be welcoming of this, but also make sure that it is built

to what we want for the city and to fit the surrounding area.

Council Member Blackham said that this is the right fit for the property because it's destination driven. Council Member Blackham asked if the city had received a proforma from BigShots yet.

Shayne Scott responded that they had not because Staff wanted to present this to the Council to see if this is something they would consider before moving forward.

Council Member Blackham said that this business will positively impact the community and it will help to create more job opportunities.

Council Member Adams asked if this would have an effect on the city police force.

Randy Douglas said that their other locations haven't had problems with criminal activities and there will be an off-duty officer on site.

Lyle Gibson commented that Staff would work with the Economic Development Committee to create a recommendation for the Council to review.

Council Member Blackham asked if it was too late to consider an RDA or CDA so that we could get other entities to participate.

Lyle Gibson responded that we would still be able to do that. It's a slower process because this property is not currently in a defined area that's eligible for the tax increment. We would go to the County and other taxing entities to begin a conversation about it.

Council Member Blackham said that he would like to see the city pursuing that because it will help show the city that the County and School District are buying into it.

Matt Gertge, the contractor and partner of BigShots, said that one of the biggest challenges they face is obtaining the financial lenders when creating a single use building. It is important that they get the commitment from the city to show the support of this project.

Adam Hughes, with Better City, said that he is excited to be here to help support this project. It's been a drawn out process to get it to this point, but it is a good fit for the property and will be a great amenity for the community.

## STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

Josh King, with The Langdon Group, explained that they have been working with the city for the past year to develop a strategic plan for the city. The objective of the strategic plan initiative has been to identify the City's purpose, aspirations and guiding principles. It will provide a framework and direction for decision-making in today's changing world and environment. While developing this plan, emphasis and resources were placed on individual involvement and community building. The process allowed for the development of a unique Community Mission Statement, Community Vision Statement, and Guiding Principles that were developed for the people of Kaysville, by the people of Kaysville. The Community Mission summarizes the purpose and associated responsibilities of Kaysville. The Community Vision is the statement identifying the ideal future

of the community that is aspirational and expresses the internal values, beliefs or philosophy that directs how the City carries out its mission. Guiding Principles are the values, culture, ideals and ideas that are found to be most important to residents of the City. Mr. King reviewed the timeline of the Plan with the City Council and presented the draft of the Strategic Plan.

Mayor Witt commented that one of the reasons the city pursued creating a Strategic Plan was for the citizens. We wanted to see what people had to say about what they want to see for the city, and what is most important to them. This strategic plan will continually be reviewed and updated in the future.

Council Member Barber commented that she is excited to be to this point in the process and feels that the plan needs to be available for the residents to be able to review.

Lyle Gibson said that the Council should review this proposed draft and provide any comments or questions to Staff by the end of the month. They hope to be able to finalize the adoption of the strategic plan by the next Council meeting. This document won't mandate or bind the city to anything, but will help to guide decisions for the city.

Council Member Barber made a motion to extend the City Council meeting past 10:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Council Member Tran and passed unanimously.

### **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Clyde Terry said that he lives on the corner of Knight's Way and Tyler's Way and has had an increasing problem with dog owners not cleaning up after their dogs on his property. The sidewalk along here is heavily traveled, especially by kids walking to and from the nearby schools. Mr. Terry asked if there was any way the city could better enforce this type of problem. Could a fine be implemented? Could signs be installed? Mr. Terry commented that he hopes the Council can take a look at this issue and see if there was anything that could be done.

### **COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS**

Mayor Witt commented that starting next month the Council will be holding a Q&A session before every council meeting at 6:30 p.m. The Council will be available to answer any questions that the public might have. This way they might be able to help answer questions before the meeting so residents don't have to wait until after the meeting to discuss an item with them.

Council Member Adams said that there are still residents within the city who are working on trying to create a museum and they are trying to find funding for it. There might be other options for what can be done with the old city library and would like to hear the reasoning behind both sides.

Council Member Barber commented that the 4<sup>th</sup> of July Committee will be holding their first planning meeting soon, and they are always looking for volunteers to help with the event.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Council Member Blackham made a motion to adjourn the City Council meeting at 10:08 p.m., seconded by Council Member Adams and passed unanimously.