

Mayor
• Robert Dandoy

City Manager
• Matt Andrews



Council Members
• Jan Burrell
• Joe Paul
• Bryon Saxton
• Ann Jackson
• Diane Wilson

ROY CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

APRIL 21, 2020 – 5:30 P.M.

ZOOM WEBINAR WITH LIVE STREAMING ON YOUTUBE

A. Welcome & Roll Call

Mayor Dandoy called the meeting to order and took roll.

B. Moment of Silence

The audience observed a moment of silence.

C. Pledge of Allegiance

D. Consent Items

1. Minutes from the March 3, 2020 Roy City Council Meeting Minutes.
2. Sale of Surplus from Parks and Rec and Public Works Department (list attached)

The Council discussed a few minor changes. Morgan Langholf, City Recorder, confirmed that she had made the suggested changes.

Councilmember Paul moved to approve the minutes with adjustments as noted. Councilmember Burrell seconded the motion. All Councilmember voted “Aye.” The motion passed.

E. Action Items

1. **Resolution 20-8** Providing for the convening and conducting of Roy City Public Meetings in accordance with the Utah Public Meeting Act 52-4-207 and Executive Order 2020-5 Issued by Governor Gary R. Herbert, temporarily suspending rules and norms relating to Public Meetings, and Establishing rules, norms and procedures for Electronic Meetings

Councilmember Wilson moved to approve Resolution 20-8. Councilmember Burrell seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All Councilmember voted “Aye.” The motion passed.

No comments were made.

1. **Resolution 20-9** Approving and Agreement with Comfort Systems USA for the Boiler Replacement Project at the Roy City Aquatic Center

Ross Oliver, Parks and Recreation Director, explained that there had been a bid opening on March 5, 2020, for the aforementioned boiler. He mentioned that there had only been one bid which had come to \$55,327.97. He noted that said bid was under budget and continued that he was coming before the Council to seek approval.

Councilmember Paul pointed that it was unclear when the Aquatic Center would be able to resume its activities. As result, he asked whether the repairs should take place now. Ross Oliver explained that the plan was to move forward with the repairs as it would take some time for the boiler to arrive. Councilmember Wilson pointed that she had been told there was a deadline for the parts to be obtained. Ross Oliver confirmed that the parts would not be obtained by



1 May 5, 2020. He added that he hoped the parts would be ordered right away and installed by June 1, 2020.

2
3 **Councilmember Paul moved to approve Resolution 20-9. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion.**
4 **A roll call vote was taken. All Councilmember voted “Aye.” The motion passed.**

- 5
6 1. **Ordinance No. 20-6;** An Ordinance amending the Roy City Noise Control Ordinance by adding section 4-
7 4-3.5 to prohibit engine braking Utah State Road (SR) 97 from 1900 West to 4300 West, except for the
8 overpass and on SR 108 from Hinckley Drive to 3500 West
9

10 Matt Andrews, City Manager, explained that Brandon Edwards had filed the application with the State of Utah. He
11 explained that SR 97 was 5600 South from 1900 to 4300 West. He added that because of safety concerns, the overpass
12 had been excluded. He continued stating that there had been complaints about engine breaks being used in the area
13 and further explained that since there were a lot of residential dwellings, the noise was an issue.

14
15 Councilmember Paul explained that one of the concerns regarded 4300 West. He mentioned that the area from 1900
16 to 3100 West was very sloped. He proposed to amend the area to include only 3100 West to 4300 West.

17
18 Councilmember Wilson explained that she had spoken with people in the industry who had shown her a great article.
19 She mentioned that the safety issue was the most important aspect of engine breaks. Precluding engine breaks, she
20 explained, would force trucks to use their regular breaks which would in turn make them have to drive slower: this
21 would render the flow of traffic difficult. She explained that many of the newer trucks were muffled. The decibel
22 ratings, she continued, showed that the noises were not much higher than regular traffic: the issue of traffic flow and
23 safety would be avoided. She proposed that the ordinance be revised to show this change.

24
25 It was noted that the ordinance stated that in the event of safety, if the driver was attempting to prevent injury or
26 damage to person, property, or animals, the ban on engine breaks was not applicable. Councilmember Wilson added
27 that the language could also say that unmuffled engine breaks would be prohibited. If she added that if they had
28 already been using their regular breaks, which tend to get hot, truckers could use engine breaks if needed.

29
30 Mayor Dandoy explained that he believed Councilmember Wilson was suggesting that trucks with unmuffled engines
31 would be prohibited from using their engine breaks. The muffled engine breaks would not have the ordinance apply
32 to them.

33
34 Councilmember Paul stated that the road was a State road, which, he added, meant that the application of the
35 ordinance might not allow this type of language. It was noted that part of the application statutes stipulated that the
36 local police would enforce the ordinance. He mentioned that he was not sure that the police would enforce an
37 unmuffled vs. a muffled engine break. Councilmember Jackson explained she agreed with Councilmember Wilson.
38 She mentioned her experience with her husband who had a big truck and insisted that the language should be added.

39
40 Mayor Dandoy stated that this could be passed as an ordinance but might not have any effect if it conflicted with
41 what the State allowed. It was then noted that the Police Chief would also have to agree. Mayor Dandoy asked if
42 the ordinance needed to be tabled. The Police Chief stated that the engine break was easy to hear if it was unmuffled,
43 but that the muffled one was quiet.

44
45 Mayor Dandoy summarized the change that needed to be made to the language. Councilmember Paul stated the
46 ordinance had to be tabled until Staff talked to the State.

47
48 **Councilmember Paul moved to table the Ordinance. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion. All**
49 **Councilmembers voted “Aye.” The motion passed.**

- 50
51 2. **Ordinance No. 20-4;** To amend the General Plan (Future Land Use Map) from Medium Density, Single-
52 Family Residential to Very High Density, Multi-Family Residential at 5154 South 2700 West
53

1 City Planner Steve Parkinson explained the also wanted to discuss Ordinance 20-5 in connection with Ordinance 20-
2 4. He shared his computer screen with attendees. He mentioned that the area was on the East side of 2700 West and
3 5200 South and was 2.8 acres. Councilmember Wilson asked about the plot, which, she was told, was made of two
4 plots: a vacant one over two acres and another to the North currently zoned R-1-8 with a house. He added that the
5 parcels were owned by the same person. Mr. Parkinson pointed to some highlighted parcels which were zoned
6 medium-density, single-family residential (R-1-6 to R-1-10). He pointed to the zoning to explain the different parcels
7 and added that, historically, there had been a request to change the parcels from medium to very high-density. In
8 2016, the Planning Commission had recommended a denial. The Council had followed suit. In early 2018, he
9 continued, the owner again requested a rezone. He added that the Planning Commission had, this time, recommended
10 approval but that the Council had denied the request. Mr. Parkinson explained what “density” meant and covered
11 the different zoning: R-1-8 allowed 5.45 dwellings per acre, which was considered medium density. He continued
12 that R-1-6 would allow 7.26 units per acre, which was also considered medium density. Finally, R-2 allowed
13 duplexes with 7600 square feet minimum per lot or 5.18 two-family units per acre or 11.6 single dwellings per acre
14 which was labeled high-density. He continued that the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance were sometimes at
15 odds as the definitions did not match. He came back to the definition of density, which sometimes were referred to
16 as the type of building. He showed a specific project on the screen. He pointed that high-density was associated with
17 apartment complexes but was also comprised of townhomes. He further discussed the possibility of having offices
18 in areas that had light manufacturing. He pointed to depiction of what the townhomes would look like.

19
20 Councilmember Jackson asked about the number of townhomes allowed. She was told it was 2.89 units per acre
21 which could potentially add up to 34 units. Steve Parkinson added that the development would also need to provide
22 roads, landscape, parking, etc.

23
24 Mayor Dandoy asked for a clarification about the number of units if the project was retained as an R-1-6. Mr.
25 Parkinson stated that there would be 7.26 single-family units. He added that he did not know what the layout would
26 look like and continued by explaining that other elements would have to be added. Councilmember Wilson pointed
27 that there would be a minimum of five units per acre. Mr. Parkinson stated that depending on the parcel, it would be
28 five to seven dwellings per acre.

29
30 Mayor Dandoy asked whether the applicants could be placed on the line.

31
32 Councilmember Jackson stated she was concerned about parking requirements and whether the dwellings would be
33 offered as rentals or ownership. She also pointed to a need for quality assurance in terms of the quality of buildings.
34 Mr. Parkinson explained that the parking was determined by the ordinance, which required two stalls per unit along
35 with half a stall per unit for visitors. He continued that all the parking would need to be on site, though no one could
36 stop individuals from parking on the street. He added that the ordinance would require for the materials to be
37 maintained. When it came to renting v. owning, he explained that he believed the units would be offered for sale.
38 This, he continued, did not guarantee that the units would not then be rented, which was each owner’s right.

39
40 Councilmember Jackson asked whether the development would fulfill the affordable housing requirements. Mr.
41 Parkinson explained that the more housing units were present, the lower the rent would cost.

42
43 Councilmember Saxton pointed that the cost of the units would be around \$267,000.00. Councilmember Wilson
44 added that there would be a homeowners’ association which guaranteed that, even in the event of rentals, the
45 properties would be cared for. Councilmember Saxton asked if it would be possible to include a requirement that
46 units be owner occupied. Mr. Parkinson explained the City could not dictate who occupied the unit but added that
47 the HOA might have more ability to dictate such a thing. He added that the development had agreed to have the units
48 up for sale, not rent, but explained that the owners could subsequently rent their unit. He added that, parking wise,
49 the requirement was for each dwelling to have one covered parking space and one uncovered. Half a stall per unit
50 would then be offered for visitor.

51
52 Councilmember Jackson asked whether there had been a reason provided to explain why the owner wished to go
53 from the R-6 to the R-3.

- 1
2 3. **Ordinance No. 20-5**; To amend the Zoning Map from R-1-6 & R-1-8 (Single-Family Residential) to R-3 or
3 R-4 (Multi-Family Residential) at 5154 South 2700 West
4

5 **Mayor Dandoy opened public comment for these items. Staff reported and recommended approval of**
6 **Ordinance 20-4 and 20-5**
7

8 **1. Janae Terry**
9

10 Ms. Terry explained that she had been passionate about this topic for many years. She expressed her love for the
11 neighborhood. She added she knew there was not a lot of affordable housing available. She pointed that the median
12 household income in Roy City was \$60,100.00 per year. She asked how the building lot price could be reduced by a
13 third. If the building lot was \$90,000.00, it had to be reduced to be affordable from someone in the median household
14 income bracket. She explained that one option would be allow smaller lots. She pointed that while keeping the
15 character of the area rural was important, providing housing to Roy residents also should be prioritized. Building
16 townhomes, she continued, would not affect the neighbors' property.
17

18 **2. Doug Terry**
19

20 Mr. Terry explained that he and his wife were passionate about the area. After looking at figures, he explained patio
21 homes would require new roads which would drive the cost of patio homes over \$300,000.00. He explained that this
22 had been why he had chosen something more affordable. From an aerial view, he continued, the Council could see
23 that his property was covered in trees. He added that directly to the left of his property were storage units, fourplexes
24 to the South, and a business with fabrication and machine shops to the North. He pointed that this was a good area
25 to add townhomes. He pointed that his property was well-manicured and well served by roads. He added that the
26 City Planning Committee seemed to agree with him. He added that all the parking had been accounted for on the
27 property, not the street. He added that they were good neighbors.
28

29 **3. Brenda Nelson**
30

31 Ms. Nelson explained that she was a real estate broker in Roy and was there to assist the Terrys. She explained that
32 everyone should have the right to own, freely transfer their property, and exercise the benefits of ownership. She
33 explained that the Terrys' vision was the best and highest use of the land. She explained it would bring change and
34 newness to the City and would tie with the current development with the Trax station and other developments. She
35 asked for the City to consider the request in zoning change as a positive contribution to the Roy area.
36

37 **4. Melanie Swartz (she also submitted a letter to the Council; I have included that with her comments)**
38

39 Ms. Schwartz stated that she had been in front of the few of the Council members in their capacity of Planning
40 Commissioners when she was trying to rezone a house that was an eyesore. She explained that several of her
41 neighbors had been able to rezone their property. She pointed that most of the area on the west side of the street was
42 zoned R-A-20. She pointed that going to condos and townhomes would be a major change to the character of the
43 neighborhood. She pointed that this kind of housing would not be consistent with Roy's goal to have consistent
44 neighborhoods. She requested that the Council denied the request.
45

46 To the Mayor, City Councilmembers and City Manager of Roy:
47

48 Thank you for taking the time to read this email. Although emails should be concise and brief, in the challenging
49 times presented to us because of COVID-19, the typical avenue of offering my thoughts at a City Council meeting
50 may only happen via Zoom. As a lifelong tech user, I have some concerns tech might fail me during the meeting, so
51 I would like to offer my opinion in a written format as a back up to the meeting.

52 I am writing regarding the proposed rezone at the parcel at approximately 5154 S 2700 W from R-1-8/R-1-6, owned
53 by Mr. Doug Terry. Mr. Terry has attempted rezoning this parcel to a higher density zoning several times in the past,

1 most recently when the empty parcel to the south was changed from R-1-8 to R-1-6 in May 2018. Past failures to get
2 this rezoned to higher density zoning failed in 2016 and earlier in 2018. Despite the southern parcel being changed
3 to R-1-6, overall, the local residents felt this was an acceptable compromise from high density housing proposed (R-
4 3) and allowed Mr. Terry to exploit the land with the potential for more single-family housing than R-1-8 allowed
5 him. Collectively, as neighbors, when it came up this year Mr. Terry was going before the Planning Commission in
6 Feb 2020 to once again have it rezoned R-3/R-4, we felt in necessary to speak out at this meeting. Despite this, The
7 Planning Commission approved this rezone, that you all have the choice of approving or disapproving.

8
9 To “paint the picture”, the houses immediately to the north and the south of this parcel, located on the east side of
10 2700, to include three houses to the north owned by his sister and his two nieces, and a fourth house under construction
11 by his nephew are all zoned R-1-8. Houses to the south on the east side of 2700 are R-1-8. Directly across the street,
12 there is a storage unit on the NW corner of 2700/5200, and a single-family residence on the SW corner of 2700/5200.
13 To the north and the south of those buildings on the west side of 2700 bounded by 5600 to the south and 4800 to the
14 north are zoned RE-20 , with a few Light Manufacturing parcels - with the exception of Metal Force, all these small
15 shops are associated with single family homes that the proprietor resides in collocated with their business. Having
16 high density housing located within one of the few areas in Roy that has larger parcels is not consistent with the
17 neighborhood nor with the findings from the FOCUS ROY CITY which proposes to have more high-density housing
18 located in the Station Area and the Downtown Area. The Roy Future Land Use Map indicates that this area is to be
19 developed as single-family homes, not multifamily dwellings.

20
21 This area will be very negatively impacted by the increased traffic brought by high density housing. As 2700 feed
22 into 5600 and 4800, and with 4800 often impacted by trains, to think that this will not increase the traffic issues within
23 Roy is naïve. 90% of the residents of Roy commute via personal cars. This parcel is not very walkable to the nearest
24 bus stop nor the Front Runner Station, nor necessary services like groceries, banks, and pharmacies. It is relatively
25 close to North Park, the golf course and water park, and the Rail Trail.

26
27 This area is also on the flight path to Ogden Hinckley airport. Back in the day (pre-COVID) I could stand in my
28 pasture and watch the Allegiant jets fly to low I could see the pilots as they passed overhead. As we have had several
29 single engine planes crash on Roy, most recently in a development like what Mr. Terry is proposing, is that not
30 ignoring a real risk to more people if this is high density housing? Similarly, the trains run directly behind this parcel,
31 and derailments are a real possibility, especially considering how seismically active the Wasatch Fault has been lately.
32 Any loss of life is incredibly tragic, but to knowingly put high density next to real hazards, especially considering the
33 events we have experienced in this town, seems foolhardy at best, and potentially litigious at worst. I have not
34 forgotten the hue and cry residents of Roy made about how high-density condos should not have been allowed on the
35 flight path to the airport and our leaders concern regarding this issue.

36
37 Several comments were made at the Planning Commission meeting in February, and I’d like to offer my takes on
38 these comments.

39
40 First, the proponents for this plan were Mr. Terry, and his Realtor, and several of his acquaintances that NO LONGER
41 live locally, but think Mr. Terry is a great guy. Obviously, Mr. Terry and his Realtor stand to gain from this rezone
42 substantially, and a rezone in no way detracts from their quality of life as neither live in this neighborhood but impacts
43 more people that do live here. I have no doubt in my mind Mr. Terry is a good person, and appreciate he has friends
44 true enough to stand up for him, but this endorsement of his character by people who are not in this neighborhood or
45 even a Roy resident are irrelevant to the proposed rezone.

46
47 Second, it was mentioned in the February meeting that with the influx of high paying contractor jobs at Hill AFB,
48 these people will need places to live. I was one of those very high paid employees, and if I were looking for a
49 townhome or condo, I’d be looking further south in Farmington Station that has the amenities walkable to my condo.
50 Why did I buy in Roy? LAND. I could afford a 1.72 acre parcel, restore a 1912 farmhouse that was filled with
51 squatters and druggies to a beautiful home that is an asset to the neighborhood, and garden and have livestock and be
52 in close proximity to a job on base that had me on call 24/7/365. The proposed plan Mr. Terry has is for “high end
53 units with an HOA” which is identified as a critical need in Roy, however, buyers for a high-end condo may not want

1 to live with trains coming by on the quarter hour, severe congestion on 5600 and stoppages on 4800, and will seek
2 out some of our neighboring cities. Additionally, low-income high-density housing is also a critical need in Roy, but
3 with the lack of walkability and public transportation adjacent to this location is not conducive for lower income
4 residents to access any needs without a vehicle.

5
6 Third, it was mentioned there is an apartment complex “directly across the street”. Not true. This complex faces 5200
7 and is only comprised of 8 total units. With the old zoning and mish mash of storage units, small home shops, and
8 this apartment complex, and then RE 20 on the west side of 2700 and R-1-8 on the east side in the area bordered
9 between 5600 and 4800- it is obvious driving down the street, or walking down the sidewalk, or enjoying the Rail
10 Trail, this is a neighborhood identified by single family homes and pastoral small hobby farms Please let us maintain
11 this last vestige of larger lots in Roy. People buying parcels like this are looking to grow things, raise their children
12 and animals, and contribute to the local Roy economy. Urban farmers deserve to buy in Roy too. Too often, despite
13 HOAs, townhomes/condos end up being leased out, and although not every renter is disreputable, the vast majority
14 are not as invested in the community as a homeowner.

15
16 I beseech every one of you, let us develop this neighborhood as “that area on the Rail Trail where there are farm
17 animals”. Let’s not continue the previous Roy style of a hodgepodge on R-3/R-4 in a bunch of single-family homes.
18 Let that activity be indicated in the Station Area as suggested in FOCUS ROY CITY.

19
20 Please consider keeping the parcel at 5154 S 2700 W remain R-1-6/R-1-8 and deny rezoning it to R-3/R-4.

21
22 Thank you for taking the time reading this, and I hope you and yours remain healthy and happy during these
23 challenging times.

24
25 Very Respectfully,

26
27 Dr. Melanie Swartz
28 5085 S 2700 W

29 30 **5. Thomas Spencer**

31
32 Mr. Spencer explained that the request had been denied twice before. When the project was approved in 2018, it had
33 been approved for medium density, which, he explained, was a good compromise. He continued that the area was
34 directly under the flight path of the Ogden airport. He explained that the density of Roy around the airport was an
35 issue. He continued that the railroad was also problematic around a densely populated area. He discussed the
36 walkability aspect by comparing it to different intersections. He explained that distances would be too great to be
37 waked. Finally, he asked the Council to deny the proposal.

38 39 **6. Samantha Tilton**

40
41 Ms. Tilton explained that she had lived in Ogden and Roy and added that she was a single mother with five children.
42 She pointed that as a single-income household, affordable housing was important. She explained that she loved the
43 community spirit of Roy but continued that there were limited options for affordable housing. A project like the
44 current one would allow her to come back and live in Roy. She voiced her wish that the Council approve the project.

45 46 **7. Tim Higgs**

47
48 Mr. Higgs explained that during a recent Council meeting, the Mayor had discussed some data about population and
49 affordable housing. He added that the Mayor had provided the median price of homes in the State v. in Roy City.
50 He explained he understood that the City needed to offer affordable housing. He continued having lived in the area
51 for half of his life. He added that he had gone to the Planning Committee and had been surprised to see that four
52 individuals were for the project: the applicant, the realtor, the lender, and a friend of the applicant who lived across
53 the City. Nine individuals were against the project: these were all individuals who lived within a quarter mile of the

1 property. He explained that the Council needed to respect the property owner's rights but also had to take into the
2 consideration the desire of the residents. He added that he had sent the City Recorder a listing of affordable housing
3 for Roy and the cities directly surrounding Roy City. He explained that he had compiled all active properties as well
4 as those "under contract" and "sold" for the last 60 days. The list included properties under \$300,000.00. Draper
5 had zero such properties while Washington Terrace had two. He pointed that Roy had sixteen. West Haven, on the
6 other hand, had 113 such properties. He further refined these figures and explored data for Davis County. Looking
7 at these numbers, he continued, Roy was doing its part. He mentioned that increasing this number to 34 units with
8 their parking stalls would mean that the rea would have 68 more cars twice a day. He explained this would greatly
9 increase traffic, which the roads were not meant to handle. He stated that he believed Roy was already doing its part
10 to offer affordable housing and that he wished the Council voted "no" on the request.

11

12 **8. Stacie Warner**

13

14 Ms. Warner explained she was a Roy resident with six children. She explained being excited for the potential 2200
15 new jobs that would benefit the City. She explained that the City needed updating to be able to support the growth.
16 She mentioned that her children were reaching the age where they would be moving out and making their own homes.
17 She mentioned that they would not be able to find affordable homes in Roy and would be going elsewhere. As a
18 result, she continued, she supported the rezoning of the Terry property. She explained that while some residents were
19 afraid of the changes, these new, affordable dwellings were needed.

20

21 **9. Dave Mcillrath & Carrie Mcillrath**

22

23 Mr. Mcillrath explained the had bought a patio home. To the South, he continued, were two sets of townhomes that
24 were kept in good conditions. He pointed that his backyard was closer than 100 yards from where the plane had
25 crashed. He continued that he had a good understanding of what it meant to live close to the airport as well as close
26 to multi-family housing. He explained that the people living behind his home were part of an HOA and though the
27 community was for those 55 years of age or older, it was well maintained. He pointed that often, people in that age
28 range experienced difficulties living next to people with children but explained that this was not the case here. He
29 continued that Roy needed to have more multifamily housing. The entire Wasatch front had an issue, he continued.
30 He explained that while preserving an "Old Roy" was a valid goal, change was good. The Wasatch Front, he
31 continued, was growing at fast pace. He mentioned that Roy City needed to be a good State citizen and provide
32 housing for the people working on Hill Air Force Base to decongest the roads. When it came to the TRAX, he added,
33 there was a basic transportation problem when traveling East to West. He added that there needed to be better
34 infrastructure with less railroad crossings and more overpasses. He concluded that the housing would provide a form
35 of noise block for residents in the area. He explained that he respected the current property owners' right to have
36 animals in their backyard but added that, overall, Roy needed to help the Wasatch Front grow. Ms. Mcillrath
37 explained that they were friends of the Terrys. They added that bringing this project would allow for beautification
38 of the area. She concluded that she would like to see the Council approve the project.

39

40 **10. Kate Bideaux**

41

42 Ms. Bideaux explained that she wanted to voice her support for the project as affordable housing was needed in the
43 area. She added it would drive younger families into the community which would increase sales in Roy. She
44 mentioned that this would also help younger single adults to stay in the community. Furthermore, she continued, the
45 HOA would ensure that the buildings would be properly maintained. She stated that she supported the project.

46

47 **11. Sarah (no last name given)**

48

49 Sarah (no last name given) explained she was a Roy resident. She mentioned the she lived on Redland Drive and
50 was aware of the traffic issues. She continued that Roy needed this type of housing. She explained that she sold real
51 estate in Roy and all-over Northern Utah and pointed that she had grown up in Ogden. She mentioned that while
52 more traffic would not a pleasant development, the project should still proceed as affordable and nice housing was
53 needed.

1
2 **There were several Public Comments that were made via email that are part of the minutes. These were the**
3 **emails submitted on this subject.**
4

5 5118 S 2700 W
6 Roy, Utah 84067
7 overbark@msn.com
8 20 April 2020
9

10 Dear City Council Members,

11
12 Roy City has been my home for my entire life. I've lived on the 'family farm', formerly known as Terry Subdivision
13 all of those years.
14

15 Our families have some serious concerns about the proposed zoning change and are adamantly opposed to this
16 change.
17

18 We were unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting but have watched the entire session online. Many of
19 our great neighbors attended the meeting and ALL who lived on our street were very opposed to the zoning change,
20 and wondered if their voices were heard?
21

22 From 5200 S. to 4800 S. is a unique pocket in our community. Many families, like us are living on properties that
23 have been in their families for many years. Some neighbors have farms and farm animals, some have small
24 businesses, many like us have big gardens and small farm animals, many have chosen to raise their families here, and
25 all in all, we LOVE our neighborhood.
26

27 Our children have grown, moved away, and have come back to live on our property. We have 4 of our children living
28 in the Underwood subdivision and 11 grandkids. It's been a dream come true having them come back and settle here.
29

30 Here are some of the reasons we are STRONGLY opposed to this zoning change:
31

32 • When Doug lived down here on the property in question, he had always been opposed to development.
33 While he lived there, the city had approached my father, Howard Terry (who was the property owner at the time) on
34 several occasions wanting to develop the land. At one point they wanted to continue 5200 S. through the middle of
35 the big field Doug currently owns. On several other occasions, developers approached our father and wanted to
36 purchase the land and put a sub-division in that would be home to 8 houses. On all occasions, my father would
37 consult with me Sandy, and Doug since we lived on the property. On ALL occasions, we were both adamant that the
38 property would not be developed.! We loved living in a rural environment, we both worked the land and loved it, and
39 moved here so that we could enjoy having property to grow things, have animals, and our children could have space
40 to run and play.
41

42 Since Doug has moved away from the property, he has lost that vision and is now interested in becoming a landlord.
43 His intent with these town homes is to keep as many as he can so that they will be rentals; thus, insuring him a steady
44 income. We understand that the property will be developed, however it our desire that it will remain 'low, to medium
45 density' housing.
46

47 • During the planning meeting, they proposed a NEED for this kind of development in Roy. I wondered about this,
48 so I took a drive. Within a one-mile radius of our home, we counted over 400 rental units. Many had 'for rent'
49 signs on them. We DO NOT see the need for more rentals!
50

51 • 2700 West is a main thoroughfare. We get a lot of traffic on our street. It is the only main thoroughfare that has a
52 30 MPH speed limit, and people tend to push that limit. Our street is busy enough without adding more 'high
53 density'!

1
2 • Currently there are 22 homes on our street between 5600 S and 4800 S. Adding up to 36 more units. Way too
3 many!
4

5 This is not the first time that this proposal has come before the planing commission and the city council. The first
6 time it was denied! The 2nd proposal was slightly different. The 3rd proposal was for 'medium density' housing. It
7 passed! Great! I am not aware that any of our neighbors opposed the 'medium density' zoning. And now it's come
8 before the council again....?
9

10 Please consider listening to us and all our neighbors that have lived here for so long, and truly care about preserving
11 our little bit of country life that we have left.
12

13 PLEASE oppose 'High Density'!

14
15 Sincerely,

16
17 Bill and Sandy Underwood
18

19 Hello, I support the idea of new townhomes, so people have more housing opportunities in Roy.
20

21 Lori Bunnell (I would love to attend the virtual meeting tomorrow; however, I work every Tuesday night.)
22

23 Hello,
24

25 My name is Sarah Valdez and I live at Royal Wood Condo's on 5270 south 2800 west. Due to my work schedule I
26 am unable to attend the meeting, but I would like to place my vote on the new (Multi-Family Residential) at 5154
27 South 2700 West. I would like to vote YES to building the town houses. I am not concerned with traffic becoming
28 any worse on 2700 west and I take that route daily. Town houses are a great option for people that can't afford the
29 current high prices of single-family homes and for people that would like to downsize. I think it would be great for
30 Roy to have nice looking town houses built in that area.
31

32 Thank you,
33 Sarah Valdez
34

35 Kevin & Randee Mayes
36 5112 S 2700 W
37 Roy, UT 84067
38 801-389-1303
39 kevinm@pipefab.com
40 4/20/2020
41

42 Mayor of Roy and Members of Roy City Council:

43 We have been residents of Roy City for 38 years each, and we are writing to express our concern for the proposed
44 zoning for the property located at 5154 S 2700 W (2nd home south of our residence). This proposal keeps coming
45 before the city, the residents of Roy and neighbors of this property have continued to oppose the construction of high-
46 density housing units here. We have heard the arguments from the professionals that have been brought in to tell us
47 why we "need" to have these units built here, we have heard the Realtor's remarks about the need for "affordable
48 housing" and how each city is supposed to come up with a plan on how to achieve this end. I think Dave Tafoya put
49 it best the last time this was presented to our City Officials, when he said "Roy City is
50 'affordable housing'!".
51

52 We are members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, our ward boundaries currently consist of more
53 than 10 high-density housing complexes, over half of the units in our ward are not single-family homes. From the

1 various positions/callings we have held within the ward, we have become familiar with and know of the strain this
2 many high-density units have put on our neighborhood. Some of these units make for unsafe environments due to the
3 illegal activity that seems to be drawn to them. These proposed units would add further strain to an already stressed
4 neighborhood.

5
6 Lastly, Roy City (as of 2015) was the sixth densest city in Utah, population wise, with an average of 4,806 people
7 per square mile. This is not our vision of Roy and not that of everyone else we have spoken with that lives here as
8 well. I hope that we can start making decisions to move away from these issues rather than compound them. Please
9 do NOT approve this proposal for more high-density units.

10
11 Thank you for serving Roy in all of your roles within our city!

12
13 To the city counsel and Mayor Dandoy.

14 I strongly oppose the rezone for high density housing. I bought my house at 5149 s. 2700 w. so I could live in a nice
15 country setting to be able to have large animals and little farm animals and a garden, and this would make it harder
16 for us getting in and out of our driveway with a truck and horse trailer with the horses in it. And if they are only
17 allowed 2 1/2 parking spaces then the extras would filter out to the main road to where we wouldn't be able park to
18 unload horses on the road if we were not able to pull in the driveway because of heavy traffic due to school kids
19 people going to and coming home from work and trains blocking the intersection. He wanted townhomes before but
20 was shot down a couple times before then he went for the patio homes and he was approved for patio homes and
21 we're fine with that. The traffic is already bad on this road we don't need to add to it. there have been several accidents
22 on this road 2 roll overs, 2 telephone poles taken out, my son has had 2 cars hit on this road just at my end of this
23 section of road. That's not counting the section towards 5600 s. where there have been even more. Emergency vehicles
24 use this road all the time we don't need to add to the congestion. Our little farming community and single-family
25 homes is not the place for high density housing. So, I am asking to please do not rezone to high density housing
26 Wendy Packer

27
28 Dear Roy City Council and Mayor Robert Dandoy I am writing regarding the land proposal for the property on 2700
29 W. and 5200 south. We live directly across the street and have gone to the meetings before and are still against the
30 property be rezoned high density. Traffic congestion would be worse, and we have small children that we are
31 concerned about. We've lived here for over 20 years and would like to keep the tight knit neighborhood we've had,
32 without adding 36 more families to such a little area. Thanks for your time, we hope you will take our thoughts into
33 consideration!
34 Maria Toscano

35
36 12 units per acre? he has 2.8. and requesting VERY HIGH DENSITY. As a city, what do we have to do to satisfy
37 housing requirements of 5-year moderate housing demands at State level requirements compared to the Roy city's
38 current accomplishments? The future land use map dated 4/19/2019 shows MEDIUM density single family
39 residential in our area. At the planning commission meeting, it was an eye opener when there were at least 11 opposed
40 to the zone change compared to 4 in favor BEFORE the planning commission voted on it! Real Estate agent Brenda
41 Nelson said there were 3 housings available, yet the next day I looked online and found 40+. What is Roy's current
42 need vrs. vacancy?

43
44 In December 2017 City Council adopted Focus Roy Plan : Downtown 1900 between 5200 s & 6000 and Front runner
45 station The plan called out for both areas to become mixed-use activity centers, where is the city now with this, as
46 there is plenty of room to build HIGH density units in those areas.

47
48 My concerns are when the tenants get in, they will find with the trains rattling their windows, floor tiles vibrate loose
49 and they won't want to live there.

50
51 Current landowners have dealt with this as well as traffic. How are people going to afford NEW housing if so many
52 are currently homeless, or can barely make rent payments now?

53

1 I strongly oppose the zone change for this Very high density request. We do have a mix zone on our area between
2 4800 and 5600 on 2700 w. The very high density will just not fit in.

3 Kay Petro

4
5 My name is David Tracy, I live at 5125 so. 2700 w.

6 I think the council members could vote not to change the zone from single family, and Mr. Terry could still build
7 houses, just not as many. Roy has too much High Density housing now.

8 Thank you.

9
10 My name is Jonathan Hale and I live at 5005 S 2500 W, Roy, UT 84067

11 Due to my work schedule I am unable to attend the meeting, but I would like to place my vote on the new (Multi-
12 Family Residential) at 5154 South 2700 West. I would like to vote **YES** to building the town houses. I am not
13 concerned with traffic becoming any worse on 2700 west and I think it will be a great addition to our neighborhoods.
14 Town houses are a great option for people that can't afford the current high prices of single-family homes and for
15 people that would like to downsize. I think it would be great for Roy to have nice looking town houses built in that
16 area.

17
18 Thank you, Jonathan Hale

19 Dear Roy City Administration:

20
21 **Re: R.C.C. April 21, 2020 ~ Ord. Nos. 20-4 and 20-5, 5154 S. 2700 W.**

22
23 Please consider this letter in support of the Doug Terry rezone application regarding 5154 S. 2700 W., Roy, Utah. I
24 recently observed and paid for the expensive construction of a 60-foot wide roadway development along 2950 W.
25 near 4600 S. in Roy. I also have an ownership interest in several homes and rental units in Roy City.

26
27 ***If Roy City recognizes an "affordable housing" problem, then Mr. Terry's rezone request, along with similar***
28 ***requests for smaller lot sizes and P.R.U.D.s, should be approved.*** ("Mayor Dandoy explained that the legislators
29 had approved SB 34 addressing affordable housing
30 "<https://www.royutah.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Minutes/02042020-522>

31
32 "The Median household income of a Roy resident is \$60,100 a
33 year." <https://www.bestplaces.net/economy/city/utah/roy>

34 Glossary ~ Affordable housing: An affordable housing units [sic] is defined as a unit in which an owner or tenant
35 pays no more than **30 percent** of their household income toward housing costs. The term is often used to refer to
36 affordable housing for low, very low, and extremely low income groups. Affordable is an adjective modifying
37 housing. <https://gardner.utah.edu/wp-content/uploads/HousingBrief.pdf>. (Emphasis added.)

38
39 Assume a homeowner should be paying about \$1,500 per month for "affordable housing" based on the median Roy
40 City income. With a zero down payment, 30 year mortgage at 4.5%, factoring in insurance, taxes, upkeep, and
41 additional factors, the \$1,500 per month payment could support a \$300,000.00 +/-
42 home. <http://www.frograte.com/mortgage-calculator/>

43
44 The NAHB single family house cost breakdown for 2017 estimates that the "finished lot cost" is 21% of the new
45 home cost. This would translate to just over \$60,000.00 for the building lot for an "affordable" median house in Roy
46 City. <https://www.nahbclassic.org/generic.aspx?genericContentID=260013>

47
48 The typical R-1-8 lot in Roy City for 2020 likely exceeds \$90,000.00. The roadway/improvement costs likely exceed
49 \$500 per running foot for a the typical 60-foot wide roadway in an R-1-8 subdivision.

50 How would one reduce the building lot price by 1/3 (\$90,000 to \$60,000) to accommodate an
51 "affordable" Roy City house for the "median" household?

52 How could Roy accommodate about 1/2 of the prospective homebuyers functioning below the median
53 income level?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

If "affordable housing" is deemed to be a problem in Roy City, one approach to the problem would be to allow smaller lots and more P.R.U.D.'s with narrower roadways. The Doug Terry application would be one step in the right direction under these circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

--
Robert J. Fuller, JD, MBA
Fuller Law Office, LC
rob@fullerattorney.com
1090 N 5900 E
Post Box 835
Eden, Utah 84310
801 791-7736

Developer CC&Rs are typically submitted at the time of development. If these CC&R's call out "no rentals" it greatly increases the likelihood that that these would not later be changed by owners of these units. Will the city be reviewing the developer CC&Rs as part of the development approval package? (lapage65@aol.com)

The comments that were emailed were forwarded to the City Council prior to the beginning of the meeting to review.

Councilmember Saxton asked for the square foot of the units. Janae Terry explained that they would be 1500 to 2000 square feet with three bedrooms and two bathrooms. Councilmember Wilson stated that this project was a dilemma. She explained that the property owners had a right to develop as they wished but that nearby property owners also had rights. She added that the Council had to look at whether the request was reasonable, which she thought was the case here.

Councilmember Wilson moved to approve Resolution Ordinance 20-4. Councilmember Saxton seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Councilmember Jackson, Saxton and Wilson voted "Aye." Councilmembers Paul and Burrell voted "Nay." The motion passed.

Councilmember Saxton asked about the logic and thinking of the Planning Commission when they recommended approval. Mr. Parkinson explained that Staff had looked at balancing the rights of property owners as well as the rights of those around it. He explained that many needs had to be balanced.

Councilmember Saxton moved to approve Resolution Ordinance 20-5. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Councilmember Jackson, Saxton and Wilson voted "Aye." Councilmembers Paul and Burrell voted "Nay." The motion passed.

F. Public Comments

1. James Carpenter

Mr. Carpenter thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak. He stated wishing to speak about the Form Based Code. He explained that he was speaking on behalf of the Utah Sign Association. The goal of the Association, he added, was to work for beneficial and enforceable sign regulation. He further mentioned that some of the concerns the Association had was that the proposed changes did not support the economic vitality of local businesses, particularly during these unprecedented economic times. The proposed changes, he continued, decreased the amount of signage allowed. The Association, he continued, would not support such a reduction. Due to these issues, the Association recommended that the Form based Code did not make any changes to sign regulations.

2. Nancy Faulkner

1
2 Ms. Faulkner explained that she would like for the ordinance concerning the Terrys property to pass. The younger
3 people, she continued, needed updated dwellings.
4

5 **3. Kevin Homer**

6
7 Mr. Homer thanked the Council for implementing the technology allowing for the meetings to continue. He explained
8 that he had often been out of town for business or pleasure and had missed being able to be a part of these meetings.
9 He explained that the City should think about how to transition out the restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 crisis.
10 He stated that it would be beneficial to continue holding meetings online. His other suggestion, he added, was to
11 make the meeting a little more interactive. He asked whether the work session would continue Zoom. Mayor Dandoy
12 explained that the work session would continue Zoom in a separate session.
13

14 **4. Dennis Brown**

15
16 Mr. Brown explained he and his wife had been long-time residents of Roy. He stated that the Form Based Code
17 proposed was concerning. He pointed to an area where residents were allowed (A and B area) and added that this
18 would take space away from businesses, and thus sales tax. Secondly, he was concerned about the landscaping for
19 trees. He explained that he had sold a property on 1900 West which now had orchards. He added that during the
20 time he owned the property, the trees pushed the sidewalks which required extra maintenance. He mentioned that he
21 would prefer to see the City use their mixed-use requirements. He concluded with the opinion that allowing high-
22 density housing in the downtown area was not a good idea.
23

24 **5. Joe Fowler**

25
26 Mr. Fowler explained that his family owned the Burger Bar. He stated that he appreciated the opportunity to speak.
27 He mentioned that he had found the information provided by Councilmember Wilson on the topic of FBC to be
28 helpful. He explained that his family was not excited about this development as they believed it would hurt businesses
29 in Roy. He pointed to Layton, which had medians in the road and forced residents to make U-Turns and lowered the
30 number of customers coming. He added that the upkeep and the maintenance would also be factor. His own business
31 would have to restrict what it could build due to all the codes. He provided a specific example. He mentioned that
32 Roy should not try to be Park City and that doing so would be harmful in the long run. He asked the Council to
33 oppose FBC and go with a mixed-use code.
34

35 **6. Melissa Schmidt**

36
37 Ms. Schmidt thanked the Council for opportunity to speak. She explained that she was speaking on behalf of the
38 McDonald's corporation, specifically the franchise located on 5413 South 1900 West. Her comments, she continued,
39 related to FBC. She mentioned there were concerns on restrictions placed for future reinvestments. She explained
40 that these restrictions impacted the business' ability to make sales. Furthermore, the top concern with the draft, she
41 added, was the signage as it reduced visibility and would turn the drive-thru a reverse one. She mentioned that the
42 drive-thru currently represented 79% of the sales, and that with the virus, this income was a must. The setback, she
43 added, would force the McDonald's to lose it bypass lane making it more inconvenient for customers to exit the site.
44 The location, she continued, had been serving the community for 48 years. She added that the restaurant had the first
45 playland and drive-thru in Utah. The operators, she continued, were involved in the community, supported local
46 sports, and hosted annual work parties at the Roy Aquatic Center. If FBC went through, she continued, the franchise
47 would no longer be viable. She continued that there was a plan for an interior remodel but that with the restrictions
48 potentially placed on the business by FBC, this might no longer be an option as it would reduce sales possibly making
49 the business not longer viable. She concludes that, as a landowner, McDonalds requested that the Council oppose
50 FBC.
51

52 **7. Jim Sachs**

53

1 Mr. Sachs explained that he owned the Common Cents store since 2001. He explained enjoying the community and
2 pointed that he had been involved in everything from design to construction. He explained that he had always avoided
3 FBC in potential developments. He added that he had given up a location in Riverton because of FBC and had looked
4 at other areas which he had not chosen because of FBC. He explained he did not find the design inviting to customers.
5 Moreover, he explained, a remodel to the car wash or anything else on the property would not be accomplished as
6 FBC would make it very cost prohibitive.

7
8 Jim Sachs requested a letter be kept as part of his comments as well.

9
10 Mr. Mayor and Council Members,

11
12 Our Common Cents Store located on the corner of 1900 West and 5600 South has been in operation for nineteen
13 years this spring. For us, serving the citizen of Roy has been a pleasure. We would like to thank you for the
14 opportunity the City of Roy has provided to our Company - we respect your process and wish to share our thoughts
15 on the proposed form-based code.

16
17 We generally would oppose the prospect of having to deal with that code in the long term. Some aspects do seem
18 appealing, like the prospect of mixed use adding more citizens living close to our store, others do not seem appealing.
19 In the desire to keep this brief we would like to provide bullet points to address our concerns. They are as follows:

- 20
- 21 • We do fear having to eventually adhere to FBC. Where development becomes more off a center facing little
22 business park. While a small business park may work for some independent and boutique shops, there is not
23 enough traffic generated for a multi-million-dollar investment. It literally is like trying to do business with a
24 person with your back to them.
 - 25 • We would be greatly concerned by the lack of immediate and easy access to our facility. To the point we
26 would likely never develop in a form-based code environment. We have been in the land use business for
27 the course of our existence and can't imagine a venue were FBC would be beneficial for our business model.
 - 28 • While we think that a pedestrian retail area may be inviting in parts of Roy. For example, east of our location
29 the proposed road additions may not be all that high traffic which may be more suitable for FBC. The mere
30 fact that there are 50K+ cars on the corner of 1900 West and 5600 South daily would make you think that
31 increased pedestrian traffic may be conflicting.
 - 32 • We have heard discussion as to the importance of form vs. function. We think this may be the real issue with
33 FBC. Those in favor of FBC may tell you form is more important. Neither with business nor people would
34 that be true. Form and appeal do matter, but the business must function to meet expenses and the investment
35 has to make sense.
 - 36 • We are concerned that medians and landscaping on 1900 West and 5600 South would cause additional
37 congestion on an already busy corner potentially diminishing our current ingress and egress. Maybe one
38 solution would be to carve out higher traffic areas.
 - 39 • Our thoughts on FBC are that it removes individuality, limits collaboration with city and the private sector,
40 and gives decision making to a small group of administrators. For these reasons FBC, in some parts of Roy,
41 could move business investment to other jurisdictions.

42 We wanted to share a few of our concerns today before tonight's meeting and your discussions on FBC. We thank
43 you for taking the time to hear and consider our concerns.

44
45 Sincerely

46 James Sachs, Director of Operations

47 Michael Bendt, Operations Manager

48
49 **G. Presentations**

- 50
51 1. Matt Andrews - FY 2021 Budget Proposals

1 Mr. Andrews shared his screen. He explained that he had detailed a strategic plan showing the City's goals. He read
2 a statement explaining that Roy City existed to enhance the quality of life of all members of the community through
3 planning, visionary leadership, and the highest quality of municipal services in an efficient and courteous manner.
4 He added that these goals were achieved through strategic directives. Because of the current situation caused by
5 COVID-19, the economic impact was unknown. He pointed that sales tax numbers were difficult to gauge. He
6 continued that the budget needed to be built in an adaptive way and added that it only took the city 10 days to modify
7 the City budget. Furthermore, he explained that the City was expecting impact to roads and sales tax. He continued
8 that some forecasts were predicting an economic boom coming out of this situation while others suggested a 30%
9 decrease in sales tax. He continued that the City was preparing plans for both these situations.

10
11 Mr. Andrews explained that the intent of the discussion was to give the City an idea of where the budget was at with
12 the strategic directives. Before allowing funds for expenditures, he added, there needed to be more clarity about the
13 economic impact. He continued that the tentative budget had to be submitted to the Council by May 5, 2020. He
14 continued that the budget had to be adopted by June 16, 2020, though the State might prolong these deadlines.

15
16 The Council had no questions.

17
18 Mayor Dandoy explained that Weber County was planning on making an announcement that there would be a soft
19 opening taking place on May 1, 2020. He added that for some time there would not be larger openings and added he
20 felt this would be the case for the Summer City Council meetings. He continued that, according to the Governor, full
21 openings and Council meetings might not happen until September. Keeping the Complex and Aquatic Center closed,
22 he added, would prevent the City from making revenue: these two centers became merely expenses. He continued
23 that the County and the State were discussing reopening some businesses on May 1, 2020, though big gatherings
24 were far away, he added.

25
26 Mayor Dandoy recapitulated what Mr. Andrews had explained.

27
28 Councilmember Wilson asked whether the budget deadline came from the State or if it had been decided based on
29 the Council having a meeting. Mr. Andrews explained that the budget could be approved during the first meeting,
30 but, by law, it had to be adopted prior to the end of the fiscal year: June 22, 2020. Councilmember Wilson asked if
31 the Council could meet in person while also social distancing. She was told that if such a meeting were held, it would
32 have to be open to the public which was not yet allowed.

33 34 **H. City Manager's Report**

- 35
36 • Summer hours to be starting on May 26th

37
38 Mr. Andrews explained that these hours should be started on May 26, 2020: M-TH from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and
39 F from 7:30 a.m. until 11:30 p.m. He pointed that the Offices were still open by appointment only and mentioned
40 that the City wanted to keep both population and employees safe.

- 41
42 • Police and Fire Department

43
44 Mr. Andrews explained that there had been food donations for the Police department. He explained that the Police
45 and Fire Department had a system where if someone had a birthday, they would get a drive by as the pandemic had
46 been hard on children during their birthdays.

- 47
48 • Construction

49
50 Mr. Andrews explained that the I-15 lanes were being expanded upon. As a result, there would be additional noise
51 and construction in the area. He added that everything was done to keep the project on schedule and pointed that the
52 reduced traffic had been helpful.

53

- Surplus

Mr. Andrews explained that when it came to surplus, the City had to have a public auction anytime it got rid of anything over \$100. He explained that the City used publicsurpluscom. This was the most successful avenue to do so, he pointed. When more expensive items were sold, he continued, the City used KSL ads. He added that publicsurpluscom charged the buyer a 10% fee.

- National League of Cities conference in Washington DC

Mr. Andrews explained that a month and a half ago, he and a couple of councilmembers had attended the NCL Conference. There, he continued, they had learned about infrastructure. He mentioned that all infrastructure was eventually due for repairs and replacement. He explained that the 5600 corridor had been discussed and added that the Mayor and Council had been heavily advocating for these repairs to be completed. He continued that they were able to meet with some of the Utah representatives there. He added that the Mayor of Washington DC had recommended that cities come together, work together, and play together. He added that affordable housing had also been a big topic. Attendees, he continued, had been able to talk with vendors.

I. Mayor & Council Report

Councilmember Saxton stated that work on the Municipal Park had started. He added that he hoped the work would be completed before the new school year began. He pointed that the Park had already been budgeted. Mr. Andrews clarified that the Park was part of the Capital Projects' fund and was therefore rolled from year to year. Councilmember Saxton continued that he had been working with several of Roy's businesses in trying to get them through the crisis and preventing them from closing. He added that some of these businesses might be applying for small business loans with the City.

Councilmember Jackson stated that she wished to thank the Staff as they always seemed to be ahead of what was happening. She continued that they had been responsive to employees as well as their families and cared for citizens. She mentioned having received a request from a citizen asking if there was anywhere on the City site listing which business was open and which was not. The citizen also wanted to know how they could best support Roy City's businesses. Mr. Andrews stated that this work had been begun on Facebook. Councilmember Jackson explained that it would be good if said businesses were linked electronically.

Mayor Dandoy explained that other cities were not planning on holding big events. He stated that guidance was needed from the City manager. He mentioned that Roy Days had been an institution in the City, however, this year might be different. Mayor Dandoy stated that the biggest concern now was that if one or two cities canceled, while other did not, there would be consequences. He explained that decisions would be based on recommendations from the Health Department but also noted that he needed a deadline as to when Staff would make a final decision. He explained it was not beneficial to spend money on planning an event that would later be canceled. He continued that Miss Roy would be an important event to maintain in some fashion.

Councilmember Paul stated that Bountiful, which he thought of as Roy's sister city, had canceled their own events. Mayor Dandoy stated that some sources had mentioned that large gatherings would not happen until September. Councilmember Burrell explained that the Council might want to make a quick decision about gatherings and let the public know that this was an extenuating circumstance, and that the City was not canceling the events for ever. Mr. Andrews explained that thinking about having 10,000 individuals in the Roy West Park sounded hard to believe considering the circumstances. He pointed again that the budget had to be adaptable. He mentioned that the Roy Days celebrations were highly unlikely to take place. Councilmember Burrell stated that the recommendation that traditional celebrations would not take place needed to happen rather soon. Mayor Dandoy asked that a recommendation be made to the Council by May 5, 2020.

Mayor Dandoy mentioned the UDOT study. Mr. Andrews explained that UDOT would come to the Council's chambers during the last meeting of May and added that the first meeting would concern the tentative budget while

1 the last one would address the impact study.

2

3 Councilmember Wilson explained that her neighborhood had been concerned about senior graduates. She stated that
4 she hoped Staff was thinking about ways to celebrate the graduates. Councilmember Paul stated that it was a difficult
5 moment for HS seniors. Councilmember Wilson stated that the administration was planning on placing individual
6 signs for each senior with their names displayed. She added that it would be fantastic to display a banner over the
7 freeway. Mayor Dandoy stated that this could be done and asked for more ideas on how the City could celebrate its
8 seniors.

9

10 Mayor Dandoy stated that data showed Roy City had 23 COVID-19 cases. He continued having received a letter
11 from the YCC which had asked for funding for its programs. Considering the nature of the current situation, he
12 continued, the Council had to think about this.

13

14 Mayor Dandoy stated that the 5700 South speed humps were scheduled to be improved: a plan had been laid out.

15

16 Mayor Dandoy explained that one of the last remaining components of the Assisted Living facility was to check the
17 noise on the emergency generator. He continued that the City had acquired the noise meter. Once the test completed,
18 the facility would make sure to fulfill the noise requirements. Councilmember Paul explained that one of issues when
19 testing the noise level was ambient traffic noises

20

21 **J. Adjournment**

22

23 **Councilmember Jackson moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Burrell seconded the motion.**

24 **All Councilmember voted “Aye.” The meeting was adjourned at 7:59 PM.**

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

Robert Dandoy, Mayor

34

35 Attest:

36

37

38 _____
Morgan Langholz, City Recorder

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

1 APRIL 21, 2020 – 5:30 P.M.

2
3 ZOOM MEETING WITH LIVE STREAMING ON YOUTUBE
4

5 **A. Welcome & Roll Call**

6
7 Mayor Dandoy called the work session to order and noted those who were present. Councilmember Saxton recused
8 himself of the meeting.
9

10 **B. Discussion Items**

11
12 **1. PRESENTATION – Councilmember Diane Wilson**

13
14 The meeting began after City Council adjourned at 8:00 pm.
15

16 **C. Adjournment**

17
18 **Councilmember Burrell motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 PM. Councilmember Jackson seconded the**
19 **motion. All Councilmembers voted “Aye.” The motion carried.**
20
21
22

23
24 _____
Robert Dandoy, Mayor

25
26 Attest:

27
28 _____
29 Morgan Langholf, City Recorder