



ROY CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA (ELECTRONIC)

MAY 4, 2021 – 5:30 P.M.

No physical meeting location will be available. This meeting will be streamed live on the Roy City YouTube channel. <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC6zdmDzxdOSW6veb2XpzCNA>

A. Welcome & Roll Call

B. Moment of Silence

C. Pledge of Allegiance

D. Consent Items

(These items are considered by the City Council to be routine and will be enacted by a single motion. If discussion is desired on any particular consent item, that item may be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately)

1. Approval of the February 23, 2021 Roy City Council Work Session Minutes

E. Public Comments *If you would like to make a comment during this portion of our meeting on ANY topic you will need to email admin@royutah.org to request access to the ZOOM chat. Otherwise please join us by watching the live streaming at <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC6zdmDzxdOSW6veb2XpzCNA>*

This is an opportunity to address the Council regarding concerns or ideas on any topic. To help allow everyone attending this meeting to voice their concerns or ideas, please consider limiting the amount of time you take. We welcome all input and recognize some topics make take a little more time than others. If you feel your message is complicated and requires a lot of time to explain, then feel free to email your thoughts to admin@royutah.org. Your information will be forwarded to all council members and a response will be provided.

F. Presentation

1. Budget Proposal FY 2022- Camille Cook

G. Discussion Items

1. Aquatic Center 2021 Season Fees
2. COVID Safety Precautions

H. City Manager & Council Report

I. Adjournment

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing auxiliary communicative aids and services for these meetings should contact the Administration Department at (801) 774-1020 or by email: admin@royutah.org at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

Public meetings will be held electronically in accordance with Utah Code Section 52-4-210 et seq., Open and Public Meetings Act. Pursuant to a written determination by the Mayor finding that conducting the meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present due to the infectious and potentially dangerous nature of COVID -19 virus appropriate physical distancing in City Council Chambers is not achievable at this time accordingly, the meeting will be held electronically with no anchor location.



Pursuant to Section 52-4-7.8 (1)(e) and (3)(B)(ii) “Electronic Meetings” of the Open and Public Meetings Law, Any Councilmember may participate in the meeting via teleconference, and such electronic means will provide the public body the ability to communicate via the teleconference.

Certificate of Posting

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted in a public place within the Roy City limits on this 30th day of April. A copy was also provided to the Standard Examiner and posted on the Roy City Website and Utah Public Notice Website on the 30th day of April, 2021.

Morgan Langholf
City Recorder

Visit the Roy City Web Site @ www.royutah.org
Roy City Council Agenda Information – (801) 774-1020



ROY CITY
Roy City Council Work Session
February 23, 2021 –5:30 p.m.
Roy City Council Chambers
5051 South 1900 West

Minutes of the Roy City Council Work Session held via ZOOM on February 23, 2021 at 5:30 p.m.

Notice of the meeting was provided to the Utah Public Notice Website at least 24 hours in advance. A copy of the agenda was posted.

The following members were in attendance:

Mayor Robert Dandoy
Councilmember Jan Burrell
Councilmember Joe Paul
Councilmember Bryon Saxton
Councilmember Diane Wilson
Councilmember Ann Jackson

City Manager, Matt Andrews
City Attorney, Andy Blackburn
City Planner, Steve Parkinson

Also present were: City Recorder, Morgan Langholf; Randy Sant,

A. Welcome & Roll Call

Mayor Pro Tem Jan Burrell welcomed those in attendance and noted Councilmembers Paul, Saxton, Jackson, and Wilson were present. She explained that the items for discussion were economic and commercial development, the setback, and the building height. She outlined the meeting guidelines. She stated that the meeting would last a maximum of one hour, and all of the comments would be limited to two to three minutes.

B. Discussion

1. Proposed Mixed Use in Downtown District

Mayor Pro Tem Jan Burrell explained that they had recently seen a presentation about the recent survey results. It was noted that information was only from 800 residents, but that the margin of error for the entire City was only 3% which indicated that the results were significant. She started the discussion by noting that the first thing they had asked was about economic and commercial development.

Councilmember Diane Wilson stated that economic development was a very important topic and that seemed to be the number one goal of the project. 82% of citizens from the survey felt that it was the priority. The different types of development were briefly discussed, as were the survey results about which type of development was desired. She expressed that desires for commercial, and especially destination commercial, had been built up because of the pandemic. She stated that they needed market studies to know where and what type of businesses would be appropriate for the area. She relayed some conversations she had with different developers. It was noted that ground floor commercial did not attract destination and that parking was essential. She discusses some parking issues that affected commercial options. She recommended that they obtained further market studies so they could truly meet the number one goal of economic development.

Councilmember Joe Paul addressed things that dealt with both economic development and building height. He thought that there were misconceptions and fears that there would be a bunch of 80 foot buildings that lined the road and made it into a tunnel. He explained the different ways to build out mixed use commercial areas that mitigated that fear, and he mentioned some examples in Ogden. He discussed the potential

buildings that would be tall, and said that they would be located in different spots and not right next to each other. He discussed market trends and their effects on malls and strip malls. He wanted to make sure that people understood that he did not see the street lined with tall buildings on either side that created a tunnel feel.

Another important piece to look at was that the people wanted change. The City had to move in some direction in order to meet those desires. Based on the survey what the people wanted was economic development. As a City, they had to in some way attract those developers who had the funding and ability to develop. The desires of those developers were to be able to develop mixed use spaces.

There was further discussion about how that downtown area had always been zoned commercial and there had subsequently been no growth. The consensus was that they needed to do something to initiate the change that the people desired. Parking was also discussed. It was expressed that the citizens did not necessarily see parking as an issue, but that the developers required more parking in order to encourage more use of the commercial developments.

It was stated that they simply needed to decide because they needed to add in creating an environment that made business want to come to Roy. Commercial growth and economic development were needed in order to meet the City's needs. The City needed to have data to know where destination commercial could go. The City needed to respect the citizens that did not want it. There was further discussion on the matter.

Mayor Pro Tem Jan Burrell said that they needed to move forward. She suggested that they take as much as they could off of the current document and move forward with the possibility of studies and additions in the future. That way they could determine what areas would be the best for commercial over the next few years while still having something in place to move forward from.

Councilmember Joe Paul noted that Riverdale had attracted a lot of the commercial developments that Roy had originally hoped to attract because they had something to offer. He stated that Roy currently did not have anything to offer on 1900 West. The Council discussed the development possibilities for 1900 West, and that most things would be better than what was there now. They agreed that things needed to change. It was said that they needed to change the attract ability in order for developers to come in and change the feel.

The conversation moved onto height. It was communicated that give or take 72% of the citizens felt that the maximum height should be 60 feet. The Council discussed the option of a building height limit of 60 feet with a variance of 20 feet.

City Planner Steve Parkinson reminded that the ordinance already addressed the setback. He stated that they also could not be vague if they went conditional. The information had to be specific and to the point. He expressed that the issue with conditional uses was that Councils in general were too vague, and that the State came down hard on it. Developers needed to have precise conditions.

Council looked at the general feel in reference to where the buildings were located and how far off of 1900 West they were. Ogden Junction and Clearfield Junction were both referenced. People liked the feel of Ogden Junction but did not like that of Clearfield Junction. Councilmember Diane Wilson outlined some points presented to her by a developer in regard to stories and heights. It was reiterated that 72% of people wanted 60 foot or less, and half of that wanted 40 foot or less. She said that her concerns with the 80 foot variance was how to keep it consistent and that it was not really a compromise. She believed there was benefit with a 60 foot maximum.

There was further discussion among Councilmembers about the potential for a hotel, and the fact that the

survey did not address where an 80 foot building would be. They discussed the high school and the IHC buildings. They also asked City Planner Steve Parkinson how they would address the issue of location for a tall building. The Council discussed potential phrasing to make sure the requirements were stated clearly and provided the necessary space. They also discussed what citizens were okay with in regard to building height, as well as what setback would provide the best feel.

Mayor Pro Tem Jan Burrell stated that she felt that the setback needed to allow for a building and that it needed to be worded to say off of 1900 West, but that it did not have to be 300 feet. Councilmember Diane Wilson relayed a developer's comment that the absolute worst problem for the project was to have it too close to the road, and that they needed to allow easier access to attract traveling customers.

Councilmember Joe Paul discussed the Harmons building and its setback. He noted other options to avoid the tunnel feel. Councilmembers briefly talked about the hotel study that had been done in 2019, and that it was 60 foot. They also agreed that a 300 setback was too big.

The Council discussed what would be a good setback for a potential hotel or office building. It was noted that parking was currently not included in the setback. They determined that if they wrote it out they would have to say what the setback was, but they could allow smaller buildings or parking in the setback. City Planner Steve Parkinson said that the ordinance was written to a particular document that wanted everything up front, and that they would have to rewrite the entire thing if they wanted to now say that parking was in the front versus side or rear. City Planner Steve Parkinson communicated that the current setback in the current zone was 20 feet. He said he would have to figure out how to legally write it out to allow for parking and small buildings in the setback per the Councilmembers request.

It was stated that what a lot of developers did when they built higher buildings was put their parking in the core of the middle of the building. That way the parking was contained within the development.

Councilmember Joe Paul suggested a setback of 20 feet for a 60 foot building, and then added an extra 10 foot for 10 foot of height. This would give a 40 foot setback for an 80 foot building. He then discussed the three potential locations for that type of building.

Mayor Pro Tem Jan Burrell inquired how citizens could get the development that they wanted within what they wanted the look to be. She mentioned that they did not want a building higher than 60 foot to be right on 1900 West.

Councilmember Bryon Saxton commented that he did not know how they could create any kind of high density project along 1900 West. He acknowledged that they had put a lot of time and effort into this project, but noted that the commercial property over by Harmons was prime commercial property. He said that it was vacant, and could have been put at the 60 foot level that was already available there.

It was commented that there was no mixed use available in the location Councilmember Bryon Saxton referred to. Councilmember Bryon Saxton acknowledged that, and noted that was his issue with this whole thing. He discussed who would stay in those apartments, and said that he did not see the people in that area living there. Councilmember Joe Paul disagreed. He mentioned that he had a conversation with one of the citizens who had emailed some concerns, and the individual had acknowledged that the explanation made a lot of sense. He expressed the importance of explaining the issue to people to help them understand. Councilmember Bryon Saxton asked how a matchbox type of development would revitalize 1900 West. The Councilmembers debated the quality of the developments and what people in those areas wanted.

Councilmember Diane Wilson talked about how it would be good to balance the developers' needs to make money, which was desired, and also balance the needs of the citizens. She said that they wanted property

owners to have rights, but still needed to do it reasonably to balance between citizens and property owners. She stated that she felt that citizens would be disappointed with a 40 foot setback and an 80 foot building.

There were comments about the consensus in a previous meeting to adopt something, and then be able to adjust it if they saw fit. There was reference to what had been done with car washes and some subsequent discussion about it.

Councilmember Diane Wilson asked what was wrong with a 60 foot height cap, since that would be a solution that citizens would be happy with while also allowing the developers a nice amount of extra space. Councilmembers discussed how 60 foot would be fine, but that developers would want more than that.

Councilmember Joe Paul declared that if he was a developer and listened to this meeting, there was no way he would come to Roy. He expressed that people were insulting developers, and that once again they would be walking out of a meeting with no decision made. Councilmember Joe Paul stated that they did not have affordable housing in Roy. He explained that mixed use provided affordable housing and gave people opportunities. There was a comment that was not necessarily true unless it was subsidized. Councilmember Joe Paul expressed frustration that they had not come to a decision on the topic.

City Planner Steve Parkinson discussed that in regard to affordable housing it came to supply and demand. He explained that if there was a large supply housing went down, and if there was a shortage it went up. He further explained that if they all of a sudden allowed significantly more units than what was currently there, then prices would go down. He said that Roy did not have more land and prices would skyrocket if they did not do something different.

Councilmember Bryon Saxton acknowledged City Planner Steve Parkinson's statement about affordable housing, however he reiterated his previous question about how it would revitalize Roy. City Planner Steve Parkinson noted that the plan said that there would be up to 1,000 residentials in the area, as well as 350,000 to 400,000 square feet of office space, and an additional 150,000 to 200,000 square feet of commercial. It was also noted that because of the land size and restrictions there, it was likely that they would only have two to four residential projects in the area and that would most likely be on the east side of 1900 West.

The question was raised of City Planner Steve Parkinson as to how much of a rewrite it would take to make the setback far enough that they did not have it right on 1900 West. City Planner Steve Parkinson discussed some phrasing options dependent on building size. Councilmember Bryon Saxton said that if they gave developers the ability to go to 80 foot, that they would likely take it and the Council would lose control of the project. It was then noted that if it was setback far enough that the Council was okay with it, then that was not a loss of control.

Councilmember Diane Wilson replied that if they put that in, they would definitely want a significant setback to appease the citizens. They discussed the potential for the setback to be 100 foot, and talked about what could be put in the setback. It was clarified that the 100 feet away from 1900 West versus the setback would be different. There was further discussion about the specifications of a 100 foot setback. Some Councilmembers felt that a 100 foot setback for an 80 foot building was reasonable. They discussed whether this would appease citizen and developer desires. It was stated that citizens did not want an 80 foot building.

Previous comments about creating an attractive environment to create economic growth and change were reiterated. They discussed the caveat that City Planner Steve Parkinson would put into the ordinance. Councilmember Joe Paul asked if they could do a work session before the next Council meeting so City Planner Steve Parkinson could bring back the updated information for them to look at. Councilmembers agreed.

Mayor Pro Tem Jan Burrell asked if there was anything else that they wanted to discuss.

Councilmember Diane Wilson said that they should also discuss the actual setback and outlined the survey results about it. She relayed that the current building setback was 10 foot, but that approximately half of the citizens wanted it to be greater than 20 foot. She thought that a 15 foot setback was a nice compromise. It was clarified that the 15 foot setback would be from Riverdale to 5600 since there was more space, and the rest would remain the same. Councilmember Joe Paul brought up that the change in the setback to be inconsistent all the way around would probably raise some questions.

Councilmember Bryon Saxton's preference was clarified that he wanted only commercial and no residential downtown. Other Councilmembers did not feel that there was enough commercial to fill that. Councilmember Bryon Saxton expressed concern that once they lost it they would not be able to get it back. He said that Roy was actually doing better with economic development than other Cities. Councilmember Joe Paul asked Councilmember Bryon Saxton to clarify if the money was generated within the City or if it was generated because their population gave them more. It was noted that two thirds came from the population, and that sales tax in Utah in general had been inking over the past year. A lot of the City's sales revenue came from the four grocery stores.

Councilmember Joe Paul reminded that he had sent an email out on December 1st, and communicated that the City still had over 1,000 acres of commercial only land even if this regional commercial went 100% residential. He said that they still had a lot of portions of the City that were still commercial.

It was stated that the current ordinance mandated at least ground floor commercial. The general consensus among Councilmembers was that that was a compromise. After subsequent discussion, the Councilmembers agreed that they would have the work session before the next meeting to review City Planner Steve Parkinson's changes.

C. **Adjournment**

Councilmember Burrell Motioned to Adjourn the City Council Work Session meeting at 7:00 p.m. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. All Councilmembers voted "aye." The motion carried.

Robert Dandoy
Mayor

Attest:

Morgan Langholf
City Recorder

dc: