



ROY CITY
Planning Commission Work-Session
March 23, 2021 – 6:00 p.m.
Digital Regular Meeting

The meeting was a regularly scheduled work-session designated by resolution. Notice of the meeting was provided to the *Standard Examiner* at least 24 hours in advance. A copy of the agenda was posted.

The following members were in attendance:

Ryan Cowley, Chair
Don Ashby
Torriss Brand
Chris Collins
Annette Mifflin
Claude Payne
Jason Sphar

Steve Parkinson, City Planner

Excused: Commissioners Samantha Bills, Jason Felt and Assistant City Attorney, Brody Flint

Chair Ryan Cowley made the following statement:

I, Ryan Cowley, Chair of the Roy City Planning Commission and in accordance with Utah Code Section 52-3-207(4) have determined that conducting a meeting in the Roy City Council Chambers presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who would be present, the basis for this determination is that due to the infectious nature and potentially dangerous health effect of contracting the COVID-19 virus there is not sufficient space in the Council Chambers to provide appropriate safe physical distancing for the safety individuals who would attend. Accordingly, the March 23, 2021 meeting will be held electronically without an anchor location.

Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Torriss Brand

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT

There were none.

2. DISCUSSION ON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Steve Parkinson, City Planner, briefly discussed the City's intent to discuss this item more last fall, when they had originally anticipated the pandemic to have slowed down. However, since that had not been the case, they decided to move forward at this time instead. He encouraged residents to participate in this process by visiting the City's website which had more information on the matter, as well as a place where comments could be submitted.

Mr. Parkinson presented several pages of updates to the General Plan that he had sent to Commissioners prior to this meeting.

Mr. Parkinson then relayed a public comment submitted by Stacey Herpel in relation to traffic calming along 3100 West. Ms. Herpel wrote:

Looking at your plan for our neighborhood, can you please add traffic calming on 3100 west as well as a greenway on 3100 west instead of side streets behind us? I would really like to improve this street because of the look already and the potential addition to new housing a block away. We would be more

than happy to sacrifice the front part of our property to the city for added trees. I feel that this street is hugely used by the school bus system, as a pass way through to other parts of the town, pedestrians, and bikes and would be safer and more appealing to upgrade this street not just the neighborhoods behind this street since they do not see as much traffic as 3100 west.

Mr. Parkinson noted that the Transportation Plan—a separate document that is still a part of the General Plan—discusses traffic calming devices. He stated there were some traffic calming devices along 6000 South and 3100 West for which the City had received grant money. These funds would come into play in 2024.

There was discussion pertaining to the particular locations identified by Ms. Herpel. Commissioner Torris Brand requested that she send a Google map to the Commissioners so they had a clearer idea of what exactly they were proposing in their request. He stated that this information would help the Commission in the decision-making process.

Mr. Parkinson presented a public comment from Allen King. Mr. King wrote:

I moved to Roy from Nashville three years ago and live at 5300S 2100W in an owner occupied duplex built in 1959. I chose this location for proximity to essential shopping and access to public transport to West Gate Hill AFB. I'm legally blind, so I walk "everywhere," typically 3-8 miles every day in Roy City.

I like the proposals in the presentation. I have several comments, cautions and a direct rebuke for the presentation itself. The presentation has visual appeal with an understated color scheme and design theme. But misinformation is useless. Roy City is not defined by an international border, and railways have a commonly used map symbol that went unused. The colors, fonts and complex shading schemes do not meet ADA standards for web and app design. You should know better.

The incomplete sidewalks were addressed. This issue is an indication of Roy City lax code enforcement. For example the recent addition of a fuel island at the Harmon's Shopping Center should not have been approved without including ADA access and routing to the complex from the nearest public transportation bus stop. Compliance to ADA is limited by law to 20% of a remodeling budget and new commercial projects are never exempt.

Roy City recently upgraded Municipal Park but has failed to comply with ADA way funding and signage, for example on toilet room entrances.

One of the most outrageous pedestrian obstacles in Roy is the irrigation both private and public. As Roy, and Weber/ Davis altogether prepare for population growth the waste of any water will quickly become a critical issue. Currently it is a nuisance to pedestrians, and sometimes an unacceptable life safety hazard. In a recent trip, after dark, to the 7/11 on 5600 from my house I had to walk in the unlit street 6 times to avoid irrigation soaking sidewalks and as far as 8 feet into the street. On 5600 where extensive traffic lane diversion is in place I was forced to walk in the single traffic lane to avoid getting soaked. My visual impairment cannot differentiate between a car headlights and the highly reflective traffic cones and the brilliant flashing reflection from business signs and the Roy Jr School sign which illuminates my whole neighborhood with intermittent 24 hrs flashing. Even the irrigation at the Roy City Office/Courthouse over sprays into the street and causes a significant fully wash daily.

In Nashville irrigation water entering a storm drain resulted in significant fines and third time offenders were disconnected from the water supply. High density development strains sewer systems more quickly than supply systems.

I believe the proposal should include the recommendation to comply with existing codes. Obviously Roy City needs to include enforcement capacity to achieve any of your proposals.

On a good day I just have to step into traffic at the crosswalk at 2100/5600. People get angry and blow their horns, but it's their problem in the end. I first encountered intersection bump outs in Louisville, Ky where the broad downtown streets encouraged speeding. At intersections the curb and sidewalk extended to the edge of the parking lanes. This reduced the length of crosswalks by two lane widths. It provides a proven traffic calming effect by narrowing the perceived traffic lane width. These bump-outs provide a clean new area for branding, trees or plant boxes, benches and in Louisville's charming cultural habit, bike racks- each a unique sculpture by a local artist tied to the identity of its immediate area. Some residential streets in Roy could use bump-outs instead of stop signs. They might be less hated than roundabouts (they hate them because they work- make drivers pay attention to driving), and assist in cleaner air efforts by reducing acceleration and idle time.

My caution is about high density infill plans. In Nashville where I bought my first home for 49,000 in 2003. Tiny lot, built just six feet from my neighbors house. Sold it in 2013 for \$225,000. It was immediately razed and in place of it and next door were four, four story one room wide houses. The problem was elderly people and poorer families with modest homes suddenly had houses appraised for half a million dollars and were unable to pay the taxes. They were forced to sell and immediately the home was replaced by 2-3. Neighborhoods became defined by developers concepts- music row is actually now just a massive condo complex with buildings named after whatever establishment or landmark they destroyed to build. People in Nashville will tear anything down. They point out that their scale replica of the Parthenon is actually better than the one in Athens because it's not broken and has restrooms and a cafe.

Roy City needs organic high density housing, such as repurposed commercial or civic buildings. Few developers deliver on their concepts so ground floor retail can remain unfinished, untaxed and economically deficient, especially if municipalities factor revenue from such retail into the "incentive" scam cities still fall for. Even in Nashville street level retail under condo hulks can remain unfinished for years.

I'd like to be in the second investor group in the station area development if its structured like the Farmington deal. The one where UTA funds the infrastructure, key planning and compliance before bankrupting and handing it over to investors almost free, and ready to develop.

Seriously, as a Roy Resident, with an encyclopedic knowledge of Codes, Civil Rights and Disability Act Compliance, IBC, and Federal Accessibility Act Funding Compliance I would offer to inspect plans and proposals for compliance. I am opposed to litigation as an operations policy, and would much rather help Roy be compliant in the planning stages where it's much less costly. Likewise, I recommend your staff, designers and marketing folks all take a serious look at meeting Federal Standards for Disability Access acronym all your platforms. It's the law, and could risk your eligibility to participate in any federally funded civic planning.

Roy City Police Department was partially funded by a Federal grant. Federal law requires the lobby of such facilities to feature art suitable to local culture, procured from contemporary local artists, and feature a minimum of two media types, like paintings and sculpture or risk having to return the grant plus fees and fines possible based on an investigation into fraudulent use of Federal funds. As a prank to irritate a civilian director at my workplace, I pursued a GSA requisition for a \$59.00 paper Mache pig I formed around a balloon and toilet paper tubes, and lent it in good faith to the Defense Information Systems Agency for display in their recently remodeled lobby. He had to because he'd already certified work complete. A great time was had by all until he amended the GSA forms. The pig is no longer on display and is inventoried by the DoD as seriously deteriorated, not recommended for restoration or repair. It can be destroyed in 7 years or upon sale or transfer of the facility.

I am not above producing such a pig to help the Police Department avoid a fraudulent grant investigation while making the point to the somewhat cavalier Roy City legal counsel about the gravity and consequences of non-compliance with Federal law, and about the contempt non-compliance shows for those who are disabled. It would be more fun than a lawsuit or getting run over.

*Regards,
Allen King*

There was Commission discussion pertaining to high density infill, a point noted in Mr. King's letter above. Mr. Parkinson noted this was an issue that was raised in a survey conducted by the City Council. He explained the concern was more focused on appearance rather than the number of units. As long as the project looked good, residents were not as concerned with height or density. Within the Focus Roy Plan, high density would be more downtown with Frontrunner. Other areas of the City would then remain as medium density. Essentially, he explained, the City is in the process of identifying areas where there can be high density housing versus areas that should be left alone.

There was also discussion regarding appraisal value going up for the elderly, another concern raised by Mr. King. Mr. Parkinson explained the importance of re-evaluating plans every five years to make sure the City was still moving in the direction it wanted to, or if changes needed to be made.

Mr. Parkinson relayed public comments submitted by Glenda Moore. Ms. Moore wrote:

Attached are my comments on the main area of the Feb. 2020 draft General Plan. Some page numbers in my comments may be different, because I didn't realize there was a June draft. (page numbers below may be different between the document I read and the June update)

Acknowledgments: Page 1: The updated plan builds upon three existing planning documents: Several paragraphs earlier, it says "form-based codes were developed concurrently with this planning process". Shouldn't that document be listed here? It will be signed, I presume, before the General Plan is finalized, because a great deal of the General Plan as it stands now cannot go forward if that document isn't approved.

Page 10, Future Growth Areas Shouldn't the two shades of yellow be defined in the Legend? Otherwise, people may read the adjacent text and wonder if they indicate the "vacant, undeveloped and under-utilized sites".

Page 14, Nodes and Gateways The accompanying text explains there are 10 key nodes, gateways, and combination nodes/gateways. Neither the legend nor the accompanying text explain what A and B indicate. The color scheme for Community Nodes splat and Community Nodes/Gateway splat is indistinguishable to my eyes. Which causes me, I suppose, to wonder why the splats don't just count to a total of 10, instead of going 1-7 then A, B, C?

Pages 15 and 16, photos that show what the 10 nodes and gateways are. Now that I've looked at these two pages, the map on page 14 makes more sense. So I strongly suggest that the accompanying text on page 14 refer to pages 15 and 16. Also, make the street labels brighter on the map on page 14.

Page 24, photos: I don't believe that the photo chosen for Economic Development quite hits the mark.

Page 29, Threats: I'm not sure that putting "Public Opinion (NIMBY) under the heading of Threats is going to go over well. At least clarify what NIMBY means and why it is obstructive to improvement.

Page 30, Strategy 3: "The City is studying the feasibility of attracting this type of anchor. " Isn't it beyond studying the feasibility of attracting a movie theater or institutional facility now? "The use of CRAs is also being explored for achieving this goal." Aren't the CRAs already in place now in the downtown district?

Page 30, Strategy 4: "Roy should continue to strive to provide timely and smooth services and should monitor its processes and identify efficiencies." I don't think "monitor and identify" is strong enough. "Identify and implement efficiencies" would be better. Maybe even add something about improving the website for business processes.

Page 30, Strategy 5, Earmark Specific Community Reinvestment Areas: I believe the acronym (CRA) should be shown at the end of that title. And second, hasn't that already been done and implemented?

Page 31, Strategy Two: This section needs to be updated to reflect the new CRAs that were implemented recently. Why does the General Plan only mention the Innovation Center twice, and then the rest of the time only talks about the Downtown and the FrontRunner place types?

Page 32, Parks, Open Space, Recreation, and Trails Action Plan, Summary... "It is projected that Roy needs to acquire and develop approximately 54.5-acres of land by 2050..." I don't see how that could happen. Or, is this considering the new cemetery, whenever that happens, to be "open space"?

Page 38, Urban Forestry Program, "1. Establish a tree board or department of professional and volunteer staff." And "Create a basic tree care ordinance" Roy City already has code addressing shade trees (Chapter 3). Existing code 7-3-4 establishes a Shade Tree Commission for a period of 3 years – I don't imagine it's been staffed officially for years, though I understand Roy City has two certified arborists on staff. I really, really, really want trees or large planters or hanging planters Downtown, and I think they would be lovely along the major roads as well to give the eye something to break up the stark white and gray of the road. A partnership could be created between the Roy High School agriculture students for growing the plants, planting the pots, and performing maintenance, while the city could handle the watering (and purchase the plants from the school?). I love the idea of an Arbor Day Planting every year or some other kind of citybased "green" event. Plantings need to be put back in at the train station and properly maintained, as well.

Page 38, Street Trees Program: I do not think you can legitimately call them "street trees" if they are not at the street. If a tree is not on the park strip, but behind the sidewalk on private property, it is in the resident's yard, not "at the street." I do like the rest of the idea, though, of the city planting the tree and providing appropriate pruning and replacement, though I really don't see how the City could maintain records of which "yard tree" they're going to prune and which neighbors' "yard tree" they're not going to replace if it dies. Page 39, Neighborhood Watch Program: I think this would work best if the City's police department – public liaison person - spearheaded this effort, making announcements of and holding meetings for specific neighborhood areas to give out relevant information, rather than waiting for a neighborhood to approach the police.

Page 39, Porch Light Program: I can vouch for how well the automatic porch light bulbs work. Last July, I bought a 2-pack of dusk to dawn LED automatic porch lights for around \$14. They have worked very well. I am usually the only house that has a porch (and side) light on all night every night; we have no street lights on our street (nor do I particularly want street lights on our street).

Page 39, Block Parties: "To promote the organization of block parties, the City may consider funding a block party grant program. Neighborhoods interested in hosting a block party may apply for an amount

of money to reimburse eligible expenses, up to twice a year." I really don't see this ever happening. In addition, the spirit of promoting block parties seems contrary to the code passed in August 2018 that puts restrictions on block parties [Title 3 - Business and License Regulations, Chapter 9, section 3-9-7 Block Party].

Page 40, Right-of-Way Enhancements: "describolutions" (typo run-on)

Page 40, Street Types System: I think most if not all of this section is going to be removed, since it is being removed from the form-based Downtown document, so I'm just skimming over it...

Page 42: It is a tactical error to include any drawing for downtown that shows a landscaped median strip down 1900 West or any other street. There is no way that can happen, and it is just going to confuse and alarm people. (I think this may be one of the reasons why street types is being removed from the form-based Downtown code document.)

Page 46, Traffic Calming: It would be better if a photo of an actual Roy City traffic calming device was used rather than a random photo from "any city," since the document says the Traffic Calming system has been adopted.

Page 49, Park Strips: "Along busier corridors, it is recommended that the park strips be widened to reasonably allow for street trees and furnishings." This seems illogical and improbable to me, because that would narrow the road, and nobody is going to want to have the streets narrower than they are now.

Page 49, Traffic control: I wouldn't use the photo of that particular lopsided roundabout, because people may think the document is displaying it as a good example. It really isn't, according to the people who have commented on it over the years...

Page 50, Pedestrian Crossings - High visibility markings: Speaking of that, it is still difficult to know when you are approaching a trail crossing, despite the lights. Is it possible - for trail crossings - to paint different symbols on the road than the standard crossing pattern? Maybe symbols of people walking...

Page 50, Physical Enhancements for Private Realms: "Building massing, scale and heights," there shouldn't be a comma at the end of the line

Pages 56 and 57: "Cozydale is challenged by very few east-west routes for walkability and a lack of parks." This document makes no mention of the existing Memorial Park next to the city offices. Since it is now an officially named park, it should be in the document.

Page 57: I like the idea of a new park. However, I think there may be push-back with it so visibly (on the map) close to the existing cemetery, that people may complain about a new park instead of using the space for a new cemetery, given the apparent size of the space.

Page 62 and map page 63: "... Roy Park ... also in this neighborhood." Please ensure that throughout Roy City documents, the official, dedicated names are used "Frank Tremea (Roy Park)" Side note: The official name of the "Roy Cemetery" per a plaque on the grounds is the "Roy City Staker Memorial Cemetery." [The Staker brothers donated the land to Roy.] At some point, the City needs to get back to that official name, and this would be a good time and place to start it.

Page 63, recommendations for "Roy Park" on map: I don't think there is room at that park for play equipment; and even if there were, kids at play would be at risk of being hit by softballs, wouldn't they? Isn't the entire park dedicated to the softball diamond?

Page 63, speaking of “Roy Park” – Frank Tremea (Roy Park): would it be a good idea somewhere in the document to include mention of the development of the 5 RV dumps across the street as a show of progress?

Page 63, unnamed park – I think that is either a new park (in which case it should say it is proposed), or it’s the informal dog park that’s located in the Rocky Mountain power corridor (in the latter case, adding park facilities/play equipment to it would not be possible.)

Page 65, map: “Potential site for new park” on the left: Can the City build an official park in the Rocky Mountain Power Corridor? That’s not Roy City-owned land, right?

Page 70: “Nearby and adjacent communities include Clinton and Sunset to the south, Hooper to the west, West Haven to the north and Riverdale Ogden to the east.” Typo: Riverdale Ogden

Page 81, Strategy 5 (and elsewhere): I’m a little concerned about making park strips water-wise but adding trees. We need to make sure that citizens (or whomever is in charge of watering) understand “water-wise” doesn’t mean “never get any water” or the trees will die, as happened at the extensive property at the train station.

I can’t bring myself to read the Appendix, sorry. However, as I was quickly scrolling through, I noted that Meadow Creek Pond needs to be shown as its full name: Roger Phil Burnett Meadow Creek Pond.

All in all, I have no issues with the proposed document except as noted above, which are primarily edits not concept changes. I love the idea of improvements to downtown Roy because they are definitely needed if we are going to move forward and thrive as a city. I am also in favor of some kind of on-target development at the train station. I like the concept of neighborhoods in Roy, because there are different areas in the city and they should be celebrated. I’m not sure, however, that most citizens are going to feel that more than one or two streets are their “neighborhood.”

The Commission remarked that the suggestions offered by Ms. Moore were solid. It was noted that staff could go through the document with the contractor to review the points she raised.

Mr. Parkinson relayed comments submitted by Denise Ballinger. Ms. Ballinger wrote:

I’m just going to acknowledge the planners for hitting most of the UN approved Agenda 21/30 talking points.

Mr. Parkinson relayed comments submitted by Kayla Kinkead, Strategic Planner II, Utah Transit Authority. Ms. Kinkead wrote:

Good morning Steve,

I took some time yesterday to review the full draft of Roy City’s General Plan update. On behalf of UTA Planning, we are thrilled to see the ambitious transit-related objectives outlined in the draft. The overall land use and transportation strategies represented in this comprehensive document will help guide the City to a more multimodal network and spatial patterns that are supportive to transit operations. We look forward to future collaboration with your City’s intended transit improvements focused on enhancing service, TOD opportunities, FrontRunner station accessibility, and bus stop infrastructure and amenities.

Please don’t hesitate to reach out to our Planning Department to help facilitate Roy’s future transit strategies once the GP update is formally adopted.

*Best,
Kayla Kinkead*

Mr. Parkinson encouraged the Commissioners to again review the documents he provided them prior to this meeting. He also encouraged them to engage their communities in this discussion, noting that a 12-minute video was also available on the City's website discussing the General Plan. The next steps in this process were then discussed.

3. COMMISSIONERS MINUTE

Commissioner Annette Mifflin stated that Mr. King made several valid points about disability access throughout the City. She noted that he had offered to help address this issue and she wanted to make sure that he was included.

Mr. Parkinson noted that DRC did look at ADA compliance. He said there was not a UTA bus stop in front of the Harmon's Gas Station, a location mentioned in Mr. King's letter. Mr. Parkinson noted that the City's ordinances also addressed matters relating to ADA compliance.

4. STAFF UPDATE

Mr. Parkinson reported that the City Council approved the Downtown Mixed Use Ordinance. The Mayor has directed him to look at the FrontRunner Station and the Innovation Center, which is over by the airport, and how to incorporate these areas into the new ordinance. He was hoping to have this ready to discuss by the next work session. He briefly reviewed each of the components included in the new ordinance.

Mr. Parkinson reported there were two new projects tentatively planned for downtown. He remarked that this was encouraging.

Mr. Parkinson reported there were two annexation areas that were being assessed on the west side of Roy.

5. ADJOURN

Commissioner Brand moved to adjourn at 6:35 p.m. Commissioner Collins seconded the motion. Commissioners Ashby, Brand, Collins, Cowley, Mifflin, Payne, and Sphar voted "aye." The motion carried.

Ryan Cowley
Chair

Attest:

Morgan Langholf
City Recorder

dc: 03-23-21