



ROY CITY
Roy City Council Meeting Minutes
July 15, 2025– 5:30 p.m.
Roy City Council
5051 S 1900 W Roy, UT 84067

Minutes of the Roy City Council Meeting held in person in the Roy City Council Chambers and streamed on YouTube on July 15, 2025, 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 also posted on the Roy City website.

The following members were in attendance:

Mayor Dandoy
Councilmember Paul
Councilmember Saxton
Councilmember Scadden
Councilmember Wilson

City Manager, Matt Andrews
City Recorder, Brittany Fowers
City Attorney, Matt Wilson

Excused: Councilmember Jackson

Also present were: Police Chief, Matt Gwynn; Fire Chief, Theron Williams; Public Works Director, Brandon Edwards; Parks and Recreation Director, Michelle Howard; CED Director, Brody Flint; Ty Chaston, Kevin Homer, Glenda Moore, Robert Percival, Lorrilee and Ron Hardy, Dustin Carter, Ivonne Carter, Paula Carter, Mike Bird, Jason Sphar, Shauna Saxton, Arom Shultz, Dennis and Clair Brown, Carolyn Owens, Blaine Esplin, Nancy Cozzens, Elmer Acevedo-Garcia, Leon Wilson, Nicole and Marcos Cabrera, Bryant McMillan, Eric and Terra Cottle, Tim Higgs, Janel Hulbert, Dan Tanner, Beth DeLaCruz, C. Garcia, and Pam and Ryan Robbins.

A. Welcome & Roll Call

Mayor Dandoy welcomed those in attendance and noted Councilmembers Saxton, Paul, Wilson and Scadden were present.

B. Moment of Silence

Councilmember Saxton invited the audience to observe a moment of silence.

C. Pledge of Allegiance

Councilmember Saxton led the audience to recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

D. Consent Items

1. May 2025 Financial Statement
2. June 3, 2025, Roy City Council Special Work Session Minutes and June 17, 2025, Roy City Council Meeting Minutes
3. Surplus Fire Department and Police Department Motorola Radios – see attached list
4. Re-appointment of Planning Commissioner, Dan Tanner

Councilmember Wilson noted she had some changes for the meeting minutes. She also asked about the additional revenue for parks development. City Manager Andrews explained that there had been more building permits than the City had expected, resulting in more revenue than anticipated.

Councilmember Scadden motioned to approve the consent items as listed, with adjustments to minutes as provided by Councilmember Saxton and Wilson. Councilmember Wilson second the motion, all present members voted “Aye” and the motion carried.

E. Public Comments

Mayor Dandoy opened the floor for public comments.

Dennis Brown, 2119 W 6000 S, Roy, spoke about Action Item Six, which was Dustin Carter’s setback request. Mr. Brown reported that he was a neighbor of Mr. Carter and said Mr. Carter’s home and property were very nicely kept. He felt that Mr. Carter’s setback exemption request was reasonable and he asked that it be permitted by the Council. He felt it was governmental overreach to not allow Mr. Carter to build his wall.

Claire Brown, 2119 W 6000 S, Roy, also spoke on behalf of Mr. Carter’s setback request. She identified herself as Mr. Brown’s wife and echoed his comments that Mr. Carter’s property was well landscaped and well-kept. She acknowledged that mistakes had been made during the construction of Mr. Carter’s home which had resulted in issues with setback compliance, but she noted that there were many properties throughout Roy that did not comply with the City Code. Mrs. Brown said that judgement and discernment were important when it came to enforcement, and she hoped that the City would be able to find a reasonable solution that worked for everybody.

Mark Whitfield, 6945 S 2100 W, Roy, said he was also a neighbor of Mr. Carter. He said that he had asked Mr. Carter over the years why his property was not finished, and he reported that Mr. Carter had told him the only reason the work was not done was because of the setback issue. Mr. Whitfield asked that Mr. Carter be granted an exemption so that the project could be completed.

Beth Delacruz, 2090 W 5950 S, Roy, stated she was also a neighbor of Mr. Carter and spoke about how long the construction had been going on. She said that she had put up a privacy wall, which had been costly for her, because Mr. Carter had installed a window in his home that had a view directly into her yard. She complained that the City had known Mr. Carter was operating without a permit for many years but had taken no action. She expressed that she had no problem with Mr. Carter building a wall that did not meet the setback requirements, but she requested that a timeline be put in place to finish the construction since it was loud and had hindered the views from her own property.

Marcos Cabrera, 5924 S 2100 W, Roy, identified himself as a neighbor of Mr. Carter and opined that Mr. Carter should receive an exemption to the setback requirement. He noted that a 16-inch difference was negligible.

Kaylin Garcia, 2461 E 8240 S, South Ogden, said that her grandmother, Mrs. Delacruz, had lived in her home for 60 years and kept her property well-maintained. Mrs. Garcia discussed that while her grandmother liked her neighbors, the Carters, the Carter’s construction project had greatly impacted her home and property. Mrs. Garcia echoed her grandmother’s request that a timeline be placed on the Carter’s construction and expressed that six years was far too long for a project of this scale to go on.

Tara Cottle, 6061 S 2225 W, Roy, said she had known the Carters for about eight years. She said the lack of a permit had been a mistake and she said the Council should give grace for cases such as this one. She said the Carters were very honest people and did not believe them to have intentionally

acted out of compliance with City Code.

Ivonne Carter, 5924 S 2100 W, Roy, spoke on behalf of her son. She asked the City Council for help in resolving the setback issue so that they could complete their home. She spoke about the stress of this problem had caused her and her family. She said this had been a great financial hardship on her family and if they were not allowed to finish their project it would be an even greater burden.

Ty Chaston, 3751 W 5575 S, Roy, spoke about the July Planning Commission that he had attended. He said there were some items that had not been addressed in that meeting which he wanted to discuss. He spoke about the General Plan's moderate housing goals and the changes to the R-5 zone that had been proposed by the Commission. He said there should be more discussion about the proposed townhome development and said there were many things to consider, including issues of access and traffic.

Blaine Esplin, 4523 Trailside Dr, Roy, discussed the RailRunner development. He thanked Councilmember Scadden for spending time in his neighborhood trying to find solutions for traffic that would result from the new development. Mr. Esplin said that although the road in his neighborhood was signed as a private road, if the townhomes went in the residents of the townhomes would utilize the private road and traffic would get worse. He said that construction vehicles already used their road although it was private, and he anticipated that the through traffic would get even worse. He advocated for the addition of stop signs. He also expressed his opposition for Phase III of the RailRunner development.

Taylor Anderson of Cole West, the developer of the townhome project, clarified that the townhomes were for sale, not for rent. He said that the R-5 zone was being proposed only because the changes to the R-4 zone had not been approved; he emphasized that the goal was not to have the greatest density possible. He said that the purpose of the development was to have an affordable buying option for young families in Roy City, which was very limited along the Wasatch Front.

Dustin Carter, 5924 S 2100 W, Roy, apologized to Mrs. Delacruz that his window posed an issue for her. He noted that his window was in compliance with the City, but expressed that he would not have built it if he knew how much it would bother her.

Kevin Homer, 5398 S 4000 W, Roy, hoped that the Council had taken Mr. Carter's previous presentation into close consideration. He said that the Carters seemed like forthright, honest people and had been very upfront about the issue at hand, although the discussion that evening was about compliance with City ordinances, not determining whether or not the family were good people. Mr. Homer suggested that the Council follow the Planning Commission's negative recommendation for the exemption. However, he said that he had spoken with City Planner Parkinson about some possible options for the Carters, and said there were some things they could do.

Mr. Homer also addressed an issue with campaign signage in Roy City. He said that if candidates could not even comply with the ordinances about where signs could be posted throughout the City, it was doubtful that he would trust them as an elected official.

Tim Higgs, 5381S 3400 W, Roy, addressed the sign that Councilmember Scadden had recommended in the neighborhood by the RailRunner development. He commended Councilmember Scadden on the initiative that he had taken on this issue. Mr. Higgs also said that although he did not know Mr. Carter personally, he hoped that the main issue about the setback exemption request was not just that the permit had not been requested and granted. He said the central issue should revolve around determining if the exemption was right for Roy City or not.

Dan Tanner, 2191 W 4880 S, Roy, said in regard to Mr. Carter's issue, the permit would have triggered the necessary inspections on the project to ensure there was structural integrity. He emphasized that the point was not about the City collecting the \$400 fee, but making sure that due process was followed to ensure safety.

Mayor Dandoy closed the floor for public comment.

F. Presentation Item

1. UDOT 5600 South Update

Nancy Cousins and Elmer Garcia and shared an update about the UDOT 5600 project. Mrs. Cousins stated that the construction on I-15 was nearly complete, and the phases were proceeding as planned. Mr. Garcia said that the ramps on I-15 were going to be closed overnight for the upcoming weekend in order to accommodate the construction.

Mr. Garcia reported that one side of the bridge on 6000 was complete, and advised that there was going to be an overnight closure of the bridge so that construction could be completed on the other side. He said the closure would begin at 7 PM.

Mrs. Cousins shared a video that they had prepared to educate drivers about how to navigate the construction and avoid the road closures.

Councilmember Scadden asked if large vehicles had been taken into consideration with the U-turn that had been designed and Mrs. Cousins replied that large vehicles, including school busses, would be able to make the turn. Mayor Dandoy asked if there were any concerns from a safety perspective and Mr. Garcia said that emergency vehicles would still be able to navigate throughout the City. Fire Chief Williams added that the fire department was going to work with neighboring fire departments to ensure a timely response to calls. Mayor Dandoy commented that the construction was only going to be for three months and he anticipated that residents would be able to work around the construction.

Councilmember Paul thanked Mrs. Cousins for finding a solution that involved very few road closures.

Chief Gwynn asked if there would be signage to indicate to drivers which lane they needed to be in to turn and Mrs. Cousins replied that there would be, though she discussed that she did not want to have too much signage on the road as that would become confusing.

Mayor Dandoy acknowledged that this project would create a lot of confusion for drivers in Roy City, although Mrs. Cousin's efforts to educate people and raise awareness was the best way to mitigate as much confusion as possible. He expected that this construction might deter people from driving through Roy City and said that the City would need to listen closely to the feedback they got from residents. Mrs. Cousins said she had reached out to all business owners that were going to be impacted.

Two members of the public made comments:

Patty Richer, 3634 S 4100 W, Roy, said that if signage was only painted on the roads, it would not be visible during peak traffic times. She said signs needed to be posted high enough that all drivers could see them.

Ty Chaston, 3751 W 5575 S, Roy, recalled that there had been a lot of accidents the last time a major construction project had taken place, likely because the lines had not been painted clearly. He urged the Council to make sure the lanes were clear. Mrs. Cousins said that striping would be done, and there would be flashing lights as well to ensure that lane divisions were obvious to drivers. Mrs. Cousins also invited the public to reach out to her if there were issues with the road.

G. Action Items

1. **Consideration of Resolution 25-20; A Resolution of the Roy City Council Honoring Louise “Weezie” Eames as the 2025 Roy Days Parade Grand Marshal.**

Parks and Recreation Director Howard explained the purpose of this resolution was to give formal recognition to the Roy Days Parade Grand Marshal.

Roy Days Coordinator Lizzie Badger presented Louise “Weezie” Eames as the 2025 Roy Days Grand Marshal and shared a short background on Mrs. Eames.

Mrs. Eames spoke about her family’s background in Roy City and expressed how much she loved the city.

The Councilmembers expressed their appreciation for Mrs. Eames’ volunteer work throughout the years.

Councilmember Wilson motioned to approve Resolution 25-20; A Resolution of the Roy City Council Honoring Louise “Weezie” Eames as the 2025 Roy Days Parade Grand Marshal. Councilmember Scadden seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, all present Councilmembers voted “Aye” and the motion passed.

2. **Consideration of Resolution 25-21; A Resolution of the Roy City Council Approving an Agreement with PacifiCorp for the Lease of Property for a Public Park and Detention Pond.**

Parks and Recreation Director Howard stated this was an extension of an existing agreement. She explained that they had changed the annual increase from a flat \$1,000 fee to a 3% increase, which was more favorable for them.

Councilmember Scadden motioned to approve Resolution 25-21; A Resolution of the Roy City Council Approving an Agreement with PacifiCorp for the Lease of Property for a Public Park and Detention Pond. Councilmember Paul seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, all present Councilmembers voted “Aye” and the motion passed.

3. **Consideration of Resolution 25-22; A Resolution Authorizing and Approving an Interlocal Agreement with Weber County for the Provision of Technical Forensic Services for Roy City.**

Chief Gwynn explained this interlocal agreement was for shared forensic services, which saved time and allowed Roy City staff to perform other tasks.

Councilmember Paul motioned to approve Resolution 25-22; A Resolution Authorizing and Approving an Interlocal Agreement with Weber County for the Provision of Technical Forensic Services for Roy City. Councilmember Saxton seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, all present Councilmembers voted “Aye” and the motion passed.

4. **Consideration of Ordinance 25-10;** Continuation of a request to amend the General Plan (Future Land Use Map) from Single-Family Residential to Multi-Family Residential.

CED Manager Flint introduced this item and reminded the Council that they had previously considered this item and sent it back to the Planning Commission for further consideration. He reported that the Commission had reevaluated the changes to the R-4 and R-5 zones and taken public comment, and forwarded a positive recommendation to City Council.

The developer provided an overview of the plan and shared images of the concept plan. He noted that their open space area was still being investigated as there might be wetlands.

Mayor Dandoy recalled the Council's previous conversation about this item. Councilmember Wilson brought up traffic concerns and the developer affirmed that a traffic study would be completed to evaluate the egress.

Councilmember Paul asked if this development would connect to Clinton and the developer replied that possibility had not been investigated yet.

Councilmember Saxton clarified these units would be for sale, not for rent. He asked about price, to which the developer stated that they were in early planning stages and did not have prices set yet.

Councilmember Scadden motioned to approve Ordinance 25-10; Continuation of a request to amend the General Plan (Future Land Use Map) from Single-Family Residential to Multi-Family Residential. Councilmember Paul seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, all present Councilmembers voted "Aye" and the motion passed.

5. **Consideration of Ordinance 25-11;** Consider a request to amend the Zoning Map from RE-20 (Residential Estates) to R-5 (Multi-Family Residential) at 2349 West 6000 South & 2365 West 6000 South.

CED Manager Flint provided a quick overview of this item. There were no questions from the Councilmembers.

Councilmember Scadden motioned to approve Ordinance 25-11; Consider a request to amend the Zoning Map from RE-20 (Residential Estates) to R-5 (Multi-Family Residential) at 2349 West 6000 South & 2365 West 6000 South. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, all present Councilmembers voted "Aye" and the motion passed.

6. **Consideration of Ordinance 25-14;** Consider amendments to Title 10 – Zoning Regulations, Chapter 10 – General Property Development Standards, § 24 – Tables of Lot and Setback Requirements for Primary Buildings, Table 10-1 – Minimum Lot and Setback Requirements for Primary Building in Residential Zones (Minimum Yard Requirements – Front Yard) – Applicant Dustin Carter.

Mayor Dandoy framed this conversation and emphasized that the proposal was to change the ordinance, not just this property. Mayor Dandoy spoke about Chapter 13, which included development in the business district and the area around the station, and also some vacant properties and the 1900 corridor. He said that everything else in the City was included in Chapter 10, which was the ordinance they were considering that evening, so the change that the Council was considering would impact a lot of properties in Roy City. He stated that only the City Council had the power to change the ordinance.

Mr. Carter thanked the Council for their time and all his neighbors who had come to support him that evening. He also thanked the City Staff for working with him about this issue.

Mr. Carter stated he wanted to complete his construction project in a timely fashion, and do the project in compliance with Roy City Code. He said the only way for him to move forward was if the City approved his ordinance change request, and he said that if the change was not approved the costs he would have to pay would be debilitating and would lead him to bankruptcy. Mr. Carter expressed that the concerns and possible problems that the Planning Commission had raised would not be an issue, and he pointed out that there were many homes in Roy City that already had the setback that he was requesting. He noted that the properties with those setbacks did not have problems, and he opined that it was unfair for some homes to have the setback, but not others. Mr. Carter said that the project would take much longer if the ordinance change request was denied, which would not only impact him negatively but also his neighbors, as they would have to live next to an incomplete project for a long time as he worked to save up money.

Councilmember Paul asked about a development agreement, and City Attorney Wilson replied an MDA would not be an option in this case, as MDAs were not permitted to be used to resolve Code violations. Mayor Dandoy said that a variance request was typically the way to resolve situations like this one. Mayor Dandoy said that everyone had the right to plead for a variance request, though there were specific criteria that had to be met in order for it to be approved. City Attorney Wilson concurred that the applicant would have to meet every criteria on the list for a variance request to be granted.

Councilmember Saxton said that it seemed this situation was creating an incredible hardship on the Carter family and he did not think there were any negative repercussions that could come of approving the request. He commented that he did not want to push the family into bankruptcy and stated he was in favor of approving the change.

Councilmember Wilson reminded the Council that although Mr. Carter was the one who brought this ordinance to light, they needed to consider the ordinance on its own and not as it related to Mr. Carter. She said this was an ordinance change request like any other and the Council needed to be impartial in their deliberation. Councilmember Wilson discussed the advantages and disadvantages that she perceived could come from approving this change. She pointed out that setback requirements were changing at the State level, and she said that approving this change would bring Roy City in-line with the changing trends in setbacks. She acknowledged that parking would be an issue, but believed there were ways to work around the parking problems that would arise, and she did not think it would be a significant problem.

Councilmember Wilson summarized that she was in favor of approving the ordinance change, as she felt it was beneficial to the City overall and the challenges presented by the change were resolvable.

Mayor Dandoy asked the Councilmembers if they had visited the site and they all indicated that they had. He appreciated Councilmember Wilson's point that they needed to think about the ordinance overall, and not only Mr. Carter's property. Mayor Dandoy also emphasized that the Councilmembers needed to think about the extent to which this change could impact the City.

Councilmember Wilson motioned to approve Ordinance 25-14; Consider amendments to Title 10 – Zoning Regulations, Chapter 10 – General Property Development Standards, § 24 – Tables of Lot and Setback Requirements for Primary Buildings, Table 10-1 – Minimum Lot and Setback Requirements for Primary Building in Residential Zones (Minimum Yard Requirements – Front Yard) – Applicant Dustin Carter.

Councilmember Saxton seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, all Councilmembers voted "Aye" and the motion passed.

CED Manager Flint directed the Council to amend the motion to change the language from 'current

setback' to 'smallest current setback measured along the same street, regardless of if it was the front or side setback.' He explained that with the current phrasing, the ordinance change did not actually benefit Mr. Carter.

Councilmember Wilson motioned to amend the above motion to include the language as presented by City Staff.

Councilmember Saxton seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken, all Councilmembers voted "Aye" and the motion passed.

CED Manager Flint expressed that Mr. Carter had been very straightforward to work with, which he appreciated. He clarified that this ordinance was just one issue and there were other issues with the project overall, mainly with the building code, and he said that Mr. Carter had been made aware by City Staff of these items.

H. Discussion Item

1. Rail Runner Stop Sign – Councilmember Scadden

Councilmember Scadden introduced this item. He reported that the neighbors who lived near the RailRunner station were concerned about traffic, and suggested that a stop sign be installed to help mitigate speeding and safety issues.

Mayor Dandoy discussed that the Federal Highway Administration had a manual that provided guidelines about how all roads in the country be equipped. He said that the manual dictated that yield signs and stop signs should not be used to control speeding, and he said that Utah was beholden to be compliant with that manual. Mayor Dandoy said if they wanted to make an exception to that rule, they would need to conduct an engineering study and make an assessment that supported a stop sign being installed at that site. He emphasized that if the City chose to install a stop sign, they could be held liable for accidents that occurred at the intersection where the stop sign was posted. Mayor Dandoy said that in lieu of stop signs, they could put speed humps, flashing lights, or other traffic calming devices to help with the speeding problem. He urged the Council to be careful and advised them to get a proper assessment before they made a decision.

Councilmember Wilson thanked Councilmember Scadden for looking into this item and for visiting the site. She reported that she had spoken to a traffic engineer, who had suggested prohibiting parking on the road to help with the safety problem. She relayed that the traffic engineer had not been in favor of speed humps, since they had the possibility of creating a noise problem. She stated that the traffic engineer had said striping the lines and creating a narrow lane could be helpful, as it reminded drivers to pay attention and signaled to them that they needed to slow down.

Councilmember Scadden asked if a traffic study had been done for the stop signs that were already in the area, and City Manager Andrews replied they had not conducted one. Councilmember Scadden asked if they could just move the stop signs to the area that the neighbors had indicated was a problem. Mayor Dandoy said they could do so, and they could also opt for lane narrowing, speed humps, or any other option. Mayor Dandoy expressed that the most important thing was for the Council to order a professional study first, as this would protect them from liability.

Councilmember Paul agreed that she wanted to see a study. Councilmember Scadden pointed out that a traffic study might be premature, since the station was not yet up and running and traffic patterns would change once it opened. Councilmember Scadden asked about the costs associated with their various options and City Manager Andrews replied that a traffic study cost about \$3- 4,000; a calming device was about \$4000; and a speed hump cost about \$1,500-2,000. Councilmember Scadden said they should look into how they could change the driving behavior on the road before resorting to these options.

Mayor Dandoy recommended that the Council monitor the situation and watch it unfold, and then get a professional study done before making a change to the area. The Council agreed that would be their course of action.

I. City Manager & Council Report

City Manager Andrews reported that this weekend was the kickoff for Roy Days, and he indicated that the Councilmembers had received emails that outlined their schedules. He also stated that Concert in the Park would be held that weekend at George Wallen Park.

Councilmember Scadden shared that he had served as a mock judge for the pageant last Saturday, and he said the pageant would be held that Saturday at Roy High and urged the Council to attend the event.

Councilmember Wilson listed some volunteer opportunities and upcoming events for Roy Days. She also asked Mayor Dandoy if they could hold another work session for the budget, and Mayor Dandoy said they could do so, but it would have to wait until August. The Council discussed this briefly and it was agreed that they would have another work session before the next public meeting about the budget.

J. Adjournment

Councilmember Paul motioned to adjourn the meeting, Councilmember Saxton seconded the motion, all present Councilmembers voted “Aye” and the meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Robert Dandoy
Mayor

Attest:

Brittany Fowers
City Recorder

dc: