MINUTES
October 8, 2025

Oakley City Council
7:00 PM
Oakley City Hall

Zoom Meeting Platform
Meeting ID 820 258 4629
Passcode 777869
Anchor Location: 960 West Center Street, Oakley UT 84055

In Attendance:
City Administration: Mayor Zane Woolstenhulme; Councilmembers: Joe Frazier, Dave Neff, Tom Smart, Steve Wilmoth; Via Zoom: Kelly Kimber.

City Staff: City Recorder, Amy Rydalch; City Planner, Stephanie Woolstenhulme; Public Works Director, Kendell Staples.

Other City Administration: City Attorney, Lisa Baskin; Planning Commissioner, Cliff Goldthorpe.

Members of the Public: In Person: Kevin Barker, Jan Pogue, Gary Berossett, Rebecca Roberts, Kevin Barker, Heidi Smart, Brenda Scharman, Jeff Juip, Trish Murphy-Cone, Chris Dillman, Amy Regan, Blake Frazier. Via Zoom: Shad Sorensen, Matt W., Samsung SM-A426W, Krista Kelly, Debs 12S, Carla Wilmoth, Kelly Edwards, Chris Dillman, Kevin Barker, Kate Sattlemeier, David Darcy, Terina Darcy, Kerbee Leavitt.

1. **Mayor Woolstenhulme** opened the meeting.
   - Invocation: **Councilmember Dave Neff**
   - Pledge of Allegiance: **Councilmember Joe Frazier**

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:**
   Written Public Comment received prior to meeting via email from Rebecca Roberts.
   (Comment is included with the meeting materials as part of the formal record of the meeting.)

   No Additional Public Comment received as part of the meetings proceedings.

3. REPORT ON THE CITY CENTER DISCUSSION AT PLANNING COMMISSION'S PUBLIC HEARING AND PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Mayor Woolstenhulme introduced the new **City Attorney, Lisa Baskin,** to the Council. He then turned the time over to **City Planner S. Woolstenhulme** to present the next steps in the City Center development application.

Planner S. Woolstenhulme summarized the City Center master plan, indicating the original study and renderings from 2008 and additional iterations, and discussed the history and context of the current 2023 formal application referring to the formal action of the City Council to originally focus on the North Side properties and then subsequently expanded the proposal into the South Side. The application has been through several public hearings at the Planning Commission level, multiple open houses have been held, and significant public comment has been received. In September 2025, the City received an amended application from the Smith development group, largely due to the feedback received from the public and the Planning Commission.

In the Planning Commission meeting held on October 1st, 2025, the Commission voted to send the application with several items for consideration to the City Council. The action did not include a formal recommendation. The intent is for City Council to evaluate the application and items for consideration with potential action to begin the process of drafting a development agreement.

Planner S. Woolstenhulme read in the formal motion from planning commission for the City Council's reference:

Formal motion made by Commissioner Steve Maynes, "I move that this matter proceed to the City Council for evaluation, enumerating the considerations that have been articulated by the Planning Commission."

She discussed that the list of items found in the staff report for this meeting came from the planning commission points of enumeration and from review of the public comments submitted both written and verbal from Public hearings.

City Attorney L. Baskin provided context for the process and discussed that the Planning Commission has done an excellent job of gathering public comment and has taken the application as far as the body is administratively able. She stated that because the application involves City property and the disposition of these parcels is a legislative action the City Council needs to weigh-in on the application. She stated that the "cart is a bit before the horse" since a site plan cannot be determined until the City Council determines the City land involvement. She is recommending to both the Planning Commission and City Council that the City utilize provisions under Utah state code that allows for approaching the application through a development agreement. She discussed that the drafting of the development agreement is non-binding and is representative of a "proposal" that may be amenable to both parties, the City and the developer, but that there is no obligation to execute the document. It is simply the next step in moving the application forward.

Councilmember Neff asked for clarification regarding the appointed team, the composition of members and process.

Discussion from **Councilmember Smart** regarding including members from the Planning Commission and City Council on the drafting team. **Councilmember Neff** stated his desire for work session(s) with planning commission during this process, which was confirmed by **City Attorney L. Baskin** that this is possible.

Councilmember Wilmoth asked the attorney if tabling any action was a possible and to postpone action until a joint work session with Planning Commission could take place. He discussed phasing the development and limiting it to the North side. He asked for clarification on when the development agreement would be approved.

City Attorney L. Baskin stated that tabling was an option and that the council was not required to take action and could wait until after a work session with planning commission.

General discussion amongst all Councilmembers regarding the pros and cons of different compositions of the drafting team. Discussed utilizing the entire City Council for the drafting team lends to a cumbersome process. **City Attorney L. Baskin** discussed what the process would look like if there were a smaller authorized team. She indicated that the team would report in City Council meetings, ask for input and reach out to Councilmembers individually throughout the process and report on progress regularly in City Council meetings.

More discussion amongst members regarding process and the process for drafting the agreement.

Mayor Woolstenhulme stated that he was not comfortable tabling the action tonight as the application has been in process for three and half years. He believes the right course of action is to take action to authorize an administrative team to work through the drafting of the document. He stated that this process will take months and won't happen overnight. He responded to the idea of phasing being included in the development agreement.

Discussion between **Mayor Woolstenhulme and Councilmember Wilmoth** regarding phasing and timeframe and what the current commitment to the current applicant/developer is.

Both the **City Attorney and City Planner** directed Council to the staff report and the desire of the Planning Commission to have a future joint work session to address the points of consideration, speak to them, and provide context. **City Attorney L. Baskin** indicated that in her experience, having a document allows for process to move forward by having something tangible to reflect on and react to. She then provided additional clarification around the drafting process, indicating that there would be multiple variations of the document before the document is ready for consideration.

Councilmember Smart reacted to **Councilmember Kimber's** question about postponing action until after the election. **Councilmember Smart** indicated that because of the length of time it is expected to take to draft the ordinance both the Council that is in place now and the one that will be in place after the election will have an opportunity to shape the document. He stated that the next Council will likely be the body that acts on the drafted proposal.

Further discussion on possible actions the Council could take in the meeting. **Planner S. Woolstenhulme** clarified to Council that there was no formal recommendation and read the formal motion from the Planning Commission again for clarity with the Council:

"this matter proceeds to the City Council for evaluation, enumerating the considerations that have been articulated by the Planning Commission."

Councilmember Frazier motioned to accept the Planning Commission's recommendation. **Councilmember Smart** seconded the motion. No further discussion. **Motion Carried 4-1 (Councilmember Wilmoth opposed).**

4. DISCUSSION AND CONSIDEERATION: APPROVE ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES, USING DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR CITY CENTER

Councilmember Smart motioned to authorize city staff, the city attorney and the applicant's development group to prepare a draft development agreement subject to and taking into consideration the Planning Commission's points of concern. **Councilmember Neff** seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

Councilmember Smart stated that he feels this approach is best because he believes it is important to get the negotiation worked out now and memorialized in a development agreement, so it stays with the property regardless of subsequent sales of the land.

Councilmember Neff stated that he prefers a process with full exposure where the Council's ideas are discussed in the open and the team takes those ideas and negotiates on behalf of the Council. He asked if members of the Council differed in their perspective.

Consensus amongst Councilmembers, as to process as described by Councilmember Neff.

Mayor Woolstenhulme called for a vote on the motion. **Vote was 5-0 (unanimous). Motion Carried.**

Mayor Woolstenhulme summarized the action taken by the Council as agreeing to the Planning Commissions recommendations and to agree to a process where staff has been authorized to move forward with negotiations to put together a development agreement for Planning Commission review and review and action by the City Council at a future point.

5. **DISCUSSSION: SPEEDING CONSIDERATIONS – NEW LANE AND OTHER CITY ROADS**
   Mayor Woolstenhulme summarized the recent contract and patrol history with the Summit County Sheriff's Department. It was discussed that primarily the effort to curb speeding has been an education and warning approach. Discussion centered around the need for a more aggressive approach and that issuing citations should be the next step toward curbing speeding. An alternative was discussed to purchase and install more sophisticated signage or consider large speed bumps. **Councilmembers** reached consensus regarding issuing citations for a six-month period and after that period evaluate the outcome and if needed give consideration of other measures. **Mayor Woolstenhulme to reach out to the Summit County Sheriff's Office.**

6. **DISCUSSION: 2025 WINTER WATER OVERAGES:**
   Mayor Woolstenhulme directed the Council's attention to the three spreadsheets of data regarding winter water usage. It was discussed that for the last two years the Council has elected to waive overage charges for all users of the Oakley Culinary Water System. This was born out of concessions for Agricultural users during winter months. The spreadsheets summarized the actual 2025 Winter water overages and the forgone revenue amounts, a proposed winter rate structure that doubles the tier usage levels, and a third proposed winter rate structure that triples the tier usage levels. Council discussed the merits of the program, how the program is applied to commercial enterprises, and the top users. It was discussed that the winter overage program should be considered again next year and that any formal action this evening is applicable only for the 2026 winter watering season.

Councilmember Neff motioned to waive the water overage rates for the (2026) Winter watering season. **Councilmember Smart** seconded the motion. **All voted in favor. Motion carried.**

7. **MAYOR, COUNCILMEMBER & STAFF REPORTS**-As Needed
   Councilmember Wilmoth presented to Council the Rodeo Committee's consideration of forgoing the drone show for the 2026 Rodeo performances and applying those funds toward additional prize monies. **Councilmembers Frazier, Smart, Neff, and Kimber (via text) are in**

favor of the Rodeo Committee's consideration. Discussion regarding securing the fireworks contract and clarification on prize money amounts.

No other reports.

8. POSSIBLE CLOSED SESSION – NO SESSION WAS HELD

Councilmember Frazier motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Approval is to form this 22nd day of October, 2025.

Joe Frazier

Joe Frazier, Mayor Pro Tem

Amy Rydalch

Amy Rydalch, City Recorder