



ROY CITY
Roy City Council Meeting Minutes
May 19, 2026– 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 May 5, 2026, 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 Jackson
Councilmember Hulbert
Councilmember Jackson
Councilmember Saxton
Councilmember Sphar
Councilmember Wilson

City Manager, Matt Andrews
Deputy City Recorder, Helen Garcilazo
City Attorney, Matt Wilson

Excused: N/A

Also present were: Police Chief, Matt Gwynn; Fire Chief, Theron Williams; Parks and Recreation Director, Michelle Howard; Public Works Director, Brandon Edwards; Management Services Director, Amber Kelley.

Monica Laws, Gary Hoeyr, Kevin Homer, Glenda Moore, Mike VanAlfen, Shelley Polston, Jacquelen Powell, Geoffrey Cox, Tami Davis, Sara Ferrida, Judy Parker, Amy Hess, Rocky Rushton, Connie Edmison, Dave and Kellie Ruffing, Amanda and Adam Day, Michelle Nielson-Pugmire, Marie Bybee, Don and Jenny McGrath, Blaine Esplin, Mark M, Trevor Foisy, Jennifer Toledo, Kay Budkley, Cindy Whinham, Clay Crabtree, Nancy Inman, Jeff Fullmer, Brad Brown, Staa Crabtree, Trevor Dearden, Leon Wilson, Christin Malan, Julie Little, Teresa Hislop, and Kirby Pugmae, Teresa Ibarra, Amy and Kim Buckway, and Gretchen Parker.

A. Welcome & Roll Call

Mayor Jackson welcomed those in attendance and noted Councilmembers Hulbert, Jackson, Saxton, Sphar, and Wilson were present.

B. Moment of Silence

Mayor Jackson invited the audience to observe a moment of silence.

C. Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Jackson led the audience to recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

D. Consent Items

1. April 7, 2026, Roy City Council Meeting Minutes and April 7, 2026, Roy City Council Special Work Session Minutes

Councilmember Wilson motioned to approve the consent items with adjustments to the minutes as provided. Councilmember Hulbert seconded the motion, all present members voted “Aye” and the motion carried.

E. Public Comments – 3 minutes

Mayor Jackson opened the floor for public comments.

Geoffrey Cox spoke about the Roy City Complex and opined it was costing the City too much money without a significant benefit. He then recalled that the former mayor of the City had recommended that cuts be made to the City employee vehicle and gas reimbursement budget. Mr. Cox thought these changes should be implemented in order to help save the City money.

Blaine Esplin discussed the proposed rezoning at 2700 West, 4800 South. Mr. Esplin asked the City to do their due diligence with this proposal, and he also inquired about the proposed points for ingress and egress. He opined that this project could not be completed safely, particularly once the train tracks were added. He elaborated about the current traffic flows in his neighborhood and asked the City to not allow the proposal to go through.

Don McGrath shared that he and his wife had bought a large rural property with the intention of teaching their grandchildren how to live off of the land. Mr. McGrath complained that Roy City had become a victim of “Californication” and the rural spaces were being encroached upon by strip malls and townhomes. He asked the City to maintain the cultural fabric of rural communities and be more mindful about the amount of gentrification in Roy.

Mike VanAlfen expressed appreciation for Councilmember Saxton’s efforts to avoid the property tax raise. He stated that there were many tax cuts that could be made in Roy City and felt it was not right to continue to tax the residents at increasingly higher rates. He reminded the Councilmembers that their job was to represent the people and he asked them to think about the interest of the taxpayer. Mr. VanAlfen also discussed the water shortage and noted that the local property owners were made to shoulder the burden of the drought to a disproportionate extent.

Teresa Heslop asked the Council to deny the rezone proposal that would be discussed later in the meeting. Mrs. Heslop reported that there were already many apartments and townhomes for rent in Roy City and she did not think there needed to be any more. She also spoke about the water consumption issue, and provided some calculations that suggested the proposed development would use too much water.

Amy Buckway echoed Mr. McGrath’s previous comments, whom she identified as her husband. She also spoke about the distinct farm-like quality of her neighborhood and asked the City to maintain that culture. She spoke about her desire to preserve the farming history of the community and the surrounding green space.

Lance Heslop supported the previous comments from his wife, Mrs. Heslop. He believed that while property owners should be allowed to do what they wanted with their land, they also should think about what was best for the overall community.

Robert Mayland discussed how much Roy City had changed since he was a child. He observed that traffic and density had increased greatly over the years and he said that the congestion would only get worse if Roy continued to add apartments and townhomes. Mr. Mayland opined that developers did not care about Roy City if they wanted to put more high-density housing in the area.

Tammy Davis asked about the water leak at 3500. She said the water leak was so bad that there were

now wild ducks living in the pooling water and asked for something to be done about the issue. Mrs. Davis then discussed that she had not seen any milkweed this year, though there had been a lot of wild milkweed in previous years. She attributed this lack of milkweed to increased development in the City.

Shelley Polston thanked the Councilmembers for responding to an email she had sent. She stated that Roy City had received a mandate from the State to build more affordable housing, and she said that Roy City was not building affordable housing. She felt the developments that were being added to Roy City were unsightly and were not affordable for residents. Mrs. Polston then thanked Councilmember Saxton for his objections to the proposed tax increase, and said that the Council needed to be willing to make budget cuts to the City department. She opined that there was administrative bloat in the City government that could be looked at more closely.

Melissa Conklin expressed appreciation for how Roy City had a lot of natural areas and hoped it could remain that way. Mrs. Conklin then shared that her adult children paid exorbitant rates for rent to live in the area and she stated that the proposed development would not be affordable for them. She asked the Council not to permit the development to move ahead and said that it would hurt everyone in the community. She also commented that the proposed tax increase was criminal and thanked Councilmember Saxton for working to get the rate lowered.

Trevor Fousey said the proposed development did not seem logical to him. He said he was not opposed to the idea overall, but he felt that the proposed density was too high and he worried that the increased traffic from the development would pose a risk to children and pedestrians. He said the neighborhood was not built for high-density traffic. He further noted that the wetlands in the area did not seem like suitable land to build such a high-density development. He suggested that the total number of units in the development be reduced.

Clay Crabtree echoed previous comments about the proposed development. He said he was not opposed to housing in the area as it was the property owners' right to do what they wanted with their lots, although he asked that the current zone be honored. He asked that the zoning remain at R-1-8.

Cody Markes stated that he had grown up in Roy City but left to join the military. Mr. Markes said that he had recently moved back to Roy and found the City to be greatly changed. He said that the proposed development did not offer affordable housing and expressed that he struggled to pay his own mortgage every month. He objected to the proposed density of the project as well.

Trevor Dearden agreed with previous comments that the proposed development was too dense. He discussed the noise complaints in the area. He further said he was opposed to 43 new homes on the grounds that the traffic would be a safety risk to children.

Ty Chaston called for a restructuring of the Complex. He said it was costing the City far too much money. He then addressed Councilmember Sphar directly and asked him to honor the General Plan and not make changes to it. Mr. Chaston then asked what the AMI (average median income) in Roy City was and he pointed out that there were many apartments in the City that were not at full capacity, which he believed was because people could not afford to live in those units.

Sarah Ferriola said she lived close to the proposed project and shared the previous commenters' concerns that the development was too high density. She asked the Council to take into consideration the impact the development would have on the surrounding area.

Teresa Ibarra said that she also lived close by to the new development. She also expressed concern

about the traffic that would result from the development. She asked about a traffic study, although she acknowledged that it had been explained to her at a previous meeting that the developer would be the one responsible for taking care of the traffic study if the plan moved forward. Mrs. Ibarra felt that the City should conduct a traffic study now. She asked for the development to be capped at 31 homes, and for the land to be kept in its current zone.

Amanda Day said she was also a neighbor to the proposed development and, like previous commenters, found the proposal to be “insane.” She vehemently opposed the development. She cited concerns about construction vehicles, and eventually resident traffic, congesting the streets and posing a risk to children playing outside. Mrs. Day also voiced concerns about the wetlands and drainage issues that might result from the construction.

Melanie Schwarts expressed concerns about traffic and congestion as well. She also noted that there were few agricultural areas in the City left. She spoke about the tight-knit fabric of her community and spoke about how meaningful the natural areas, friendly neighbors, and livestock animals in her neighborhood were to her. She worried that these things would be lost if the development moved forward.

Thomas Venture also discussed how much he valued his neighborhood and felt that the community sense would be lost if the City “crammed” more people into the area. He echoed previous comments that objected to the development because it would result in the loss of the agricultural zone.

Connie Edmondson said the development would impact her, although she did not live directly adjacent to it, because of the increased traffic. She said that a large strip mall was being built close to her home. She also said that there were certain times of day that she was not easily able to get to work because of how bad the traffic on 4800 was during peak hours. She asked the Council to not compound the traffic issues on 4800 by continuing to build more developments.

Jackie Powell reported that she had spoken with the previous owner of the land that the proposed development would be built on, and they had told her that they were unaware that the development planned to rezone and construct 43 homes. Mrs. Powell felt that the former property owner had been lied to and asked the Council to revert back to the original plan of 18 homes.

Evette Torres expressed that while she loved Roy City, she was considering moving out of her home because of the increased traffic congestion and density in the City. She said that her husband had served in the Air Force and risked his life for his job, although he was paid less than some of the City employees. Mrs. Torres felt that this showed the corruption within the City.

Mark Meyer said that he had watched the previous Council meeting and noticed that there had been overwhelming support for the land at 2715 West 4800 South to be developed, just not with 43 homes. He asked the Council to carefully think about the wetlands and proper drainage, as well as the density and traffic impacts on the existing residents. He urged the Council to think about the sustainability of the development and to make sure that all the proper studies were completed before they moved forward. Mr. Meyer said that he was also a public servant and felt that a happy medium could be reached if the Council worked with the residents.

Andrew Lucco directly addressed City Manager Andrews, whom he reported he had emailed with previously. Mr. Lucco felt that Roy City was in violation of the Equal Employment Opportunity requirements. He said that nepotism did not foster an inclusive or productive work environment. He recalled that although he had volunteered for the City in the past, he felt that he had been overlooked for hiring opportunities in favor of individuals that were more connected.

Gretchen Parker discussed proposal for the new development on 2715 West 2800 South. She felt that because the City Planner was not originally from Roy City, he was not sufficiently invested in making the best decisions for the City. She worried that the development would pose risks to the surrounding neighbors, and particularly she worried that there were not enough access points in and out of the City in the event of a wildfire. She called on the Council to think about the needs of the residents. She felt that the Council was too worried about saying 'no' to developers.

Cindy Whinham reported that at the previous Planning Commission meeting, City Planner Parkinson had rejected a proposal for a credit union to move into Roy City because their site design had their front entrance facing the wrong way. Mrs. Whinham appreciated that the Code needed to be followed, although she recalled a previous case in which the City Council had made a Code change in order to accommodate another building. She pointed out how important it was for businesses to come into Roy City and asked if there was a way to work with Mountain America Credit Union so that they could move into the City. She lastly asked if something could be done about light pollution, noting that the light from businesses bothered her and some of her neighbors at night.

Jeff Fulmer read a passage from Roy City's Five-Year Strategic Plan as well as their mission statement. He read that the Council's main directive was to maintain and initiate programs and policies that would increase resident's quality of life. Mr. Fulmer expressed that the residents of Roy wanted to ensure that the comfort, friendliness, and history of the City was preserved properly.

Melissa Barton shared the opinion of previous commenters that she was not in support of the proposed development. She thought 43 homes was too many and worried about the repercussions on traffic if the development was to move ahead. She pointed out that the average household in Roy City had more than two cars and she felt the impact on traffic would be substantial.

Jan Rushton said she lived next to the lot where the proposed development was slated to be built. She said she was not opposed to a new development and appreciated that growth was needed in Roy, although she did not think this particular development was wise. She especially expressed concern about possible flooding and draining issues given the surrounding wetlands. She asked how the HOA for the development would be maintained. Mrs. Rushton also agreed with previous comments that the new development would not actually be affordable. Mrs. Rushton also addressed the property tax increase and asked if there would be an audit to ensure that her taxpayer dollars were well-spent by the City government.

Stacy Crabtree worried that her children would not be comfortable playing in their own backyard if the proposed development was built. She expressed that she loved her neighbors and did not want to move, but felt that the new development would ruin her neighborhood. She thought the developers should be held to the same standards as the residents, who were not allowed to make whatever Code changes they wanted.

Jennifer Toledo shared that she had experienced a similar issue to this proposed development when she lived in Arizona. She recalled that she had owned livestock animals that she had been forced to get rid of when a high-density development was built near her former home. Mrs. Toledo also shared that she liked to jog at night, but had stopped since a recent townhome development had been built in Roy City because she was concerned about being the victim of a crime. She felt that the new development would exacerbate the issues with traffic congestion and raise the crime rate.

Kevin Homer discussed Councilmember Saxton's proposal for the property tax rate. Mr. Homer appreciated this proposal, although he thought that it could be better to consider getting a bond to

adjust the employee salaries in the City. Mr. Homer pointed out that if they raised the tax rate, it would likely never come back down, whereas a bond would only raise rates for a finite amount of time.

Mayor Jackson closed the floor for public comment.

F. Action Items

1. **Consideration of Ordinance 26-2;** Consider a request to amend the General Plan (Future Land Use Map) from Single-Family Residential to Multi-Family Residential for property located at 2715 West 4800 South

Assistant City Manager Flint indicated that the applicant was present that evening. He explained the request and provided a history of the item thus far. He reported that the Planning Commission had forwarded a negative recommendation to the City Council.

Monica Laws introduced herself as the applicant for this proposal and as a resident of Roy City. She first discussed her family's deep roots in Roy City and expressed that she was not a random developer who did not care about the City. She shared that she had grown up in Roy and raised her children there. Mrs. Laws noted how much Roy City had changed over the years and she appreciated that the growth in the City was inevitable, and she and her family wanted to help Roy to grow in the right way. She emphasized that the rezone request to R-3 was intended to help Roy meet its housing goals in a sustainable and ethical way. Mrs. Laws added that the proposal utilized waterwise landscaping and would maintain the existing trails and green space in the surrounding area.

Mrs. Laws then justified why her property was an ideal location for the development. She explained the area was walkable and located close to schools, grocery stores, as well as the Roy City Complex and Air Force base. She added that the lots were close to the Front Runner station, which meant that residents would not have to rely as heavily on their cars. She said the proximity to the station would be good for the environment as well traffic pressure, and it also enabled people to shop local in Roy City, which would help the economy.

Mrs. Laws then discussed the water, which she felt was one of the most compelling arguments for the development. She acknowledged that Utah was experiencing a water crisis, and she said that transitioning the land from grass to drought-tolerant landscaping aligned with requests from the State. She said that maintaining pasture was not sustainable. She concluded that the rezone would help to save water in the City and added that it would also provide an economic benefit. Mrs. Laws provided some calculations to support her suggestion that switching the land from pasture to waterwise landscaping would save water and money.

Mrs. Laws moved on to a discussion about how the development would serve the residents of Roy City. She shared a story about how her adult children, as well as their friends' children, had been unable to find affordable housing in Roy City when they had been forced to move home after the Covid-19 pandemic. She said that having townhomes would have alleviated the pressures on young adults who could no longer afford to live in the area. Mrs. Laws emphasized that townhomes provided a bridge for young professionals and families to start building equity while staying within Roy City.

Mrs. Laws then provided some statistics to support her claim that townhomes did not hurt the property values of surrounding homes. Mrs. Laws expressed that her proposal constituted "missing middle" housing in Roy City and aligned with mandates from the State. She opined that the cons of the project were outweighed by its many pros. She also noted that the plan aligned with Roy City's own General

Plan and stated that the project would generate much-needed revenue for the City. Mrs. Laws said that on top of the property tax revenue the project would generate, it would also help attract businesses to Roy City, thus raising the sales tax revenue as well. Mrs. Laws presented some calculations that projected how much revenue the project could generate for the City, and she listed some of the services that the extra revenue could pay for.

Mrs. Laws addressed the traffic and safety concerns. She shared some data about how many daily trips townhome developments generated on average, and she emphasized that the projected increases to traffic did not pose a substantial issue for neighborhood safety or traffic flows.

Mrs. Laws reiterated that Roy City was going to grow no matter what they did; and said that the best thing to do was to help Roy grow in a sustainable way. She emphasized that her facts and figures showed that the development did not pose a threat to the neighborhood, and would result in water savings and an increase in revenue for the City. She appreciated her neighbors' concerns about big developments, but asked that her proposal be considered for its own merits.

Councilmember Jackson asked at what point the traffic study would be conducted. City Manager Andrews replied that a study could be done before the zone change, and could certainly be done before any actual construction began. Councilmember Jackson discussed that it was difficult to conduct a traffic study before they knew what kind of development would go on the property.

Councilmember Jackson asked Mrs. Laws how she had decided to request the R-3 zone and Mrs. Laws explained her reasoning as to why R-3 was the most reasonable zone for her project. Councilmember Jackson clarified that there were higher-density zones, which Mrs. Laws had not requested.

Councilmember Jackson also asked why Mrs. Laws had not proposed apartment buildings and Mrs. Laws replied that her vision was to have townhomes because she and her daughter felt that townhomes were a better fit for the surrounding neighborhood. Mrs. Laws elaborated that she did not think apartments were a cohesive fit for the homes in the area.

Councilmember Jackson clarified the administrative and legislative process with City Manager Andrews. City Manager Andrews explained that if the Council moved forward with the rezone, they would not necessarily be able to mandate that the final project ended up being townhomes. Councilmember Jackson acknowledged the housing issues in Roy City, although she felt that allowing the rezone would take too much control away from the City. Councilmember Jackson clarified that while she believed that the current developer's intention was to build townhomes, she noted that plans and ownership could change and she did not want a different future developer to build something different on the property. She thought that a development agreement might be better to allow the City more control.

Councilmember Hulbert clarified that culinary and secondary water were different because culinary water was recirculated back into the system, whereas secondary water evaporated or drained into bodies of water. Councilmember Hulbert stated that the City's primary concern was secondary water.

Councilmember Wilson said there were some things she wanted to research further, including the ingress and egress details. She asked if the motion could be tabled to allow the Councilmembers time to do more research.

Councilmember Jackson asked if there was a zone that specifically designated townhomes.

Councilmember Jackson said that she was not opposed to apartments, but her main concern was that the flexibility of the zone could result in a significantly different final project than the proposal they were looking at now.

Councilmember Sphar said that he wanted to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation to not

move forward with the proposal. Councilmember Saxton agreed that he wanted to go with the Planning Commission's perspective and deny the motion. Councilmember Saxton added that he personally would not want to live near this development and so he did not think it was appropriate for Roy City.

Councilmember Hulbert commented that she lived near several townhome developments and thought that the townhome residents made wonderful neighbors. Councilmember Hulbert thanked Mrs. Laws and the members of the public for keeping their comments professional and focused on what was best for the City, rather than personal attacks.

Councilmember Wilson discussed property rights. She appreciated Mrs. Laws' right to do what she wanted with her property, although she wanted more time to look into the issue and ensure that the proposal aligned with the General Plan and the surrounding community. Councilmember Wilson said that she wanted to table the issue so that she could be certain it was the correct thing to grant or deny property owners' rights in this case.

Councilmember Wilson motioned to table Ordinance 26-2; Consider a request to amend the General Plan (Future Land Use Map) from Single-Family Residential to Multi-Family Residential for property located at 2715 West 4800 South. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, Councilmembers Wilson and Councilmember Jackson voted "Aye" and Councilmember Sphar, Councilmember Hulbert and Councilmember Saxton voted "Nay" and the motion was denied.

Councilmember Sphar motioned to deny Ordinance 26-2; Consider a request to amend the General Plan (Future Land Use Map) from Single-Family Residential to Multi-Family Residential for property located at 2715 West 4800 South. Councilmember Saxton seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, all present members voted "Aye" and the motion carried.

2. **Consideration of Ordinance 26-3; Consider a request to amend the Zoning Map from RE-20 (Residential Estates) to R-3 (Multi-Family Residential) for property located at 2715 West 4800 South**

Councilmember Sphar voted to deny Ordinance 26-3; Consider a request to amend the Zoning Map from RE-20 (Residential Estates) to R-3 (Multi-Family Residential) for property located at 2715 West 4800 South Councilmember Hulbert seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, all present members voted "Aye" and the motion carried.

3. **Consideration of Ordinance 26-4; Consider a Development Agreement with Steward Land Co. regarding a potential project located at approximately 3925 West 4965 South (Parcel Number 09-072-0016, 09-072-0064 & 09-072-0065), to allow 43 single-family detached dwellings on smaller lots.**

Assistant City Manager Flint presented this item as well. He provided the history of the item and explained the Planning Commission had issued a negative recommendation after holding a public comment period.

The applicant, Brad Brown, acknowledged the high turnout and commented it was nice to see how much the community cared about Roy City. He appreciated that the residents felt that Roy City was special and did not want to lose its essence. He expressed that his goal was to maintain the qualities of Roy that people valued.

Councilmember Wilson said that from what she had heard, the goal for this development was around \$400,000 per unit. She asked for a ballpark cost if they changed the size to 8,000 square foot lots. Mr. Brown explained how the company he worked with calculated their final prices, so an 8,000 square foot lot would be around \$550-600,000 range. Councilmember Wilson noted this would price out many residents, since that amount was outside of what the average Roy resident could afford. Councilmember Wilson commented that people who wanted a single-family home in Roy City did not have affordable options.

Councilmember Wilson asked Assistant City Manager Flint why developers had a different Code. Assistant City Manager Flint explained that although it was possible for any homeowner to request a zone change, it was more likely that a developer would need to ask for a zone or land use ordinance change. Assistant City Manager Flint clarified that any land-owning resident in Roy City could undergo the same process that developers went through. Assistant City Manager Flint additionally noted that new developments like this one usually resulted in a substantial increase in property tax revenue for the City.

Councilmember Wilson asked Mr. Brown if he would sell the lots to an individual person, or if he only wanted to sell in sections. Mr. Brown replied that typically they sold to builders, although that was not set in stone.

Councilmember Jackson commented there were concerns about the water drainage in the area and asked if there was information on that. Mr. Brown stated that there were non-jurisdictional wetlands on the property and reported that they had an engineer come and look at the area. Mr. Brown added that they would work with the City Engineer to ensure that they were compliant with State and City standards about how the wetlands were managed.

Mr. Brown stated they planned on having an HOA and that the streets would be private. He said that he had never experienced an HOA failure, although he appreciated that such a thing was possible.

Councilmember Wilson asked about plans for traffic studies. Mr. Brown reported that he had spoken with his engineer about what the main issues were as far as safety was concerned.

Councilmember Jackson asked about fire codes. Mr. Brown explained that there were standards about how far apart buildings needed to be and said the development would be compliant with those requirements.

Councilmember Hulbert stated there were some small houses in Roy City that were built several decades ago as part of an affordable housing initiative, and she noted those homes had been built very close together. She expressed that her main concern with those developments was that the homes were so close together there was not room for things like RVs or additional vehicles to get behind them.

Councilmember Hulbert asked Mr. Brown if he had taken that element into consideration. Mr. Brown replied that the lot size was small in order to ensure the homes were affordable and said that the lots were smaller than the kind of projects he usually worked on. Mr. Brown added that there would be an HOA, which would place limits on what kind of things the individual lot owners could build on their parcels.

Councilmember Hulbert also acknowledged that this project was at the beginning of this process.

Councilmember Jackson brought up some of the points that the Planning Commission had made in their previous meeting. She expressed surprise that all of the Commissioners had voted "nay."

Councilmember Jackson noted that some backyards faced the development and wondered if they could reach a compromise about the number of units. She appreciated that reducing the number of units would

increase the price. She also asked if doing a development agreement was possible. Mr. Brown said that placing a deed restriction on the title could make things more complicated in the future, although he said that an MDA could be possible.

Councilmember Hulbert noted that Mr. Brown would lose some of the plots due to the water retention basin that would need to be built. Mr. Brown anticipated that he would lose about two lots, although he said that he had not yet conducted a study to be sure.

Councilmember Wilson also inquired about the retention pond. Mr. Brown expressed that he wanted the community to look nice, and said that he would landscape the pond and make sure the area looked nice, as long as it was possible given the slope and the water table level. Councilmember Wilson appreciated Mr. Brown's commitment to improving Roy City.

Councilmember Hulbert commented that she wanted the density in this area to decrease a little bit. She appreciated that Mr. Brown wanted to do single-family homes, which she noted were increasingly difficult to find in Roy City. Mr. Brown appreciated that density made people wary, but expressed that there were ways to offset the impacts of density, such as traffic mitigation measures. Mr. Brown hoped they could find a price point that made sense for the needs of the community.

Councilmember Jackson said that there were many things about this proposal that she liked and said that it was always a trade-off between affordability and attainability. She thought that making small changes to the density, like taking away ten homes, would result in a small change for the property tax revenue but it would greatly increase the attainability.

Councilmember Jackson motioned to approve Ordinance 26-4; Consider a Development Agreement with Steward Land Co. regarding a potential project located at approximately 3925 West 4965 South (Parcel Number 09-072-0016, 09-072-0064 & 09-072-0065), to allow 43 single-family detached dwellings on smaller lots. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Councilmember Sphar, Councilmember Hulbert and Councilmember Saxton voted "Nay," Councilmember Wilson and Councilmember Jackson voted "Aye" and the motion was denied.

4. **Consideration of Ordinance 26-5;** Consider a request to annex a 3.96 acre-parcel into the City with a zoning designation of S-n (Station North) for properties located at approximately 2175 West 3750 South

Assistant City Manager Flint presented this item and oriented the Council to the location of the site in question. He explained the rationale for the annexation. He noted that the County and Ogden City were in favor of the annexation.

Councilmember Wilson motioned to approve Ordinance 26-5; Consider a request to annex a 3.96 acre-parcel into the City with a zoning designation of S-n (Station North) for properties located at approximately 2175 West 3750 South. Councilmember Hulbert seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All present members voted "Aye" and the motion carried.

5. **Consideration of Resolution 26-11;** A Resolution of the Roy City Council Adopting a Traffic Calming Program

Councilmember Hulbert presented this item and noted this resolution had evolved from previous Council conversations. She explained the resolution would streamline the process for residents who wanted to raise concerns about certain City roads that they felt required a traffic calming device. Councilmember Wilson said she was glad to hear there was now a system in place that would save time and manpower.

Councilmember Sphar motioned to approve Resolution 26-11; A Resolution of the Roy City Council Adopting a Traffic Calming Program. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All present members voted “Aye” and the motion carried.

6. Consideration of Resolution 26-12; A Resolution of the Roy City Council Amending the Roy City Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual

City Attorney Wilson explained that Roy City was required to adopt this policy and said the intention behind the policy was to ensure safe driving practices when City employees operated City vehicles.

Councilmember Wilson motioned to approve Resolution 26-12; A Resolution of the Roy City Council Amending the Roy City Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual. Councilmember Hulbert seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All present members voted “Aye” and the motion carried.

G. Discussion Item

1. 2026 Parks Water Restrictions Management Plan – Parks and Recreation Director Parks and Recreation Director Howard presented a summary of the 2026 Parks Water Restrictions Management Plan. She explained the structure of the document. She said the first section dealt with turf; the second section considered trees; and the third section was about the splash pad. She added that there were also changes to their irrigation plan that had been introduced that year as part of water-saving measures.

The Councilmembers debated reducing the hours of the splash pad in order to save water. Councilmember Wilson thought that full closure would be excessive, since it provided a needed service for children in the City. Councilmember Jackson asked about the process if the water levels reached dangerously low levels. City Manager Andrews said that their water usage and water levels could be monitored online, and he added that Roy’s water consumption aligned with State requirements. Parks and Recreation Director Howard commented that the splash pad used culinary, not secondary water.

Councilmember Wilson proposed alternate hours for the splash pad that would help save money. Councilmember Hulbert agreed it would be wise to reduce the hours, and proposed that they align the splash pad hours of operation with the summer school hours. Parks and Recreation Director Howard suggested that they could close the splash pad on Mondays, since the Complex was open late on that day. Councilmember Sphar felt it was important to have an amenity available for those who could not afford the Complex. Councilmember Wilson asked when the bathrooms were open and commented about how pervasive the issue of vandalism was at the facilities.

Councilmember Hulbert asked why the cemetery had to be on the highest tier for watering. Parks and Recreation Director Howard replied that the cemetery would be closely monitored, and explained that they did not want to put it on the middle tier because they did not want to lose any grass as they moved sod over the summer.

The Councilmembers thanked Parks and Recreation Director Howard.

2. Tax Increase Proposal – Councilmember Saxton

Councilmember Saxton listed the four options that had been presented to the Council at their most recent budget meeting. He opined that a 30% or 55% property tax increase was too high and thought an 18% increase could be sufficient. He stated an 18% percent increase would generate enough money to cover staff COLAs for March and begin to work on wage adjustments, starting with the Public Works department. Councilmember Saxton thought doing this would show the City employees that the Council was dedicated to making wage adjustments. Councilmember Saxton also advocated for using their reserve funds to help mitigate the need for the tax increase. He opined that a 55% increase was historic and emphasized it was very important to bring this figure down. He cautioned that if the Council moved forward with the tax increase, they would inhibit people from moving into Roy City and risked losing residents who currently lived there.

Councilmember Jackson thanked Councilmember Saxton for bringing this issue up so early. She said that she had been meeting with department heads in the City to get a gauge of how serious the budget deficits were as well. She explained that she looked at the issue with a focus on employee retention and ensuring there was no interruption to City services, rather than focusing on the increase in taxes. Councilmember Jackson said that the employee turnover rate was unsustainably high and cautioned that if the Council did not do something to stem the employee loss, then the City would start losing services.

Councilmember Hulbert thanked Councilmember Jackson for her research on this topic and Councilmember Saxton for bringing this issue to their attention. Councilmember Hulbert said it was hard to make a decision about taxes at this stage and proposed that they hold some work meetings.

Councilmember Wilson asked what services Councilmember Saxton planned on cutting. Councilmember Saxton discussed his plan was to focus on wage adjustments for Public Works first, namely the Police and Fire departments, as these departments seemed to be the ones that the public was the most concerned about. Councilmember Saxton added that his plan was not to cut anyone in the City, but to assure other employees in the City that their wages would also be addressed in due time. Councilmember Saxton thought it was important to start making real changes, as he felt this would signify to all employees that the City was working on the issue. Councilmember Wilson expressed that all the departments in the City were important and provided necessary services.

Councilmember Wilson worried about picking just one or two departments to start with and felt this may cause division. Councilmember Saxton acknowledged this point but still felt it was best to do something versus nothing. Councilmember Wilson said that the most straightforward cuts to make were to personnel and asked what they would do if they did not generate enough sales tax revenue to make wage adjustments for all employees. Councilmember Wilson emphasized that other cuts would need to be made in order to make up the budget deficit. Councilmember Jackson supported this point and explained that she had a chart which helped her see what cuts would bring them closer to their budget target.

Councilmember Jackson emphasized that they could not continue to put the burden of the budget issues on the City employees. Councilmember Jackson discussed the extent to which Roy City underpaid their employees compared to other cities. Councilmember Jackson said that even without a full salary survey, it was clear to see that Roy City had an issue and needed to close their wage gap. Councilmember Jackson added that the best approach was an incremental one, and said that they could not move forward with anything else until they got out of this rut. Councilmember Hulbert agreed with Councilmember Jackson's sentiments and reiterated her suggestion that they work through these issues in a work session. Councilmember Wilson added that there were some services in Roy City that actually resulted in savings and pointed out that they needed to take these factors into account when they considered the budget cuts.

She stated that things were not as black and white as they often seemed and said that they would need to take other data into account when they considered their wage gap. She added that their employee turnover rate cost extra taxpayer money since it was very expensive to constantly train new employees, especially members of the Police and Fire department. Councilmember Wilson expressed that she took taxpayer money very seriously.

The Councilmembers stated that they would hold a work session to discuss this at greater length.

H. City Manager & Council Report

City Manager Andrews announced that the Parks and Recreation department were collecting flags that they wanted to retire. He said that the Daughters of the Revolution would hold a retirement ceremony for the flags.

Councilmember Hulbert asked if they would hold one more Open House about the Fire department before they made a decision and City Manager Andrews said he could coordinate that meeting.

Mayor Jackson announced there would be a ceremony at the cemetery for Memorial Day. Mayor Jackson also reported that Roy High School's graduation ceremony had taken place earlier that day.

Mayor Jackson thanked the members of the public for attending the meeting and sharing their thoughts. She said that even in disagreement, she knew that everyone who had attended the meeting cared about Roy City. She said that she and the Councilmembers were working hard to make Roy City a good place to live.

I. Adjournment

Councilmember Sphar motioned to adjourn the meeting, Councilmember Hulbert seconded the motion, all present Councilmembers voted "Aye" and the meeting adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

Ann Jackson
Mayor

Attest:

Brittany Fowers
City Recorder

dc: