ROY CITY CORPORATION
Council Meeting Minutes
Date: September 1, 2026
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Roy City Council Chambers, 5051 S 1900 W. Roy, UT 84067

These are the pending minutes that have been prepared in draft form and are subject to change before being approved by the public body that held the open meeting. Notice of this meeting was provided in accordance with Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-203. This meeting was also streamed on YouTube, and the video archive can be found at youtube.com/@RoyCityCorporation.

Elected Members present:
Mayor Ann Jackson
Councilmember Hulbert
Councilmember Jackson
Councilmember Saxton
Councilmember Sphar
Councilmember Wilson

Legislative Staff present:
City Manager, Matt Andrews
City Recorder, Brittany Fowers

Legal Staff present:
City Attorney, Matt Wilson

Department Directors present: Management Services Director, Amber Kelley; C.E.D Director, Brody Flint; Police Sergeant, Travis Kearl; Deputy Fire Chief, Mike King; Parks and Recreation Director, Michelle Howard; Public Works Director, Brandon Edwards.

Presenters:

A. Welcome and Roll Call
Mayor Jackson welcomed those in attendance and noted which Elected Members were in attendance.

B. Moment of Silence and Pledge of Allegiance
Councilmember Jackson invited the audience to observe a moment of silence followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. Business Item
1. Employee Longevity Recognition

Parks and Recreation Director Howard invited Deputy Parks and Recreation Director Flint to share in the acknowledgment of employee Cindy Taylor's tenure with the Roy City Complex.

Assistant City Manager Flint recognized employee Cindy Taylor for 40 years of service at the Roy Recreation Complex. Assistant City Manager Flint described Mrs. Taylor as a dedicated instructor and program leader. He noted that her aerobics, strength-training, and swimming programs had improved the health and confidence of thousands of residents. Assistant City Manager Flint estimated that Mrs. Taylor had taught more than 10,000 swimmers and thanked

FINAL

Mrs. Taylor and her family for four decades of service. He lastly clarified that the recognition was not a retirement announcement.

D. Consent Items

1. July 7, 2026, Roy City Council Meeting Minutes and July 21, 2026, Roy City Council Meeting Minutes
2. Surplus Vehicles
3. June 2026 Financial Statements
4. Appointment of Alternate Planning Commissioner, Randy Scadden

Councilmember Wilson welcomed Mr. Scadden to the Planning Commission and moved to approve the consent items.

Councilmember Wilson moved to approve the above consent items. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion; Councilmembers Jackson, Hulbert, Wilson, and Sphar all voted in favor and Councilmember Saxton voted Nay.

E. Public Comments

Mayor Jackson opened the floor for public comments. Public comments are held to a 3-minute maximum per speaker in accordance with the Roy City Council Meeting Rules of Procedure and Order.

David Young supported the recent property tax increase and said Roy's infrastructure and services demonstrated why tax revenue was necessary. Mr. Young stated that the increase had been overdue and cited the Tenth Amendment and provisions of the Utah Constitution as authority for state and local taxation.

Geoffrey Cox described a near-collision with a turning vehicle while he was using the pedestrian crossing at 5600 South and 1900 West. Mr. Cox thanked Officers Baker, Ward, and Benson for responding to his report and said other residents had shared similar experiences. Mr. Cox also described a video he had seen of a mother and child stranded in the crossing while traffic continued around them and requested zebra-striping, improved signs, and repaired warning lights.

Trevor Dearden addressed a new development proposal. He said he was not opposed to homes being built in the area, but felt that the current proposal of 43 new units was excessive. He noted that this number of homes would increase traffic to an unsafe level and pose a threat to pedestrians and children playing outside.

FINAL

Clay Crabtree echoed Mr. Dearden's support for development under the existing zoning and opposition to 43 homes. Mr. Crabtree pointed out that several proposed homes would border his backyard. He felt that the smaller lots would be inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood and that the project would worsen traffic on streets with limited access.

Shelley Polston presented follow-up notices to the Mayor, Councilmembers, Police Chief, and City Recorder concerning constitutional and private property rights. She recalled that she had previously distributed these notices at the August 11th Council meeting. Mrs. Polston questioned the City's authority to tax or restrict private property. She asserted that the City had not posted a response, as she had previously requested, and said that she considered the City to be in default of the prior notice.

Jeff Howard echoed the earlier opposition to 43 homes and asked for any developments to use lot and home sizes consistent with the existing neighborhood. Mr. Harward stated that 3900 West already lacked secondary water and expressed concern that the project would increase demand on the City's culinary-water system.

Rachel Sandoval supported the proposal for 43 new homes as an opportunity to provide newer, more attainable single-family homes for younger buyers. Mrs. Sandoval said she was a recent graduate with a finance and real-estate education, and said smaller lots could help bring prices within Federal Housing Administration lending limits while allowing younger residents to remain near their families and community.

Laura Burroughs supported the development as well, but opposed the proposed density and smaller lots behind her home. Mrs. Burroughs said homes were available in Roy City near the projected price range. She asked the Council to preserve the existing zoning, neighborhood character, and safety of surrounding families.

Staci Crabtree opposed the proposed density and described existing traffic and construction delays affecting families traveling to school. Mrs. Crabtree questioned whether very small lots would produce more affordable homes than existing homes in Roy and reiterated previous commenter's concerns about fire access, sidewalks, and stormwater runoff. She also questioned the need for the zone change. Mrs. Crabtree pointed out that runoff from the field already flooded her yard during wet years, and asked that any development solve the drainage problem without shifting water onto neighboring properties.

Mark Meier asked what had changed since the Council's earlier consideration because the public notice still referred to 43 homes. Mr. Meier questioned whether the proposed homes would be affordable to younger buyers and expressed concern about traffic, children playing near the road, wetlands, and drainage. Mr. Meier supported development under the existing zoning, which she felt would ensure that the project would remain consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

FINAL

Mayor Jackson closed the floor for public comment.

F. <u>Action Items</u>

1. Re-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 explained that State law and City ordinance allowed an applicant to request reconsideration and that the Council first had to approve a motion to reconsider before discussing changes to the proposal. Assistant City Manager Flint stated that the original 43 home proposal had been denied and that Steward Land Company now intended to reduce the maximum to 39 homes.

Councilmember Wilson moved to reconsider Ordinance 26-4; Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion to approve. The roll call votes are as follows:

Councilmember Hulbert	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Jackson	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Saxton	**___ "Aye"**	**_X_ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Sphar	**___ "Aye"**	**_X_ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Wilson	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**

Ordinance 26-4 was now on the floor for reconsideration with a vote of 3:2.

2. 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.

Mr. Brown, the applicant for the development, spoke first. Mr. Brown thanked the Council for reconsidering the application and described the reduction from 43 to 39 single-family homes as an effort to respond to neighborhood concerns while keeping the project feasible. He said that his new proposal was not substantially different from the old one. He compared the proposal's average lot size of approximately 3,200 square feet with an as-zoned concept that he said could practically accommodate 16 homes on approximately 8,000-square-foot lots. Mr. Brown estimated that homes under the proposal could sell near $450,000, and added that new homes could cost approximately $675,000 to $700,000. He felt that the development addressed housing needs within the City.

Mr. Brown then addressed concerns about traffic. He stated there was sufficient capacity on local streets. He appreciated that children liked to play outside and said that he wanted the development to integrate well into the surrounding community. He emphasized that he had endeavored to listen to the neighbors and address their concerns in the new plan.

FINAL

Councilmember Wilson asked how the development would address standing water on neighboring properties. Mr. Brown explained that the development would be required to retain its stormwater and added that the project engineers could evaluate existing runoff problems while designing the drainage system. Councilmember Wilson then asked whether the traffic generated by the development would remain within the capacity of the neighborhood streets, and whether residents outside the development could use the proposed pocket park. Mr. Brown replied that the traffic impact would be minimal and that the park would be privately owned and controlled by the HOA, although he added that he hoped it would function as a gathering place for children throughout the neighborhood.

Councilmember Wilson brought up fire risk and asked Deputy Fire Chief King to address concerns about emergency access and the proximity of the proposed homes. Deputy Fire Chief King stated that the Fire Department's principal requirements were separate entrance and exit routes and a sufficiently wide, unobstructed roadway for emergency apparatus. Deputy Fire Chief King stated that the proposal included two access points and the required minimum road width.

Councilmember Jackson asked Mr. Brown to identify the source of his traffic estimates. Mr. Brown responded that Civil Solutions Group had provided the unit counts, based on an estimate that 41 homes would generate approximately 369 daily trips and 37 trips during the peak hour. Mr. Brown explained that he had asked the engineer to assign 75% of the traffic to 3900 West, rather than dividing the traffic equally between the two exits. He clarified the calculations were part of an informal estimate and not a formal study. Mr. Brown stated that this was a conservative estimate, which assigned approximately 263 daily trips to 3900 West and kept the street below the customary capacity for a local road. Councilmember Jackson appreciated that Mr. Brown had taken the resident's most common routes into consideration.

Councilmember Jackson then asked how much parking would be provided within the development. Mr. Brown stated that each home would have a two-car garage, at least two driveway spaces, and access to street parking. Mr. Brown added that the development would likely include additional parking near the pocket park. Councilmember Wilson asked Mr. Brown to clarify whether the HOA could prevent residents outside the development from using the park. Mr. Brown reiterated that the park would be controlled by the HOA and that he could not guarantee how a future HOA would regulate access.

Councilmember Jackson asked whether the private streets would be maintained by the HOA and whether the City would continue to maintain the public utilities. Mr. Brown confirmed that the HOA would maintain and plow the private streets, while the water and sewer systems would remain public utilities.

Councilmember Jackson noted that the existing zoning could theoretically allow approximately 25 homes and asked representatives of the police department whether the difference between 25 and 39 homes would create a significant safety concern. A member of the police department stated that development of the vacant field could reduce some existing public-safety concerns but cautioned that vehicles parked on both sides of a private street could obstruct emergency access. He also clarified that the Police Department could not enforce an HOA's private parking rules.

FINAL

Councilmember Jackson asked whether parking restrictions or other safety requirements could be imposed during the later stages of project review. Assistant City Manager Flint explained that approval of the development agreement would establish a maximum of 39 homes but would not replace the normal engineering, site-plan, and building-permit reviews. Assistant City Manager Flint stated that later review could require wider roads, parking restrictions, changes to the site plan, or fewer homes but could not increase the approved maximum.

Councilmember Hulbert thanked the residents for speaking respectfully in the public comment section and also thanked Mr. Brown for attempting to respond to the concerns raised during the Council's earlier consideration. Councilmember Hulbert stated that she still would have preferred fewer homes and additional parking. She reiterated her appreciation for Mr. Brown's willingness to adapt the plan based on feedback from the public and discussed that she had carefully considered the advantages and disadvantages of the project. She expressed that she had struggled to come to a decision about this development but felt that she had arrived at a conclusion.

Councilmember Wilson asked whether the proposed site plan remained preliminary and could change after the required surveys, geotechnical analysis, engineering, and other technical reviews. Mr. Brown confirmed that the location of the detention area, setbacks, road configuration, and number of homes could change as additional information became available. Councilmember Wilson also identified minor corrections that needed to be made in the development agreement document.

Councilmember Jackson stated that she relied on the professional assessments provided by the traffic engineer, Fire Department, Police Department, and City staff. Councilmember Jackson said the projected increase in traffic appeared relatively minor and noted that the arrangement of the proposed homes would create a natural separation between the development and the surrounding properties. She stated that the proposed home values would be comparable to values in the surrounding neighborhood despite the smaller lots. Councilmember Jackson also expressed concern that future State legislation could potentially reduce the City's authority over residential zoning, so she concluded that the current revised proposal was a safe and reasonable use of the property.

Councilmember Wilson commented that the project would provide an attainable single-family housing option that was not otherwise widely available in Roy. Councilmember Wilson acknowledged that the homes and lots would be close together, but said the needs of future residents should also be considered. Councilmember Wilson agreed with Councilmember Jackson that approving a locally negotiated development agreement could preserve more City control than possible future state zoning requirements.

Councilmember Saxton said he did not have any questions, but wanted to ensure that his concerns were recorded. He said that while he wanted to see development in Roy City, he felt that the density of this proposal was too high. He stated that reducing the proposal from 43 to 39 homes did not resolve his concern about the development's density. Councilmember Saxton said the proposal would place nearly 10 units per acre and crowd residents together. Councilmember Saxton expressed concern that approving the

FINAL

project despite the objections of surrounding residents would reduce public confidence and stated that he would not change his earlier vote to deny the agreement.

Councilmember Wilson responded that the Council had a responsibility to consider both existing and future residents and said the revised proposal could provide a reasonable balance. Mr. Brown encouraged the Council to reach a locally controlled solution and reiterated that he was willing to work with the City on additional changes that would keep the project feasible. Mr. Brown said he preferred reaching a compromise rather than leaving the property undeveloped.

Councilmember Hulbert stated that she preferred development under the existing zoning, though she acknowledged that the concept might not be financially feasible for the applicant with the current zone.

Councilmember Sphar discussed that when he was a Planning Commissioner, he considered what the best use of the land might be, but his perspective and priorities had shifted since his appointment to the Council. He stated that the proposal could represent the best and highest use of the property from a planning perspective, although his responsibilities as a Councilmember led him to oppose the proposed density. Councilmember Sphar thanked the applicant, residents, and Staff for the information provided and acknowledged that the decision was difficult.

Councilmember Wilson moved to approve Ordinance 26-4; Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion to approve. The roll call votes are as follows:

Councilmember Hulbert	**___ "Aye"**	**_X_ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Jackson	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Saxton	**___ "Aye"**	**_X_ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Sphar	**___ "Aye"**	**_X_ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Wilson	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**

Ordinance 26-4 was not approved with a negative vote of 3:2.

3. Consideration of Ordinance 26-8; To consider amendments to Title 10 Zoning Regulations; Amending Chapter 31 – Definitions adding Garage & Yard Sales.

Assistant City Manager Flint explained that Staff had received repeated complaints about garage and yard sales that appeared to continue indefinitely. He explained the issue was that the existing Code did not provide a clear enforcement standard, and so the Code Enforcement Officers were unable to cite the offenders. Assistant City Manager Flint then recapped the discussion about this item thus far, and reported that the Planning Commission had held a public hearing and unanimously recommended language defining and regulating garage and yard sales.

Councilmember Hulbert requested that the ordinance reference the City's sign regulations so residents could readily identify the applicable requirements.

Councilmember Wilson described the proposal as a clarification of existing business-license rules and sought to avoid burdening residents who used yard sales responsibly. She discussed that she had been speaking about this ordinance with residents in order to get a sense of what their needs were and when

they liked to go to yard sales. Councilmember Wilson proposed allowing one three-day sale per quarter and increasing the annual limit from eight to twelve days, as well as changing the permitted starting time from 8:00 AM to 7:00 AM and adding side and rear yards to the locations identified in Section 2. The other Councilmembers concurred that they were in favor of starting at an earlier time.

Councilmembers Hulbert, Jackson, Saxton, and Sphar discussed the proposed changes. Councilmember Hulbert asked for clarification about why they should increase to twelve days, and the other Councilmembers discussed that they wanted to be respectful of residents who frequently held yard sales with good intent. The Councilmembers briefly discussed the item further and agreed that the revised limits would allow reasonable household sales while still giving Code Enforcement a standard for unusually long or frequent sales.

Councilmember Wilson moved to approve Ordinance 26-8 with the changes as stated in the meeting: the addition of side and rear yards, the increase from eight to twelve days, the change in start time from 8:00 AM to 7:00 AM, and reference to the sign ordinance. Councilmember Hulbert seconded the motion to approve. The roll call votes are as follows:

Councilmember Hulbert	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Jackson	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Saxton	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Sphar	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**
Councilmember Wilson	**_X_ "Aye"**	**___ "Nay"**	**___ "Excused"**

Ordinance 26-8 was approved with a vote of 5:0.

G. Discussion Items

1. Reinstating and Amending the Penalty for Building without a Permit – Councilmember Sphar

Councilmember Sphar explained that the former $500 penalty for beginning construction without a permit had been removed following an earlier Council discussion. Councilmember Sphar reported that contractors and subcontractors had begun taking advantage of the absence of a penalty and were obtaining permits only after being caught. Councilmember Sphar said this had made it more difficult for the Building Inspector to enforce the permitting requirements. Councilmember Sphar proposed restoring the penalty while establishing a warning or waiver for first-time violations and distinguishing between professional contractors and homeowners who made an honest mistake.

Councilmember Hulbert supported the idea of starting with education or a warning for residents, and suggested authorizing a penalty of up to $500. She thought this way, the consequence could reflect the circumstances of the violation. Councilmember Hulbert opined that taxpayers should not be required to bear the cost of enforcing permitting requirements against individuals who knowingly failed to comply. Councilmember Sphar explained that the property owner was ultimately responsible for obtaining the permit, even when a contractor had been hired to perform the work. Councilmember Sphar said staff

FINAL

should have discretion to distinguish between an uninformed homeowner and a contractor who repeatedly disregarded the requirements.

Councilmember Jackson asked whether the former penalty had been $500 for every violation. Councilmember Sphar confirmed that the former penalty had been $500 and reported that the Building Inspector believed a substantially smaller amount would not provide a meaningful deterrent for professional contractors. Councilmember Wilson requested a copy of the former ordinance and asked staff to provide information about the number and types of violations, including any repeat offenders, during the preceding several years. Councilmember Wilson also requested guidance from the Legal Department about the language that could be used.

Councilmember Jackson asked whether an ordinance could legally establish a warning system. City Attorney Wilson explained that the Building Inspector already had some enforcement discretion and that the ordinance could provide for a first-offense warning followed by a penalty. City Attorney Wilson cautioned that requiring a warning in every case could prevent staff from responding effectively when a person had knowingly and intentionally violated the permitting requirements. City Attorney Wilson stated that keeping the balance between a mandatory warning and Staff discretion was a policy decision for the Council.

Assistant City Manager Flint reported that the Building Inspector estimated that a penalty would have been appropriate approximately ten times during the preceding 30 months. Assistant City Manager Flint explained that the penalty would generally have been used only in cases involving intentional disregard or repeated violations. Assistant City Manager Flint stated that most residents cooperated and obtained a permit after staff explained the requirement. Assistant City Manager Flint cautioned that it would be difficult to write an ordinance covering every possible circumstance and said staff needed sufficient discretion to address individuals who knowingly refused to comply.

Mayor Jackson expressed concern that many residents did not realize permits were required for projects such as replacing a water heater, constructing a shed, or converting a carport into a garage. Mayor Jackson said residents might not learn that a permit was required until a neighbor complained or an insurance company questioned whether the work had been inspected.

Assistant City Manager Flint described a case in which homeowners had hired a contractor to construct a deck without obtaining a permit. Assistant City Manager Flint said the homeowners contacted the City after becoming concerned about the quality of the work and that the Building Inspector determined the deck was unsafe. Assistant City Manager Flint reported that the homeowners had to hire another contractor and spend approximately $8,000 to $10,000 to rebuild the deck correctly. Assistant City Manager Flint stated that the original contractor had committed multiple violations and that the City had little recourse without an enforceable penalty.

Councilmember Hulbert asked whether a warning could initially be issued to the homeowner, allowing the homeowner to determine whether the contractor had failed to obtain the required permit. Assistant

FINAL

City Manager Flint recommended allowing the City to cite the responsible contractor or subcontractor directly when appropriate. Assistant City Manager Flint explained that the property owner remained legally responsible but suggested drafting the ordinance with shared or split liability so staff could cite the contractor, subcontractor, or homeowner according to the circumstances. Assistant City Manager Flint also explained that the City did not have the staffing necessary to search proactively for unpermitted construction and that most enforcement began with a complaint or request for assistance.

Councilmember Jackson asked whether the proposed ordinance would still allow staff to cite a homeowner who repeatedly violated the permitting requirements. Assistant City Manager Flint confirmed that homeowners would need to remain subject to the ordinance. Councilmember Jackson described accompanying the Building Inspector during a ride-along and said the Inspector had emphasized education and voluntary compliance when speaking with residents. Councilmember Jackson supported preserving that discretion and said the Council could amend the ordinance later if enforcement became excessive or ineffective.

Councilmember Hulbert agreed that holding contractors directly responsible would provide the strongest deterrent while protecting homeowners who did not realize a permit had been required. Councilmember Hulbert also noted that insurance companies frequently contacted the City to determine whether work involved in a claim had been permitted and inspected. Councilmember Hulbert said obtaining the proper permit could therefore protect homeowners if a fire, flood, structural failure, or other losses occurred.

Mayor Jackson observed that rising construction costs had encouraged more residents to complete projects themselves or hire acquaintances, rather than hiring a professional. Mayor Jackson said that residents might learn how to perform work online without understanding the permitting, inspection, licensing, or insurance consequences.

Councilmember Wilson stated that they should utilize language that preserved education and enforcement discretion. Councilmember Wilson said the ordinance should provide a consistent framework for treating residents fairly while allowing stronger enforcement against repeat offenders and professional contractors. Councilmember Jackson agreed that the ordinance could provide for a warning without requiring one in every case. Councilmember Jackson cautioned that a mandatory sequence of warnings could prevent the Building Inspector from responding appropriately to an immediately dangerous or intentional violation.

Mayor Jackson asked how Staff generally became aware of unpermitted projects. Assistant City Manager Flint explained that the Building Inspector usually learned about violations through complaints or calls from property owners rather than through proactive patrols. Councilmember Hulbert added that the Building Inspector and Code Enforcement Officer could also notice possible violations while traveling between other assignments.

Mayor Jackson emphasized that residents needed to investigate contractors carefully because licenses, qualifications, and online information could be difficult to verify. Assistant City Manager Flint asked the Council to confirm whether staff should prepare a revised ordinance based on the discussion.

FINAL

Councilmember Wilson requested that staff include the former ordinance language so the Council could compare it with the proposed changes.

Mayor Jackson directed Staff to return with an updated ordinance draft that preserved enforcement discretion. She asked for the document to reflect permitted responsibility to be assigned to homeowners, contractors, or subcontractors according to the circumstances.

2. Comprehensive Review of City Communication Methods and Software Consolidation – Councilmember Sphar

Councilmember Sphar provided a summary of the Council's earlier discussion about improving communication with residents. He requested pricing and service comparisons for printed and digital options. Councilmember Sphar noted that the City already used some CivicPlus products and said expanded services could provide targeted notices by text, email, or telephone while allowing electronic information to be corrected quickly. Councilmember Sphar also supported retaining a printed option for residents who did not use computers.

Councilmember Wilson recalled that the *Standard Examiner* had offered to prepare and distribute a Roy-focused publication if the City paid postage. She commented that Ogden's mayor had described a similar arrangement as a significant benefit. Councilmember Saxton recalled that the estimated annual cost was approximately $31,000 and wondered whether the publication would provide sufficient value and reach to Roy residents to justify the price.

Councilmember Hulbert supported the idea of comparing practices in other cities and reviewing the options in a work session. Councilmember Jackson asked for the comparison include how cities using printed publications also distributed timely electronic information. Mayor Jackson agreed that both formats had advantages. Mayor Jackson further commented that printed information remained important to some residents, even though it could become outdated in the future.

City Manager Andrews agreed to gather information and circulate possible dates for an October work session.

3. Engine Brakes on 5600 South – Councilmember Saxton

Councilmember Saxton relayed a concern that a resident had raised about increased use of engine-compression brakes on 5600 South. Councilmember Saxton explained that the resident had reported that the traffic had grown as a result of the roadway project. He elaborated that the road improvement project had been quite substantial and said that the neighbors who lived in the area were upset about how loud the project had been. He explained that the residents had requested a noise ordinance to help mitigate the issue. Councilmember Saxton said the City could consider a noise ordinance to solve the issue, but cautioned that restricting engine braking could create public-safety concerns and also be difficult to enforce.

FINAL

Mayor Jackson clarified that Councilmember Saxton was talking about jake brakes on larger vehicles, which she agreed were very noisy. She said that although they were noisy, they were an important safety feature. Mayor Jackson pointed out that engine brakes could be necessary to prevent collisions involving heavy vehicles, particularly with the higher speed limit and increasing pedestrian and bicycle activity along 5600 South. Councilmember Saxton concurred that the brakes were very noisy. Councilmember Saxton said that although the road in question was a State-owned road, he thought there was something the Council could do to respond to the residents' concerns. Councilmember Saxton discussed that he did not want to jeopardize resident safety, so he was interested in getting input from the other Councilmembers to get their opinions on the matter.

City Manager Andrews provided some history on the discussion. He reported that the Council had considered an ordinance in 2021, but no motion had ultimately been made to adopt it. City Manager Andrews also recalled that UDOT had not allowed the City to impose a restriction limited to certain hours at that time.

Police Chief Gwynn said an engine-brake restriction would be difficult to enforce because an officer would need to witness the violation in real-time and make a determination whether the braking was necessary. He added that the short grade along 5600 South did not appear to create the same braking need as a steep route such as the North Ogden Divide, but the department had not experienced a significant enforcement issue there.

Councilmember Jackson suggested comparing Roy's situation with cities that regulated similar roads and grades. Councilmember Saxton agreed to investigate comparable ordinances and return with additional information.

H. City Manager and Council Report

City Manager Andrews reminded the Council about the My Hometown event on September 19th. City Manager Andrews reported that the Recreation Complex would reopen September eighth after its annual cleaning. He finally reported that the Aquatic Center's final operating days of the season would be September fifth and September seventh.

Mayor Jackson thanked Parks and Recreation Director Howard, Public Works Director Edwards, public-safety personnel, sponsors, and other participants for their work on Roy Days. Mayor Jackson reported there had been overwhelmingly positive feedback about the parade and fireworks. She expressed appreciation that no major incidents had occurred, despite the heat and large attendance.

Councilmember Hulbert also spoke about Roy Days. She especially praised the cooling misters and the improved spacing of parade entries. Councilmember Sphar stated that he intended to bring forward a future discussion about a possible beer garden as a source of additional Roy Days revenue.

FINAL

I. Adjournment

Councilmember Hulbert motioned to adjourn the meeting; Councilmember Sphar seconded the motion; all present members voted in favor and the meeting adjourned at 7:47 PM.

_____
Ann Jackson, Mayor

Attest:

_____
Brittany Fowers, City Recorder

FINAL