



MINUTES

August 24, 2022

**OAKLEY CITY COUNCIL MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING FOR TRUTH IN TAXATION AND FY 2023 FINAL BUDGET
7:00 PM**

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR DISPOSAL OF CITY PROPERTY
Oakley City Hall
Anchor Location: 960 West Center Street, Oakley UT**

In Attendance:

City Administration: Mayor Zane Woolstenhulme, Councilmembers: Joe Frazier, Kelly Kimber, Dave Neff, Tom Smart, Steve Wilmoth; Planning Commissioners: Cliff Goldthorpe, Doug Evans, Richard Bliss, Jan Manning, and Lane Livingston.

City Staff: City Recorder, Amy Rydalch; City Planner, Stephanie Woolstenhulme,

Others in Attendance: (Please see the attached attendance registry)

1. **Mayor Woolstenhulme** welcomed everyone to the hearings and asked **Councilmember Frazier** to lead the Pledge of Allegiance and **Councilmember Kimber** offered the invocation.

2. **Public Hearing for Proposed 2022 Tax Increase and FY 2023 FY Final Budget**

Mayor Woolstenhulme expressed his pleasure at the attendance for the hearings as important decisions need to be made and this is an opportunity to share information and understanding. He then presented the the PowerPoint presentation that was shared at the June 22nd City Council meeting in preparation of the 2023 fiscal year budget. He explained that this hearing is required because of the proposed property tax increase. He then summarized the purposes of local government, basic needs (infrastructure), a sense of community, and local control and explained that Oakley City has not gone through Truth in Taxation for quite some time if ever. He then explained the inverse relationship between the property tax rate and property values and how the objective is usually to keep tax revenues constant despite fluctuating property

42 values. If an entity wants to collect more property tax revenue the entity must go through the
43 Truth in Taxation process. A summary of Oakley City's historical taxable value along with their
44 respective certified tax rate was presented. The City is proposing to keep the rate the same
45 0.001 and capture the increase in taxable values to generate additional monies for a total of
46 expected tax revenues \$382,782. The City is proposing to capture the monies pledged toward
47 the expired 1996 Water bond and make double payments on the new USDA well financing with
48 a goal to pay it off in 20 years as opposed to 40. This leaves an additional \$30,000 available for
49 further infrastructure needs i.e., bridges, roads, water/sewer lines. Council has also discussed
50 using the additional \$30,000 toward a dedicated public safety officer. **Mayor Woolstenhulme**
51 then described the impact to the average home-owner in Oakley City. Annual impact on an
52 average home valued at \$761K is \$148. He discussed relief programs for those that need
53 assistance and for those that want to appeal the value of their home.

54
55 **Mayor Woolstenhulme opened the Public Hearing for Public Comment:**

56
57 **Alyssa Woolstenhulme, 4210 N Meadow Lane:** Stated that her understanding was that the increased
58 tax revenue was to be used for debt and for a public safety officer. She asked if those funds were used
59 for the public safety officer could that officer enforce city code as well.

60
61 **Lori Hoggan, 4549 N State Road 32:** Understands the property tax increase but is frustrated that the
62 website is not up to date with the City minutes. It is a compliance issue and the minutes need to be
63 posted for purposes of transparency.

64
65 **Bob Elbert, 527 E Weber Canyon Road:** Wants to know what happens if the well is not completed.
66 Where will the additional property tax money go. **Mayor Woolstenhulme** stated that the City is making
67 every effort to minimize the risk of problems in the development of the new well. Regardless of the
68 success of the new well the City will need to find additional culinary sources of water for sustainability.

69
70 **Cami Fernandez, Boulderville Rd:** Has been in the City for approximately two years. Is concerned about
71 the tax rate going up in the same year that property values have increased. Is also concerned about
72 financing of the new well and why it is being pursued. Is it for new home growth? And if so why do
73 existing homeowners have to pay for this additional development.

74
75 **Blake Hansen, 5450 N Franson Lane:** What is the need to make principal payments over 20 years vs. 40
76 years?

77
78 **Blake Frazer, 4951 N 850 West:** Is in favor of the property tax rate increase if it is needed which it
79 appears is the case. But wants the public to understand that even though the tax rate is being proposed
80 to stay the same at 0.001 it is an increase in the amount they will be paying because of the increased
81 property values. Also wanted to know if the City considered a General Obligation bond as opposed to
82 financing with USDA.

84 **Carla Wilmoth, 4317 N River Road:** Is concerned that the City is asking residents for property tax
85 increase to make a double payment on a loan when most people in the room aren't able to afford
86 double payments on their own homes. Is this a reasonable burden to place on the residents who are
87 here now but those that are here in 40 are not asked to share in that burden.
88

89 **Chris Dillman, 35 East Oakridge Lane:** With the increase in taxes not having happened for a long time is
90 this increase going to recur more frequently or is this a one and done? Has the City looked at impact
91 fees for infrastructure needs as opposed to a tax increase?
92

93 **Mayor Woolstenhulme closed the Public Hearing.** He then addressed several of the questions
94 from the public hearing. The well is not just for new growth. The restrictions during the summer
95 months for the last couple of years and the current moratorium on development are because
96 the City is not able to meet the current summer watering needs and maintain adequate fire
97 protection requirements. The well is for both current and future watering needs. The benefit of
98 the infrastructure you enjoy now is because of the forethought of those that were here before.
99 There is a cost savings by paying the debt off early but also the incentive is that the city has
100 several infrastructure projects that need attention and that freeing up capital sooner for these
101 projects assists the City in getting to these projects sooner. The Utah Taxpayers Association
102 actually encourages entities to go through this process at least every five years so that entities
103 can keep up with the inflation without overly burdening the taxpayer all at once. Impact fees are
104 an excellent source to capture the effect of new development. The City is in the process of
105 having a comprehensive analysis done of our fees and rates to make sure the City is capturing
106 what it should in these revenues.
107

108 **Mayor Woolstenhulme turned time over to the Council to speak to this issue before any**
109 **proposed action.**
110

111 **Councilmember Smart** pointed out that Oakley City has one of the lowest tax rates in the area.
112

113 **Councilmember Neff** stated that there has been thoughtful deliberation regarding the amount
114 of increase that is being asked at this time. That because of the length of time Oakley has
115 stayed at the same revenue level there are significant areas that need investment. He wanted
116 to assure the public that the Council even though it's an unpleasant ask to increase their tax
117 burden the Council is being prudent in their ask for the additional revenues.
118

119 **Mayor Woolstenhulme** addressed the issue regarding the minutes and acknowledges that the
120 City is behind and is working on getting them up to date. However, he stated that all agendas
121 for City Council meetings are posted and noticed accordingly and members of the public are
122 encouraged to attend these meetings. He pointed out that when the budget was first presented
123 to the Council in an open meeting in June there were approximately two members of the public
124 in attendance. He encouraged the public to come to the Council meetings as this is the best way
125 to stay informed.

126

127 **(Combined Agenda Items 3 & 4 in same motion)**

128

129 **Councilmember Smart** motioned to adopt the FY 2023 Final Budget and to set the certified tax rate at
130 0.001 as proposed. **Councilmember Neff** seconded the motion. **All voted in favor. Motion carried.**

131

132 **5. Public Hearing for Disposal of City Property**

133 **Mayor Woolstenhulme** addressed the subject of the public hearing by stating that this hearing
134 is a state and city requirement. The City has not made any commitments to any party to sell any
135 City property. There is interest in development of the City Center and the City is engaging
136 conversations with a party. He then reiterated that there have been no commitments made on
137 behalf of the City. Anything regarding the City Center development will involve the thorough
138 vetting by the Planning Commission, Public Hearings, and City Council.

139

140 **Mayor Woolstenhulme opened the public hearing:**

141

142 **Alyssa Woolstenhulme, 4210 North Meadow Lane:** is opposed to the sale of City Center property and
143 believes the City should retain control of said property. She is mostly concerned about the property to
144 the South of City Hall. She does not want to see retail and cited Kamas City and the problems they have
145 with retail not being successful. Would like to see Dutch's and Kens Kash stay. In favor of more public
146 spaces with picnic tables and gathering spaces, no living space.

147

148 **Jake Woolstenhulme, 4210 North Meadow Lane:** is opposed to the sale of the City Center property.
149 Wants it to be outdoor public spaces with walkways etc. In favor of saving it for the future.

150

151 **Carla Wilmoth, 4317 N River Road:** read written statement – please see attachment to minutes. (Went
152 over 3 minute limit. Lori Hoggan ceded her time to Ms. Wilmoth for continuation.)

153

154 **Larry Devey, Business Owner – Ken's Kash** stated that Ken's Kash is at it's limit and is in need of
155 expansion. (Speaking to the option of leasing or purchasing property) He Stated, as a business owner,
156 it's difficult to justify significant investment into a new store if the property is not owned by the business
157 owner? There is far fewer incentives to invest in building a new store if the underlying ground is tied to a
158 lease. He asks the public to consider the reality of asking businesses to invest without ownership. He
159 asked the public to give the City a chance.

160

161 **Lane Livingston, Planning Commissioner, 5350 N Franson Lane:** the real purpose of this meeting is the
162 City's obligation to meet the due diligence requirement before disposing of City property. He addressed
163 the public that it is their responsibility to seek out elected representatives and share their thoughts and
164 opinions about selling the property. He feels strongly that there should not be any agreement to sell
165 city property without a full development agreement in place that dictates what will be in every location.
166 It must have a plan that the planning commission reviews and the public is pleased with.

167

168 **Lori Hoggan, 4549 N State Road 32:** continued reading in the written statement by Carla Wilmoth. She
169 then asked Council and the Mayor to listen to the Public before they proceeded with any sale of
170 property.
171

172 **Laura Davis, 4178 Millrace Road,** not in favor of hotel or a shopping center, loves the idea of a pond.
173 Likes the farmers market idea and a way to support our local people. Appreciates the small town nature
174 of the City.
175

176 **Craig Davis, 4178 Millrace Road,** wants to improve what the City has but would like to maintain control
177 of the land.
178

179 **Pat Cone, 4410 Millrace Road,** read in the City Code ordinance regarding the sale of property and stated
180 that he did not believe the City had complied with their own code. Also referred to a conversation with
181 Councilmember Tom Smart and represented that Councilmember Smart indicated that the City had an
182 offer and was proceeding with the sale for appraised value. *(Councilmember Smart disagreed with this*
183 *portrayal of the conversation.)* Pointed out the benefits of bringing in business and the sales tax revenue
184 that comes from this type of development. Encouraged the City to look into the MAG program for
185 technical assistance. Emphasized that the City has one shot and wants this done right.
186

187 **Jan Perkins, 1190 West 4960 North:** stated that she is not sure whether she is in favor of the sale or not
188 because there have been no details presented to the public. She asked the Council to be more
189 transparent and to not communicate in vagaries. She feels it is unfair to sell property with one hearing
190 without knowing what the development plan is for the property. She asks the City to bring the plans
191 into the light to build more public trust. Cautioned about gentrification.
192

193 **Chris Dillman, 35 East Oakridge Lane:** opposed to the sale of property without any development plan.
194 Concerned about growth and infrastructure, what would a development here in City Center do to those
195 systems. How does a development here benefit the citizens.
196

197 **Peter Sorensen, 591 E Weber Canyon Road:** wants the city to consider how difficult it will be in the
198 future for Oakley to attain property for open space use. Once this property is gone that opportunity is
199 gone also. Stated that City Center is also the most populated area of the town and will continue to
200 become more so and this area could benefit from the open space. When commercial development
201 comes in it opens the door for future business that is not always foreseen. Asks Council to keep in mind
202 that many residents come here to avoid commercial enterprise.
203

204 **Blake Frazier, 4951 North 850 West:** stated that most of the folks that spoke here tonight have been
205 here 10,15, 20 years. He stated he's been here close to 70 years and has roots that go back further. He
206 stated that most of what was invested here in infrastructure was built to not only serve those that were
207 here but those that came and are to come. Including those that have been here 10, 15, 20 years. He
208 stated that if you want a city to survive, a city must have commercial business. Residential taxes will not
209 pay for your roads, water, and sewer. He stated that the property needs to be sold. It needs to be

210 developed. He's heard several comments tonight about how this development is going to affect Oakley
211 and then pointed out that he lives adjacent to City Center property and is directly affected by the
212 development. Oakley City needs an improved store. The sales tax needs to stay here. The service
213 station needs self service pumps. We need to upgrade the City. There is a Master Plan Development in
214 place. The process is in place. Recommended that the Council get independent appraisals. Asked
215 Council about why the facilities were no longer being rented under current policy and stated that it was
216 a Council decision.

217

218 **Blake Hansen, 5450 Franson Lane:** is an advocate for development but cautioned Council. As a
219 developer he stated that he always asks for control of the land because that is how he ensures
220 development goes as desired. He stated it's very important to understand the development plan before
221 the land is sold. It's important that the development is sustainable and serves the City. This takes place
222 in the planning process. Hard to control once land has been sold.

223

224 **Robert Jones, 5957 N Triple Crown Trail:** agrees with sentiments expressed by Mr. Blake Hansen.
225 Referred to the City's mission statement and mentioned transparency and asked for the Council to be
226 more engaged with the Community.

227

228 **Doug Evans, 5370 North New Lane:** addressed the public as a representative of the Planning
229 Commission. He stated that the planning commission is very unified. That the City does have a master
230 plan for the City Center. It was done in 2008. The goal of the Planning Commission is to follow that plan
231 and update it where needed. He assured the public that there is no formal application currently with
232 the City. The mixed-use zone allows the City to work out a development plan with the developer that is
233 completely at the City's discretion. It requires several public hearings and allows the city to reject or
234 approve what is being proposed. Development of property in this mixed-use zone regardless of land
235 ownership requires this master plan development process that involves the public.

236

237 **Kerbee Atkinson, 4451 N River Road:** addressed her comments to the South portion of the City Center
238 property. Is concerned that retail will not work in this area. She expressed her nostalgia for the area
239 and prefers community space and is willing to volunteer time to create that space. If development
240 begins when does it end? The small town disappears.

241

242 **Jamie Knaphus, 914 W Center Street:** spoke to the public desire to have these community spaces but
243 asked the public how these amenities were going to be paid for, particularly if they are opposed to taxes
244 being raised. She is building a home adjacent to the City property and is probably one of the most
245 affected. She has no issue with small boutique businesses coming in and the increased tax revenue to
246 pay for some of these amenities that have been proposed this evening.

247

248 **Sam Aplanalp, 4230 North Meadow Lane:** thanked the officials for their service. He appreciates the
249 comments made tonight. He is not opposed to the sale of the property but wants to make sure that the
250 city not just satisfy the minimum requirements but take extra care to go above what is required to
251 involve the public. He agrees with comments by **Ms. Knapphis** and recognizes the realities of the cost

252 for community spaces. He is concerned about open spaces becoming large weed patches. Believes that
253 a good development plan does ensure control and that the private sector does a better job when it
254 comes time to develop this land. Concerned about the appraisals, are they looking at density or vacant
255 ground. This will change the valuation based upon how the ground is viewed. Wants to know what the
256 proceeds from the sale of the property would be applied to.

257
258 **Heather Massa, 4532 North State Road 32:** asked how Oakley can reconcile the City mission statement
259 with the sale of the ground. Can we accommodate both? Encourages the Council to do more due
260 diligence and push back the timeline to allow for more vetting.

261
262 **Mayor Woolstenhulme closed the public hearing.**

263
264 **Mayor Woolstenhulme** reiterated that the Council will not be taking any action on this item
265 tonight. It fulfills a legal requirement to allow for further conversations. Any sale of ground will not be
266 done without a thoroughly vetted development agreement that has been through Planning Commission,
267 and additional public hearings before it comes to City Council for action. There is no intention of selling
268 out the City. Thanked the public for the sentiments. Expressed his opinion that he as the Mayor and on
269 behalf of the Council do intend on doing what they believe is in the best interest of the City.

270
271 **6. Consent Calendar:**

- 272 a. **Extension of Farmer's Market Dates 2nd and 4th weekends in September 2022**
273 b. **Invoice Register**
274 c. **Interlocal Agreement with Summit County for Emergency Manager – Kathryn**
275 **McMullin**

276
277 **Councilmember Frazer** motioned to approve the Consent Calendar. **Councilmember Wilmoth** seconded
278 the motion. **All voted in favor. Motion carried.**

279
280
281 **7. Meeting was Adjourned.**

282
283 Approval is to form this 12 day of October, 2022

284
285
286
287 
Zane Woolstenhulme, Mayor


Amy Rydalch, City Recorder