



AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
SEPTEMBER 22, 2026
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Tim Holley	Council Member
Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Ernie John	Council Member

Members Absent:

Clark Taylor	Council Member
--------------	----------------

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Christina Tuiaki	Executive Assistant
Anna Montoya	Finance Director
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Sam Kelly	Public Works Director
Patrick O'Brien	Community Development Director
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief
Cameron Paul	Police Chief
George Schade	IT Director
Heather Schriever	Legal Counsel

Also present: Megan Shaw, Roy Shaw, Debbie Shaw, Bill Allshouse, Cheryl Sitton, Jale Cox, William N. Allshouse, Emily Nelson, Craig H. Walker, Daniel Sroka, and Brooke Hansen.

The American Fork City Council met in a regular session on September 22, 2026, in the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 PM.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Receiving public comments on amendments to the fiscal year ending June 30, 2026, city budgets.
No public comments were made.

REGULAR SESSION

1. Pledge of Allegiance; Invocation by Council Member Holley; roll call.

Mayor Frost welcomed everyone to the meeting. Those present recited the Pledge of Allegiance and an invocation was offered by Council Member Holey. Council Member Taylor was excused and expected to late.

2. Twenty-minute public comment period.

Roy Shaw an American Fork resident and retired Air Force Security Police member, spoke about the standards of integrity, impartiality, and accountability he had upheld during his military career. He expressed concern about the American Fork Police Department's conduct over the past several months and urged the chief and mayor to hold officers accountable, take disciplinary action when warranted, and be more transparent with the community.

Emily Nelson, an American Fork resident, proposed a community garden and said Community Action Services and Food Bank had expressed interest in supporting it. She is surveying residents to gauge interest and help identify a location. The mayor asked her to leave her contact information so the city could follow up, possibly through the Beautification Committee, and permitted her to leave a QR code for residents to complete the survey.

Timothy Bean, a new homeowner off of 700 West, raised concerns about parking restrictions on a 28-foot-wide road. He said the no-parking signs preserve access for fire trucks but leave some residents, including older adults and late-shift workers, walking long distances to their homes. He presented a petition signed by 59 people and asked the city to explore widening the road through discussions with the adjacent landowner and developer. As a lower-cost possibility, he suggested permits allowing some residents to park off the roadway on adjacent grass while maintaining fire access. He said Mr. Kelly was looking into that option.

Daniel Sroka, an American Fork resident, said he had a productive meeting with Chief Paul about the incident involving Ben Schneider. He appreciated the chief's willingness to discuss the matter and said the department was moving in the right direction, though further steps were needed. He expected to meet with the chief again in about a week to discuss the findings of the chief's case review.

3. City Administrator's report.

Mr. Bunker had nothing to report

4. Council reports.

Council Member Hunter had nothing to report

Council Member Holley reported that the Beautification Committee had discussed upcoming classes and was seeking residents interested in joining in 2027. He invited Emily Nelson to discuss her community garden proposal, noting that the committee had previously explored the idea and visited community gardens in Vineyard.

Council Member John had nothing to report

Council Member Carroll had nothing to report

5. Mayor's report.

Mayor Frost had nothing to report.

COMMON CONSENT AGENDA

(*Common Consent* is that class of Council action that requires no further discussion or which is routine in nature. All items on the Common Consent Agenda are adopted by a single motion unless removed from the Common Consent Agenda.)

1. Consideration regarding authorization to release the Improvements Durability Retainer of \$3,574,043.30 for Fenn Farms located at 350 South 700 West.
2. Approval of a Class A beer license for Solrise II UT-8 LLC located at 21 North 1020 West.
3. Approval of a Class A beer license for Solrise II UT-10 LLC located at 585 East State Road.
4. Ratification of city payments (September 2, to September 15, 2026) and approval of purchase requests over \$50,000.

Council Member Hunter moved to approve the common consent agenda. Council Member John seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Result:	Approved
Mover:	Council Member Hunter
Second:	Council Member John
Yes:	Staci Carroll, Ryan Hunter, Ernie John, Tim Holley
No:	
Absent:	Clark Taylor

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review and action on a resolution approving amendments to the fiscal year ending June 30, 2026, city budget.

Council Member Holley moved to approve Resolution No. 2026-09-44R adopting budget adjustments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2026, city budget. Council Member Carroll seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Result:	Approved
Mover:	Council Member Holley
Second:	Council Member Carroll
Yes:	Tim Holley, Ryan Hunter, Staci Carroll, Ernie John
No:	
Absent:	Clark Taylor

2. Review and action on a water banking agreement with Deer Park Development LLC for water rights in the amount of 42.112 acre-feet.

Council Member Hunter moved to approve the water banking agreement with Deer Park Development LLC for 42.112 acre-feet of water rights. Council Member John seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Result:	Approved
Mover:	Council Member Hunter
Second:	Council Member John
Yes:	Ernie John, Tim Holley, Ryan Hunter, Staci Carroll
No:	
Absent:	Clark Taylor

3. Review and action on an ordinance amending Section 17.5.136 the American Fork City Development Code to authorize and regulate detached accessory dwelling units in accordance with Utah Code Section 10-21-304; establishing development, occupancy,

parking, utility, and use requirements; providing for severability; and providing an effective date.

Mr. O'Brien presented a proposed ordinance for detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs), following earlier work session discussions. He said state law requires municipalities to permit detached ADUs on qualifying single-family lots of at least 11,000 square feet while allowing the city to set certain standards for setbacks, height, size, materials, and parking.

Mr. O'Brien provided diagrams showing how the proposed setbacks could apply to interior and corner lots and asked for council direction on height limits, including whether a detached ADU could be taller than the primary home. The proposal would prohibit a property from having both an internal and a detached ADU, provide a process for converting an existing accessory structure where it meets the requirements, and require additional parking and applicable development fees. He also noted Planning Commission suggestions, including clarification of the parking terminology, and asked what refinements the council wanted.

Mayor Frost asked Mr. O'Brien whether the state legislation establishing detached ADU requirements would take effect by default in October.

Mr. O'Brien explained that state law allows the city to set restrictions in specified areas, but if the city does not adopt them, those restrictions may not apply. He recommended establishing local standards now and revisiting them as the city gains experience with detached ADU applications. He noted that other communities are also adapting their ordinances to the new state requirements and that the council could later adjust provisions that prove too restrictive or need further refinement.

Council Member Carroll expressed concern that the proposed 12-foot setback and 24-foot maximum height could allow a detached ADU to stand too close to a neighboring home. She suggested considering a graduated height limit, with a lower height near the property line, and asked how such a provision might be written.

Mr. O'Brien noted that a primary home may be up to 36 feet tall and that the proposal calls for 12-foot side and rear setbacks for a detached ADU. He cautioned that greater setbacks could substantially reduce the buildable area on some lots, particularly those that are wider than they are deep. He said he was open to discussing an additional height restriction.

Council Member Carroll said the council should consider the height and setback provisions carefully because residents had raised the issue several times. She questioned whether a 24-foot-tall detached ADU would be appropriate at a 12-foot setback.

Council Member John expressed concern about how detached ADU's height would fit within different neighborhoods. He suggested limiting its height to that of the primary home, subject to an overall maximum, so an ADU besides a single-story home would not tower over it.

Mr. O'Brien said the council could set separate maximum heights for the eaves and roof ridge to address the effect of features such as dormer windows. He also raised privacy as a consideration, including whether windows facing neighboring properties should be restricted, while noting that landscaping could provide screening.

Council Member Hunter said the council needed to balance a property owner's ability to build a state-permitted detached ADU with neighboring residents' privacy and the character of existing neighborhoods. He noted that larger qualifying lots could accommodate structures that feel out of place among smaller, ranch-style homes and said the relationship between an ADU and the surrounding homes deserved consideration.

Mayor Frost noted that some newer neighborhoods already contain a mix of taller homes and single-story ramblers. He said this could make it difficult to define one typical neighborhood height when setting limits for detached ADUs.

Council Member Hunter suggested mapping the city's lots of at least 11,000 square feet to see where detached ADUs would be eligible under the proposed ordinance.

Mr. O'Brien said qualifying lots are likely concentrated among older, larger properties, including horse properties, some lots in the northeast part of the city, and deep lots near downtown. He noted that many newer lots do not meet the 11,000-square-foot threshold, and some that do may lack the depth needed for a detached ADU. He said eligible lots appear to be spread across the city, so he did not expect detached ADUs to cluster in one area. He also noted that, despite the proposal being under discussion for several months, staff had received little interest from property owners. He anticipated a few applications rather than widespread construction in the near term.

Council Member Holley stated that the cost of building a detached ADU would likely limit how many property owners pursue one. He also noted that some neighborhoods already have taller new homes among older, single-story homes, making existing building heights varied.

Mr. O'Brien agreed that some residents would pursue detached ADUs over time but said current construction costs make converting space within an existing home more affordable than building a separate structure with new utilities and connections. He recommended adopting standards now, then refining them as applications reveal practical issues. He said staff would work with early applicants and keep the council informed.

Council Member Holley said he generally supported the proposed ordinance, including its parking requirements. He was comfortable with a 10-foot setback for a single-story detached ADU and suggested that a taller, two-story unit could have a greater setback, such as 12 or 14 feet. He reiterated that construction costs would likely limit the number of applications.

Council Member Hunter noted that tall trees along property lines can already affect neighbors' views, which may be relevant to the discussion of ADU height. He asked for confirmation of the rules on nightly rentals and expressed support for requiring a dedicated, hard-surfaced parking space for a detached ADU.

Council members and Mr. O'Brien confirmed that detached ADUs could not be rented for stays shorter than 90 days. Council Member Hunter favored the ordinance's term "on-site" for the required parking space, noting that "off-street" parking could be interpreted to allow a space on another property. They agreed that the required parking should be located on the same parcel as the detached ADU and that "on-site" conveyed that requirement. They also began discussing whether tandem parking should be restricted.

Mr. O'Brien explained that tandem parking could leave one vehicle blocked by another, prompting a resident to park on the street despite having the required spaces on site. He suggested side-by-side spaces where two stalls are required. The discussion also raised whether state law allows the city to regulate the layout of those spaces.

Ms. Schriever explained that state law limits the city, it requires one parking space for a detached ADU of 650 square feet or less and two for a larger unit but does not specifically address tandem parking. She said staff could examine whether the city may prohibit tandem spaces, cautioning that such a rule could be problematic if it makes the required parking impossible to provide on a qualifying lot.

Council members differed on whether tandem parking should count toward the detached ADU parking requirement. Some were comfortable allowing it, noting that residents might park on the street regardless of how on-site spaces are arranged. Others favored a layout that would make the spaces easier to use and reduce the impact of an additional dwelling on neighbors.

Council Member Holley and Mr. O'Brien discussed that the city already has rules for street parking, but providing spaces does not ensure residents will use them. They discussed allowing tandem parking if the required spaces are provided, with the goal of ensuring sufficient on-site parking for the detached ADU.

Council Member Hunter connected the discussion to the earlier public comment about the difficulty residents face when street parking is restricted. He said property owners who build detached ADUs should provide and use parking on their own property, rather than relying on street spaces for overflow. He expressed concern that tandem spaces could be inconvenient enough to shift parking onto the street and affect neighbors.

Council Member Holley agreed that ADU owners should provide parking but noted that residents sometimes choose to park on the street even when their garage or driveway has

open spaces. He said tandem parking would not necessarily be the reason someone parks on the street.

Council Member Hunter said his concern was the combined effect of adding detached ADUs in neighborhoods where residents already park on the street despite having space at home. He felt the property owner creating an additional dwelling should bear the responsibility for its parking needs. He was not ready to vote without further discussion of that issue, while acknowledging the approaching state deadline.

Mr. O'Brien clarified that the state law permits the city to require parking for detached ADUs but does not impose that requirement by default. He said the city would need to adopt a local parking standard for it to apply.

Ms. Schriever clarified that, in her reading of Utah Code Section 10-21-304, American Fork must adopt an ordinance permitting detached ADUs on qualifying lots by October 1, 2026.

Council Member John asked how the city would address infrastructure needs when detached ADUs are added in older neighborhoods, where water and sewer systems may not have been sized for additional dwellings. He raised questions about water dedication and impact fees to support the added demand.

Council members and Mr. O'Brien continued discussing how detached ADUs would contribute to water and sewer infrastructure costs. They considered whether the ordinance should address separate utility connections or refer to the city's fee schedule for applicable charges. No requirement was settled in this portion of the discussion.

Ms. Schriever reminded the council that the proposed detached ADU ordinance could be amended after adoption. Any changes would first go to the Planning Commission before returning to the council for consideration.

Council Member John asked whether the proposed ADU ordinance could serve as a starting point while the council continued working through unresolved issues. Ms. Schriever said it was a fair start and would meet the statutory requirement to enact an ordinance. Council Member Holley supported moving forward for now and revisiting it if needed. Council Member John requested a future work session to discuss water use, particularly whether replacing irrigated grass or trees with an ADU would increase demand and where that water would come from.

Council Member Hunter said an internal ADU is arguably less impactful than a detached ADU, particularly in terms of water use. He supported evaluating the actual impact of a detached unit and setting requirements accordingly, while recognizing that its demand

would be substantially less than that of a single-family home. He also asked whether a detached ADU would need its own utility meter and connection to existing infrastructure.

Mr. O'Brien said the ordinance may need clarification on setbacks. Under another provision of city code, a structure within 12 feet of the primary home is treated as part of that home for setback purposes. He asked whether the ordinance should specify that a detached ADU must still meet its required setback, even when it is within 12 feet of the home.

Council Member John asked whether the council could approve the ordinance and return to it soon in a work session to quantify the remaining issues. Council Member Hunter asked the council to identify the questions staff should be prepared to answer. For him, one issue was the required parking and whether tandem parking would satisfy it.

Council Members and Mr. O'Brien discussed the proposed height limit for detached ADUs. They noted that a 20-to-25-foot height is typical for the roofline of a single-story home but could also allow a two-story ADU with a flat roof. A smaller building might require two stories to provide enough living space. Council Members also identified utility services, impact fees, tandem parking, height requirement, and water dedication as issues for staff to address at a future work session.

Council Member Hunter moved to adopt Ordinance No. 2026-09-21 amending the American Fork City Development Code to authorize and regulate detached accessory dwelling units in accordance with the Utah code section 10.21.304 establishing development occupancy parking, utility and use requirements providing for severability and providing and effective date. Council Member Holley seconded the motion.

Mayor Frost commented that the ADU ordinance could return to a work session soon. He suggested circulating a separate document before the meeting and coordinating with Mr. O'Brien so council members could arrive with ideas. Council Member Carroll said the discussion was more focused than at the previous meeting and that the council had made significant progress.

Voting was as follows:

Result:	Approved
Mover:	Council Member Hunter
Second:	Council Member Holley
Yes:	Ryan Hunter, Tim Holley, Staci Carroll, Ernie John
No:	
Absent:	Clark Taylor

4. Review and action on an ordinance approving a code text amendment of the American Fork Municipal Code. Amending Section 12.12.030, the code text amendment clarifies maintenance of sidewalk along the frontage adjacent to property.

Council Member Holley raised concerns about requiring residents to clear sidewalks behind their properties. He said rear fences, long walks from cul-de-sacs, winter conditions, mobility limitations, and busy adjacent roads could make the work especially burdensome for some residents. Council Member Carroll shared the concern but asked who would be responsible for maintaining those sidewalks if the property owners were not.

Mayor Frost observed that about half the properties along 700 West have rear gates and that maintenance varies among residents. Council Member Hunter supported keeping the proposed maintenance rule while helping residents who cannot reasonably do the work, such as an elderly couple. He suggested coordinating with the senior committee, Scouts, or other community volunteers.

Council Member Holley said he could support the maintenance rule but did not want the city to rigidly fine residents who could not clear the rear sidewalk because of age or disability. Council Member John asked whether the city should revisit its standards for future developments and require rear gates where lots back onto roads such as North County Boulevard or 700 West, so residents can access those areas for maintenance.

Mayor Frost expressed confidence that neighbors would help residents who could not maintain their adjacent sidewalks, as they do with other needs in the community. He noted that clear sidewalks benefit people walking for exercise and parents with strollers, giving residents a shared interest in keeping them accessible.

Council Member Hunter moved to adopt Ordinance No. 2026-09-22 approving a code text amendment of American Fork Municipal Code. Amending 12.12.030 titled Sidewalks, cleaning by property owner to clarify the owner or occupant of the property responsible for maintaining the entire frontage of the property including front, side, rear, and providing and affective date to the ordinance. Council Member John seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Result:	Approved
Mover:	Council Member Hunter
Seconder:	Council Member John
Yes:	Staci Carroll, Ernie John, Ryan Hunter, Tim Holley
No:	
Absent:	Clark Taylor

5. Review and action on approval of a purchase order request to CO Building Systems for steel for the metal building at temporary Station 53.

Mayor Frost explained that manufacturing and shipping the steel would take time. The city was working to get ahead of those lead times in hopes of installing the structure before snowfall, although the timeline remained uncertain.

Council Member John noted the extensive work underway, including modifications to the house, and said the project was moving in the right direction. He emphasized efforts to complete the installation quickly.

Council Member John moved to approve the purchase order request to seal building systems for steel for the metal building at temporary Station 53. Council Member Carroll seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Result:	Approved
Mover:	Council Member John
Second:	Council Member Carroll
Yes:	Tim Holley, Staci Carroll, Ryan Hunter, Ernie John
No:	
Absent:	Clark Taylor

6. *Consideration and action on entering into a closed session to discuss (A) the sale, purchase, and/or lease of real property and (B) pending or reasonably imminent litigation as described in Utah State Code 52-4-204 and 52-4-205.

Council Member Holley motioned to enter into a closed session at 8:00 p.m. to discuss the sale, purchase, and/or lease of real property and pending or reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Hunter seconded the motion at 8:01 pm. Voting was as follows:

Result:	Approved
Mover:	Council Member Holley
Second:	Council Member Carroll
Yes:	Staci Carroll, Ryan Hunter, Tim Holley, Ernie John
No:	
Absent:	Clark Taylor

Mayor Frost announced that the council would move downstairs for a closed session. Afterward, the council would reopen the meeting and adjourn from downstairs.

The City Council met in a closed session at 8:06 p.m. to discuss the sale, purchase, and/or lease of real property and pending or reasonably imminent litigation. Those present included Mayor Frost, Council Member Carroll, Council Member Holley, Council Member Hunter, and Council Member John. Council Member Taylor was excused. Also present included City Administrator David Bunker, Legal Counsel Heather Schriever, and Development Services Director Patrick O'Brien.

The closed session was audio recorded as required by state law.

Council Member John moved to end the close session and returned to regular session at 8:31 p.m. Council Member Hunter seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Result:	Approved
Mover:	Council Member John
Second:	Council Member Hunter
Yes:	Staci Carroll, Ryan Hunter, Tim Holley, Ernie John
No:	
Absent:	Clark Taylor

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.



Stephanie Finau
Deputy Recorder