

Town of Leeds

Planning Commission Meeting for Wednesday, September 17, 2025

1. Call To Order/Roll Call: 7:06pm

ROLL CALL:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
CHAIR: CHUCK BENTLEY	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: KEN HADLEY	<u> </u>	<u>X</u>
COMMISSIONER: LAURIE SULLIVAN	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: ALAN ROBERTS	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: DAVID RHOADS	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>
TOWN PLANNER: SCOTT MESSEL	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>

2. **Invocation:** Commissioner Roberts
3. **Pledge of Allegiance**
4. **Declaration of Abstentions or Conflicts:** None
5. **Agenda:**

- a. Tonight's Agenda of September 17, 2025
Motion to approve made by Commissioner Roberts, 2nd by Commissioner Sullivan.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
CHAIR: CHUCK BENTLEY	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: DAVID RHOADS	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: KEN HADLEY	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>X</u>
COMMISSIONER: LAURIE SULLIVAN	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: ALAN ROBERTS	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

- b. Meeting Minutes of September 3, 2025
Motion to approve made by Commissioner Roberts, 2nd by Commissioner Rhoads.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
CHAIR: CHUCK BENTLEY	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: DAVID RHOADS	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: KEN HADLEY	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>X</u>
COMMISSIONER: LAURIE SULLIVAN	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
COMMISSIONER: ALAN ROBERTS	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

1. Announcements:
2. Staff Reports:
3. Discussion and Possible Action Items:
 - a. Mixed-Use Ordinance 2025-05

Chair Bentley: We went through the version that we submitted to the council in December and made some modifications.

Planner Scott Messel: What you want to do, is prepare for the next meeting is taking the draft that's approved by the town

and crossing all that out, having this inserted as underlined, and I will include the changes that you talk about today, and that will be ready to recommend.

Chair Bentley: I want to know if this is what's marked up, this is what we're going to present as our new proposed ordinance, and it is what the public is going to be able to look at and go over.

Planner Scott Messel: Absolutely correct, what we will do is we will have what was approved, page number one, and then this will be right, and it'll be a big X or crossed out, and then this will be there, and this is what you're adopting.

Chair Bentley: Going over the changes for the record. Definitions, we are going to add the definition for a townhome. Density and dimensional standards: we are going to change the minimum lot size for development of single family and two-family dwellings to 9,000 square feet.

Commissioner Roberts: In the current ordinance, the current zone, they specifically spell out what that density of lot size can be for townhouses. Is that something that we want to include to give a clear idea?

Chair Bentley: Under the A for the minimum lot size for development of single- and two-family dwellings is no 9,000 the minimum lot size for a townhouse can be 6,000 square feet.

In that same A maximum residential density in the multi-use zone is 9 units per acre, we want to change that to 5 units per acre. And then have that section from the Farmington code underneath there that would allow an increase to 6 units per acre for attainable housing.

Chair Bentley: Then we go to 12.1.15.9 pedestrian and vehicle circulation. A. Bike path shall be at least 4 foot in width we want to change that to 6 foot in width. Then sidewalks at least 4 feet in width shall be provided along each public right of way, which we want to change to 6 feet also.

Chair Bentley opens up for public comment:

Susan Savage: I'm picturing, you know what's happened so far with Silver Cliffs. It's getting off all the vegetation. I'm thinking about all the big trees that are over there. I'm not sure if the town can say anything about that, but it just seems like such a shame to take out everything that's natural. And those of us who live out north of town have seen these huge walls of sand when the wind blows. All of that area is blow sand, so it's unstable soil. The second thing that I would say, we were talking about a little bit before the meeting, your work meeting starts, I don't know what's happening over there. I haven't been over to see what the equipment is doing, but the 900 North is not the original Babylon Road. 900 North was donated by Alan Howard for the neighbors who live out where the cherry orchard is because the original road kept washing out. There was a bridge that was torn out, and later there was a, looks like maybe why they're working down there, was a crossing that just went down the side of the hill, a little hill, and across the bottom of the washing up the other side of the hill. I don't know if it was after the freeway was built, and I think you, Chuck, said in another meeting that we attended that you knew, and I knew this, that at one point the Grapevine Wash had almost turn out the freeway. So once the gravel was taken out on the west side of the freeway and it created, it changed the grapevine wash from a narrow channel to a big open area where the debris would block the tunnel and back the water. And then as the water started pulling away, eating away at the debris, then that whole big head of water would come down through there. And so that completely tore out that second crossing, such a big area that it wasn't, it wasn't reparable. What I'm thinking here is, depending on what the town does with the dedication of roads and whoever accepts that as a jurisdiction, I'm concerned about who bears the cost because the developers will be gone who bears the cost of maintenance and repair. I'm concerned about the floodplain, what's built along the floodplain. This area is, from the beginning of the time that this area started to develop, people kind of took the desert for granted, that you could just kind of do what you wanted and didn't realize that there's not water here enough, there's not enough precipitation here to sustain the kind of vegetation that along the Leeds Creek there are little springs so there's vegetation that makes a difference in what comes down when there's a flash flood. The Grapevine Wash drains about a 3,000-acre drainage basin that's raw ground that all comes down with mud and boulders. There's a huge potential for destruction along the Grapevine Wash, it has always been a big challenge. I'm wondering what happened to the bridge watching.

Chair Bentley: I can address a few of those items, they are going to extend the box culvert on the old highway by 700 feet and put an angle to get it running straight down the wash instead of eroding that bank on Babylon, they have identified the problem, and they're taking corrective measures on their own at this point. They haven't been asked to do it, but it looks like they're actively working on correcting some of the problems on Grapevine Wash. As far as landscaping requirements

in the mixed-use are quite stringent, to say the least. The landscaping that they are doing is going to be revegetated, but its not going to be revegetated with sagebrush and junipers and cedars. It's their responsibility to do dust control. They have water trucks out there but obviously you can't keep up with Mother Nature and blow sand.

Susan Savage: As far as the Grapevine Wash goes, its great that they are planning for that, where the road comes into Highway 91 and that culvert. I'm talking about way down at the bottom where you get to where I've seen them working there. If they are planning to enlarge or increase their ability to access because of that long road isn't wide enough for what they want to do if they're doing anything like that, or if they are crossing the wash, they are going to have a major thing to deal with, so my question is who is going to be responsible to pay for the damage and rebuild things when it gets turned out?

Chair Bentley: It will be the City of Leeds because we take over responsibility for it.

Wayne Peterson: I brought this to the attention of one council member when I saw the public hearing noticed on Monday of this week. Our 2008-04 land use ordinance which is the one that we're speaking of tonight, Chapter 1, Section 14.1, following state code says that any amendment to it will be given public notice of at least 10 days. Monday notice is actually only nine days before when it is being suggested. The other thing I would highlight is that in the past, there has always been either an attachment to that public notice saying this is what's going to be the subject of the public hearing, or it would say that a copy of that is available at town hall for public inspection so that people know what it is they're being asked to comment on. Given that we're a little bit out of the requirements that are there, I would just encourage the Planning Commission and Town Council it would be less than a week delay to do it right. I would encourage that 10 days be not nine days is almost 10 days. That the document which, as I understand what you've described this evening, will be available tomorrow, could be made available at the time that the public notice is given at least 10 days prior to the public. It says 10 days before. David Church, who was the counsel for Utah League of Cities and Towns, also highlighting, it said calendar days with this he mentioned that he's never counted a day that he couldn't find on his calendar.

Paul Morris: I agree with Wayne if you publish Monday, you can't do it on Wednesday. You've got to give 10 days' notice, and the rule is you don't count the first day and you count the last day, and you don't count the first day. You just have to stay long, but you just don't count the day that you put the notice in but you can count the day that you have the hearing and that's 10 days, but it's got to be full. You don't count the Monday you go Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and so on.

If we've made an error on the 10 days, we will just post it for our normal meeting on the first Wednesday.

Paul Morris: My second point that I was going to make is that I know what you said about being transparent and open and being able to speak to this because I want to propose changes to the mixed use as you know. I know Scotts is going to be drafting, but I'm going to be proposing so I have gone through your ordinance extensively. Spent quite a few hours going through it and it's not controversial stuff, but I want to make sure it's really good. I've got a draft that Ill be doing and sometimes I know some have said you can't submit which I've never had that experience anywhere where I can't submit something in writing. I found in your ordinance there you can propose a text change, and you pay \$1300 so I am going to do that. I'm going to pay the money and I'm going to submit my version of what I think would fix it. I've gone through the entire code because there references to mixed-use from the old mixed use that are still on the code. I'm going definition by definition there's double definitions; your code says townhouse State law says townhome. I'm not being critical, but I know you don't have full-time staff. I'm not the end all but I've done this a fair amount, so I'm going to propose it. All I'm trying to do is make it so it's so clean and not ambiguous. When the council adopted the ordinance, I got the version of the ordinance that has two different definitions of planned development and multi-use complex. They are word for word with the same definition as two different things. I'll submit it to Scott. Then you've got property already in the town that's already zoned mixed-use from the old mixed-use but still has the designation, so you want to make sure that it works for that also. We're not doing triplexes or fourplexes, these are going to be townhome, patio home, single family with commercial we are still trying to do the grocery store, I'm not shifting up or doing the affordable housing missing middle. Owner-occupied, we're really working with the state of Utah and trying to do something really good that way for our workers and firefighters.

Chair Bentley: We are going to cancel next Wednesday's meeting, we are going to move to October 1st, the regularly scheduled for the public hearing and possible action on the mixed-use ordinance.

Commissioner Roberts: I expect landowners to have dialogue about any ordinance that is being worked on that might have an effect on their properties.

Michelle Johnson: I agree with what Alan is saying. Do not pay the \$1300 dollars because we are already opening it. You are already at the table. My next comment, is that the problem that we had this last time around we had what Scott proposed and then we got another draft from you and a redlined draft and we had all these different drafts they were looking at and they got so confused and they got so fed up they said forget it and made their own thing. It went away from what was proposed. Since you were not here for the beginning of the meeting, I wanted you to understand their going off of the original, what they originally gave to town council. So, if you now go through our ordinance that is already done, and you redline that we are going to be in that same problem. I do believe we are because that is what happened last time. I suggest, if you take what they're proposing along with the changes that they are making tonight, and you redline that we will get a whole lot farther with that. Don't take what's already been adopted because they are going back to what they originally proposed and if you take what's been changed and change that again and put that against it we're going to have that same problem where everybody says hold up why is the developer writing it, hold up this is not what they are proposing, and it will be an issue. My suggestion is to go off of what they are proposing tonight, redline that to what you need, to what you suggest. Don't go off of what's already been adopted because they are going to cross that whole thing off. They are not going to keep what they had because they sent it back to you.

Chair Bentley: We are set for October 1st we will be. We are going to be timely in our 10 days.

Motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Roberts, 2nd by Commissioner Sullivan.

4. Adjournment 7:45pm

Approved this 1st Day of October 2025.

Chuck Bentley, Planning Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Cari Bishop, Clerk/Recorder