

# Town of Leeds

## Town Council Meeting for Wednesday, November 12, 2025

### 1. Call To Order/Roll Call: 7:20pm

| ROLL CALL:                       | <u>Present</u> | <u>Absent</u> |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| MAYOR: BILL HOSTER               | <u>X</u>       |               |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING |                | <u>X</u>      |
| COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK       | <u>X</u>       |               |
| COUNCILMEMBER: MICHELLE PEOT     | <u>X</u>       |               |
| COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY       | <u>X</u>       |               |
| TOWN PLANNER: SCOTT MESSEL       | <u>X</u>       |               |

### 2. Invocation: Councilmember

### 3. Pledge of Allegiance

### 4. LEEDS GENERALELECTION CANVASS – TO CANVASS THE ELECTION RESULTS

- a. Clerk read off the canvass report for the Leeds General Election and passed out the certificate of election to the candidates that won. Council certified the results with a roll call vote.

| ROLL CALL VOTE:                  | Yes      | No | Abstain | Absent   |
|----------------------------------|----------|----|---------|----------|
| MAYOR: Bill HOSTER               | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING |          |    |         | <u>X</u> |
| COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK       | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |
| COUNCILMEMBER: MICHELLE PEOT     | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |
| COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY       | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |

### 5. Declaration of Abstentions or Conflicts: NONE

### 6. Agenda:

- a. Tonight's Agenda of November 12, 2025  
Motion to approve with 10c being struck from the agenda made by Councilmember Furley, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Peot.

| ROLL CALL VOTE:                  | Yes      | No | Abstain | Absent   |
|----------------------------------|----------|----|---------|----------|
| MAYOR: Bill HOSTER               | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING |          |    |         | <u>X</u> |
| COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK       | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |
| COUNCILMEMBER: MICHELLE PEOT     | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |
| COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY       | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |

- b. Meeting Minutes of October 22, 2025

Motion to approve made by Councilmember Cundick, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Peot.

| ROLL CALL VOTE:                  | Yes      | No | Abstain | Absent   |
|----------------------------------|----------|----|---------|----------|
| MAYOR: Bill HOSTER               | <u>X</u> |    |         |          |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING |          |    |         | <u>X</u> |

|                              |   |       |       |       |
|------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|
| COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK   | X | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: MICHELLE PEOT | X | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY   | X | _____ | _____ | _____ |

- c. Meeting Minutes of October 22, 2025, Work Session  
Motion to approve made by Councilmember Cundick, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Peot.

|                                  |       |       |         |        |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|---------|--------|
| ROLL CALL VOTE:                  | Yes   | No    | Abstain | Absent |
| MAYOR: Bill HOSTER               | X     | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING | _____ | _____ | _____   | X      |
| COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK       | X     | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| COUNCILMEMBER: MICHELLE PEOT     | X     | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY       | X     | _____ | _____   | _____  |

## 7. Staff Reports:

Councilmember Peot: It came to my attention that Jerry Glazier and his property company have put his mining land up for sale. I do not know if we might consider shoring up our ordinances around environmental hazards and whatnot if we need to, but it might be a good time to be thinking about those sorts of things.

Chief Butterfield: With Hurricane Valley Fire, this month, well this last month, there were 11 calls for service within Leeds. Most were medical calls. We finished out the month as a department just shy of 5,400 calls for the year. We follow that track. We're probably going to hit about 6,500 this year. That seems to be about that. We're quite a bit above what we were last year.

Councilmember Peot: Would you like to offer any guidance regarding Christmas trees and decorations from a fire hazard standpoint?

Chief Butterfield: Make sure you keep your tree watered and unplug it when you're not home. No candles. Just be mindful of open flames because you basically already started the link right there. Candle warmers are preferred. Just be careful with cooking. If you're going to deep fry a turkey, just make sure you don't do it inside and make sure that it's not wet. Just follow the instructions, cooking instructions, and don't leave anything unattended. Hopefully we'll all have great, uneventful holiday season.

## 8. Announcements:

December 6, 2025, in the town park Christmas holiday celebration, there will be only local vendors, people that live here in Leeds, and we have 6 at this time. Then we're going to have Mr. and Mrs. Claus and ornament making and writing letters to Santa and just a lot of really fun stuff. Trying to bring the community together and just have a good time positively and just have fun. We do need volunteers, if you guys are so inclined, we also adopted 3 local families that are really in need this Christmas. We'll be getting that out too as their needs, I just got the list yesterday and today. We will be doing that as well.

## 9. Citizen Comments:

Wayne Peterson: I just wanted to publicly thank the voters of Leeds for doing the most important thing, and that was voting. Voting participation in Washington County averaged 42%. As we heard Cari say, Leeds had 69%, not just a little, but an awful lot above the county average. I think that's really great that the town took that interest in the election. Thank you for voting, everyone.

Chuck Bentley: CCRs and Leeds. Leeds kind of shuns them. As a matter of fact, all through the code, it says they won't be responsible for helping to enforce or really even recognize. But we're looking at a project that the CCRs are going to be an intricate part of the development agreement. Kind of seems like an oxymoron that we ignore some, but the other ones are going to be so critical to the

development agreement. I think we need to think about it, specifically Bonanza Estates and El Dorado Hills, when they annexed in 203, recognizing CCRs as part of the annexation agreement. I think we need to kind of do a little soul searching on that as a town and decide where we're going to fall on them.

Councilmember Peot: Part of the reason they have CCRs in place is because of the environmental rules. One possible approach might be to roll some of those into the environmental covenant. That way we don't have to worry about a double standard. As a planning commission member, do you have an opinion about that?

Chuck Bentley: I will at the next planning commission meeting.

Ken Hadley: December 13<sup>th</sup>, it's a Saturday. Wreaths Across America. We are putting wreaths on the military graves. 12 o'clock.

Nathan Shakespear: Some of those sidewalks and roads are damaged. It's a safety hazard for scooters, at least on the sidewalks. There are always big bumps on the sidewalks that need to get fixed. People at night are not paying attention. They can trip easily if they don't have a flashlight. Next thing that needs to be fixed is going to be the roads. We have some potholes that was created when maintenance was happening. Same thing, scooters with small wheels, they will just dip into that, especially if you're not going down this way or Main Street, it's a down slope. People aren't probably going fast if they aren't choosing the safe side to get a scooter on because the road is more, a little less bumpy because of the sidewalks. that's just a thing that I want the council to look into.

## 10. Discussions and Possible Action Items:

### a. Babylon Lands, LLC Mixed-Use Development Agreement Ordinance 2025-08

The development agreement between the town and the developer has gone through several revisions. There was debate about whether to link the approval of the development agreement with the denial of the developer's petition to disconnect from the town. The latest draft November 12, tries to tie these two decisions together, but the town attorney and the mayor consider this approach unusual. Their recommendation is to keep the votes on the development agreement and the disconnection petition separate. The draft ordinance currently states that if the development agreement is signed, the town automatically denies the disconnection petition. This language can be amended or removed if the council prefers to keep the decisions independent. There are specific terms and conditions that would also need to be revised to reflect this separation. The council is reminded that if they do not act on the disconnection petition within a set timeframe, it will be automatically deemed denied by law.

The developer is requesting certain rights regarding density, commercial space, and the timing of construction. There is negotiation over how much residential development must be completed before commercial construction begins. The developer wants to limit the towns liability for damages in case of a dispute, except in cases of bad faith, which the attorney advises against including. The developer is also seeking administrative approval for future site plans and subdivisions, bypassing further council or planning commission review. There is a request to allow open space requirements to be met using adjacent parcels, some of which are outside the town's jurisdiction.

Mayor Hoster: Paul, just for a clarification on that. I was just informing the town council that they can decouple the disconnection petition if they want from this agreement as it's written now it kind of takes care of both it correct you know would grant it and deny it the grant that you know if it was approved the development agreement would be approved and executed and simultaneously the disconnection would be denied right and so I'm just advising them that if they don't want that they can also decouple that issue so.

Paul Morris: As you know, we had originally planned on for over a year to do the mixed-use, the first version of the ordinance did not work, so we filed the disconnection. Then I was approached by you, as well as Chuck, the Planning Commission, said we'd like to take a look at doing a new mixed-use. We'll, in good faith, we'll move forward with that. We got a version that I think works, but it does require a development agreement, as you've given our property the zoning, but it means nothing without a development agreement. This is the development agreement that I think that works for us. Highway has been great going back and forth. I can tell he's done a fair amount of these. I've done a fair amount of these. I thought that was a good working relationship. We're just down to these, a couple of issues. I want to address one of the issues with 60% versus 70% versus 50%. That's always challenging. It's a legitimate issue because generally a town would like the, though as important as I think you should see the affordable housing as being very important. But still, you want the commercial, the tax base. What a city doesn't want is build the residential and then you don't do the commercial. Or you come back in and say, commercial didn't work. We want to just do more houses. We wanted to address that. It was discussed at the planning commission member, I think your mayor-elect, Wayne Peterson, brought up the issue. I acknowledge it is a legitimate issue. We had to grapple with it. How do we deal with it? Because it's legitimate. But our builder, the primary group that will build houses is not the commercial, and the commercial is not the residential. The commercial has made it crystal clear, they want rooftops. They want your existing rooftops, they want silver cliff rooftops, but they also want these rooftops to walk there. We spent a lot of time on it, and we came up with 70% that we could get a certificate of occupancy for 70% of the residential and can't get any more until we had a building permit for at least 11,000 square feet, half of the non-grocery store commercial. Hyrum came back and said, how about 50%, and you have to have it completely built. Well, and that doesn't work. Building commercial buildings could take over a year, so you just stop even though it's being built. Having a building permit, I see his point. I came back and said, OK, how about 60%-- and by the way, I haven't got that approved yet by my residential. group that you've got to stop at 60%, but I thought that was fair. I said, OK, 60%, but rather than us having a building permit, we actually have to be under construction. It's got to be going vertical. I thought that was a fair result of Hyrum and I going back and forth. I like where we ended up. I hope you would see it the same way. This plan works. We have worked heavily with the county on the right half.

We're through the processes and finalizing that through finalizing the processes with the county. But we are confident that side's going to be developed. These were designed to be integrated and go together. We think that would work well. The question comes up, will we annex the other half in if going forward? The answer to me is we've always said we want to be part of the Leeds. If Leeds wants us, if Leeds doesn't want us, then we're glad to be in the county. I think it's only fair to your new council, because other than council member Furley, you're going to have four new people. You've got to let them get aboard and talk to them and see what they think and what they want and what direction they want. I know at your public hearing on disconnection, you had a majority of people said, let them disconnect. It wasn't like, oh, don't, you know, I understand that there's some sentiment that, yeah, we don't want this as part of the leagues. I'm going to respect that if that is what the new council wants, but we're going to have to take some time and understand what their feelings are. With this half and with this development agreement, we're comfortable, I'm comfortable recommending to our group to move forward. They want to know what the final version is that's adopted, and we'll know on Thursday when it's adopted. I don't know if you have any questions for me, but I think this version with the 60% and the damages issue, we want that because we want it to be the previous owners of the property had a challenge in litigation, and I have no intention of going through that. We don't want to do it. The damage language is only if the city's acting badly. The city's acting with bad faith. Otherwise, it's specific performance. I just don't want to have that experience again. We'll do our part. The town needs to do its part.

Mayor Hoster: Paul, thank you for that commentary. I've gone through this many, many times. I've gone through it with Hyrum many, many times and tried to get as deep into this as possible. I think we're at a point to where it would make the most sense in my mind if we propose a motion to approve the developer's agreement after striking sections E is an echo. Section 3 to allow the separation of the vote for disconnect.

Councilmember Peot: I had a question because technically this has commercial in here as well. It's not strictly an STT subdivision, correct?

Scott Messel: Correct, yeah.

Councilmember Peot: Then it should not be able to bypass the legislative body approval if it's also on it.

Scott Messel: They are requesting that the overall project be administratively handled that way though.

Paul Morris: Your mixed-use ordinance you adopted allows for this. It specifically allows in the mixed-use that it says if there's commercial and residential combined, your default rule is that you've got to go through the normal subdivision process.

Councilmember Peot: But that's an option for us, correct?

Paul Morris: Correct. In mixed-use, you adopted it specifically allows for what's written here. Okay. But it allows for this. It's not a violation of your ordinance.

Hyrum Bosserman: The language that's included in here is permissive language built into the mixed-use ordinance. This under that ordinance that the council could elect for this to be administrative. That's why I brought it to the attention that, that is something that they're specifically asking for.

Councilmember Cundick: Reflects on the lengthy process of working with the developer and the town regarding a development project. Initially, the plan was to annex an extra piece of land so the entire project would be under the town's jurisdiction, but this wasn't possible due to the lack of a suitable ordinance. After creating a mixed-use ordinance, the developer plans could move forward. A petition to disconnect part of the project from the town also arose, causing division among residents. Councilmember Cundick strongly supports keeping the whole project under one jurisdiction, arguing that splitting it would be poor management and policy. Having something nearby but outside the towns' control brings disadvantages without benefits. The resulting agreement is favorable, even if not perfect, and urges the town to approve it so progress can continue. The agreement includes benefits especially regarding density that wouldn't be available otherwise.

Councilmember Peot: I'd like to say for the record that I represent the majority of citizens I've spoken to. I don't appreciate the way that I felt very pressured into this and how the changes went through for the mixed-use agreement. We had some issues with transparency and having a clean red line copy and not putting them online. I feel like we're being pressured into signing this and I just wanted to say that for the record for myself.

Paul Morris: This is a very, very technical issue. It doesn't change the substance. Hyrum, you're probably aware of this, but I wasn't aware until recently that the legislature changed the numbering system. In this agreement, it cross-references the state law. For years, it's always been Title 10, Chapter 9A. They changed it, and it went into effect last week. As of November 6th, it's now Title 10, Chapter 20, and then they changed the numbering just slightly, but the words are the same. I was going back and I just discovered it because it was November 6th that took effect. In your motion, if you're going to prove it, you need to give your lawyer the chance to get the cross-references to match the current section numbers.

Motion to approve with excluding any reference with any express denial of any disconnect terms subject to review by legal to accommodate non-substantive changes by legal counsel made by Councilmember Cundick, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Furley.

| ROLL CALL VOTE:                  | Yes | No | Abstain | Absent |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|
| MAYOR: Bill HOSTER               | X   |    |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING |     |    |         | X      |
| COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK       | X   |    |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: MICHELLE PEOT     |     | X  |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY       | X   |    |         |        |

b. Disconnection of L-2-D - Ordinance 2025-07

Mayor Hoster: This town legal has described effectively. The clock started ticking on this already. It would be prudent for the town to make a response during the limited time we have available on this request to disconnect. We can either approve it, or we can deny it. Understanding the ramifications, you're welcome to ask counsel what those each means. But in summary, if we approve the disconnect, if we deny it and they still want to disconnect, then it just goes to court.

Motion to deny the disconnect made by Councilmember Cundick, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Furley.

| ROLL CALL VOTE:                  | Yes | No | Abstain | Absent |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|
| MAYOR: Bill HOSTER               | X   |    |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING |     |    |         | X      |
| COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK       | X   |    |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: MICHELLE PEOT     |     | X  |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY       | X   |    |         |        |

c. Review of Water Supply Agreement

Item was removed from the agenda.

11. Closed Session may be held pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-204 & 205.

Motion to close regular meeting made by Councilmember Furley, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Cundick all Aye. Closed at 8:19pm

Motion to go into closed session for reasons of discussion of pending litigation made by Councilmember Furley, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Cundick. 8:21pm

| ROLL CALL VOTE:                  | Yes | No | Abstain | Absent |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|
| MAYOR: Bill HOSTER               | X   |    |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING |     |    |         | X      |
| COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK       | X   |    |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: MICHELLE PEOT     | X   |    |         |        |
| COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY       | X   |    |         |        |

Motion to go out of closed session made by Councilmember Cundick 2<sup>ND</sup> by Councilmember Furley. All Aye.

Motion to go into regular session made by Councilmember Cundick. All Aye

12. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn made by Councilmember Cundick. All Aye. 8:29pm

Approved this 10th Day of December 2025.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Hoster, Mayor

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Cari Bishop, Clerk