

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
January 13, 2026**

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

This regularly scheduled meeting and public hearing of the Elk Ridge City Council was scheduled for **Tuesday, January 13, 2026, at 7:00 PM**. The meeting was held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah. Notice of the time, place, and Agenda of this Meeting was provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E. Utah Ave, Payson, Utah, and to the members of the Governing Body on January 12, 2026.

WORK SESSION

WORK SESSION SPENCER FOSTER STRATEGIC PLANNING DISCUSSION

Spencer Foster stated strategic planning is a road map for goals, mission vision, values and plan goals for the year, who will head them and how to implement them. Strategic planning accountability, responsibility. The following items are a quick brainstorming session and questions to consider: Goals for the year wish list - mountain access, sewer plan, adequate notices on wells and tanks and redundancy, replace the well, water main line, affordability/utilities. Mission statement is present focus - why the city exists and who does it serve. Community, family friendly, safety, essentials, services, serving. Core role - to be invisible, if we are doing it right residents don't even think about us. Vision is future focus - independence, expansion, more commercial, maintain small town feel, balance, benefits worth the cost. What is a thriving Elk Ridge in 2035 - mountain access achieved, parks done, debt free, roads fixed. What are the most important things for the council to do. Values how the city operates, how decisions are made, - citizen wants, collaboration, involvement, engagement, transparency, communication, kindness, haven from world, trust. Biggest priorities - challenges and opportunities related to growth and capacity the city must address - impact fees, capital facilities plan, growth capacity, sewer connections, financial help with grants, infrastructure and roads, maintenance, staffing, citizen responsibility. Community character- consistency, inclusiveness, need to be friends not just friendly. Priorities- What do you have and what you want to keep, what you don't have but what you want, what we have and don't want and what you don't have and don't want. Set annual goals and make the plans to implement them. Top priority - sewer plant, finish feasibility study - set finish date. Last, who is going to be accountability and follow-up, staff or council level? Will schedule another planning session in February - with pizza.

ROLL CALL

Mayor: Robert Haddock

Council Members: Melanie Paxton, Tanya Willis, Jared Peterson, Charles Wixom, Cory Thompson

Others: Royce Swensen, *City Recorder*, Laura Oliver, *Deputy Recorder*

Public: Larry lee

Opening – Resident

Pledge - Councilmember Wixom

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AND TIME
FRAME COUNCILMEMBER THOMPSON SECONDED

VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved

PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE

No Update

PUBLIC FORUM

Gordon Reynolds lives by the Highlands 2 development. He spoke previously about the zone change and concerns as neighbors are how does rezoning benefit the city, he would like a no vote on the rezone but not to stymie the development but to take into account all the stakeholders involved.

Gordon Cottrell bought his lot in 2016, not naive that development won't happen behind him. Previously there was supposed to be a buffer zone, right of way behind them. As of now the development would be right up to his fence. Doesn't see how smaller lots benefit the city and would like the larger lots to stay. He doesn't want a house that close to his house. He has concerns with runoff.

Chris – is concerned with changing the zone from 15 to 20,000 what is the criteria. What is in it for the city to rezone. Why does the city not push back a little bit when they are asked for a rezone.

Matt – is part of the Constitution Council at the APA Academy. They are asking cities to take part in having reading of the Constitution and or Bill of Rights in celebration of the country's 250th birthday sometime this year. Council asked questions and will look at the calendar and coordinate with the committee.

Steve Morley is representing the Homeowners Association they have 2 clients that are trying to expedite a lot line adjustment. City code 10-15a-18 (?) states you can do a lot line adjustment between parcels without doing a subdivision amendment, who was directed they had to do a subdivision amendment. Also, another client who wants to combine parcels and make 1 lot.

PUBLIC HEARING

RESOLUTION 26-01-14-1R REINSTATE IMPACT FEES FOR ROADS

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR RESOLUTION 26-01-14-1R REINSTATE IMPACT FEES FOR ROADS COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON SECONDED

VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved

AGENDA ITEMS

1. HIGHLANDS PHASE 2 REZONE AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Shawn Eliot, City Planner, The Highlands of Elk Ridge originally came to the city in 2021. Phase 1 is completed. At the time the development was rezoned R-1-15,000 with open space, trails, and a wide new road (Canyon View). Some of these things were done in Phase 1 and some were not. Phase 2 did not happen, and the zone change reverted back to R&L 20,000 zone. The applicant is asking to rezone it back to R-1-15,000 and didn't know it reverted back. The question is does it benefit the city? We met with the applicant and went over the things that needed to be worked out. Those items were still in progress when it was presented to the planning commission. My

97 recommendation was to table it. Planning Commission recommended approval contingent upon
98 the items being completed from staff recommendations. The recommendation of the connection
99 of Ridge View to Canyon View was from Shawn. Councilmember Thompson stated it his
100 understanding that City Council is no longer to have any decisions as to the planning of the actual
101 subdivision. Correct, the Planning Commission approves and sends recommendations to the SRC.
102 The amenity for open space is the blue area, which is zoned open space on the General Plan. The
103 area along Loafer Canyon was planned as open space in phase one which did not happen and is
104 not on the table this time. The trail along Loafer Canyon could be discussed. Councilmember
105 Thompson asked if improving Loafer Canyon with curbing and gutter is worth the expense with
106 the amount of traffic and development. Councilmember Willis stated it may develop someday.
107 Developer Joe Wilkins stated that he has never owned Loafer Canyon Road, that property is
108 owned by Jay Christensen and he won't sell it. He cannot improve what he does not own.
109 Councilmember Willis stated that it was part of the original plan and was used to determine the
110 open space for the initial rezone of that property. Councilmember Peterson stated the city only
111 has a certain number of sewer connections. The original discussion, which Joe Wilkins might not
112 have been involved in, he had to agree with some of it. There is some unbuildable property, put
113 the homes where they made sense. The open space was to be deeded to the city which is one of
114 the issues. Phase one is a little shy of the open space versus the density, with phase 2 it's not even
115 close. Without the open space it's back to being 20,000. The only thing the council can decide on
116 is the rezone. Shawn Eliot stated that when this whole area was rezoned, keeping the same
117 amount of connections, is basically saying that the connections are equal to the 20,000 sq ft lots,
118 but moving the density from the open space area to the 15,000 sq ft lots. It wasn't more density,
119 the homes were moved closer together to preserve the open space area. Councilmember Willis
120 doesn't see enough benefits that it would be worth it to the city to rezone to smaller lots.
121 Councilmember Thompson asked Shawn which benefits drive the decision to rezone, if that is
122 your recommendation? Shawn Eliot stated being new to the position, he did not know about the
123 sewer connections and sees that the open space is important. The trails and road improvements on
124 Sunset, which should have already been done, which doesn't sound like it is enough benefit. The
125 developer asked to hear what all of the council members think about the rezone. All council
126 members stated they would vote no for rezone due to lack of open space and connections.

127 The other item is the removal of the Sunset Trail General Plan amendment. The developer stated
128 the trail on Canyon View was previously offered as an alternative, that's why it is on the General
129 Plan map. Councilmember Paxton confirmed this, the alternate trail was brought to the Parks and
130 Trails Committee and was approved and the map was amended. Shawn Eliot stated the report
131 said the alternative trail was a compromise and only one of the trails and they wouldn't do both,
132 they would do one or the other. Is there enough benefit from that for the rezone and the amenities
133 being proposed to move the trail down Canyon View/Ridge View and have the road.

134 Close the public Hearing

135 COUNCILMEMBER THOMPSON MOTIONED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR
136 RESOLUTION 26-01-14-1R COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON SECONDED.

137	VOTE	AYE (5)	NAY (0)	Approved
-----	------	---------	---------	----------

Highlands Rezone continued

Shawn Eliot asked the developer when the original development happened the landowner of the open space along Loafer Canyon being discussed was a part of the discussions from the beginning? Knowing that the open space is important to the development, can you go back to the landowner? Joe Wilkins stated yes, Jay Christensen, was at the last Planning Commission meeting, but the piece of land up Loafer Canyon is not for sale and that piece was never for sale, even with Richman America.

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO KEEP THE R&L 20,000 BECAUSE THE DEVELOPER HAS NOT PROVEN THE SEWER CONNECTION CALCULATION AND THE OPEN SPACE BASED ON THE ORIGINAL DESIGN HAVE BEEN PROVEN OUT
COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

VOTE	AYE (5)	NAY (0)	Approved
------	---------	---------	----------

2. TRAIL MAP AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Shawn Eliot stated the recommendation to the Planning Commission was to not approve the trail removal until the Highland Phase 2 was approved and recorded with the trail on Ridge View. Discussion ensued on the road Shawn Eliot recommended between Ridge View and Canyon View to disperse traffic and improve connectivity.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLISf MOTIONED TO TABLE THE TRAIL MAP AND GENERAL MAP AMENDMENT UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON SECONDED

VOTE	AYE(2)	NAY (2)	vote not completed
------	--------	---------	--------------------

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO ALLOW THE REMOVAL OF THE TRAIL MAP IF THE DEVELOPER CAN WORK THROUGH THE DESIGN WITH STAFF ON ITEMS FROM STAFF REPORT

VOTE	AYE(2)	NAY (3)	Not Approved
------	--------	---------	--------------

3. BUCKY GAY WOODLAND HILLS ANNEXATION

Bucky Gay would like to annex a portion of land on the east side of Loafer Canyon into Woodland hills. It was previously brought to Elk Ridge and was told the drainage would need to be improved, which they have done. Councilmember Willis would be fine with the whole lot, going to woodland hills, with the exception of a strip along Loafer Canyon and a different engineer reviewing the drainage plan. Councilmember Peterson stated he is a lot happier with the improvements. Bucky Gay stated Woodland Hills has worked with the drainage and retention issues putting in several basins. Discussion ensued on the retention basins and what has been piped. Councilmember Peterson would be fine allowing that portion to go to Woodland Hills, Councilmember Willis is fine with it but has reservations on the drainage system. Shawn Eliot has no concerns with that property going into Woodland Hills. Bucky Gay stated his attorney wants a motion.

COUNCILMEMBER MOTIONED AUTHORIZE THE ANNEXATION OF LOT 231 AND LOT 230 FROM SUMMIT CREEK AND THE SURROUNDING RED AREA ON THE MAP TO WOODLAND HILLS COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED

VOTE	AYE (5)	NAY (0)	Approved
------	---------	---------	----------

4. BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR TRAIL FEASIBILITY STUDY WITH WOODLAND HILLS

Councilmember Paxton stated this would be to join a feasibility study to include access from Elk Ridge for a trail from Woodland hills switch backs at the cost of \$10,000 to talk to and work with property owners. A grant would then be needed to do the trail, which there is no guarantee the city would get. Councilmember Wixom is concerned about property owners allowing this, even after a feasibility study is done and the terrain is way too steep and we need to be fiscally responsible to our residents. Councilmember Thompson stated why not just walk up the road to access the trail and the Loafer Canyon is very steep. Councilmember Willis stated it would be amazing to be able to access the switch backs from Elk Ridge but isn't sure they would get anything for \$10,000. Councilmember Paxton shows the Utah Trails Network that Elk Ridge is trying to be collaborative. Councilmember Peterson stated the problem is the landowners who put up with people abusing their property over the years with illegal fires, drug paraphernalia, letting cattle out, etc. and having to go to the landowners and be reminded of that. Councilmember Paxton read a letter from the Glen Water Conservation fund regarding a non-match grant for conservation areas. There are opportunities but Elk Ridge can't get anyone to sell her the land. Councilmember Thompson stated he thinks this issue is important to the residents and should be pursued.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS MOTIONED TO SEND THE BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR \$10,000 FOR THE FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR TRAILS WITH WOODLAND HILLS TO PUBLIC HEARING COUNCILMEMBER THOMPSON SECONDED

VOTE	AYE (3)	NAY (0)	Abstain (2)	Approved
------	---------	---------	-------------	----------

5. RESOLUTION 26-01-13-1R REINSTATE IMPACT FEE FOR ROADS, FEE SCHEDULE

COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON MOTIONED TO REINSTATE IMPACT FEES FOR ROADS AS RESOLUTION 26-01-14-1R COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

VOTE	AYE (5)	NAY (0)	Approved
Councilmember Wixom	AYE		
Councilmember Peterson	AYE		
Councilmember Thompson	AYE		
Councilmember Willis	AYE		
Councilmember Paxton	AYE		

6. LIFT FEES NON-EMERGENCY FEE SCHEDULE

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO APPROVED 26-01-14-2R FOR NON-EMERGENCY LIFT FEE FOR COMPENSATION TO PUBLIC HEARING COUNCILMEMBER THOMPSON SECONDED

218 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
219 Councilmember Wixom AYE
220 Councilmember Peterson AYE
221 Councilmember Thompson AYE
222 Councilmember Willis AYE
223 Councilmember Paxton AYE
224

225 7. **APPROVE MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 11, 2025**
226

227 COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTION NOVEMBER 11, 2025, COUNCILMEMBER
228 WILLIS SECONDED
229

230 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
231

232 8. **APPROVE MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 9, 2025**
233

234 COUNCILMEMBER WIXOM MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR
235 DECEMBER 9, 2025, COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON CORY ABSTAIN
236

237 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
238

239 9. **APPROVE MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 16, 2025**
240

241 COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR
242 DECEMBER 16, 2025 COUNCILMEMBER WIXOM SECONDED TANYA AND CORY
243 ABSTAIN
244

245 VOTE AYE (5) ANY (0) Approved
246

247 COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS MOTIONED TO ADJOURN COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON
248 SECONDED
249

250 VOTE AYE (5) ANY (0) Approved
251
252
253
254

255
256
257
258


Laura Oliver