

# Town of Leeds

---

## Town Council Meeting for Wednesday, February 25, 2026

### 1. Call To Order/Roll Call: 7:00pm

ROLL CALL:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
MAYOR: WAYNE D. PETERSON	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: JEFFREY ALLEN	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: CHRISTINE HARVEY	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: AARON PRICE	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>

Planner Scott Messel was in attendance.

### 2. Invocation: Sharon Shores from Universal Life Church Ministries

### 3. Pledge of Allegiance

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

### 5. Consent Agenda:

- a. Tonight's Agenda of February 25, 2026  
Minutes of February 11, 2026

Motion to approve agenda made by Councilmember Harvey, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Price.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE D. PETERSON	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: AARON PRICE	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: JEFFREY ALLEN	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: CHRISTINE HARVEY	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>

### 6. Announcements: Grillin' and Chillin' Town Cookout at the Peach Pit Pavillion, Friday, March 20 at 5:30pm Come with an entrée to cook on the grill and side dish to share. We will have water available and charcoal for the grill.

New Harmony Night on March 18<sup>th</sup> Interfaith Council.

### 7. Public Hearing: NONE

### 8. Public Comments: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. **(Three minutes per person.)**

Martha Ham: What I want to talk about is the planned development multi-family zone. It was mentioned in passing at the last meeting. What this is, the County is establishing the zone, a 15-mile zone from mile 16, which is about the Hurricane exit to mile 31, which is Pintura. The purpose of it is two things. One thing is the County has to meet a requirement to identify how they're going to meet the needs of moderate-income housing, which has a lot of different names-- attainable housing, low-income housing. People who could access this property have to qualify for this property or these developments along I-15, let me emphasize that's in the unincorporated county, not in the Town of Leeds. It's a one-mile area on either side of I-15. This zone has already been approved by the Land Use Authority of Washington County, and it is up for approval on March 3rd with the Washington County Commissioners. I have a lot of concerns about this zone. The first reason is the location is just ridiculous because the point and purpose is to promote affordability and letting people get a home. Part of that is having easy access to employment, to their services, parks, schools, and so on. I think all of us are very aware that there is a cost to living here, and you've got to have a vehicle that can make it to and from, along with that we have increased costs, and they've increased dramatically in the last five years because of wildfire risk. There's a concern about this kind of concentrated

development being right along the corridor in wildfire region, and along with you talking about affordability. You have to call community development with the County to get a copy. The density for these developments is 18 units per acre. I listened to the hearing, the public hearing that, in my opinion, was not well advertised about this particular zone change here in the county, the notices went up in certain libraries around the county, and then it went on the official public notice website. If you're not signed up to be notified and you're not checking that, you're not going to know what these changes are and what the hearings are about or when they are. When they held a hearing on February 10th, two people testified. One of them was Jared Westhoff what he said in the meeting is his own development, which is south of town here. Some of us have seen the plat maps that are following those criteria. They're part of the multi-family planned development zone. He's laid everything out with regard to these requirements. He also announced that The Cove, the development over here on the other side of the interstate owned by Gary Crocker and perhaps others, is also planning to take advantage of this and to use this zoning. He said about 200 acres in Leeds would be leaving Leeds and would be interested in this zone and these possibilities. To conclude, I have a handout that has everything on it except for what's happening with The Cove, just found out today. I'm asking each of you to write to the county commissioners. I have the e-mail address and the phone number and request that they postpone this approval of this until they can collect more public opinion about the importance about the viability of this and again I am not against high density a high density, development to accommodate the missing middle low-income folks or lower income folks but this is a terrible location along the I-15.

Michelle Peot: I'm going to comment on the same thing, but in a different way. My concerns about this are, I don't think this is really about affordable housing because the way HUD defines affordable housing is that housing that would be potentially available to somebody who makes 80% of medium income or less. Then there's another clause there that says that the amount they would pay would not exceed 30% of the household income. That piece is missing, my concern about this is I don't see those additional provisions. I get that they say no short-term rentals, but there's nothing that says no long-term rentals. There's nothing that says this can't be somebody's second home. I'm not convinced that this is truly in good faith for affordable housing. Then I do agree with Martha for the reasons that it just seems perplexing that you would locate this so far north from amenities when you're talking about folks that may not have reliable transportation. The other concern that I have, just based on the history of what I've seen with the County Commissioners and our US Reps is that there's a significant number of public lands in between there, and they have now made two attempts to sell off that public land using amendments to various bills. Thankfully folks like Ryan Zinke of Montana and other folks have shut that down. I actually had previously requested the map that they gave to Celeste Malloy of their wish list of that land that would go into the amendment, and they refused my GRAMA request. They've been very opaque about their plans, some of these have been last minute, midnight, rush this through budget amendment type of things. To me, it is a bit suspicious. Some of those wish list properties sit in that corridor.

Martha Ham: Michelle, I did some research today on the long-term rental. Yes, owners can establish long-term rentals with their property.

## 9. Action Item: NONE

## 10. Discussion and Possible Action Item

### a. Purchase of parts for Crack Seal Equipment

Councilmember Furley: We received a donation from Washington City for a crack seal machine that our Town, desperately needs to help us propel forward into taking care of our roads. In order to get that up and running, it did get donated for a reason. It wasn't perfectly running. We were very well aware of the problems it had. They were great to even consider this. We have to purchase a diesel burner for the back of it, that heats the tar as well as a coolant reservoir tank and another tar temperature sensor and the only place to get these parts are from Caterpillar. I've received a bid for those parts, and the total is \$6,445.72. I think that'll get us up and running. One of the Washington City representatives agreed to come out and help us learn how to use it. And so once it's up and going, if it's still good weather to be able to crack seal, we'll start.

Question was asked when we get this up a running where do we get the tar from?

Councilmember Furley: That can be covered under B&C Road funds as well. Tar can be purchased from a couple different places. There's a company in Salt Lake; there's also one in Hurricane that's over by the Caterpillar dealer. I was also approached by one of the Washington City employees that buys this tar, and he said that if we wanted to he'll

show us how to calculate based on the running or linear feet of the roadway. He'll teach us how to calculate that, and we can jump in on their purchasing power and buy it with them so we can actually get it cheaper than we could on our own.

Mayor Peterson: We do have accumulated B&C road funds from previous years, and we are continuing to receive B&C road funds right now. It is something that would be available for the current fiscal year budget, and later on I'll be speaking about the next fiscal year budget, which starts on July 1. There is money immediately available from the B&C road funds. B&C road funds, for those who are not familiar, are road funds that we get from UDOT, to take care of kind of the local roads. It's not for the state road, which Main Street is. It's for our other roads, and it's allocated based on our miles of roads that we have, and it comes out of the UDOT budget from the taxes that they collect in order to maintain the state's roadways.

**Motion to bypass the three-bid requirement, move forward with purchasing the parts from Caterpillar and approve the bid made by Councilmember Furley, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Price.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE D. PETERSON	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: AARON PRICE	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: JEFFREY ALLEN	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: CHRISTINE HARVEY	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY	X	_____	_____	_____

b. Adobe Alcove Request for Liquor License

Mayor Peterson: We have a completed application in front of us right now. It's been shared with Town Council. We do have the applicant here as well. If we have questions.

**Motion to approve the liquor license application from Adobe Alcove made by Councilmember Furley, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Price.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE D. PETERSON	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: AARON PRICE	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: JEFFREY ALLEN	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: CHRISTINE HARVEY	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY	X	_____	_____	_____

c. Establish Date for Public Hearing on Disconnect Petition Submitted by The Cove

Mayor Peterson: The final discussion and possible action item is establishing a date for the public hearing on the disconnect petition submitted by The Cove. We received it on the 13th, and it was forwarded to Town Council. What we are required to do with regard to a disconnect petition is to set a public hearing on it. That public hearing must be set no earlier than twenty-one days following the submission of the application. It requires a few different notifications from the landowners involved. Our Town Ordinances also have adjoining landowners to be notified, and then there's also a general notice that must go out that requires twenty-one days of posting. As a result of that, our next Town Council meeting would not be far enough forward relative to that other 21-day advance posting. However, March the 25th would be, and that would be the first time available at a regularly scheduled Town Council meeting that we could have the public hearing. That is what I would suggest as a starting point. Is there any discussion from Council?

**Motion to hold a public hearing on March 25<sup>th</sup> for The Cove disconnect request made by Councilmember Price, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Councilmember Furley.**

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE D. PETERSON	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: AARON PRICE	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: JEFFREY ALLEN	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: CHRISTINE HARVEY	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY	X	_____	_____	_____

**11. Discussion Item: Town Culinary Water**

Mayor Peterson: About 20 years ago, the Leeds Water Company pressurized their system. At that time, they set up a connection here at Town Hall for the water, and it is separate from the Town's culinary water. Our culinary water is LDWA water, and as the Town, we have an account with the LDWA. However, watering the Town park was something that was very expensive, utilizing culinary water. As a result, the irrigation company had put in a connection for their setup. That particular connection costs right now, it's about \$800 a year. We've been paying for that for the last 20 years and we've been using water. What has been brought to the Town's attention from the irrigation company, the Leeds Water Company, is that if we don't want to use culinary water and we want to use irrigation water for the park, it was an oversight that the Town did not have a water share. What we need to do if we want to continue to use that water is to get the water share and then pay a fee that is under \$60 a year for the water itself. We've been paying for most of it and we've been utilizing it for 20 years, but it's been noted that we actually did not have that necessary water share. That water share would grant us the right to water 0.89 acres, which would cover the park under a full allocation. At times, the water company has had to reduce the amount of water that they make available to all of the irrigation shareholders. If that is the case, it would be a pro rata reduction with regard to what the Town would have. It would require us to purchase a share. Shares are available from time to time. The most recent, a fractional share sold, a half a share for slightly under \$6,000 is the most recent sale of a share in this area. Is there anything for public discussion? We're not going to discuss how much we would be willing to pay. That's one of the few topics that we are allowed to go into a closed session. We would be, later today, if Council's in agreement going into a closed session in order to figure out how we would work that particular part of the transaction to be able to continue using irrigation water in the park.

**12. Staff Reports**

Councilmember Harvey: I attended a Trust Land Zoom meeting where action item 10A was the proposed major development in Leeds. There was a discussion on the brief history of the project presented to the Trust Lands Administration Board, and it outlined the previous work on the project dating back to 2005. The project reviewed the final deal points in January 26<sup>th</sup>, and the board, the Trust Lands Administration Board, approved the final terms at that meeting on February 19<sup>th</sup>. It was mentioned that there are contaminants, mitigation, monthly checks. DEQ passed off on the inspections, and they said they hope they're good for 20 years. It was mentioned that the project will be done in three phases and will mirror the Kayenta format where there's a portion of each lot that is designated space for building and the natural vegetation will be left untouched. There were entitlements that were re-upped and they have water deeded to LDWA for will serve letters in 2009. There was a plat approval in 2023, although the town council meeting notes from 2023 don't specifically say that the approval was done on October 11<sup>th</sup> like it does in the documentation from Trust Lands Administration. There were multiple meetings past that initial town council meeting discussing more about the plat. Wayne and I met with Mike Chandler from the Ash Creek Special Service District to get more details and clarification on key points in regard to sewer service and Leeds. While there's no immediate plan to implement a plan for sewer with Ash Creek, there's more understanding on the process. It was not a deep dive

meeting. It was just an overview. Also, there is information being prepared for a presentation regarding an alternative option that has been brought to our attention.

13. Public Comment: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. ***(Three minutes per person.)***

Chuck Bentley: To follow on Martha and Michelle, I've talked to two of the Commissioners on the corridor and I think that if we would all take time to give comments and express concerns, they're a long way from making their mind up on this. I stressed Leeds is, if you live here, you got to be capable of owning 2 cars because one car doesn't take you to town and back if there's two of you. Everything's a travel. We have no schools, no medical services, no transportation, no groceries, no anything. It's all a commute. That's really something they seem to listen to. With that being said, they're politicians, so they usually listen if you can get to them. I think it'll be productive the more comments they get and not necessarily all negative, because if you just point out the realities of here and being 15 miles from services, it doesn't really work for the criteria that affordable housing is supposed to work for. I'd encourage everyone to send an e-mail, call them, and leave a voicemail, but contact them because they're listening to this and I don't think the decision's made.

Martha Ham: I agree with what Chuck is saying about not being all negative. I think that the Community Development Department and Planning and Zoning with the County are doing a good thing with trying to look at where can we put this kind of housing. We need this kind of housing in this County. This is just the wrong place. I want to be supportive of their interest in doing this. The State's requiring them to do it, but as I listened to the hearing, I heard some concern for the community and wanting to see good development for the full array of our economic profile here in Washington County.

Councilmember Allen: The question I have is, this only applies to unincorporated or to unincorporated or unannexed land, right? Is there a situation where it would have been to our benefit to have annexed property ahead of time? Is this an annexation question?

Planner Scott Messel: Yes, it is a way to strategically, play chess with the development. There's been some jurisdictions, I'll use Virgin or Apple Valley as examples. When they first became a municipality, they went out and annexed tons of land and then ended up deciding, we don't have the money to maintain all of the roads out there. They ended up disconnecting some of it. It's a strategic thing. It is best for a municipality if there is land that they want to have a say in how it develops to annex it into the municipality.

Michelle Peot: I strongly urge the Council to consider some potential negative ramifications to further annexation. As some of you know, I attend the Conservancy District Board meetings. One of the things that they have stated in there is they would love all of this property to go into a municipality and then have each of those municipalities sign into the regional water supply agreement, because then that inserts the municipality as a middle man in order to deal with the developers. They have fully admitted that they do not have enough water for all of the developments, even though they're still issuing will serve letters. You won't know as a developer until you really have water available until you go to pull a building permit. If a municipality then becomes the retailer, that puts the town at liability if that developer goes to pull a building permit and you say, oh, sorry, we don't have any water to retail. That's one thing. The other thing is, and you're encountering this, depending on what type of sewer you have to support, if it were tied into the greater system, the town, or they have to figure out how the developer will cover this, the global infrastructure, which is quite significant for a town of our size. I think there are a lot of financial and potential liability ramifications that need to be considered in that annexation decision.

Chuck Bentley: We don't have any carrots because we don't provide power, we don't provide water, we don't provide sewer. We don't have a lot of things to entice people because we don't provide any services other than the fire service. If LDWA has water available, that's a carrot because you have to be in Leeds to be served by LDWA. But that's really the only carrot we have.

14. Closed Session: A Closed Session may be held pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-204 & 205 for a Acquisition of Real Property

Motion to close meeting and open a closed session for Acquisition of Real Property by Councilmember Harvey Second by Councilmember Furley at-7:54pm

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE D. PETERSON	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: AARON PRICE	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: JEFFREY ALLEN	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: CHRISTINE HARVEY	X	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: KOHL FURLEY	X	_____	_____	_____

Closed Meeting Started at: 8:09pm and Finished at 8:53pm

15. Adjournment: 8:53pm

Approved this 11th Day of March 2026.



Wayne D. Peterson, Mayor

ATTEST:



Cari Bishop, Clerk/Recorder