

**WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION--SEPTEMBER 29, 2026**

The Woods Cross City Council held a special session on September 29, 2026, at 6:30 P.M. The meeting took place at Woods Cross City Hall, located at 1555 South 800 West, Woods Cross, Utah.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ryan Westergard, Mayor
Julie Checketts
Jim Grover

Eric Jones-via zoom
Wally Larrabee-via zoom
Rachel Peterson

STAFF PRESENT:

Bryce Haderlie, City Administrator
Curtis Poole, Community Development Director
Dan Schultz, Assistant Police Chief

Annette Hansen, City Recorder
Brian Passey, Finance Director
James Bigelow, Police Chief

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE:

LeGrande Blackley
Jessica
Rebecca Packer
Charles Dearden

David Lewis IV
Julie Dixon
Brett Dixon
Susan Dearden

Spencer Lewis
Kristi Christensen
Andie Stocks
Tallie Beach

INVOCATION/PLEDGE:

Julie Checketts

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

Council Member Jones and Council Member Checketts said they had questions on each of the consent agenda items, so the Mayor moved them to the regular agenda for further discussion.

CONSIDERATION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 2026-1019 APPROVING INSTALLATION OF PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SIGNS AND MARKED CROSSWALK NEAR ODYSSEY ELEMENTARY APPROXIMATELY 1950 W 1950 S

The Council was given the following information regarding the installation of a crosswalk at approximately 1950 W 1950 S :

“The purpose of this request is to improve pedestrian visibility and provide a clearly identified crossing point for students, parents, guardians, and other pedestrians traveling to and from Odyssey Elementary. School arrival and dismissal periods create increased interaction between pedestrian and vehicle traffic in the area. A designated crossing treatment would help alert motorists to pedestrian activity and reinforce a predictable location for pedestrians to cross.

“The proposed project would include pavement markings for a pedestrian crosswalk and pedestrian/school crossing signage at the selected crossing location. Before installation, City staff should confirm the exact crossing location, sight distance, sign placement, pavement-marking configuration, and any related requirements under current City standards and applicable traffic-control guidance.

“The requested improvements are intended to increase driver awareness, improve the visibility and organization of pedestrian movements, and support safer access to Odyssey Elementary. The project is particularly focused on student and parent safety during school arrival and dismissal periods.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 2**

“Upon Council approval, staff can determine the materials, labor, installation schedule, and funding source. If additional engineering review or coordination with the school or other roadway stakeholders is required, staff should complete that coordination before installation.”

Following the information given, Council Member Checketts asked if there will be a crossing guard at this intersection.

Assistant Chief Schultz said there is currently a crossing guard at this intersection but one of the biggest problems they have is that there are no marked crossings on the south or west side of this intersection. He said they would like to have designated marked zebra markings on the south and west sides. He said they are trying to make this intersection safer for the pedestrians crossing in all directions. He said they are also requesting signs to help mitigate traffic in this area. He said there will be pedestrian crossing signs not school crossings signs. It was noted that is school signs were to be put up and that they would need to be initiated by the school and school district. Assistant Chief Schultz said they did ask for the school signs last year and the district said they felt they were not needed in this area.

Council Member Peterson asked if there was a need for the flashing school signs. It was suggested that the crossing guards be asked if they felt the flashing signs were needed.

Assistant Chief Schultz said the idea was to just make sure this area is clearly marked for pedestrians to cross and make it a safer area.

Chief Bigelow said he felt like this change would help the crossing guard. He said he wanted to try this first in hopes it would work would be a good option He said if it did not work and the intersection was still not as safe and they would like; they can consider other actions in the future.

Following the discussion, Commissioner Grover made a motion to adopt resolution 2026-1019 approving the installation of pedestrian crossing signs and marked crosswalks near Odyssey Elementary at approximately 1950 W 1950 S.

Council Member Checketts seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

CONSIDERATION TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 645 AMENDING TITLE 12, CHAPTERS 2, DEFINITIONS, AND 28, LAND USE AND SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS, TO ESTABLISH REGULATIONS FOR INTERNAL AND DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

The Community Development Director, Mr. Curtis Poole, noted the following for the City Council:

“During the 2026 General Session, the Utah Legislature adopted S.B. 284, which created Utah Code §10-21-304 addressing detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs). The new requirements become effective October 1, 2026.

“Utah Code § 10-21-304 requires cities to adopt land use regulations permitting a detached accessory dwelling unit on any lot or parcel that is at least 11,000 square feet and contains a single-family dwelling when the single-family dwelling is a permitted use on the property. The statute also establishes regulations cities are

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 3**

required to include limitations on regulations cities may impose, and additional standards cities may elect to adopt.

"The city's existing Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance, Section 12-28-123, currently prohibits external accessory dwelling units in all zones and only provides regulations for internal accessory dwelling units. As a result of S.B. 284, the city's ordinance must be amended to permit DADUs consistent with state law.

"Staff prepared amendments to Chapter 12-2, *Definitions*, and Section 12-28-123, *Accessory Dwelling Units*, to bring the city's regulations into compliance with state law and establish objective standards for the review and approval of both internal and detached accessory dwelling units. The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed amendment and held a public hearing on September 8, 2026.

"The City Council reviewed the proposed amendment at its September 15, 2026, meeting. As part of its review, the Council considered the proposed ordinance, the Planning Commission's recommendation and comments, and staff's recommendations regarding the proposed changes, and held a public hearing.

"Following the City Council's review and discussion of the proposed amendment, the Council directed staff to make additional revisions to the ordinance before final consideration. The revisions directed by the Council are summarized below:

- **DADU Minimum Lot Size.** The Council directed that the minimum lot size for a detached accessory dwelling unit be reduced from the 11,000 square feet originally proposed by staff to 7,500 square feet. State law requires the City to allow a DADU on qualifying lots of at least 11,000 square feet but allows the City to permit DADUs on smaller lots. The 7,500-square-foot minimum represents a middle ground between the original staff recommendation and the Planning Commission's recommendation to eliminate the minimum lot size altogether. The other applicable requirements of the ordinance, including setbacks, lot coverage, parking, building separation, and other development standards, would continue to apply.
- **Temporary Owner Absence.** The Council also directed staff to develop language addressing circumstances in which a property owner may be temporarily absent from the property without losing compliance with the owner-occupancy requirement. The intent is to provide reasonable flexibility for temporary absences while maintaining the underlying requirement that the property remains the owner's primary residence. Following the Council's direction, the City Attorney drafted language defining and regulating a temporary owner absence, which has been incorporated into the proposed ordinance for Council consideration.
- **Minimum Rental Period.** The state allowed cities to increase the minimum rental period from 30-days to 90-days. Current city code for IADUs is a 30-day minimum rental period. The Commission recommended keeping the same period for DADUs for consistency. This was missed on amendment the Council reviewed last time.

"No other substantive changes have been made to the proposed amendment from the version reviewed by the City Council on September 15. Except for the revisions specifically directed by the Council and the minimum rental period, the proposed ordinance remains unchanged."

Following the information given, Council Member Jones noted he was not able to attend the last Council Meeting and said he had reviewed the original proposal as well as the revisions. He said he had a few concerns about the direction this was going. He said he felt there is a lot of administration with the ownership of homes

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 4**

and the owner residing on the property. He said they are restricting the right for people to use their homes as they would like. He said the equivalent would be restricting rentals city wide. He said there are a lot of exceptions and it seems overburdening. He said he understands the concerns with the owner occupied but it seems unfair.

Council Member Checketts said there were several Planning Commission Members that came to the City Council meeting and explain their positions. She said the concern that had been discussed at the last Council meeting was that these DADU's would turn into duplexes in a single-family residential area. She said that was why they came up with the temporary owner clause for the owner occupation.

Commissioner Jones said he felt like a duplex is two homes connected adjacent.

Council Member Checketts said the concern is that there would be two rental properties on a single property that would be similar to a duplex.

Council Member Jones said he felt like he did not see that as a differentiation and a property is allowed to rent and not have an owner on the property.

Mr. Poole said if a person could rent the home and the ADU to separate people it would essentially be turning into a rental complex or a duplex.

Council Member Grover asked if both units were rented by the same family how that would be considered. Mr. Poole said it would be like one is rental.

Council Member Jones said he did not feel like it read that way in the ordinance. Council Member Jones then said he backed what the Commission had discussed.

Council Member Checketts said one concern for the DADU's were that rental units are usually not maintained as well.

Council Member Jones said he felt like that is a separate issue and needs to be addressed separately from the ADU considerations. He said he is concerned about limitations for a homeowner.

Council Member Checketts said she felt like they are opening the city for more duplexes and there is residential zoning for a reason. She said when you start to allow other uses in the zones then other people can start doing what they like. She said she felt it is the principle that an R-1-8 zone is for one home and if you put in an ADU you essentially put in two residences so there would be two separate residences and then can become a rental.

Mr. Poole said the purpose of the ADU is to provide a lower income opportunity for someone to rent. He said his concern is for a property when the owner is not there, it could turn out to be a rental and that part is market driven. He said that having two people renting on one piece of property is moving away from the intent of what was for the ADU was intended for in the first place. He said the intent was for lower rent for and ADU but if it becomes a rental property, it loses the intent. He said as far as renting to anyone you want; the code does not prohibit that. He said the ADU can be rented and if the owner leaves and a family want to rent both home and ADU the can both be rented by that family. He said it prevents the two properties from being rented out to two separate people.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 5**

Mr. Poole went over the ordinance with the Council. He said there is allowance for an owner that moves away from the property for a temporary period of time for both units to be rented assuming they will come back and live at the residence after the temporary residence.

Council Member Jones said he felt like that was a lot to ask.

The City Manager said one other element of an ADU is typically there is one water and one sewer attachment. He said one of the good reasons for an owner occupancy is because there are shared utilities and if there are two renters you run into the problem of who will be paying for the utilities. He said a duplex has separate sewer and water lines, so the property owner takes care of these things. He said this precipitates the utilities not being managed like a true duplex. He said the owner is obligated to manage the utilities with the owner occupancy, and it is an important thing that needs to be overseen.

Council Member Jones said that could be worked out in a lease agreement.

Mr. Poole said ADU's are not in demand a lot and all the cities he has worked in have not been big draws. He said they are expensive to put in so that limits many people from putting them in. He said since he has been in the city, there have been about four ADU's put in during the past 2 ½ years. He said they are not a popular thing. He said putting in these provisions provides a little precaution for the city so that down the road they can loosen things if they find they need to, but once you open the door for things it is hard bring them back in. He said he would rather be a little stricter right now and then loosen things in the future if they feel like they need to.

Council Member Peterson said she would rather be more conservative. She said there are some sticky points and possibly some unintended consequences but wants to make sure it serves the city and individuals to be the best experience it can have. She said she would rather rein it in a little at first and then reevaluate if and when it is needed.

Council Member Jones said he was a little more concerned the ordinance that has not gone through Planning Commission review. He said he would request that process would be gone through and see if the Commission and would like their thoughts and recommendation from them. He said he realized there is a time constraint but would like to do so.

Mr. Poole said the Commission did see this, and they reviewed it and made their recommendations. He said the Council have made a few changes after they had reviewed it.

Council Member Jones said he would like to see it go back through the Planning Commission.

Council Member Checketts said she did not feel like it needed to back through the Commission as they had already looked at it and had reviewed the information and made their recommendations to the Council.

Council Member Larrabee said he did empathize with Council Member Jones, and he felt there was a little bit of overreach and urged the Council to accept the proposal as the Planning Commission had recommended. He said he did not feel like there will be as many ADU's and felt there was too much on property owners.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 6**

Council Member Peterson asked for clarification on what is the role of the Council when there are Planning Commission recommendations, staff recommendations, and doing their own research as Council Members.

Council Member Jones the Planning Commission is an advisory body, but it is the Council that makes the final decisions. He said it is up to the Council to take a look at their own research and Planning Commission recommendations and then decide on action.

Council Member Peterson said she did look at all the recommendations and felt like she would like to be more conservative with the ADU's so they can be safe and not sorry.

Council Member Grover said he said he is owner of an IADU. He said he does understand what someone would be taking on. He said when there are two separate groups renting there can be friction that goes on and he does not feel like that is the type of community he wants to live in. He said there is value in having two rental properties, but he does not feel comfortable with that. He said he likes what is written with the changes.

Council member Peterson asked if they allowed the temporary owner absence would make Council Member Jones feel more comfortable.

Council Member Jones said he wanted to simplify the ordinance by saying only one renter per residential property would be better and he would like to allow two renters in certain circumstances.

The City Manager said he could go back to the attorney with the request for a change in language and bring it back for an amendment to the ordinance, but it needs to be approved tonight by state ordinance.

There was no further discussion and Council Member Checketts made amotion to adopt Ordinance 645 amending Title 12, Chapters 2, Definitions, and 28, Land Use and Supplementary Regulations, to Establish Regulations for Internal and Detached Accessory Dwellings Units. Council Member Peterson seconded the motion and Council Members Grover, Peterson, Checketts, Jones voted for the motion and Council Member Larrabee voted against the motion. The motion carried by a vote of four to one.

**CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS AUTHORIZING EMINENT DOMAIN CONDEMNATION FOR
TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT WITHIN THE CORPORATE BOUNDARIES OF BOUNTIFUL
CITY FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES 1500 S WATER TANK**

The Mayor gave the floor the Public Works Director who noted the following for the City Council:

"Demolition of the 2 old reservoirs and construction of a new tank require temporary soil shoring because the tank footing will be 20-24 ft below ground. To complete the work safely, shoring with soil nails is required to properly retain the property around the project.

Since May 2026, Woods Cross City employees and the City's consultants have been communicating with a representative of the Dixon, Dearden, and Lewis families to obtain the temporary construction easement voluntarily. City representatives have worked to explain the need for the easement and complete the acquisition without condemnation proceedings.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 7**

“As part of the required acquisition and condemnation process, the City sent the required Four Options Letters on July 30, 2026, and a Notice of Condemnation on September 10, 2026, with an offer letter to all affected property owners. These notices informed the affected parties of the proposed acquisition and the City’s intent to proceed with condemnation if it could not otherwise obtain the easement.

“Despite the City’s continued efforts to acquire the easement through negotiations, the City has not secured the easements within the timeframe needed for the public improvement project. The City must therefore proceed to the next step in the condemnation process so that the project can move forward.

NEED FOR THE TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT

“The temporary construction easements are required to complete the planned 1500 S Tank Replacement Project. The proposed resolution formally determines that acquisition of the easement is required for the public interest, safety, welfare, health, and necessity. It further finds that the easement has been located in a manner intended to provide the greatest public good while minimizing private injury.

“Approval of the resolution does not prevent the City from continuing to work cooperatively with the Dixon, Dearden, and Lewis families or their representatives to reach a voluntary agreement. Instead, the resolution authorizes the City Attorney to preserve the project schedule and proceed through the statutory condemnation process if a negotiated acquisition cannot be completed.

CONDEMNATION AUTHORIZATION

“The proposed resolution authorizes the City Attorney, on behalf of Woods Cross City, to acquire the temporary construction easements pursuant to Utah eminent domain law and to prepare and prosecute any necessary proceedings in the appropriate court.”

The Mayor noted the soil nails would be left in place, but the temporary easement would be vacated after the construction was completed.

The Mayor invited attendees who would be affected by this project to address the Council. The Mayor opened the meeting for public input. He said it is not a public hearing; it is meant to hear public input to residents who are affected. These residents are from Bountiful City where the city’s owns property for a water tank.

Mr. and Ms. Charles and Susan Dearden were present to address the Council. Mr. Dearden addressed the Council and said going through this process had been confusing and had been rushed. He said there had been extremely high pressure and eminent domain had been a threat from the beginning of the process. He said they had asked for details and said they had not received any key details about how many soil nails would be placed and how deep they would be located. He said they could not expand their home or add an ADU to their property because of the soil nails that would be permanently in the ground of their property. He said he would like to have answers to their questions and did not feel like they should bear the cost of removal of the nails if they decide to expand their property.

The Council reviewed where the tanks are currently placed and where the work will be done and how it might affect the properties in question.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 8**

Mr. Brett Dixon addressed the Council. He said he appreciated the opportunity to express his thoughts. He said he was not opposed to the project and is actually in favor of the project. He said it was the process he did not agree with and the aggressive condemnation of his property that was his concern. He said there would be many of these soil nails put into his property. He said the compensation for land value that was offered was extremely low. He said the easement agreement was very long and hard to understand as well. He said he felt like this matter should be handled with sensitivity and said he was not treated fairly. He said he felt like poor planning and poor handling of this matter should not lead to eminent domain and condemnation through the city. He said he felt like the good faith offer by the city was not a good faith effort.

Council Member Checketts asked who the people were that were negotiating for the city. The Public Works Director said it was JUB Engineering and the Langdon Group who were public information contacts. He said contact was also made by the lead engineer who is no longer with JUB. It was also noted that the City Attorney has been doing reviews of the project. Council Member Checketts asked if information contacts were attending the meeting and it was noted they were not in attendance.

Mr. Spencer Lewis addressed the Council. He said he did not receive the proper information of where the nails would be placed because they would be very close to the foundation of his home. He said there could be permanent damage to the properties that would be affected by putting in the soil nails. He said he was concerned there would be cement trucks brought in on the easement and he is concerned about his driveway being affected and there is nothing in the contract stating that the driveway would be replaced if damaged. He said he is also concerned about his driveway being blocked during this process. He said there have been two uses of the easement in the last few months. He presented pictures to the Council of trucks using this easement and blocking the driveway so they could not get out. He said he felt like the negotiation has been in bad faith. He said it will be at his own cost to have some of this done. He said they have had to hire an attorney at their own expense to help with this issue.

The Mayor thanked the residents for how they had approached this situation, and he appreciated the manner in which they had addressed the Council.

Council Member Checketts said she was disappointed in the way the JUB and the Langdon Group had approached things and said that is not how our city does business. She said she thought this is premature in moving forward with this action. She said there had not been clear communication and there had been a lack of understanding of what is happening. She said she was not happy with where things are today. She said she was disappointed in the representation of how this has happened. She said she felt like they could have proceeded in a better way and the residents need better information. She said she felt like a key person from the city needs to be in the meetings going forward so things can be communicated correctly. She said she was deeply sorry for how things had been handled so far. She said she hopes there can be better solutions moving forward. She also said appraisals needed to be ordered for the residents properties and compensation needs to be given to try to help relieve some of the financial burden the residents are facing. She said she had some understanding of what they are going through and feels like it needs to be approached in a different manner going forward.

The City Manager said he appreciated the information and details that have been given. The City Manager said he would make sure that JUB and the Landon group have access to the record so they can understand where the city residents are facing at this point in the process. He also said appraisals will be done and any damage that might take place will be compensated.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 9**

There was discussion on the appraisals on the affected properties and how the amounts were calculate. It was discussed that the appraisals should be fair. The City Manager said the city will communicate with the residents and evaluate their needs and concerns. He said the city would agree to pre and post inspections and he and the Public Works Director would review those and would also hold meetings with the city representatives and the property owners to make sure everyone had the correct information moving forward.

There was also discussion on the placement of the soil nails and whether they would be permanent after they had been placed. It was noted the nails would be left in place but would be non-intrusive because of the depth that they would be placed.

There was also discussion on where the easements would be located, and how long it would take to get the appraisals done. It was also noted the property owners had the right to be on the property when the appraisals take place.

Following the above discussions, the following action was taken:

CONSIDERATION TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION 2026 AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION FOR TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT LOCATED WITHIN THE COPORATE BOUNDARIES OF BOUNTIFUL CITY FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES (DEARDEN PROPERTY)

Council Member Checketts made a motion to table this item. Council Member Peterson seconded the motion, and all voted in favor with the motion through a roll call vote.

CONSIDERATION TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION FOR TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT LOCATED WITHIN THE CORPORATE BOUNDARIES OF BOUNTIFUL CITY FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES (DIXON PROPERTY)

Council Member Checketts made a motion to table this item. Council Member Peterson seconded the motion, and all voted in favor with the motion through a roll call vote.

CONSIDERATION TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION FOR TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT LOCATED WITHIN THE COROPORATE BOUNDARIES OF BOUNTIFUL CITY FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES (LEWIS PROPERTY)

Council Member Checketts made a motion to table this item. Council Member Peterson seconded the motion, and all voted in favor with the motion through a roll call vote.

The Mayor thanked the residents for their patience in this matter and said the city would do better with communicating with them and helping them moving forward.

CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EMINENT DOMAIN AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE CORPORATE BOUNDARIES OF WOODS CROSS FOR THE 1100 W ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (PROPERTY NEAR 2335 SOUTH 1100 WEST)

The following information was given to the City Council for their review regarding the 1100 W roadway improvement project:

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 10**

“During the project's design phase, the City Surveyor, with JUB Engineers, identified an unclaimed parcel at the port end of the project on the west side of the road. Further investigation and the Title Report found no clear owner of the parcel but identified 2 potential interested parties. Silver Eagle Refining and Zions Securities Corporation (currently Property Reserve Inc)

“Because the parcel has no clear owner, the City could not obtain a right-of-way or temporary construction easement. Under the direction of the City Attorney, Jayme Blakesley, the city is filing a condemnation complaint to have the courts determine ownership and grant the city the required right-of-way and temporary construction easement.

“As part of the required acquisition and condemnation process, the City sent the required Four Options Letters and a Notice of Condemnation on September 10, 2026. These notices informed the affected parties of the proposed acquisition and the City's intent to proceed with condemnation to determine ownership.

“City must therefore proceed to the next step in the condemnation process so that the project can move forward.

“The proposed City Right of Way and Temporary Construction Easement would allow for the City to widen 1100 W along the frontage of this parcel. The proposed resolution formally determines that acquisition of the easement is required for the public interest, safety, welfare, health, and necessity. It further finds that the right-of-way and temporary easement have been located in a manner intended to provide the greatest public good while minimizing private injury.

“This resolution authorizes the City Attorney to preserve the project schedule and proceed through the statutory condemnation process.

“The proposed resolution authorizes the City Attorney, on behalf of Woods Cross City, to acquire right-of-way and the temporary construction easements pursuant to Utah eminent domain law and to prepare and prosecute any necessary proceedings in the appropriate court.”

There were no further questions from the Council, and the Mayor opened this item for public input for the affected parties to comment.

There were no comments, and the Mayor closed the public input period.

Council Member Larrabee made a motion to approve resolution 2026-1020 authorizing eminent domain authorizing condemnation of property located within the corporate boundaries of Woods Cross for the 1100 W Roadway Improvement Project (Property near 2335 S 1100 W.) Council Member Jones seconded the motion and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the City Council, Council Member Checketts made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:27 P.M. Council Member Peterson seconded the motion, and all voted for the motion through a roll call vote.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SPECIAL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
PAGE 11**

Approved by City Council October 20, 2026

