



Agenda

Town of Leeds Town Council
Wednesday, March 26, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the Town of Leeds Town Council will hold a **PUBLIC MEETING** on Wednesday, March 26, 2025, at 6:00 PM at the Leeds Town Hall, 218 N. Main Street, Leeds, UT 84746.

The purpose of this work session is to facilitate open dialogue among the Town Council members and Staff, regarding agenda items. Public comment will not be taken in this session. Decision-related discussions will be scheduled for a future Town Council meeting. This session prioritizes candid idea exchange, with no formal action taken.

Work Session 6:00pm

1. Work Session
 - a. Village Commercial
 - b. CiviclinQ Code Hosting

The Town of Leeds will provide reasonable accommodations for persons needing assistance to participate in this public meeting. Persons requesting assistance are asked to call the Leeds Town Hall at 435-879-2447 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The Town of Leeds is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Certificate of Posting: The undersigned Clerk/Recorder does hereby certify that the above notice was posted March 24, 2025, at these public places: **Leeds Town Hall, Leeds Post Office**, the **Utah Public Meeting Notice website** at <https://www.utah.gov/pmnl/>, and the **Town of Leeds website** at <http://www.leadstown.org>.

Michelle Rutherford, Clerk/Recorder

Town of Leeds

Town Council Work Session for Wednesday, March 26, 2025

Work Session 6:00pm

Call to Order: 6:00 pm

In Attendance: Mayor Hoster

Councilmember: Ron Cundick

Councilmember: Danielle Stirling

Councilmember: Michelle Peot

Councilmember: Kohl Furley

Town Clerk: Michelle Rutherford

Deputy Clerk: Cari Bishop

Planning Commissioner Chuck Bentley

Planning Commissioner Alan Roberts

Town Planner Scott Messel

Legal Counsel Craig Hall

a. Village Commercial

Work session discussion, discussing the Village Commercial document and the updates that were made. The Town Council wanted to clarify with the Planning Commission the mixed signals on the different drafts of the Village Commercial.

Councilmember Stirling stated that the document had substantial changes from the document that came from the Planning Commission. The document says the Village Commercial Zones established provided districts in which the primary use of the land is for small-scale commercial retail or service uses located throughout Leeds. I remember you had done a great job explaining that you wanted more of that allowable for more commercial to be in a higher density. I called Scott and asked him; do you have a track change. Then I asked how it got from the recommendation from the Planning Commission to the current version.

Planner Scott Messel stated that there are probably 3 versions that we have here. We have the version the Planning Commission reviewed and recommended, approval of the second one would be feedback from Paul and so we had his recommendations and then the third would be what was posted, and I think there were comments from Paul and legal counsel in there.

Mayor Hoster stated that the version approved by the Planning Commission was the one that they received in November.

Councilmember Peot stated that the one that the Planning Commission recommended also went through a public hearing, so there was an opportunity for citizens to give input.

Planner Scott Messel: Commercial that's written in the code is, The Village Commercial Zone is established to provide a district in which the primary use of the land is for small scale commercial, retail or service uses located throughout Leeds at crossroads along state highways, community gateways and convenient strategic locations of town. To meet community needs for both the residents and the visitors to the area development, the VC should reflect the rural pioneer in agricultural heritage of small-town America and Leeds as the downtown area. The Village Commercial Zone should be clearly identifiable from other zones and its appearance and intensity of development. The VC Zone should feature a mix of land uses, quaintly lit streets, village scale development with abundant pedestrian walkways, and outdoor gathering areas and shared off street parking areas, the VC Zone should make provisions for affordable and employee housing,

especially as second story dwelling units over commercial uses the front of buildings and lots should be inviting and accommodating pedestrians, bikes, vehicles or horses. Development should be landscaped with appropriate drought tolerant vegetation.

Councilmember Cundick stating we understand the purpose; the question is are we in agreement with all the things.

Mayor Hoster stated that we have coupled with compatible residential uses that was added in, we also have in the original text, second story dwelling units over commercial units and so why is it in there twice?

Commissioner Bentley stated that the builder changed it because he wants to do residential behind the market. Separate residential, not part of the building where employees are, it was left in there. When we approved it, we were approving it in conjunction with mixed-use, so this had some characteristics which we were trying to make it adaptable. The revised version, the big differences are the 5,000 sqft building to 35,000 sqft on grocery stores. Having some residential for employees above the business, we have separate residential, is allowed on the remainder of it. The parking which was not going to be allowed on the front and sides, which lends to the village commercial would now be allowed. The village commercial has some really good merit and was presented in the first version to the council in December, it can maintain Leeds proper and give some flexibility. We don't mix and match, but attached to this, we have village commercial that is either done by a development agreement, planned area, conditional use and in that it lists out that you can have a store up there and apply to parcels that are 25 acres or bigger.

Mayor Hoster asks for reference from everyone here on line 48. It says villages shall be lit and this is based on the comment that was made with regard to the developer's agreement villages shall be limited in physical size to control the amount of development therein. If the development is 50 or 50 or more acres, it is a VC planned area. It shall be approved through a development agreement entered into simultaneously with the village commercial designation of the property. If there is any conflict between this chapter and the development agreement, the development agreement shall prevail, which is, I think, troublesome. I want to make sure because you have referenced the development agreement, but it seems to me like the ordinance should prevail in every case.

Commissioner Bentley states that if we leave the original ordinance intact and then add to it. The 25 or 50 acres, whatever we decided can be addressed and use this with some modifications which I'm fine with the modifications going to a 40,000 foot retail. You could have separate residential and some revisions to parking.

Councilmember Stirling asks what's the difference between village commercial and what you're explaining and mixed-use?

Commissioner Bentley: The village commercial as sent to you is for Leeds proper, we are going to have developments that are bigger, that we don't want, I get the feeling mixed-use isn't what everybody wants but the village commercial would still allow for some flexibility, because it's on bigger parcels.

Councilmember Stirling: Do you think it would be advantageous to at least look at the mixed-use?

Councilmember Furley: You wouldn't want that in the middle of town. He is saying that the Village Commercial would be for newer developments.

Planner Scott Messel: No, he is saying it would be tiered.

Commissioner Bentley: You could have the trigger be acreage or date.

Planner Scott Messel: It could be commercial or have some mixed-use in it and people getting off at the freeway, you're not going to have walkable commercial adjacent to a freeway. It's car centric. It's at your discretion. There's no precedent set with the zone change. It can be discretionary; you could decide to put it in as another tool in your toolbox of how development could happen in the appropriate locations. Trying to be proactive rather than reactive, if we have the ordinances in place with the standards, we can be proactive.

Councilmember Stirling: Then Paul says for VC planned areas of commercial mixed-use with residential units above commercial spaces were changed by the developer to the commercial and residential use may be in separate uses.

Councilmember Cundick: We have already been through the mixed-use thing. First, I'd like to clarify that if we have a development agreement, that it doesn't take precedence over any of our ordinances. Second, we should not if you're going to have a VC Zone, I don't think we should allow residences, unless they're on top of the commercial, I think we

should limit it. We are opening the door to all kinds of residences. My thoughts are, on that, if you want more than that then make a smaller VC Zone.

Planner Scott Messel: The current concept he has, there is more separation, which would be rather than the integration of the commercial and the residential.

Mayor Hoster: We can have a good conversation and have this annexed in, if it does come down to what they have already bought with what they are trying to do. Finding a common ground of developer and ordinance, that's where we need to land in this work session.

Councilmember Cundick: The big concept is we want space. We let them park in front, and we increased the amount of traffic there, so you are no longer walking around. The sidewalk is 15 feet, it allows for flexibility, you can go all the way up to the sidewalk. If your whole idea is to create a walking space every time, you need to set the boundaries. There is no limitation to the size of the lots. No minimum for the lot size. I'm a little nervous if there is no minimum set. There is no minimum lot width either. As well as the distance between buildings.

Mayor Hoster asks if there is a fire hazard for the size between buildings.

Councilmember Furley: Depending on how you classify this use, most of them are forced to do automatic fire suppression. That reduces the whole discussion of whether it's safe or not because you are buying time with the fire suppression for the fire department to get there. If there's no setback distance between the buildings to allow you to put a ground ladder that's very dangerous.

Councilmember Peot: It's mentioned here, in the purpose, that there's affordable housing and I do agree that we do need some affordable housing, but then there's nothing in the requirements that mandate any sort of affordable housing. There is no mandate for affordable housing.

Councilmember Cundick: It could be anything.

Councilmember Furley: It could be for a hotel, St. George is a prime example of that, they have this exact thing we're talking about downtown right now.

Councilmember Cundick: This doesn't restrict.

Councilmember Peot: Because I did appreciate the mixed-use that it addressed because we are at some point when our population is big enough going to be having to do quotas for affordable housing and I like how this is planned out in a nice way or could be planned out in that way.

Planner Scott Messel: There is a line drawn in State Code that once your population is a certain number then you have to accommodate for moderate income housing. You will have to have that as part of your general plan.

Councilmember Peot: I'd rather have it be in a planned way like this.

Councilmember Cundick: It says we want these scattered around the town in various places.

Commissioner Bentley: This was written for the town as it exists, and if we're going to incorporate bigger ones, it needs to be separate because otherwise it totally dilutes this.

Councilmember Peot: Mixed-use has a lot more guard rails like minimum size of residences and having provisions for affordable housing and design standards than does Village Commercial.

Councilmember Stirling: Wanting clarification on number 71, it sounds like he is saying that there's a minimum parking area, not maximum parking area because that to me is a huge red flag.

Mayor Hoster: In conclusion, we already have our recommendation, and procedurally we have the ability to bring in the commissioners in on the legislative dialogue and make the decision, I think the most efficient way here is to keep it at this level and bring in one or two people from the planning commission to help us out.

Councilmember Furley asks Commissioner Bentley what he feels comfortable with.

Commissioner Bentley: What I would like is to have both the Planning Commission and Town Council at the next Planning Commission meeting for a joint meeting to discuss.

Commissioner Roberts: Made supporting comments on what Commissioner Bentley wanted to happen. Reiterated what Commissioner Bentley was stating for the process to move forward.

b. CiviclinQ Code Hosting We did not get to this topic.

Mayor Hoster motion to close the work session at 7:12pm

Adjournment: 7:12 pm

Approved this 9th Day of April 2025.



Bill Hoster, Mayor

ATTEST:



Cari Bishop, Deputy Clerk