

PUBLIC NOTICE

TOWN OF LEEDS TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION & LEEDS TOWN COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL JOINT WORK SESSION

The Town Council of Leeds will hold a Work Session and
The Leeds Town Council & Planning Commission will hold a Special Joint Work Session on
Wednesday, August 18, 2010 at 6:00 & 7:00 p.m.

At Leeds Town Hall, 218 North Main Street
Public is welcome to attend

AGENDA

Up to Town Council or Planning Commission Members may participate in the meeting by telephone or video conferencing (Ord 2006-08)

TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION

6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Declaration of Abstentions and Conflicts by Council Members, if any
4. Approval of Tonight's Agenda
5. Announcements
6. Discussion on a proposed Site Plan Ordinance

BREAK:

SPECIAL JOINT WORK SESSION WITH TOWN COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION


7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Pledge of Allegiance
4. Declaration of Abstentions and Conflicts by Commission Members, if any
5. Approval of Tonight's Agenda
6. Announcements
7. General discussion of general plan update to date
 - A. Vision Statement
 - B. Community Goals
 - C. Land Use
8. Adjournment

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Town of Leeds will make reasonable accommodations for persons needing assistance to participate in this public meeting. Persons requesting assistance are asked to call the Town Hall at 879-2447 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Certificate of Posting

The undersigned Clerk/Recorder does hereby certify that the above notice was posted August 16, 2010. These public places being at Leeds Town Hall, Leeds Post Office, the Utah Public Meeting Notice website <http://pmn.utah.gov>, the Town of Leeds Website www.leedstown.org, and Spectrum Newspaper



Fran Rex, Clerk / Recorder

LEEDS TOWN COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL JOINT WORK SESSION

MINUTES

August 18, 2010

7:00 p.m.

1. **Call to Order** – At 7:12 p.m. by Mayor Hyrum Lefler.
1. **Roll Call** – Present was Mayor Hyrum Lefler and Council Members Alan Roberts, Frank Lojko and Angela Rohr. Also present was Planning Commission Chair Jeff Mathis, and Commissioner Denise Johnson. Also in attendance were Form Tomorrow President Peter Stempel, Representatives Nicole McDermott and Will McLoughlin, and Leeds Clerk /Recorder Francene Rex. Council Member Keith Sullivan and Planning Commission Members Bailey Muir and Ray Beal were excused.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance** – was led by Mayor Lefler
3. **Declaration of Abstentions and Conflicts by Commission Members** – None
4. **A Motion** was made by Jeff Mathis with a **second** by Alan Roberts to **Approve Tonight's Agenda**. An **Aye Vote** was **Unanimous** by those in attendance.
2. **Announcements** – Mayor Lefler noted that the Town of Leeds had entered a float into the Washington County Fair Parade to highlight Leeds Wild West Days Festival on October 8th & 9th 2010, and flyers were handed out along the parade route. He said the float was made completely from donations and won first place in the General category, winning a cash prize of \$75. He said the committee was looking for volunteers to help with the event.
5. **General discussion of general plan update to date** - Mayor Lefler invited Form Tomorrow Representative Nicole McDermott to begin the discussion. Ms. McDermott said the Planning Commission (PC) desired feedback from the Town Council (TC) on the work done to date. She began with the vision statement because it sets the tone for the General Plan. Using the information gathered from the public process; the recommendation report of Form Tomorrow of prior Representative Elissa Black; and the current General Plan as an outline, Nicole said the PC had made updates where needed and removed information no longer pertinent. She said the PC wanted to get input from the TC and ascertain if they were all "on the same page" before moving forward. Chair Mathis reiterated the PC's desire for TC feedback, to make sure the PC was "moving in the right direction." They then discussed each updated section as follows:
 - A. **Vision Statement** – Mayor Lefler wondered if "businesses" should be added to the list in the last sentence to balance the desire to keep a rural town with the need to protect property rights, and allow for businesses. The sentence would read "Creating a welcoming environment for residents, businesses, and visitors...." Rohr wondered if this agreed with public input, and Form Tomorrow President Peter Stempel advised the subject was already addressed more appropriately under economic development. He noted the goals section could add more specifics to each topic. Lefler thought that would suffice. Town Council Member Frank Lojko suggested the last sentence replace the word "creating" a..." with "maintaining".....a welcoming environment. He also suggested the addition of "unique leisure" to the list in the last sentence. Stempel noted this could also be addressed later in the document. Council Member Alan Roberts asked what the general consensus regarding density was. Mr. Stempel replied the public was open to a variety of densities providing there was protection to sensitive areas.

- B. Community Goals** – Ms. McDermott stated policies were derived from the goals. She noted the goals were created by herself, Peter Stempel, the Planning Commission, and originated from the public input surveys . . .
- i. **Enhance Community** - Frank Lojko suggested a few grammatical corrections.
 - ii. **Historic Preservation** – No changes were made.
 - iii. **Agriculture & Rural Character** – A grammatical correction was made. It was ascertained that the phrase “mix of uses” did not pertain to mixed use zoning. For example: there are fields next to houses next to businesses.
 - iv. **Infrastructure** - Mayor Lefler noted that road infrastructure section need to be discussed with the desire of planning ahead to promote less traffic on small streets. Ms. McDermott said the update would address a transportation plan. Mr. Stempel said a sub-point of developing an appropriate hierarchy of roads would be included. Alan Roberts noted the term for the road plan has been “Road Master Plan” rather than Circulation Master Plan. Ms. McDermott suggested either two maps be drawn or an overlay be made to show: a road master plan and a circulation master plan which included trails. A grammatical correction was made.
 - v. **Economic Development** – Mayor Lefler suggested the verbiage be changed. A possible future interchange was briefly discussed. Peter stated public input had noted the desire to avoid situations where the Town was impacted by development, but did not receive the benefit of it (with reference to the Wal-Mart distribution center). He said there was a strong favoring of small businesses over large business; however, if big business was inevitable, Leeds should benefit. Mayor Lefler agreed to leave the opportunities open, so Leeds could guide it.
 - vi. **Housing** – No changes were made
 - vii. **Environs** – No changes were made. It was ascertained that the water run-off referred to in this sections is storm water, over-irrigation, and any other run-off.
- C. Land Use** – The following five sections were discussed as follows:
- i. **Existing Conditions and Build-Out Estimates** – No changes were made.
 - ii. **Key Land Use Issues** –Rohr wondered how the desire for a rural character conflicted with the desire for larger lots and property rights. Peter said the surveys showed a lot of desire to have open space; however, there was also desire to not unduly restrict property rights by imposing open space zoning. He also noted that large lots drive sprawl by spreading out houses over a large area and contradicting the preservation of open space. Roberts noted open space was not defined as five acre lots, to which Mayor Lefler agreed that a neighborhood with all five acre lots covers more space than a neighborhood with two to three acre lots, therefore leaving less area for actual open space.
 - iii. **Housing Typologies** - Johnson noted the survey also illustrated people wanted more affordable housing as well as open space. She said if the Town was proactive in deciding what zoning was appropriate in which locations, it would not end up zoned piecemeal. Frank Lojko added that current schools were far away, which made transportation hard for families with school aged children. He thought putting in a lot of density without having a local school or other businesses might be “jumping the gun.” Mr. Stempel noted the public seemed to want little pockets of density here and there connected by open space. He said they did not want massive apartment buildings, but were open to a little variety as long as it was buffered by what people really wanted. He noted people wanted to enable their grown children or grandparents to live in Leeds. He said people wanted “Leeds scale” density of things. They were open to higher density on part of a parcel if open space or other desirable features were maintained/created on the other part. Stempel also reminded of the possibility to bonus developers greater density for leaving greater buffers than currently required by washes, hillsides and other sensitive areas. Lojko said the extent of open space should not just be drainage areas, or private parks and etc, and added Leeds needed to be protected from the expense of big developers/businesses challenging our ordinances. Stempel said the language in the ordinance needed to be clear. He gave the example that if density bonus is tied to the amount of buffer that leads to a wash, it promotes the land owners desire to provide more real contiguous open space. He said having a standard for buffers or connectivity provided continuity, and reiterated the importance of crafting a clear and concise ordinance. Roberts agreed that strong ordinances stating the direction the Town desired to go and allowing only certain maximums would inhibit legal battles. Stempel said absolute “no’s” in an ordinance produce legal challenge; whereas

"channeling" with a clear concise path lessens legal challenges. He gave the example of an ordinance stating a baseline zoning of five acres, but then allowing for "bonusing" into half acres by doing "x,y and z." He said having a clear path and a nexus between the two things clarified the process, which lessened legal challenges. Roberts added that if the ordinance language lead to allowing individual property rights, it would also lessen legal challenges. Lojko agreed that strong language was the key. Mathis stated the language in the goals and policy section would help create a strong ordinance.

- iv. **Future Land Use and Annexation** – The Town Council and Planning Commission Members then discussed the foreseeable possibility of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) building a four-way Leeds interstate interchange. Discussion was had that the placement of such interchange would impact the placement of certain zoning. There was discussion of a survey to ascertain public opinion of placement, and then creating a committee to lobby for such placement. Discussion was also had regarding the possible desire to have a local elementary school. Roberts recalled that having an elementary school was highly favored in the survey. Mayor Lefler and Mathis recollected the same, and Lojko agreed having a local elementary was a "lifeblood" to a town, and helped young families. Peter noted schools created a community nexus. Ms. McDermott said she would incorporate the idea into the housing typology and future land use sections. Mathis added that a "community bonus" may create the incentive for a developer to provide space for a school. Stempel also added that in order for an item to enable a bonus, it needed to be an amenity for the Town. (ie. A private development park would not evoke a bonus, but a community assessable park would). Audience member comment by Drake Howell agreed, stating developers needed to understand that in order for them to have a marketable project they needed to have a sense of community, but that often did not run crosswise to their own interests. Roberts, Stempel, and Lefler agreed that a school would be a benefit to a development as well as the Town. G-6 of the goals and policies referencing landscaping was discussed. It was discussed that if having landscaping requirements were desirable, an ordinance was needed. Stempel suggested if a certain percent of a lot needed to be landscaped, "landscaping" could include native vegetation. He thought this would promote minimizing native vegetation disturbance. He said the ordinance should be simple, clear and clean, and not too far reaching, and noted using a simple percentage does this.
- v. **Land Use Goals and Policies** – The Council and Commission were asked to give input on the New Economic Development Section, and a Future Land Use Map by September 5, 2010.

6. **Adjournment** by Jeff Mathis at 8:47 p.m.

APPROVED BY TOWN COUNCIL ON THIS 22nd DAY OF September, 2010

Hyrum Lefler
Mayor Hyrum Lefler

Attest:
Francene Rex
Clerk/Recorder Francene Rex

APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS 6 DAY OF October, 2010

Jeff Mathis
Chair Jeff Mathis

Attest:
Francene Rex
Clerk/Recorder Francene Rex