



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Wednesday, November 19, 2025

Approved January 7, 2026

The following are the minutes of the Herriman Planning Commission meeting held on **Wednesday, November 19, 2025, at 6:00 p.m.** in the Herriman City Council Chambers, 5355 West Herriman Main Street, Herriman, Utah. Adequate notice of this meeting, as required by law, was posted in the City Hall, on the City's website, and delivered to members of the Commission, media, and interested citizens.

**Presiding:** Chair Andrea Bradford

**Commissioners Present at Work Meeting:** Brody Rypien, Darryl Fenn, Andy Powell, Heather Garcia, Adam Jacobson, Alternate Forest Sickles, Alternate Preston Oberg, Jackson Ferguson

**Staff Present:** Planner I Laurin Hoadley, Planning Manager Clint Spencer, Communication Specialist Garret Reynolds, Deputy Chief of Police Cody Stromberg, City Recorder Jackie Nostrom, Staff Engineer III Josh Petersen, Planning Director Michael Maloy

### 6:00 PM WORK MEETING (Fort Herriman Conference Room)

Chair Andrea Bradford called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

#### 1. Commission Business

##### 1.1. Review of City Council Decisions – Michael Maloy, Planning Director

Planning Director Maloy reported that the City Council adopted the Water Element of the general plan and noted it went smoothly, with no significant concerns raised. The public works department contributed helpful input.

He also shared positive news that the state has officially accepted their moderate-income housing plan report. As a result, the City has maintained its eligibility for priority state transportation funding, which he described as a good outcome.

## 1.2. Review of Agenda Items – Planning Staff

### Item 4.1 - Game Haven Site Conditional Use Amendment

Planning Manager Spencer presented a review of the Game Haven site after discovering multiple unapproved changes made between the project's original planning commission approval and the final zoning inspection. Although the overall character of the building remained similar, he found numerous alterations such as different siding orientation and color, missing canopies, removed windows, and other design modification that exceeded what is normally seen. Because of the extent of these changes, Manager Spencer felt it appropriate to return the item to the planning commission for re-review and accountability.

Commissioner Jackson Ferguson arrived at 6:12 p.m.

An additional issue emerged: the second building had been approved and parked as a retail use, but was operating as an event center, which required different parking standards. Manager Spencer recommended that the applicant provides a parking management plan to demonstrate how the shared parking arrangement will function.

Commissioners questioned whether allowing such deviations could set a precedent, how common these discrepancies are, and what enforcement options exist. Planning staff explained that while minor changes are normal, the number in this case was unusually high. Because the site is in a Master Development Agreement (MDA) and still meets the master developer's design criteria, formal violations were limited. However, the commission's review was needed because this was an amendment to an older conditional use permit and because the building's use was officially changing to include an event center.

The planning department planned to better communicate the need for approval of substitutions or modifications in future projects, and they are coordinating with building inspectors to catch changes earlier. The commission discussed potential impacts of the new event center use such as parking demand and alcohol licensing but concluded these were manageable under existing agreements and regulations. Despite the changes, planning staff noted that the building still looks good overall.

### Item 5.1 - Panorama Master Development Agreement Amendment

Planning Director Maloy introduced the amendment to the Panorama development agreement and explained that, although a public hearing was not required, the City Council preferred that the Planning Commission review such amendments and provide a recommendation. He noted that Panorama is one of several major South Hills development agreements and that future amendments are expected as property exchanges occur.

Commissioner Sickles questioned whether sections of the agreement conflicted regarding amendments. Planning Director Maloy clarified that because this amendment involves property transfers, it must go to the City Council rather than being handled administratively. Some minor changes can be approved administratively, but this one could not.

Chase Andrizzi, representing the applicant, described the changes: the lot mix would shift from uniform 50–60-foot lots to a blend of 50- and 70-foot lots to create more variety and respond to market demand. The main driver of the amendment was a land swap with the Jordan School District, enabled by the developer's acquisition of adjacent property. The swap required realigning boundaries within and outside the development agreement. Although the district now owns the property, no one confirmed whether it would actually build a school.

Commissioner Fenn asked about double-frontage residential lots. Applicant Andrizzi explained these resulted from adjusting the plan to better match the natural topography. The revised design drastically reduced the amount of material that would need to be hauled off, eliminating roughly 700,000 of the originally projected 1,000,000 yards. This topography-based layout created some lots with roads on both sides, though double-fronted lots were not a design goal. He noted that visuals would be shown to illustrate the elevations. Planning Manager Spencer added that the City commonly sees double-fronted lots along arterials, though these are interior lots in this case.

**1.3. Review and discuss Herriman City Land Development regulations, standards, policies, and best practices to ensure compliance with Utah State Code and implementation of the adopted General Plan – Michael Maloy, AICP, Planning Director**

Director Maloy invited Commissioner Heather Garcia to share insights from her City Council campaign, noting that she had spoken with many residents about development. Commissioner Garcia reported that the main concerns she heard involved density, traffic, and difficulty getting in and out of the city. Residents were generally satisfied with parks, trails, and city administration. Some residents expressed interest in allowing detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) on larger lots with fewer restrictions, often for family use. She also said rural property owners wanted to preserve the community's rural feel and ensure adequate buffers when development eventually reaches their areas.

Director Maloy shared that even eighth-grade students he met at a local school event were asking about upcoming commercial development, which Commissioner Fenn noted mirrored interest he saw from students at a UDOT conference.

Commissioner Garcia described her campaign experience, saying she visited many homes and was encouraged by increased voter turnout in her district. She expressed respect for the winning candidate and shared a positive outlook.

She then raised a policy idea: reviewing commercial zoning to prioritize businesses that bring stronger revenue into the city. Commissioner Garcia suggested the city consider strategies to avoid an oversaturation of low revenue uses which was another common concern she heard from residents.

The Planning Commission watched training videos for the remainder of the work session.

## **2. Adjournment**

*Commissioner Darryl Fenn moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:58 p.m.*

## **7:00 PM REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING (Council Chambers)**

### **3. Call to Order**

Chair Andrea Bradford called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

#### **3.1. Invocation, Thought, Reading and/or Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Chase Andrizzi led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **3.2. Roll Call**

Full quorum present.

#### **3.3. Conflicts of Interest**

No conflicts of interest were noted.

#### **3.4. Approval of Minutes for the October 15, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting**

*Commissioner Garcia moved to approve the Minutes for the October 15, 2025, Planning Commission meeting; Commissioner Powell seconded and all voted aye.*

### **Administrative Items**

4. Administrative items are reviewed based on standards outlined in the ordinance. Public comment may be taken on relevant and credible evidence regarding the application compliance with the ordinance.

**4.1. Review and consider approval for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment for Game Haven at 5254 & 5262 W Anthem Park Lane in the C-2 Commercial Zone.**  
**Applicant: GH Leasing (property owner)**  
**Acres: ±1.24**  
**File No: C2025-141**

Planning Manager Spencer presented the conditional use permit amendment request for Game Haven, explaining that it was a straightforward matter involving two main considerations: modifications to building elevations and a change of use for the secondary building from retail to an event center. He began by providing context, noting that the Game Haven site is located on the north side of the Anthem commercial area and encompasses two buildings - the main Game Haven building and what is now called the Enchanted Event Center.

Manager Spencer detailed how the issue came to light during a routine zoning inspection conducted after the site was fully developed. During this inspection, staff discovered several changes had been made to the buildings that differed from the approved plans. Due to the number of changes and the change of use from retail to event center, staff felt it appropriate to bring the matter before the Planning Commission for re-approval of the elevations and use.

He methodically walked through the changes to both buildings using comparison slides. For the main Game Haven building, he showed how windows had been removed from the approved elevations on multiple sides of the building. The roof structure had been altered significantly from what was originally proposed, and metal awnings that were supposed to be installed above windows had either been changed or not installed at all. For the event center building, originally approved as retail space, similar modifications had occurred including the removal of a main window where bathrooms were located, changes to the installation of siding from vertical to horizontal, and the relocation of metal awnings from between doors and transoms to above the transom windows.

Commissioner Ferguson quickly confirmed with Manager Spencer that these changes were made after the permitted drawings had been approved by the city. Commissioner Garcia inquired about the capacity of the event center, which Manager Spencer deferred to the applicant to answer.

Commissioner Fenn expressed significant concern about the situation, stating that it felt like the city was sold one product and now are receiving a different product. He acknowledged that while the changes might be structurally and functionally equivalent, he questioned what the city could do in the future to prevent such unauthorized changes.

Manager Spencer responded by explaining that this situation had sparked considerable discussion between planning and building departments. He acknowledged that the city lacked a dedicated zoning inspector who regularly monitors construction progress, and with current staffing shortages, they don't have the bandwidth to inspect every building through all phases of

construction. While building inspectors do conduct multiple inspections, they primarily focus on building safety issues rather than compliance with Planning Commission approvals. Manager Spencer outlined several measures being considered to address this issue, including better coordination with the building department, adding specific conditions to approvals requiring that no elevation changes be made without city approval, and potentially implementing requirements similar to those used for landscaping plans.

Planning Director Maloy added context to the discussion and explained that the administration had been overseeing land use development in a typical fashion, similar to his experience in other cities, but that this type of significant modification during construction was unusual. He noted that recent events, including COVID-19, had created rapid changes in the marketplace, supply chain issues, and other pressures on development that the city was still adjusting to accommodate.

Commissioner Powell suggested the possibility of requiring third-party oversight to help monitor compliance, noting that while it would add cost to developers, it wouldn't burden the city and might discourage unauthorized changes. Chair Bradford asked about potential legal recourse, such as withholding bonds or business licenses. Planning Director Maloy explained that while they could bond for occupancy under certain conditions, they generally only bond for public improvements, not private ones. He noted they had issued a temporary certificate of occupancy in this case and that the applicant had been cooperative once the concerns were explained.

Troy Noorda with CSM Construction, representing the builder, then addressed the commission. He began by expressing that he felt like he had been "thrown under the bus," emphasizing his 35 years of experience building hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of projects in Utah. He stressed that had he known exterior elevations needed to be held to such specific standards, they would have been upfront about any changes. He adamantly stated this was not an attempt to "pull the wool over anyone's eyes" but rather a misunderstanding about the level of adherence required to the approved elevations.

The developer explained that they had made changes they thought improved the aesthetics without realizing they needed approval for what seemed like minor modifications. He acknowledged their error and took responsibility while suggesting that better education and communication could prevent such issues in the future. He specifically suggested that a simple red stamp on plans indicating that any exterior elevation changes require planning approval would have been immensely helpful.

Regarding the specific window modifications, the developer clarified that windows shown on elevations for what became a storage room filled with shelving were supposed to have been removed by the architect but were overlooked. He explained that the location - a dark corner of the building facing a 12-foot cinder block wall just 15 feet away - made windows impractical and potentially a security risk as a break-in point.

Manager Spencer then explained the staff's proposed remedy: rather than requiring actual windows to be installed, they were requesting spandrel glass (decorative glass panels) be installed in locations where windows were removed to maintain the aesthetic intent. This led to detailed discussion about exactly which elevations would require this treatment, with commissioners and staff working to identify specific locations on the building facades.

Several commissioners engaged in discussion about the appropriate number and placement of spandrel glass panels, with some suggesting four panels instead of three for better symmetry and balance. The discussion revealed that some confusion existed between different sets of approved plans but ultimately focused on installing three spandrel glass panels on specific elevations of the main building.

Commissioner Rypien raised the broader question of whether the city had specific standards defining how much change was acceptable. He suggested that clearer, more objective criteria might be helpful rather than subjective determinations about what constitutes too much change. Commissioner Ferguson pointed out that this was more of a general policy discussion for later rather than specific to this application.

Planning Director Maloy emphasized that this property was within a Master Development Agreement (MDA) with specific design approval requirements, making adherence to approved plans particularly important. The commission also discussed alternatives to spandrel glass, with Commissioner Garcia suggesting possibilities like trellises similar to those at Mountain View Village. The applicant proposed using powder-coated metal frames with grids that could support climbing vines, shaped like the windows that would have been installed.

After extensive discussion about the best solution for the missing windows, the commission settled on allowing either spandrel glass or a landscape feature of similar size with powder-coated framing to match what would have been the window frames.

*Commissioner Jacobson moved to approve item 4.1 Review and consider approval for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment for Game Haven at 5254 & 5262 W Anthem Park Lane in the C-2 Commercial Zone with staff's three recommendations,*

1. *Receive and agree to all recommendations.*
2. *Install spandrel glass on the game haven main building as shown on the building permit plans, and on the west elevation where the windows have been removed.*
3. *Applicant provide a parking plan satisfying the parking needs of the events space.*

*And modifying condition number two to allow for spandrel glass with powder-coated framing or powder-coated landscape feature that matches the same size on the Game Haven main building as shown on the building permits and on the west and south elevations where windows have been removed.*

*Commissioner Rypien seconded the motion.*

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Commissioner Darryl Fenn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Jackson Ferguson</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Heather Garcia</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Brody Rypien</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Adam Jacobson</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Andy Powell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Alternate Commissioner Forest Sickles</i>	<i>not voting</i>
<i>Alternate Commissioner Preston Oberg</i>	<i>not voting</i>

*The motion passed unanimously.*

## 5. Legislative Items

Legislative items are recommendations to the City Council. Broad public input will be taken and considered on each item. All legislative items recommended at this meeting will be scheduled for a decision at the next available City Council meeting.

**5.1. Review and consider a recommendation to the City Council to amend the Panorama Master Development Agreement (MDA) to modify (1) the project boundaries without changing development entitlements, (2) clarify procedures regarding potential administrative approval of residential lots with double-street frontages, (3) the “Grading Plan,” and (4) the “Village Plan.”**

**Applicant: Chase Andrizzi, DAI Utah (property owner, authorized agent)**  
**Acres: ±318**

**File No: M2025-146**

Planning Director Maloy introduced the Panorama MDA amendment, clarifying that while this wasn't a noticed public hearing since it didn't affect baseline zoning regulations, the City Council traditionally sought Planning Commission input on MDA amendments. He explained that the commission's role was to review the proposal, discuss the amendments, consider alternatives, and forward a recommendation to the City Council.

Chase Andrizzi, representing the applicant DAI Utah, presented the details of the proposed amendments. He began by explaining that the amendments were not intended to change land uses, increase density, or alter the mix between single-family and multi-family housing. Rather, they had been able to refine their plans based on more detailed site analysis, particularly regarding topography and grading.

The first major element involved modifying the MDA boundaries due to a land swap with Jordan School District. Applicant Andrizzi explained that Jordan School District owned 12 acres nearly

in the center of the project but wasn't a party to the development agreement. Through negotiations, they had arranged an acre-for-acre land swap that would benefit both parties. The school district's original rectangular-shaped parcel would be exchanged for a more suitable location, with a portion of the new site including Blooming Rose Boulevard, which the developer confirmed they would still construct entirely. This boundary adjustment was necessary because the land swap resulted in Jordan School District owning some property that was within the MDA boundary while the developer who traded land received property outside the MDA boundary.

The second major element addressed double-frontage lots, which applicant Andrizzi acknowledged were not their primary design goal but had become necessary due to the site's challenging topography. He presented a plan showing multiple lots in red that would have frontage on two streets. He emphasized that while this configuration was more expensive to build, it allowed them to work with the natural topography more effectively and significantly reduce the amount of earth that needed to be hauled off-site. He expressed openness to working with staff to develop standards addressing safety and aesthetic concerns associated with double-frontage lots.

Commissioner Jacobson raised specific concerns about several unusually shaped lots, particularly one curved lot that appeared to have multiple frontages but limited buildable area. He questioned whether the actual buildable area had been analyzed for these challenging lots. Applicant

Applicant Andrizzi acknowledged these concerns and indicated they were still examining whether some lots could be reconfigured, though he noted that road placement, largely dictated by topography and the need to avoid excessive slopes, limited their options.

The third element was an updated grading plan incorporating retaining walls. Applicant Andrizzi explained that the new plan represented a significant improvement despite still requiring some retaining walls up to 13 feet in height. The revised approach would substantially reduce both the number and height of retaining walls compared to the original plan while preserving more of the natural topography.

The fourth element involved updates to the village plan. Applicant Andrizzi showed how the original rigid, straight road layout had been replaced with roads that better followed the natural topography. This change, combined with the school site relocation, had resulted in approximately 55 fewer units than originally planned. He emphasized that this reduction wasn't necessarily permanent, as unit counts could change with final platting, but stated that from a business perspective that more density does not always equal more money.

The Commission engaged in detailed discussions about various aspects of the proposal. Commissioner Ferguson asked about maintenance responsibilities for the park strips along double-frontage lots, with discussion revealing that the 40-foot right-of-way cross-section included an 8-foot trail on one side rather than traditional park strips, helping to address maintenance concerns.

Commissioner Garcia noticed changes in the village designations and coloring on the plans, expressing concern about whether they were losing commercial area or adding more houses in certain locations. Applicant Andrizzi clarified that villages 2 and 9 had been combined, actually resulting in two fewer units in that area, and confirmed that all commercial areas remained the same size and in the same locations. He also confirmed that an emergency access route would be provided for one cul-de-sac area that appeared potentially isolated.

Commissioner Jacobson raised important technical questions about the proposed 2:1 slopes and retaining walls shown on the grading plan. Staff Engineer III Josh Petersen explained that 2:1 slopes were allowed with a geotechnical engineering report and city engineer approval. The discussion about retaining walls revealed that walls within lots would be maintained by individual homeowners, raising concerns about shared walls spanning multiple properties. Commissioner Jacobson specifically highlighted the risk of drainage systems becoming clogged during construction, potentially leading to wall failure, referencing similar incidents in Draper. He emphasized that homeowners typically don't understand the maintenance requirements for retaining walls, suggesting this needed careful consideration, especially for walls up to 12 feet in height.

Commissioner Oberg later raised broader concerns about connectivity within the revised layout, noting that the plan showed significantly more cul-de-sacs than the original. He worried about fire code compliance for cul-de-sacs serving more than 30 units and the overall impact on neighborhood walkability and traffic flow. He expressed concern about residents potentially having to drive long distances to reach nearby neighbors and the concentration of traffic through limited intersections, especially problematic on hillside developments. He urged the city to review these connectivity issues carefully to prevent developers from using topography as an excuse for poor connectivity.

Planning Director Maloy assured Commissioner Oberg that staff was aware of these issues and would continue working with the developer through subsequent iterations. He also noted that while current MDA requirements didn't specifically address connectivity standards, fire code requirements would need to be met. There was discussion about potentially adding trail connections between cul-de-sacs to improve walkability even if vehicular connectivity wasn't feasible.

Applicant Andrizzi mentioned near the end of the discussion that they were also under contract to purchase all remaining Rosecrest property, which would eventually require another appearance before the commission to formalize that addition to the Panorama development agreement, though no changes to that area were currently proposed.

Staff recommendations included ensuring proper exhibit references in the amendment language, developing standards for double-frontage lot configurations (particularly regarding setbacks and fence lines where rear yards abut front yards), and reviewing all MDA exhibits for consistency,

particularly noting that some exhibits showed the school property as rectangular while the new plan showed a more organic shape.

*Commissioner Rypien moved to forward a positive recommendation of approval to City Council of item 5.1 Review and consider a recommendation to the City Council to amend the Panorama Master Development Agreement (MDA) to modify (1) the project boundaries without changing development entitlements, (2) clarify procedures regarding potential administrative approval of residential lots with double-street frontages, (3) the “Grading Plan,” and (4) the “Village Plan.”*

*Commissioner Powell seconded the motion.*

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Commissioner Darryl Fenn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Jackson Ferguson</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Heather Garcia</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Brody Rypien</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Adam Jacobson</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Andy Powell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Alternate Commissioner Forest Sickles</i>	<i>Not voting</i>
<i>Alternate Commissioner Preston Oberg</i>	<i>Not Voting</i>

*The motion passed unanimously.*

## 6. Chair and Commission Comments

Commissioner Powell reiterated his concerns from the earlier Game Haven discussion about maintaining standards during construction when working within MDAs. He wondered if there were ways to put more accountability on MDA owners or property developers to ensure standards are upheld, acknowledging the challenges of monitoring construction while recognizing that product availability and other factors can necessitate changes. He emphasized the value of having someone present to help guide the process when changes become necessary.

Commissioner Oberg asked whether the city could implement fines for variations from approved plans, not suggesting the Game Haven situation was intentionally deceptive but noting it exposed the potential for abuse. Planning Director Maloy indicated they could research this further, explaining that the different development culture in Herriman, where many commercial projects require conditional use permits rather than being permitted by right, created different expectations and oversight needs. He noted that many changes made wouldn't necessarily violate building codes but didn't match what was approved by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Ferguson observed that the fact the Game Haven issue was caught and brought before the commission indicated the system was working, even if catching issues at the end of

construction was painful for everyone involved. The discussion revealed ongoing efforts by staff to find better intermediate measures to catch such issues earlier in the construction process.

Commissioner Oberg reiterated his concerns about the Panorama development's connectivity, specifically requesting that someone from the city review the proposed site layout to evaluate how much connectivity had degraded from the original plan. He emphasized not wanting developers to reach a point where they claimed topography prevented connectivity when earlier planning might have allowed for better solutions.

## 7. Future Meetings

**7.1.** Next Planning Commission Meeting: December 03, 2025

**7.2.** Next City Council Meeting: December 10, 2025

## 8. Adjournment

*Commissioner Jacobson moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 p.m. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion and all voted aye.*

*I, Angela Hansen, Deputy City Recorder for Herriman City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on November 19, 2025. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Herriman City Planning Commission Meeting.*



Angela Hansen  
Deputy City Recorder