

**HEBER CITY CORPORATION**  
**75 North Main Street**  
**Heber City, UT 84032**  
**Heber City Council Meeting**  
**May 13, 2025**

**APPROVED 06.10.2025**

**6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting**

**1. Regular Meeting:**

I. Call to Order

Chairman Phil Jordan called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone present.

II. Roll Call

**Planning Commission Present:**

Chairman Phil Jordan  
Vice-Chair Tori Broughton  
Commissioner Dave Richard  
Commissioner Darek Slagowski  
Commissioner Josh Knight  
Commissioner Robert Wilson  
Commissioner Greg Royall  
Commissioner Robert McKinley

**Planning Commission Absent:**

Commissioner Dennis Gunn

**Staff Present:**

Planning Manager Jamie Baron  
Planner Jacob Roberts  
Planning Admin Meshelle Kijanen

**Staff Participating Remotely:**

Robin Bond

**Also Present:**

Elisha McKenzie, Kim Snyder, Mary Snyder, Jon Buss, Julie Franklin, Bridget Whiting, Oakley Franklin, Cal Johnson, Kris Parker, Kasey Plourde, Ralph Stanislaw

**Also Attending Remotely:**

Brittany Renshaw, D. Harris, Deb, Eric Bunker Grace Doerfler, Jamie Hewlett, Kelli, Lindsey, Marianne, Mr. Garner

III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Chairman Tori Broughton led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Prayer/Thought by Invitation ()

Tori Broughton shared a thought/experience/joyful news See Recording or notes in the

recording.

V. Recuse for Conflict of Interest N/A

## **2. Consent Agenda: N/A**

## **3. Action Items:**

### **I. Public Hearing for 1874 South Daniels Road Zoning Map Amendment (Jacob Roberts)**

Planner Roberts presented this item. He explained this was a zone change request from R-1/I-1 to I-1 Industrial only and oriented the Commission to the location of the site. He shared maps of the current zoning as well as the proposed zoning. Planner Roberts also shared maps of the General Plan land use designation. He added that the applicant wished to use the house on the site as their personal residence and he explained this could be grandfathered in as a permitted use.

Applicant Chris Parker stated that he owned the property and planned to eventually use it for an industrial use, which was why he had requested the zone change. He said at some point in the future, the house on the land would be torn down and then the use of the land would be purely industrial.

Planning Admin Kijanen read the rules for the public comment section. Chairman Jordan then opened the floor for a public hearing.

Jami Hewlett gave an online comment. She asked how many acres the parcel was and where it was located. Chairman Jordan stated that had been explained in Planner Robert's overview. The applicant added his property was one acre. Ms. Hewlett asked where the parcel was located and the applicant stated it was within Heber City's boundaries. Ms. Hewlett continued to ask questions about the specifics of the proposal and Chairman Jordan encouraged her to look over the provided materials which outlined all of the information.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Richards commented that another applicant had recently come before the Commission with a parcel similar to this one and there had been questions with that application about sewer and road connections. He asked City Engineer Hansen if he foresaw similar issues with this application and City Engineer Hansen indicated that everything seemed good from an engineering perspective. Commissioner Richards asked if the property was part of the public sewer line or had a septic tank and City Engineer Hansen replied the property had a septic tank. Commissioner Richards expressed that given Engineering's approval, he was in favor of the proposal since the area was mostly industrial already.

Chairman Jordan asked if changes could be made to the house if it passed to another owner. Planner Roberts explained that the house would be considered legal non-conforming, so as long as no substantial changes were made to the house it could continue to be used as a residence, even if the ownership changed hands. Planning Admin Kijanen noted there was a question in the online chat that asked about the intended use of the property. Mr. Parker replied that he planned to continue using the

house on the property as a personal residence, and parts of the land behind the home would be leased out to a towing company and a landscaper.

**Motion:** Commissioner Knight moved to approve the 1874 South Daniels rezone with the findings and conditions as presented in the Staff report. Commissioner Royall made the second.

**Discussion:** N/A

**Voting Yes:** Chairman Phill Jordan, Vice-Chair Tori Broughton, Commissioner Dave Richards, Commissioner Darek Slagowski, Commissioner Josh Knight, Commissioner Robert Wilson, Commissioner Greg Royall

**Voting No:** None. The motion carried.

## II. Public Hearing for Body Art Facility Text Amendment (Jacob Roberts)

Planner Roberts presented this item as well and recalled that the Commission had previously discussed this item. He provided background on this item and stated that a business owner had approached the Council after finding out that tattoo shops were not permitted anywhere in Heber City. He reported that the business owner had called attention to the fact that there was no definition in the Code about body art facilities, and the word “tattoo” was vaguely defined. Planner Roberts explained that the question to consider was if Heber City should adopt a new ordinance that updated the definition of body art facilities. Planner Roberts discussed that body art facilities were not considered to be a sexually-oriented business. He said that the central issue was aligning their definitions with State Code and he indicated the section of State Code that dealt with body art facilities like microblading, permanent cosmetics, and other similar services.

Planner Baron listed the proposed changes to Heber City’s Code. He explained the proposal was to create a new definition of body art facilities and he read the new definition aloud. He recalled that the Commission and Staff had determined to not include branding or scarification in the new definition at a previous meeting. He also read the definition for permanent cosmetics and microblading and opined that their definition covered the services that were already taking place throughout Heber City. Planner Roberts then noted that the new ordinance would affect certain zones and said that a large portion of the City had been noticed about the possible changes. He said that they had not made any changes to home-occupied businesses at this time, in part because it was not cost-effective to notice such a large part of the City at once and also because the home-occupation Code needed to be reviewed in greater depth, so they planned to go through it at a later time.

Planner Roberts listed the zones that had been proposed to allow body art facilities with no conditions, which included certain industrial zones, commercial zones, and business and medical park zones. He said that these zones already allowed services that were similar to body art facilities. He said that City Staff recommended approval based on the findings and conditions identified and recommended to adopt the proposed language and change the existing ordinance in order to clear up the confusion about definition. He expressed he was happy to answer any questions before they moved into a public hearing.

Chairman Jordan asked the applicant if they had any comments and if they felt the

presentation aligned with what they had been asking for. The applicant's comments were not captured as they were in the audience, though they indicated that the presentation aligned with their initial request.

Chairman Jordan opened the floor for the public hearing and reminded the public of the rules.

Planning Admin Kijanen read aloud the comments that had been submitted via email.

The first comment was from Megan Harris: "I would like to show my support for the necessary zoning changes that will allow more body art services in the community: tattoos, microblading, permanent makeup, etc. Body art might not be for everyone, but there are many people who want or need these services. We would rather keep our business in our valley than drive 30-60 minutes somewhere else. Thank you for your time."

Comment from Denise Harris: "In case I am not able to make the meeting on May 13th, I want to express our family's support for the zoning change that will allow for more body art services in our community, whether it is tattoo, microblading, piercings, or permanent makeup. Sadly, many people have negative connotations surrounding body art- if so, that is their choice, but I would like to see more options for it here in Heber for people who do support it. Then they won't have to travel 30-60 minutes."

Comment from Jeanie Richards: "I'm writing to express my strong support for the proposed change to the City Code that would allow for the operation of body art facilities within our community. This change represents more than just a regulatory update, it acknowledges the evolving culture, artistic and economic landscape of our city. The women leading the initiative have shown remarkable dedication and patience in their efforts to make a positive difference. Their leadership has been rooted in professionalism, community engagement, and a deep respect for health and safety standards. Body art is a legitimate and respected form of personal and artistic expression. Allowing licensed and well-regulated facilities in our city will not only provide new opportunities for local artists and entrepreneurs, but ensure that this practice is carried out in safe, clean, and professional environments. I commend the City for considering this change and urge you to vote in favor of updating the Code to support these businesses. The individuals behind this movement have shown a sincere commitment to our community and I stand with them in their support of progress."

Comment from Nicole Robinson: "I am writing in support of changing (changing back?) zoning that would allow body artists more freedom in Heber City. I understand that tattoo parlors may once have been a shop that carried negative connotations and culture, but not only have times changed, so has the body art industry. A more liberal zoning situation giving them the ability to practice in multiple places without outdated ideas of tattooing are what we need in Heber City. Additionally I am in deep support of Oakley Franklin and the work she has done, and she should be allowed to practice in the location they reside. I don't know the details of this quiet change made in October of 2021, but it frustrates me that changes like this aren't clearly changed with business owners. Thanks for your time, hope that small businesses thrive."

Jami Hewlett made a comment online. She did not understand what actual changes were being made and asked if she could open tattoo shops wherever she wanted in the industrial and commercial zones. Chairman Jordan clarified her question. Planner Roberts explained that tattoo shops had once been allowed in commercial zones, but

this had been changed in 2021 as part of a major Code rewrite. Planner Baron added that it was his understanding that tattooing had once been permitted in some industrial zones, though the current ordinance did not allow tattoo shops in any zone. Planner Baron explained that with land use law, it was considered best practice to permit tattoo shops in at least some parts of the City. Ms. Hewlett expressed confusion about the changes made in 2021 and reiterated her original question about opening tattoo shops in the City. Commissioner Broughton commented there were many regulations through the Health Department and the State that would need to be followed to operate a tattoo shop, in addition to the business license.

Commissioner Richards said that he was not opposed to the idea of tattoo shops, although he personally would not be a customer. He agreed that tattoo shops should be permitted at least somewhere in the City. He commented that he was glad to know that scarification had been removed from the proposal. He also expressed that he liked that the tattooing itself would take place in back rooms, not out in view of the public and Ms. Franklin confirmed that would be the case. Chairman Jordan clarified there was nothing in the ordinance that required the tattooing be kept out of public view and Ms. Franklin replied that although it was not required, it was generally done in private out of respect for the customer.

Commissioner Knight thanked Planner Roberts for his work in clarifying the definitions. He expressed he was glad to see Heber come into alignment with the State Code. He commented that tattooing was not cheap and was a valid art form, and he felt these services would benefit many people in the community. Chairman Jordan echoed Commissioner Knight's commendation of Planner Robert's work on this item.

Chairman Jordan asked how Heber City's policies compared to other cities. Planner Roberts discussed that Provo was currently updating their Code to be more permissive, Payson City was very permissive, and Lehi was somewhat permissive. Chairman Jordan asked Planner Roberts to update the list of other cities' Codes and distribute it to the Commissioners.

Chairman Jordan asked the other Commissioners if they were willing to move forward with this item since they had discussed it several times. The Commissioners all indicated they were willing to move forward with a vote.

**Motion:** Vice Chair Broughton moved to approve the Body Art Facility Text Amendment with the findings and conditions as presented in the Staff report. Commissioner Josh Knight made the second.

**Discussion:** N/A

**Voting Yes:** Chairman Phil Jordan, Vice-Chair Tori Broughton, Commissioner Dave Richards, Commissioner Darek Slagowski, Commissioner Josh Knight, Commissioner Robert Wilson, Commissioner Greg Royall

**Voting No:** None. The motion carried.

III. Public Hearing for Karl Malone Polaris MDA located at 900 South and Main Street (Denna Woodbury)

Planner Baron presented this item and indicated that David Hicks, General Manager of Karl Malone, and Cal Johnson, engineer of the project, were present that evening.

Planner Baron explained that the applicant Karl Malone wished to expand their facility

and said that the proposed expansion would push their setback out of compliance with what was required by the City. Planner Baron said that Karl Malone was requesting an MDA that would allow them to circumvent this setback requirement. Planner Baron explained the need for the expansion and shared architectural renderings of the proposed design, noting that the design was within the City's guidelines.

Planner Baron highlighted that there was a chain-link fence, which had actually been prohibited by the City Code since the time the fence had been installed. As such, he said the applicant would need to add some kind of metal fencing and he indicated that City Staff and the applicant had discussed this issue. Mr. Hicks confirmed that they were willing to modify the fence design.

Commissioner Broughton commented that she had visited the property and asked what improvements the applicant planned to make to the front. She also inquired about elevation. Mr. Hicks oriented Commissioner Broughton to the cardinal directions that the property faced as well as the surrounding buildings. Mr. Hicks then addressed her question about improvements and said there was currently no landscaping, and they planned to fix the setbacks, add landscaping, and remove the chain-link fence. Mr. Hicks affirmed that their concept would blend in with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Broughton asked Mr. Hicks if he still planned to display inventory in front of the building once the fence was removed and Mr. Hicks replied that they would; they would use landscaping features rather than a fence to keep the inventory secure.

Commissioner Richards asked about traffic flow and worried if there would be ample room to drive large vehicles through the parking lot with the proposed modifications.

Mr. Hicks assured Commissioner Richards that he would have room to maneuver vehicles. Mr. Hicks provided more information about how to access the property.

Chairman Jordan asked Planner Baron about noticing procedures for the public hearing. He asked if the immediate neighbors had been noticed and Planner Baron replied that all adjacent neighbors had been noticed. Mr. Hicks commented that he had a positive working relationship with his closest neighbor.

The neighbor, Shawn Iverson was present online and commented. Mr. Iverson said he owned the adjacent property 906 South Main, which he reported had recently been remodeled. He expressed that he was excited for Karl Malone to improve the looks of the rest of the block and said he would appreciate it if the proposal could be given a positive recommendation.

Chairman Jordan opened the public hearing.

Jami Hewlett asked about rules for noticing. Chairman Jordan replied that noticing policies were publically available. Planner Baron added there was both a City Code and State Code for noticing procedures and he indicated Planning Admin Kijanen could pass that information along to Ms. Hewlett.

Chairman Jordan closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Knight asked if trees or other live vegetation could be added to the landscaping plan in addition to the rocks that had been proposed in the front. He thought vegetation could be more aesthetic than only having rocks. Planner Baron commented the applicant would have to comply with the Street Tree ordinance.

City Engineer Hansen acknowledged this was in a preliminary phase, but asked if there was a written record of the agreement that the applicant had with their neighbor about access to the property. Mr. Hicks replied that it was currently a verbal agreement,

though said he could get a written agreement when they came back before the Commission and Staff as the process moved forward.

Chairman Jordan asked the Commissioners if they felt comfortable moving forward and the Commissioners indicated that they were.

Commissioner Richards commented there was no 'one size fits all' for different businesses and their unique needs, and he commented that a setback exemption made sense given the kind of inventory placed in front of the store. Commissioner Royall agreed and said he liked the idea of having the area become more developed.

**Motion:** Commissioner Royall moved to approve the Karl Malone Polaris MDA, located at 900 South and Main Street, as presented with the findings and conditions as outlined in the Staff report. Vice-Chair Broughton made the second.

**Discussion:** N/A

**Voting Yes:** Commissioner Phil Jordan, Vice-Chair Tori Broughton, Commissioner Dave Richard, Commissioner Darek Slagowski, Commissioner Josh Knight, Commissioner Robert Wilson, Commissioner Greg Royall

**Voting No:** None. The motion carried.

#### IV. Plourde Annexation & MDA (Jacob Roberts)

Planner Roberts outlined this item. He said the applicant, Casey Plourde, had submitted a request for annexation of her parcel to facilitate the construction of an event venue. He reported that the application petition had been accepted by the City Council in January of 2025 and had first been brought before the City in March of 2024.

Planner Roberts explained that the purpose of the discussion that evening was to obtain a recommendation from the Planning Commission if they should move forward into a public hearing. He then shared maps of the property and noted it was a challenging topography with several steep slopes, meaning that only part of the property could be developed. He said that the General Plan's designation of the area was currently Mountain Preservation.

Planner Roberts explained that the request was for the zone to be the Mountain Community Zone with some adjustments as part of the MDA, which he listed. He discussed some details of the landscaping and said that portions of the land would be dedicated to be part of a trail network. He noted as well that a portion of the land would be used for a caretaker's dwelling, which he explained was a residence that would be located near the event center that would house the managers of the center.

Planner Roberts outlined the parking stalls, fire lane, and bathrooms that were identified in the site plan.

Planner Roberts shared the concept that the applicants had submitted. Planner Roberts explained that the site plan and building elevation would get approved as part of the MDA, so there would be little flexibility once they went through the MDA approval process. He clarified that although the MDA was not before the Commission that

evening in written form, the list of adjustments that he had presented was essentially the MDA. Chairman Jordan clarified that this item would not come back before them if they made a recommendation that evening, which Planner Roberts confirmed.

Commissioner Knight asked what the purpose of the event center was and Ms. Casey Plourde replied that the center did private events like weddings. She said her company was Harvest Moon Events and noted that Commissioner Knight had worked with her in the past in his capacity as a florist.

Planner Roberts stated that the question for the Commission was if they wished to issue a positive or negative recommendation to move this application forward before the Council and to a public hearing. Planner Roberts noted that many logistical hurdles had already been overcome, such as UDOT road access, sewer connectivity, and fire safety, and said Staff had been working on these issues for over a month and now felt comfortable moving the application forward more publicly.

Ms. Plourde identified herself as the property owner and gave an overview of her event company. She said she was excited about the prospect of having her own venue in Wasatch County and said this was something she had wanted for many years. She thought this proposal was a good fit for the topography and location of the parcel. She also noted that her father, who was present that evening, was an architect and had helped with some of the planning.

Ms. Plourde explained the vision she had for the space and said that she wanted to use a lot of glass in the buildings to capitalize on the views. She imagined there would be a lot of decks, which would help with the challenging topography. She said that the venue would be small, with about 1,500 square feet and a maximum capacity of about 212 people. Ms. Plourde added there were some yurts on the property for potential overnight stays, as well as restrooms and ancillary rooms for storage. She hoped to impact the land as little as possible and use it in the best possible way. She summarized that she felt the plan was in a good place to move forward. Ms. Plourde's father commented about the small trails on the property that were intended to provide access to guests with accessibility challenges.

Commissioner Richards asked about Exhibit G, which was a concept plan that included an amphitheater. He noted this differed from the concept plan presented by Planner Roberts. Ms. Plourde replied that Exhibit G was part of their initial petition submission, and the plan had changed since then.

Commissioner Richards then asked about utilities and Ms. Plourde noted that water had proven to be a challenge. She said that they had promised the Fire Department that they would install either a fire hydrant or a retention pond, which would require pouring under the highway. She added that the sewer was on their side of the highway so that would be easier to connect. Ms. Plourde also noted that they had spoken with an electric company and said they would be able to get power to the site.

Commissioner Richards asked about storm drains and City Engineer Hansen said they would be required to comply with the storm water design manual, though they had not yet reached that stage of the application. Commissioner Richards commented that storm drains often posed a challenge for applications. Commissioner Richards also commented that a gas connection was not necessary since they could use electric or propane.

Commissioner Knight asked if the parking lot was gravel and Ms. Plourde's father



confirmed that was correct. Ms. Plourde's father said the goal was to avoid any non-pervious pavement and said they would hard-pack the driveways. Ms. Plourde's father said they wanted to avoid problems with water collection and disbursement.

Commissioner Richards agreed this was an appropriate course of action and commented about some properties that he had developed in the past. Commissioner Richards added that he liked the vision of the proposed property and hoped they could move through any logistical issues.

Commissioner Broughton asked where the caretaker's dwelling would be located and Ms. Plourde indicated on the map where this would be located. Ms. Plourde also discussed that they wanted to donate 32 acres to a conservation easement and said the caretaker dwelling would be located within that section. Ms. Plourde acknowledged that the easement would need to be located in an area with slopes that were less than 30%, and said they needed to do further research to identify what section of the property met that requirement.

Commissioner Broughton also asked if they still planned to have portable toilets and trailers. Ms. Plourde replied that although that was the original plan since it did not impact the land, she had realized that she needed permanent facilities in order to comply with the City's requirements. Ms. Plourde noted permanent facilities would increase their cost. Chairman Jordan confirmed that Ms. Plourde had calculated the maximum capacity of 212 people based on the facilities that she planned to provide. Commissioner Broughton asked for clarification about the maximum density given the proposed zoning and Ms. Plourde confirmed that the only part of the property that would be developed was one third of an acre. Planner Roberts spoke to the density as well. Chairman Jordan asked if the density could increase in the future and Planner Roberts replied that it would not, at least in the foreseeable future, since a majority of the property would be set aside for a conservation easement and also because the parking requirements would prevent the capacity from increasing dramatically.

Planner Roberts explained the process moving forward and explained that the Commission would not see this application again until they saw a site plan after the property's annexation. Planner Roberts outlined the annexation process.

The Commission continued to discuss the possibility of the occupancy limit increasing. Commissioner Knight emphasized that the parking requirements were such that the occupancy limit could not increase substantially, since they needed to provide parking for guests. Commissioner Knight noted that the slope of the property inhibited more parking lots from being developed.

Commissioner Broughton asked to see the zoning map. Planner Roberts pulled up the map and indicated that the surrounding zones were Mountain Community. Ms. Plourde commented that she had reached out to the landowner of a neighboring parcel to see if they were interested in being annexed, but said she had not heard back.

Ms. Plourde also offered to include language in the MDA that limited the occupancy.

Chairman Jordan said that language would have to be included in their motion that evening.

Commissioner Wilson asked if the event center would operate year-round and Ms. Plourde replied that it would. Commissioner Wilson then asked about snow removal plans in the winter months, given that the paths were unpaved. Ms. Plourde replied that they should still be able to plow since the path was hard-packed. Chairman

Jordan added that the paths would likely not be utilized in the winter; only the main building.

Chairman Jordan recused himself from the vote since he was participating in another assembly venue that would be operating nearby.

**Motion:** Vice-Chair Broughton moved to approve the Plourde annexation as presented, with the findings and conditions as presented in the conclusion of the Staff Report.

Commissioner Knight made the second.

**Discussion:** Chairman Jordan recommended that the Planning Commission consider including an occupancy limit in their recommendation to the Council. Commissioner Knight asked if this was an unbiased opinion and Chairman Jordan acknowledged his point, but expressed he was interested in the best use of the land. Commissioner Richards thought the parking and bathroom requirements would limit the occupancy load. Commissioner Richards said he wanted to see things move forward, and added that he was more interested in ensuring that the caretaker's unit maintained its original intent.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked for clarification if the caretaker's dwelling was separate from the rest of the parcel and Ms. Plourde replied that the dwelling was part of the eight acres that had been set aside. Ms. Plourde elaborated that there was another 0.3 acre portion of the land that they hoped to sell in order to alleviate the financial burden of the development. Commissioner Broughton pointed out that if the parcel was only a third of an acre, there was nothing that could be done with the property within the Mountain Community Zone. Planner Roberts acknowledged that point and said they needed to work out those details in the MDA with the Council. Planner Roberts said the Commission needed to determine if they would be okay with a subdivided parcel with a use that was legal within the zone. Commissioner Broughton thought the Commission needed to agree on a use for the parcel now.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked if the conservation easement was part of the MDA and Planner Roberts said it currently was not, but they could add it to the MDA.

Commissioner Broughton said the easement would limit the capacity to further expand the property and increase the occupancy. Planner Baron indicated where the conservation easement was located on the map.

Commissioner Knight asked for the dimensions of the main building. Ms. Plourde's father replied it was 27 by 55 feet, and he showed the structure outline. Ms. Plourde's father added there was a gathering space to the side of the building.

City Engineer RossHansen asked about the boundary of the conservation easement. He said that currently, the zone allowed for one unit per acre and asked if they would need some of the conservation easement boundary to move in order to meet that requirement of one acre. Ms. Plourde said she was flexible with changing the boundary and said they had picked 32 acres somewhat arbitrarily, so they could alter that if it allowed them to meet a requirement.

Commissioner Knight suggested that the MDA be changed to include that a one-acre portion be cut into the 32-acre conservation easement, in order to make a one-acre subdividable parcel. Commissioner Broughton thought it would be best for both the Commission and the applicant to work through this issue now.

Vice-Chair Broughton began to amend her motion to approve the Plourde annexation with the definition of the 31-acre conservation easement, eight-acre event site, with no

less than one acre for the caretaker dwelling. The Commission discussed what the acreage of the conservation easement and event center would work out to be. Planner Roberts proposed that they not outline the acreage; but simply say that the parcel that was to be sold needed to be in compliance with the zone, which in this case meant that it would have to be at least an acre. Commissioner Richards agreed they did not need to clarify what the acreage for each section would be as he did not want to be overbearing on the applicant. Planner Baron agreed they could say “the remainder of the parcel be put into a conservation easement.”

**Vice-Chair Broughton amended her initial motion to approve the Plourde annexation with the definition that the event site be eight acres, the sellable parcel be compliant with the zone, and the remainder of the property be placed in a conservation easement. Commissioner Knight affirmed his second.**

**Voting Yes:** Vice-Chair Tori Broughton, Commissioner Dave Richards, Commissioner Darek Slagowski, Commissioner Josh Knight, Commissioner Robert Wilson, Commissioner Greg Royall.  
Chairman Jordan abstained.

**Voting No:** None. The motion carried.

**4. Work Meeting: N/A**

**5. Administrative Items:**

**I. City Council Communication Item**

Planner Baron summarized the City County Communication Item and noted he was not present for the entirety of the meeting. He reported there had been a work meeting first, which included a follow-up budget workshop. In the main meeting, he stated the Council had approved the tax recommendation project for the board and they had discussed- but not approved- the possibility of amending the Code to allow fee-in-lieus for affordable housing to go to the City, not just the Housing Board. Planner Baron said there had also been a resolution regarding Red White and Blue Festivals and America 250, as well as an annual report from the Wasatch County Health Department.

Planner Baron also reported that the Council had discussed the Commission’s recommendations for the Red Rock annexation proposal and said a public hearing would be held for that item soon, likely in June. Planner Baron said there had been a public hearing as part of the budget process, as well as a public hearing about the Harvest Village Public Infrastructure District. Planner Baron summarized that the majority of the meeting had been budget related.

Chairman Jordan reminded the Commissions of their annual training requirements.

Chairman Jordan also stated he would be absent for the next two meetings and Commissioner Broughton would serve as Chair.

**6. Adjournment:**

**6. Adjournment: Commissioner Slagowski motioned to adjourn and the motion carried.**

Meshelle Kijanen  
Meshelle Kijanen, Administrative Assistant