

**HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, UT 84032
Heber City Council Meeting
October 28, 2025**

Approved 12.09.2025

6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

1. Regular Meeting:

I. Call to Order

Chairman 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 Darek Slagowski
Commissioner Josh Knight
Commissioner Robert Wilson
Commissioner Greg Royall
Commissioner Robert McKinley

Planning Commission Absent:

Commissioner Dennis Gunn
Commissioner Dave Richard

Staff Present:

Community Development Director Tony Kohler
Planning Office Admin Meshelle Kijanen
City Engineer Ross Hansen
Consultant Landmark Design Inc.

Staff Participating Remotely:

Consultant Denna Woodbury, Jamie Baron

Also Present:

Paul Watson, DeAnna Lloyd, Russ Poulson, Cal Johnson, Laurel Nordi, R. Citris, Rae Lynne Kohler

Also Attending Remotely:

N/A

III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Chairman Phil Jordan led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Prayer/Thought by Invitation ()

Chairman Phil Jordan offered a thought on voting.

V. Recuse for Conflict of Interest N/A

2. Consent Agenda:

I. 10.14.2025 PC Minutes for Approval

Motion: Commissioner Knight moved to approve the items on the Consent Agenda. Vice-Chair Broughton made the second.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Chairman Jordan, Vice Chair Broughton Commissioners Slagowski, Knight, Wilson, Royall, **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 6-0.

3. Action Items:

I. Public Hearing on the Heber City Water Use and Preservation General Plan Element (Planner Jamie Planner)

Planner Baron introduced the consultant, Landmark Design, and reported that in 2022 the State legislature had passed a law that mandated all municipalities needed to have a specific element in their General Plan that addressed water use and planning. He explained they needed to adopt this policy by the end of the year and were looking to solicit feedback from the public and Planning Commission about the proposed guidelines.

Landmark Design Inc. Consultant Larson presented the Staff Report. She overviewed the history of the draft thus far and elaborated on the requirements in SB 110.

Consultant Larson emphasized the water element would be a new section in the General Plan. She then discussed the document, noting that the four main ideas were 1. Growing Pains, 2. Annexation Complexity, 3. Water-intensive landscaping, and 4. Evolving Rates. She provided some context about Heber City's water sources and explained that the focus of the document was only on Heber City's population, not the special service districts.

Consultant Larson summarized the main demands for water in Heber City and also went over conservation measures that the City had already implemented. She presented a list of ideas about how to increase their conservation efforts, explaining that they had conducted a study to see what kinds of programs the residents were interested or already participating in.

Consultant Larson compared the City's current demand with the forecasted demand in coming years. She noted there was not ample evidence about availability of secondary water, but it was projected for Heber to have sufficient culinary water by 2045. She shared the City's conservation goals for the future and commended Heber City for already having a Water Shortage Plan in place.

Consultant Larson identified Heber City's goals. She reported goal one was to consistently review current water usage; goal two was to explore opportunities to promote water conservation through City programs and planning; and goal three was to support long-term water sustainability by supporting opportunities for water reuse.

Chairman Jordan referenced the recommended actions and their outcomes. He asked

which actions were new and which were actions that they were already doing in the City. Consultant Larson explained in the chart which goals were already implemented in Heber City. Chairman Jordan also asked about who would be involved with the Water Conservation Committee and Consultant Larson explained it depended on what the City wanted to use the committee for, and said the concept of a committee was relatively new and was something other cities were currently exploring.

Consultant Larson asked the Commission if they wanted to model their goals off of the format in the current General Plan, or switch to a model that was more timeline-based.

Chairman Jordan asked about resources required to implement the goals. Consultant Larson discussed that there were a varying amount of resources needed for the goals; with some goals being much smaller than others. Consultant Larson also reported that the goal of a 32% reduction by 2030 came from a State report from 2015, and she noted that there may be an update to that figure soon.

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

There were no public comments.

Chairman Jordan closed the floor.

Chairman Jordan asked Community Development Director Kohler about the resources required to achieve their goal. Commissioner Knight clarified that the goal was a 20% reduction by 2065, which Chairman Jordan said was more reasonable. Consultant Larson reiterated her earlier comment that the variables about the goals meant that the resources needed would vary significantly.

Chairman Jordan brought up City ordinances about watering hours. He asked if there was a penalty for the use of irrigation water outside of the approved hours. Community Development Director Kohler noted there was a lot of recent growth in Heber City and said there may be some confusion from newly arrived residents, as Heber City did not have such an ordinance. Community Development Director Kohler noted it was best practice to not water during the heat of the day.

Commissioner McKinley expressed concerns that their goals would not be acted upon if there was not a committee formed.

Chairman Jordan asked for a motion.

Vice-Chair Broughton motioned to forward a positive recommendation of the Water Use and Preservation General Plan with the findings and conditions as identified in the Staff Report. Commissioner Knight made the second.

Discussion:

Vice-Chair Broughton asked how the City would actually put this plan in motion.

Community Development Director Kohler acknowledged that plans could become stale if not acted upon quickly. He said there was an upcoming Council meeting and said Staff could raise the issue of the water plan at that meeting.

Chairman Jordan liked that the plan addressed the root of their issues, namely growth of the population, rather than just trying to create 'band-aid' solutions. He agreed with Commissioner McKinley that a committee needed to be formed if this plan was to be successful.

Voting Yes: Chairman Jordan, Vice Chair Broughton Commissioners Slagowski, Knight, Wilson, Royall, **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 6-0.

Voting No: None. The Motion Passed 7-0.

II. Public Hearing for North Village Views 2nd MDA Amendment (Planner Denna Woodbury)

Planner Woodbury provided an overview of this request and reported on the history of this application thus far. She explained the applicant wished to amend their MDA due to some issues with topography that they had encountered on the site. She listed the four requested variances. Planner Woodbury noted they did not have the elevations for the buildings, since that would come with future applications, although she confirmed there were issues with the topography. She reported that City Staff recommended that a positive motion be sent to City Council, subject to all findings, conditions, and restrictions identified by Staff and the Planning Commission.

City Engineer Hanson clarified that they were considering amendment of an MDA, and confirmed that they did not currently have a draft of the document. Community Development Director Kohler replied that was correct and explained the process for approval of an MDA amendment. City Engineer Hanson said he had no further comments at this point, but would like to see a copy of the amended MDA once it was drafted.

Applicant Seth Hobby introduced himself on behalf of Northwood Properties. He summarized the history of this application and explained that they had made amendments to the roads and some other features at the behest of the City. Mr. Hobby indicated that there were substantial changes to the roadways, although there were minimal changes with their actual site plan. He explained the changes had been made to accommodate requirements from both the City and UDOT. He noted that the main changes to the site plan were that the number of units had slightly reduced and the buildings were slightly closer together. Mr. Hobby stated that they were willing to accommodate any other requests from Staff.

Community Development Director Kohler commented that this application had been through several iterations as they worked to accommodate both the City and UDOT. He agreed with Mr. Hobby's comment that the project had been greatly influenced by the City's transportation plan. Community Development Director Kohler affirmed that there were issues with the topography of the site that inhibited development.

Community Development Director Kohler noted that if there were to be front-loaded garages, he wanted there to be private roads, which he believed this development had.

He commented that if the roads were managed by the City there could be challenges with the HOA as far as snowplowing and other maintenance issues were concerned.

Engineer for the project Paul Watson stated that they intended to follow the City's Master Plan for the trail system, although the trails were not recorded on the site plan.

Chairman Jordan asked about how the garage design had changed and Mr. Hobby said there had been no changes to the garages; only changes to the roadways. Mr. Watson noted the most significant change they had made was to the roundabout by Highway 40, and since the roundabout design had changed the Senior Center now had to be on the other side of the road.

Community Development Director Kohler discussed how this project aligned with NVOZ's specifications for garages. He said the reason for having small blocks was to ensure walkability, although small blocks were difficult to accommodate when there were canals and explained the applicant had asked for the variance about block lengths due to the canals. He said that the North Village had topography challenges which

made rear-loaded garages difficult to build. Mr. Watson elaborated on the challenges posed by the slopes on the site.

Community Development Director Kohler explained the rationale for the windows and building variations, and he noted that these variances had also been requested by DH Horton for Highlands for the same reasons. He said that in that case, the City had asked for DH Horton for architectural assurances that not all the buildings would look the same and he requested that they do the same for this application.

Mr. Hobby spoke to the reasons for the variances as well and explained that because they had been asked to move one of their roads, they needed to cross over the drainage ditch. Community Development Director Kohler clarified that the road crossed over the storm drain canal that the City had identified. City Engineer Hansen clarified that 'ditch' was not the proper term; what they were referring to were 'drainage channels.' City Engineer Hansen explained that per City ordinance, developments were required to maintain a certain distance from storm drain channels but because these development needed to cross over the channel, they were requesting an exemption from that requirement. City Engineer Hansen emphasized that the exemption was not for the entire length of the channel; only in the place where they needed to cross.

Commissioner McKinley asked about the phrase 'single-family dwelling units under 30' in the section about fire safety requirements. He thought the phrase was ambiguous and should be clarified. Planner Woodbury noted that the language came from the Fire Department and was in reference to secondary access point requirements. Chairman Jordan opened the floor for public comments. There were no public comments and Chairman Jordan closed the floor.

Commissioner Slagowski clarified that the developer was using the buildings to make the grade transitions so the roads could remain relatively on-grade. He thought this solution was more attractive than retaining walls or other measures. He said it made the roads looked more natural.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked if these changes impacted the amount of open space and Mr. Hobby replied it did not change it. Mr. Hobby also noted that these changes did not alter the affordable housing component of the development either.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked Community Development Director Kohler if they should continue the item and Community Development Director Kohler replied that if any of the Commissioners or any members of the public were uncomfortable with any element of the plan then they should table it.

Commissioner Knight asked Community Development Director Kohler if he felt this project would set a precedent for others and Community Development Director Kohler replied that he did not think so, noting that most other developments in the City were not impacted by slope to the extent that this development was. Community Development Director Kohler commented that the variances requested by this applicant were the same as what the Highlands development had been granted for the same

challenges with topography. Planner Woodbury spoke to the similarities between this application and Highlands as well.

Mr. Hobby stated that most of their changes had been requested by the City. He said this application had been in progress for three years as they worked to accommodate the City, and he noted that the changes had lowered the overall density from what they had originally been approved. He discussed that they could have done stacked flats and retaining walls, they had opted not to do so because it was not in the best interest of the City, even though it made the development less profitable for them.

Commissioner Slagowski and Commissioner Royall expressed that they did not have a problem with the development and appreciated that the developer wanted to ensure it was aesthetically pleasing. Commissioner Slagowski said that projects had to accommodate for grade all the time and that roads posed an issue in steep areas.

City Engineer Hansen spoke to the process moving forward for this application.

Chairman Jordan asked the Commission if they were comfortable making a motion that evening.

Vice-Chair Broughton motioned to send a positive recommendation to City Council for the North Village Views MDA amendment, with the findings and conditions as identified in the Staff Report. Commissioner Royall made the second.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Chairman Jordan, Vice Chair Broughton Commissioners Slagowski, Knight, Wilson, Royall, **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 6-0.

Voting No: None. The Motion Passed 7-0.

III. Public Hearing for Springs at Coyote Ridge Phase 5 Development Agreement (Planner Jamie Baron)

Planner Baron presented a history of the Coyote Ridge development. He explained the purpose for the public hearing was to solicit feedback about the proposal to build a row of townhouses and two commercial buildings on a property adjacent to the Springs at Coyote Ridge development. Planner Baron said that the property in question was not a part of the original development, but Thrive Development, who had built the Springs at Coyote Ridge, was under contract to annex the land wanted to pull the property into the existing development.

Planner Baron presented the site plan and indicated that the plan was to extend the road, as required by the development agreement and build twelve townhomes. He said the townhomes were front-loaded, not alley-loaded, due to an elevation change. He highlighted other features of the site plan and noted there was no proposed connection to UDOT, although the current plan only required them to have access for Fire without having to connect back to UDOT. He pointed out the existing elevations and said the applicant's goal was to build something that was congruous with the existing development.

Planner Baron said the plan for twelve townhomes and two commercial buildings were

allowed in the zone and were in fact less dense than the maximum density allowed in the zone. He added that the open space requirement was also met, and so he reported that City Staff recommended approval subject to comments from Staff, Engineering, and the Planning Commission.

City Engineer Hansen said Engineering had no conditions beyond what was already stated in the Staff Report. He said there was nothing substantial.

Russ Poulson from Thrive Development and Cal Johnson from Legend Engineering introduce themselves and expressed willingness to answer questions.

Chairman Jordan opened the floor for public comments.

Randy Christ, 1723 N Highway 40, said he lived across the street from the existing buildings in the development. He said he had previously had an issue with the lighting and the signs, and said the City had worked with the applicant to get the lighting issue resolved. Mr. Christ said he had seven acres, but the lighting from the development extended far into his property. Mr. Christ said if these new buildings were similar to the existing ones, he hoped that the same lighting restrictions would apply. He discussed that the new building to the north had scones on white walls, which reflected a lot of light. Mr. Christ asked for the night lighting to be considered. He asked that no lighting be mounted on the white walls and he pointed out that the lights on brown or dark walls did not cause the same issue. He further asked that the material on the buildings and the windows be of high quality in order to avoid having issues with the building reflecting heat and light from the sun during the day.

Mr. Christ also asked about access and Mr. Johnson explained where the access road would extend. Mr. Christ brought up traffic and said the new light on Coyote Parkway was great. He spoke about some of the plans UDOT had for the road. He thought the light had slowed traffic down and also made the road quieter. He reiterated his comment about the poor finish on the buildings.

Mr. Christ brought up Envision 2050 and said the purpose of the plan was to keep the commercial space clustered in Heber City. He did not like that commercial developments were being stretched out along the road and he said that did not align with the requirements of Envision 2050.

Deana Lloyd said she lived to the south of the annexation. She asked for clarification about the access road and Planner Baron responded that the existing townhomes had a road in front of them, but that was not the main access road. Planner Baron indicated how the roads would run on the site plan map. Mrs. Lloyd asked if the townhomes were going to be similar to the ones that already existed and Mr. Johnson replied that they were very similar, with the main difference being that the new townhomes had front-loaded garages.

Mrs. Lloyd said the developer had been a good neighbor so far and noted they had put in a privacy fence in the past. She asked that the fence be continued as the development expanded, and said she was overall in support of the development. Mr. Johnson said that their plans included a continuation of the privacy fence.

Laurel North said she lived on the other side of the highway and said her adult son also lived nearby. Mrs. North voiced concerns about the water from a nearby spring and asked if the developer had considered the fact that the water flowed under the road.

Mr. Poulson replied they had consulted with the City about the water's course and said they would not interfere with it. Mrs. North also asked about access and Mr. Johnson

replied that UDOT would not allow them access to Highway 40. Mrs. North expressed that she liked what the developers had done so far with the existing buildings.

Raylyn Corry said she was the owner of the property in question. She opined that the plans for the development aligned with what they had done so far. She expressed concerns about the road and hoped that her neighbors would not be negatively impacted in the future. She asked for the road to go in a direction where it would not impact her friends negatively.

Chairman Jordan closed the floor for public comment.

Vice-Chair Broughton thanked the commenters for sharing their thoughts. She said it was always nice to hear from people who were civil and had an understanding of what the Planning Commission had the power to do. She thanked the commenters for being so informed and engaged with the City.

City Engineer Hansen affirmed he had no problems with the development besides what he had already noted in his report.

Chairman Jordan asked about front-loading versus rear-loading garages. He said he was the president for the Muirfield HOA and said many of the garages in that development ended up being used for storage. He expressed that he liked the parking area identified in the site plan and appreciated that front-load garages allowed for backyards. He asked if the backyards were going to be fenced off from each other and Mr. Poulson replied the backyards would at least be semi-private. Chairman Jordan said that in his neighborhood many of the residents had built private fences, but many of them did not take care of their lawns.

Chairman Jordan said that rear-loading garages allowed for a more attractive streetscape and said it in his opinion, it would be better to have rear-loaded garages.

Chairman Jordan elaborated about how many residents did not maintain their backyards and parked on the street and opined that both of these issues could be circumvented with rear-loaded garages. Commissioner Knight agreed that there was a risk of an eyesore with front-load garages. Chairman Jordan noted that poor maintenance of properties also led to a decrease in the surrounding home's values.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked if there was an affordable housing requirement. Mr. Poulson replied that 10% of the properties were affordable and their AMI was about 80%, although they were still waiting to hear back from Council.

Commissioner Knight motioned to forward a positive recommendation for the Springs at Coyote Ridge Phase 5 Development Agreement to the City Council, subject to the findings and conditions identified in the Staff Report. Commissioner Slagowski made the second.

Discussion: Chairman Jordan asked if there should be an amendment subject to the night sky requirements that had been discussed that evening. Commissioner Slagowski thought that the Planning Commission should revisit their ordinance overall rather than addressing this application specifically.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked about the commercial buildings. Planner Baron explained that the commercial buildings were permitted by conditional use permit, and the

applicant had asked for the use to not be limited to medical offices only, but also other kinds of offices. Vice-Chair Broughton clarified that the conditions were met. Planner Baron noted that the plan did not include retail, only different kinds of offices.

Commissioner Knight thought this made sense because office spaces would not be in use on the weekends when the residents would be home.

Voting Yes: Chairman Jordan, Vice Chair Broughton Commissioners Slagowski, Knight, Wilson, Royall, **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 6-0.

Voting No: None. The Motion Passed 7-0.

4. Work Meeting:

- I. Central Heber Overlay Zone (CHOZ) wrap up discussion and celebration (Tony Kohler)

Community Development Director Kohler discussed the final changes made to the Central Heber Overlay Zone before it was finalized, although the recording did not capture his presentation. Tony Köhler explained the Agenda Item. Please refer to PowerPoint.

5. Administrative Items:

Chairman Jordan asked that an email be sent out to all Planning Commissioners reminding them to complete their Annual 2025 Planning Commission Training.

Planning Office Admin Kijanen stated she would send the email with training materials.

6. Adjournment:

Motion: Commissioner Knight moved to Adjournment:. Commissioner Slagowski made the second.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Commissioner Slagowski, Commissioner Knight, Commissioner Jordan, Commissioner Wilson, Commissioner Royall, Commissioner McKinley, Board Member Broughton. **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 7-0.

Meshelle Kijanen
Meshelle Kijanen, Administrative Assistant