

**HEBER CITY CORPORATION  
75 North Main Street  
Heber City, UT 84032  
Heber City Council Meeting  
December 9, 2025**

**Approved 01.26.2026**

**6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting**

**1. Regular Meeting:**

I. Call to Order

Chairman Phil Jordan called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:06 p.m. and welcomed everyone present.

II. Roll Call

**Planning Commission Present:**

Chairman Phil Jordan  
Vice-Chair Tori Broughton  
Commissioner Dennis Gunn  
Commissioner Dave Richard  
Commissioner Derek Slagowski  
Commissioner Robert Wilson  
Commissioner Greg Royall

**Planning Commission Absent:**

Commissioner Josh Knight  
Commissioner Robert McKinley

**Staff Present:**

Community Development Director Tony Kohler  
Planning Manager Jamie Baron  
Planner Jacob Roberts  
Planning Office Admin Meshelle Kijanen  
City Engineering Manager Russ Funk  
City Engineer Ross Hansen  
Consultant Denna Woodbury

**Staff Participating Remotely:**

Commissioner Dennis Gunn and Consultant Denna Woodbury

**Also Present:**

Tracy Taylor, Logan Johnson, Dave Stoddard, Cathy Lengeling, Justin Keys, Diane Turn, Ryan Miller, Andrew Dorobek, James Copeland

**Also Attending Remotely:**

Catherine, Bryanna, Ryan, and Sandra

III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

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

IV. Prayer/Thought by Invitation ()

Dave Richards and Phil Jordan shared a thought See Recording (SR)

V. Recuse for Conflict of Interest N/A

**2. Consent Agenda:**

I. 10.28.2025 PC Minutes for Approval

**Motion:** Vice Chair Tori Broughton moved to approve the items on the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Slagowski made the second.

**Discussion:** N/A

**Voting Yes:** Chairman Jordan, Vice Chair Broughton, Commissioners Richards, Slagowski, Wilson, Royall, and Gunn **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 7-0.

**3. Action Items:**

I. Consider Subdivision Preliminary approval for Harvest Village (The Slope), located at River Rd and Hwy 40. (Planner Denna Woodbury)

*This item was discussed after Action Item II.*

Chairman Jordan prefaced discussion by explaining that this item was not a public hearing, since a public hearing about this topic had already been held. He emphasized the agenda item for the evening was an administrative matter.

Community Development Director Kohler provided a history of this item and recalled that the Planning Commission had previously continued this item in order to allow the Engineering team to hire a third-party storm water expert who could research this property in greater detail. Planner Woodbury added that since the previous meeting, the Engineering requirements had changed. Planner Woodbury read the current list of conditions.

Commissioner Richards asked if drought years had been included in the study and if that had any bearing on the report. City Engineer Hansen explained that the original report only had current readings included, and said that the third-party expert had used modeling to look at historic seasonal levels in the groundwater. City Engineer Hansen said that there were a total of three reports- the original, another one conducted by the applicant that looked at seasonal levels, and a final one conducted on behalf of the City that also looked at seasonal levels.

Commissioner Gunn asked about pumping. City Engineer Hansen asked the applicant to speak about this question. Ryan Miller, James Copeland, and Andy Dorobek identified themselves on behalf of the applicant and Mr. Miller said he did not anticipate that they would have to pump groundwater.

Chairman Jordan asked how long the report had been available to the City and City Engineer Hansen replied that the most recent report had been submitted on December third. City Engineer Hansen added that the first report was received in 2024 and he

elaborated on the history of the various reports. City Engineer Hansen noted that when there was a dispute, it was the recommended approach to get multiple expert opinions.

City Engineer Hansen also explained that the project would be costly, in part because of Heber City's requirements and design standards for storm water were more stringent than other municipalities. City Engineer Hansen elaborated about Heber City's standards and emphasized that the City had done their due diligence to enforce their Code and that the developer had been cooperative about meeting the City's requirements.

Mr. Dorobek commented that they had done their due diligence in finding the expert who had conducted their study. He expressed confidence in the report that their third-party expert had created.

Commissioner Gunn stated he was comfortable with using modeling to find historic groundwater levels. He asked if UDOT would be okay with their access, and he also asked if JSSD was involved with the project since it would have an impact on their waste water system. Community Development Director Kohler replied that UDOT would need two points of access; one off of River Road towards Midway and one off of Highway 40. Community Development Director Kohler said that all parties understood that the second point of access was temporary, and eventually there would be a frontage road off of Highway 40 where the access point would be. Mr. Dorobek replied that they had been in contact with JSSD and had worked with their engineering team.

Mr. Dorobek added that JSSD had given them an invoice for sewer work. Mr. Miller added that they were working with North Village Special Services District as well.

Commissioner Richards brought up the service agreement and commented about the construction drawings. Commissioner Richards stated that at this point, they were only considering the plat and were not yet at a point to think about architectural details. He discussed the density and said the role of the City was to help manage what was there. He asked if the applicants foresaw any issues and asked if the entire lot needed to be raised four feet, or just certain areas. Mr. Dorobek replied that the elevation only needed to be changed in some areas, based on the groundwater level. Mr. Dorobek added that four feet of fill was the average for the site overall. Mr. Dorobek stated that he did not anticipate any significant issues and did not plan on asking for an exemption to any of the staff conditions. Mr. Dorobek also affirmed that he represented all of the lots except lot three, who he explained had a different owner.

Chairman Jordan asked about lot three. Planner Woodbury explained the lot was part of the overall plat, although the lot would go through a separate approval process for their site plan and design. City Engineer Hansen clarified that lot three, five, and one would all go through separate site plan applications, and Mr. Copeland confirmed that was correct. Mr. Copeland explained that they were platting the entire 40 acres and the lots would be included in the plat, although those lots were part of separate applications. Mr. Copeland explained that those three lots had been included in their capacity studies.

Commissioner Richards asked about their anticipated timeline once they had the plat. Mr. Copeland replied that they believed in the project and acknowledged they were on an aggressive timeline, but felt it was achievable.

Commissioner Slagowski felt that the concerns that they had in the last meeting had been addressed. Chairman Jordan felt it was worth it to get the third-party opinion and felt comfortable moving forward. The City Staff concurred they were comfortable moving forward.

**Motion:** Commissioner Richards moved to approve the Subdivision Preliminary approval for Harvest Village (The Slope), located at River Rd and Hwy 40, as presented in the staff report with three findings and four conditions. Commissioner Slagowski made the second.

**Discussion:** N/A

**Voting Yes:** Chairman Jordan, Vice Chair Broughton, Commissioners Richards, Slagowski, Wilson, Royall, and Gunn.

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

II. Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Approval for Commercial Complex located at 677 South Main (Planner Jacob Roberts)

*This item was discussed first.*

Planner Roberts presented this item. He shared the architectural renderings and the site plan first and oriented the Commission to the location. He read the Staff Report and explained this proposal was for a commercial complex. He said Staff had already noted several outstanding conditions. Planner Roberts shared the background of this item briefly and summarized the Staff conditions, noting that the primary issue was that there were detrimental effects from arising incompatible design in terms of use, scale, intensity, character, architectural design, and colors. He said the form of the building was not the issue, but the design was a problem since it did not create harmony with the rest of the C-3 zone. He commented that the facade was monolithic, which stood out compared to the rest of the zone. He added that the materials were a problem as well. Planner Roberts summarized which design elements were at the discretion of the Planning Commission. Planner Roberts pointed to the nearby UPS store, which he said was a good example of how to blend in with the zone.

City Engineer Hansen reported that he had found some engineering deficiencies, and said he had met with the applicant about those issues. He reported that the applicant had expressed they could resolve those issues, although he had not yet seen the issues be addressed. Chairman Jordan asked if the problems were straightforward and City Engineer Hansen replied that he believed the issues were solvable.

Logan Johnson with Wright Development introduced himself as the owner of the land and project. Mr. Johnson explained what their project was and said their application was a commercial complex, although they were not yet certain who all of their tenants would be and what kind of businesses they would have. He explained that the only reason they needed to come before the Planning Commission and not just the Staff

was due to that ambiguity. Mr. Johnson also explained that they had resolved some, but not all, of the engineering issues, and so they were waiting until all of the issues were fixed before they resubmitted the application. Mr. Johnson also spoke about the building layout and said there were no detrimental effects with the site itself, only the materials. He said the identified issues with the design did not have a bearing on the site approval. Mr. Johnson summarized that he felt confident that they could resolve the issues that had been pointed out by Staff, and explained he wanted to move forward with the project as quickly as possible since some of his tenants were winter-oriented businesses and he wanted to ensure that they could open in time for next years' season.

Planner Roberts explained that the standards for approval of a conditional use permit stipulated that the application met all of the standards, including design standards.

Commissioner Richards asked about the criteria for parking, especially given that not all tenants had been identified. Planner Robert said the parking requirements were satisfied, but he could not recall the requirements. Mr. Johnson added that they had estimated parking stalls based on the upper end of the required range, and added that they had 20 additional stalls being built.

Commissioner Richards also asked about design and agreed that there were very disparate design elements. He acknowledged the subjectivity of design requirements and said he did not have a problem putting design into the hands of Staff.

Commissioner Gunn echoed Commissioner Richards' sentiment. He said the main thing for him was to ensure that the Engineering conditions were met, and anticipated that resolving the storm drain issue should be straightforward.

Commissioner Slagowski agreed with the previous comments in regards to materials, and he asked about not allowing CMU. He commented there were some good-looking CMU products, and noted it was very durable. He added there were some products that looked like sandstone.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked if the facade might change depending on who the tenants were and Mr. Johnson replied that they would not do that; they would work the facade design out with the Code.

Vice-Chair Broughton said she was very pro-business, however, she did not feel the project was ready yet and thought the application was being rushed. She asked the other Commissioners if they wanted to see more of the conditions met before they moved forward.

Commissioner Richards expressed that as long as the Engineering requirements were met, he was comfortable moving forward. He said that parking was sufficient, which was the other main thing he was worried about. He commented that the Planning Commission did not get to control all of the design details, and he agreed with Commissioner Slagowski in regards to his comment about CMU, noting that there were some nice products in town that used CMU. He also noted that other buildings in that zone were not cohesive.

Chairman Jordan asked Mr. Johnson what stage the architect was at. Mr. Johnson replied they had an architect in-house, so they could make the changes easily since they did not have to change the form of the building. Mr. Johnson said they could make changes to the exterior of the building. Mr. Johnson added that he wanted to move forward so he could meet his tenants' needs.

Commissioner Royall expressed that he was comfortable leaving this project with the Staff. He said he did not see the need to delay the application just because the Planning Commission did not like the facade.

Chairman Jordan asked Planner Roberts what he needed from the Commission. Planner Roberts expressed confidence in the application and said the Commission could either approve it with conditions or continue the item. Commissioner Slagowski commented that the purpose of the Commission was not to be an HOA and said he did not want to micromanage the project. Chairman Jordan said the main goal of the Commission was about cohesion with the broader area, rather than mandating the specific materials of each development in the City. Planner Roberts noted the applicant's desire to get this project approved quickly and anticipated that the developer would be able to complete the project quickly once it was approved.

**Motion:** Commissioner Richards made a motion to approve the Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Approval for Commercial Complex located at 677 South Main as presented with findings and conditions as identified in the Staff Report, highlighting that there are twelve conditions from Planning Staff and four from Engineering, and requiring that the applicant will work directly with Staff to resolve the conditions. Commissioner Gunn made the second.

**Discussion:** N/A

**Voting Yes:** Chairman Jordan, Vice Chair Broughton, Commissioners Richards, Slagowski, Wilson, Royall, and Gunn.

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

#### **4. Work Meeting:**

##### **I. Review of Annual Planning Commission Report to the City Council for Calendar Year 2025. (Community Development Director/Tony Kohler)**

Community Development Director Kohler explained that he would present to the City Council at the following week's meeting, and explained he was looking to get feedback about the presentation and encouraged the Planning Commissioners to attend the meeting, if possible.

Community Development Director Kohler shared his presentation that summarized the highlights of the Planning Commission for the year 2025. Community Development Kohler listed the main policy updates, cell towers, plat amendments, and development agreements that the Commission had approved that year. He reported the preliminary plats and site plans that the Commission had approved or were currently working on, and he shared the site plan for Highlands Stacked Flats.

Community Development Director Kohler asked if the Planning Commissioners had met their annual training goal. Commissioner Richards confirmed that he had and there was a short discussion amongst the Commissioners in which they all confirmed they had completed their training. There was also a short conversation about training conferences that were available for the Commissioners to attend.

Community Development Director Kohler spoke about opportunities for the future. He listed historic preservation and General Plan implementation as main goals for the coming year, and he discussed that they wanted to see if any parts of the town would qualify for a National Historic District designation, which would open up State and Federal tax advantages. He commented about the Main Street program that Heber City was currently working on and clarified this was a separate initiative, but it would also open them up for more funding opportunities if they were approved.

Community Development Director Kohler identified some of their other goals, including filling in 'missing middle' neighborhoods and an Arts and Recreation District. He said they would have to determine if the Council and Commission had the bandwidth to work on that project in the coming year. He then discussed a possible Public Facilities Zone.

He also stated that there had been discussion about adding more neighborhoods with Open Space, and said this could help with infill. He explained that they wanted to have something in place which would avoid them having to make exceptions every time a developer wanted to have a neighborhood with open space, so they were considering creating a zone.

Community Development Director Kohler moved on to the General Plan implementation plan in regards to transportation. He said they had a lot of projects with UDOT that year including street widenings and median installation. He reported that the Planning Commission would need to work on advocacy for the bypass and decide what speed limit and features they wanted Main Street to have. He said that the General Plan called for a re-imagining of streets in the historic core, and added that the Council had started thinking about this topic but the Planning Commission would need to work on it as well. Community Development Director Kohler also said the Planning Commission would need to come up with a policy decision about curb, gutter, and sidewalk and the Commission briefly discussed the advantages of not having a curb.

Community Development Director Kohler brought up the CRA and said the City needed to keep pursuing that. He added that they also needed to consider the UVU campus and think about how they wanted to redesign it. Community Development Director Kohler discussed city land purchases, city land development concepts, and open space. He noted that the General Plan called for a lake to trail system, and said that was something they could think about as well.

Community Development Director Kohler reported on the C Street Master Planning. He announced that the City had hired a consultant to create a conceptual 30% design for the park, and he said they would be holding workshops with the public to test different ideas. He said the consultant was also working on C Street and would be working with landowners along the street. He explained one of the ideas for the street was to have small, mom-and-pop shops along the street. He noted that parking was something they needed to think about in the downtown area as well and he commented on the parking design of C street. He opined that the fee-in-lieu model for parking was not a good idea for downtown.

Community Development Director Kohler added that it had been proposed to transform the fire station into an arts space and possibly a restaurant as well. Chairman Jordan said that last year, Heber City had considered funding an Arts Master Plan, which would include things like the proposed makerspace in the fire station. Chairman Jordan said there needed to be a master plan to design things like that, and he pointed out that

it would need to be managed. Chairman Jordan suggested that a city-wide Arts Master Plan should be added to Heber City, and he commented about other cities that had successfully revitalized their downtown areas by using the arts as an economic driver. Community Development Director Kohler stated there were two rezones that were going to come before the Commission and would include a public hearing. He said that they needed to update their Moderate Income Housing Plan and he noted that many of their upcoming developments included moderate housing. Community Development Director Kohler commented that he anticipated that the State legislature would make changes to their moderate housing requirements, so he recommended that they wait until February or March to make their changes. He then explained Flex Ready homes. Community Development Director Kohler listed some other priorities for the coming year, including the Airport Overlay Zone, commercial design criteria updates, massage Code updates, Dark Sky lighting updates, starting a Water Conservation Committee, and exploring a Nationally Designated Historic Area.

Commissioner Richards thought they should have a discussion about their permitted materials at some point in the coming year and there was a short discussion about architectural design. Commissioner Slagowski commented that the Commission was not a design review board. Commissioner Richards thought they should just update their list of materials, and identify what materials they did not want to allow. Chairman Jordan highlighted some buildings in the downtown areas that he felt were not aesthetic because of their visible utility hookups. Commissioner Richards replied that there was not much that the Planning Commission could do to mitigate things like that.

Community Development Director Kohler noted they could require a wall or screen or something similar that would block the view of the utilities.

Community Development Director Kohler commented that they were re-addressing the Dark Sky ordinance at the best of Commissioner Knight. Community Development Director Kohler said they needed to consider if they wanted the City to be wholly Dark Sky compliant, which they currently were not. He stated there were ways to offer incentives to residents in order for using Dark Sky compliant lighting. The Commissioners expressed interest in continuing to work towards total Dark Sky compliance.

Community Development Director Kohler said he anticipated making the presentation for the Council about 30 minutes in total, with extra time for comments and questions.

## **5. Administrative Items:**

## **6. Adjournment:**

**Motion:** Commissioner Wilson moved to Adjournment. Commissioner Gunn made the second.

**Discussion:**N/A

**Voting Yes:** Chairman Jordan, Vice Chair Broughton, Commissioners Richards, Slagowski, Wilson, Royall and Gunn, **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 7-0.

Meshelle Kijanen  
Meshelle Kijanen, Administrative Assistant