

**HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, UT 84032
Heber City Council Meeting
January 27, 2026**

APPROVED 02.10.2026

6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

1. Regular Meeting:

I. Call to Order

Vice Chair Tori Broughton called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone present and welcomed the newest full-term voting member, Greg Royall to the Planning Commission and also mentioned that the Mayor will be recognizing long-term Planning Commissioner Dennis Gunn in the City Council Meeting and has asked all to attend, if possible.

II. Roll Call

Planning Commission Present:

Vice-Chair Tori Broughton
Commissioner Darek Slagowski
Commissioner Josh Knight
Commissioner Greg Royall
Commissioner Robert McKinley

Planning Commission Absent:

Chairman Phil Jordan
Commissioner Dave Richard
Commissioner Robert Wilson

Staff Present:

Planning Manager Jamie Baron
Planning Office Admin Meshelle Kijanen

Staff Participating Remotely:

N/A

Also Present:

Mike Johnston and Howard Saldarini

Also Attending Remotely:

N/A

III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Alternate PC Member Robert McKinnley led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Prayer/Thought by Invitation N/A ()

V. Recuse for Conflict of Interest N/A

2. Consent Agenda:

Motion: Commissioner Knight moved to approve the consent agenda for the minutes

from December 9, 2025 and the approval for the 2026 Planning Commission meeting dates. Commissioner Greg Royall made a second to the motion.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: 5 Voting No: None. The Motion 5-0.

- I. 12.09.2025 PC Minutes for Approval
- II. Approve 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Dates

3. Action Items:

- I. Saldarini Annexation, located at 110 W Moulton Lane.

Planning Manager Jamie Baron presented the Staff Report as included in the meeting materials. The State requires a zone at the time of annexation and staff is requesting neighborhoods with open space (NOS). There is not a Master Development Agreement or Concept Plan for this Annexation as Mr. Saldarini only wants to annex into the City. Also, there is a master plan trail along the Timpanogos Canal, which is right along the back side of the applicant's property. We would require that at the time of development, whether by Mr. Saldarini or successors of his property, that they abide by the Timpanogo Canal Master Trail Plan. See the full Staff Report as included in the meeting materials.

The applicant, Mr. Saldarin agreed with the contents of the Staff Report.

Commissioner Darek Slagowski asked why the City is recommending NOS rather than University Village (UV)? Mr. Baron responded, Staff is recommending the Nos based mostly from the General Plan and because of the zoning map and where those boundaries are, the majority of this property is within and surrounded by NOS.

However, if this Planning Commission feels that something else is more appropriate, it's within your purview to recommend something else. Mr. Slagowski followed up with asking if the applicant thought the Zone was acceptable, and the applicant confirmed that the zone was acceptable.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked what level of change to the property would then be required to do a trail? Mr. Baron responded, We're looking at full development or a subdivision to the lot to initiate the trail requirement. If the applicant is doing an accessory building, I don't see that being a trigger for the trail compliance.

Commissioner Joshua Knight asked for the difference between the NOS and the UV Zone. Mr. Baron responded, that the University Village (UV) Zone is a lower density zone with more mixed-use and commercial, with more intense uses that are

surrounding the UVU campus, with no single family homes in the. Neighborhoods with open space is limited commercial and more like townhomes and single-family homes.

Commissioner Greg Royall asked when the original annexation was taking place, when the applicant decided not to annex with everybody else. Was it the area zoned NOS zone or was it the UV zone? Mr. Baron said he wasn't sure and would need to do research and get back to Mr. Royall with an answer. However, as he could recall without research,

I think the actual application for that annexation probably came in before we have this current version that we are discussing today. At the time, we had the original North Village overlay Zone (NVOZ), which had more of a strip type development instead of clusters. The NVOZ was structured from the highway up the hill with Town Center, then Village Center, and then Neighborhoods. Mr. Baron continued, the NOS I believe, was adopted during that process and this Annexation was on hold for the new zoning, which we now have these sub-designations. Mr. Baron concluded that was a ruff summary of the timeline.

Motion: Commissioner Knight moved to make a positive recommendation for the Saldarini Annexation, located at 110 W Moulton Lane and to be in the NOS classification. Commissioner Royall made the second.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Commissioner Slagowski, Commissioner Knight, Commissioner Royall, Commissioner McKinley, and Vice-Chair Broughton. **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 5-0.

4. Work Meeting: N/A

5. Administrative Items:

I. Discuss Planning Commission Bylaws

Commissioner Knight asked whether any changes had been made to the Planning Commission Bylaws since the last review. Mr. Baron responded that no changes had been made, noting that only the Planning Commission has the authority to amend the bylaws. Staff can prepare proposed amendments for the Commission's consideration upon request.

Commissioner Knight then asked whether staff believed there were any specific provisions the Planning Commission should review. Mr. Baron responded that attendance requirements are always important to revisit. He explained that failure to meet attendance requirements could result in a Commissioner being asked to step down due to inactivity. While no Planning Commissioner has ever been removed for inactivity, he emphasized the importance of understanding the commitment involved in serving on the Commission.

Mr. Baron also noted that the Commission may wish to discuss the six-year term length. After discussing the pros and cons, the Planning Commission decided to retain the six-year terms as currently written in the bylaws.

The Commission further discussed potential discrepancies between the Planning

Commission Bylaws and the Municipal Code, specifically regarding whether the Commission is allowed one alternate or two alternates, and how vacancies are handled when a Commissioner leaves before completing a term. Staff stated they would review the Municipal Code and bylaws for any inconsistencies and report back to the Commission.

Mr. Baron and the Commissioners also discussed staff and public participation rules and the order of proceedings. It was determined that the Planning Commission follows the appropriate participation and procedural rules.

Commissioner Knight asked how many Commissioners could communicate without violating the Public Open Meetings Act. Mr. Baron clarified that three or fewer Commissioners may communicate, as a quorum consists of four Commissioners. He noted that different types of conversations and scenarios can affect compliance.

The Commissioners were informed that this bylaws discussion would count toward their required four hours of annual training. The Planning Commissioners requested that the full four hours of required training be conducted during regular meetings when agendas are light. The Commissioners also shared the types of training they would like to receive. Mr. Baron reminded the Commission that attendance at the fall conference counts toward the annual training requirement.

Vice-Chair Broughton requested highlights from the City Council retreat. Mr. Baron summarized key topics, including parks, traffic, C Street, dark-sky regulations, amortization of commercial uses, a possible change to dogs in parks, and affordable housing.

Commissioner Knight commented that he would like the City Council to reevaluate deed restrictions related to affordable housing. Vice-Chair Broughton and Mr. Baron continued the discussion, with Mr. Baron outlining the benefits and limitations of deed restrictions.

Mr. Baron then addressed the old fire station building, explaining that a presentation had been given regarding the idea of converting the building into an incubator space, particularly for artists. The concept includes allowing the public to observe artists working along C Street, fostering local art, and reusing the semi-industrial building in the downtown area. The idea also includes potential renovation of the building and use of surrounding parking. The Commissioners and Mr. Baron discussed parking impacts related to public activities on C Street and Main Street. Mr. Baron reminded the Commission that the City does not currently own the old fire station but is in negotiations with Wasatch County.

Vice-Chair Broughton commented that a traffic study would be needed for First South.

Commissioner Royall suggested removing the grass area in front of the Public Safety Building and converting it into parking. Access more detailed information that is included in the meeting materials

- II. Discuss any changes needed on the PC Term End Date List (emails, addresses, phone numbers) A paper copy will be provided to the Commissioners at the Meeting.

The Planning Commissioners looked at their specific information listed on the PC Term End Date List and reported on any changes that were needed.

6. Adjournment:

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

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Commissioner Slagowski, Commissioner Knight, Commissioner Royall, Commissioner McKinley, Vice-Chair Broughton. **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 5-0.

Meshelle Kijanen
Meshelle Kijanen, Administrative Assistant