

HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, UT 84032
Heber City Council Meeting
August 11, 2026

Approved 09.08.2026

6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

1. Regular Meeting:

I. Call to Order

Chairman 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 Darek Slagowski
Commissioner Josh Knight
Commissioner Greg Royall
Commissioner Kristina Goodnough

Planning Commission Absent:

Commissioner Dave Richards
Commissioner Josh Knight
Commissioner Robert Wilson
Commissioner Robert McKinley

Staff Participating Remotely:

Consultant GCGarcia

Also Present:

Kasey Lindstrom, Paul Watson and Zack Buterfield

Also Attending Remotely:

Ali North, Laurel Bevans, AE Urgia - Seth, Kirk Langston, Robert Madsen

III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Vice Chair Tori Broughton 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:

- I. Valley Hills Plat E Lots 133, 134, & 135 Plat Amendment (Planner Jamie Baron)

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

Discussion: N/A

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

3. Action Items:

- I. Consider approval of Subdivision Preliminary for Mayflower Views (Formerly North Village Views). (Planner Denna Woodbury)

Planning Consultant Denna Woodbury explained the Staff Report. Please refer to the 08.11.2026 Staff Report, PowerPoint and Video for additional information through this link: <https://hebercityut.portal.civicclerk.com/event/482/overview> The item was to consider the proposed Subdivision Preliminary for Mayflower Views, formerly North Village Views. The project was located at the intersection of Highway 40 and University Avenue. The proposed project would create parcels and would realign the project boundaries, allowing the project to develop as proposed and approved conceptually with the Master Development Agreement (MDA). The application would subdivide the land into residential parcels. The Staff Report listed previous actions that had occurred. Because the road was realigned, the project boundary changed. Therefore, the preliminary subdivision plat created large parcels for the three phases of townhomes.

The project would also amend two other subdivisions; the North Horizon Subdivision, which would vacate unnecessary easements and would dedicate North Village Parkway to an 80-foot right of way. The second subdivision would combine three parcels into one parcel, and it would remove all the interior easements and establish exterior easements, add two new public roads and realign the existing access road to the UVU campus and this subdivision would be the College Downs Plat. The subdivision plans conformed to the conceptual site plan which was approved with the Development Agreement in February 2026.

Staff recommends that the Subdivision Preliminary for mayflower Views, formerly North Village Views, be approved by the Planning Commission subject to the findings of fact and conditions listed in the Staff Report. The conditions included all conditions of the Engineer be met, and the second condition was that the code requirements be met. The third condition was that an Affordable Housing Plan be submitted to the city and approved prior to the approval of the Subdivision Final approval. Ms. Woodbury explained, the applicant was currently working on their Affordable Housing Plan to make sure it worked correctly. Staff recommended allowing the project to move forward as they continued to work on their Affordable Housing Plan. The fourth condition was other conditions or changes as articulated by the Planning Commission. The fifth

condition was any conditions from other approving agencies, including any conditions from Wasatch County Fire (WCF) and WCF did have some conditions that were listed in the Staff Report.

Chairman Gunn asked the City Engineer, Ross Hansen, if he had anything to add. Mr. Hansen reiterated that there were two plats that would need to be amended in order for the subdivision to function. As Denna had mentioned, one was College Downs, which was already recorded and would need to be amended, and the other was the North Horizon Subdivision plat that would also need to be amended. Mr. Baron explained both amendments would need a separate application and would need a Public Hearing at the City Council because the application would be a Road Vacation. Mr. Hansen stated that Engineering had signed off on the Preliminary Plat seeing the project as doable and feasible. The Engineer representing the project, Mr. Paul Watson, commented that they had planned to submit separate submittals for the North Horizon and the College Downs Plat Amendments. The applicant commented, their goal was to run both of the Plat Amendments concurrently, perhaps before the agreement, but they would move forward with both of those applications.

Motion: Commissioner Slagowski moved to approve the Subdivision Preliminary for Mayflower Views (Formerly North Village Views) with the findings and conditions presented in the Staff Report. Commissioner Royall made the second.

Discussion: N/A

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

4. Work Meeting:

I. CHOZ Update (Jacob)

Jacob Roberts explained the Staff Report. Please refer to the 08.11.2026 Staff Report, PowerPoint and Video for additional information through this link: <https://hebercityut.portal.civicclerk.com/event/482/overview> , Mr. Roberts explained he would be discussing 14 changes to the Central Heber Overlay Zone (CHOZ). (It was actually twelve changes and two proposals). There would be two types of changes; clerical changes and substantive changes. However, Mr. Roberts began by highlighting the CHOZ projects so far and explained he had spoken to dozens of different people about dozens of different properties within CHOZ, but only three official applications had been submitted. One of the applicants was in the chambers to listen to the discussion. Mr. Roberts explained, the applicant in the Chambers had applied for the first CHOZ application, which was a double flag lot. Mr. Roberts went on to explain the project and that it was almost complete, and it had allowed a lady to sell off a portion of her lot to assist her with her retirement financial plan and it enabled her to keep her

home and stay in Heber City, Additionally, the same project allowed a younger couple to purchase the other portion of the lot and also stay in Heber City.

Mr Roberts explained that so far, the few applications submitted had been successful, and it had been fun to be a part of a unique challenge that was a huge benefit to the community who were able to take advantage of CHOZ and what it offers. However, there had been some unexpected problems and Mr. Roberts stated he wanted to streamline the CHOZ process and help it to be more easily understood and that was the plan for the evening. After CHOZ was adopted last summer, the Council directed staff to revisit the ordinance in one year and recommend necessary changes.

- There were two types of changes:

1. Clerical Changes: Changing wording or formatting without changing the meaning or intent.
2. Substantive Changes: Changing the meaning of portions of the ordinance to allow different things or allow CHOZ to function better.

The first change was regarding permitted and conditional use chart and was a substantive category.

The chart had been organized into two sections and there were a couple of changes in each section. The first change was to strike out no fast food and Mr. Roberts' reasoning behind that was that the council's intention was to avoid drive-throughs and large queuing of cars and vehicles downtown. Alleviating drive-throughs would achieve that goal. Because if the change would be no fast food, that would run the risk of cutting out small businesses. In other words, a burger shop may not be allowed, and a small restaurant may not be allowed and that is not the intent of the zone. The intent was to ensure that businesses were oriented towards walkability and small scale businesses instead of a large commercial restaurant with a drive-through.

Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The second change was regarding Spatial Standards and was a clerical category.

The Current Zoning Text read:

A. The minimum spatial standards shall be as set forth in the underlying zone, with the addition of Small Lots, Flag lots and SDUs, and described below.

B. The maximum height of all principal structures shall be thirty-five feet and accessory buildings shall follow the requirements of the underlying zone.

The proposed change read:

A. Spatial standards for all building typologies allowed by this ordinance are outlined below. Any development approved with the underlying zoning must use the spatial standards of that zone. Mr. Roberts suggested adding the height information to the existing chart under Max Height.

Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The third change was under Building Typologies & Design Requirements and was a

clerical category.

The current ordinance text read: Utilities normally found above ground are not required to be placed underground unless located directly adjacent to existing underground utilities. Curb, gutter, and sidewalk are not required except along and between 100 East and 100 West, where diagonal street parking is encouraged where it can be accommodated. Curb, gutter, and sidewalk shall also be required along current and proposed Collector Roads according to the current adopted Transportation Master Plan. Sidewalks or agreements to provide sidewalks in the future are required in all other locations where street frontage is disrupted.

The Proposed Ordinance Text suggestion was:

- Utilities normally found above ground are not required to be placed underground unless located directly adjacent to existing underground utilities.
- Curb, Gutter and Sidewalks
 1. Curb, gutter, and sidewalk are not required except along and between 100 East and 100 West, where diagonal street parking is encouraged where it can be accommodated.
 2. Curb, gutter, and sidewalk shall also be required along current and proposed Collector Roads according to the current adopted Transportation Master Plan.
 3. Sidewalks or agreements to provide sidewalks in the future are required in all other locations where street frontage is disrupted.

Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The fourth and fifth change was under: Building Typologies & Design Standards (E Special Standards for Uses and Structures) Continued and was a clerical category. See Current Ordinance Text and proposed Ordinance Text through this link:

<https://hebercityut.portal.civicclerk.com/event/482/overview>

Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The sixth change was under: Building Typologies & Design Standards (E Special Standards for Uses and Structures) Continued and was a substantive category. See Current Ordinance Text through this link:

<https://hebercityut.portal.civicclerk.com/event/482/overview>

The proposed Ordinance Text is listed here:

9. Undergrounding of powerlines is not required.

10. ADU's in the CND are permitted to be between the home and the street on corner lots.

- Must be setback 15' from right-of-way
- May not be located in the visibility sight triangle.

11. 50% of available on-street parking may be counted for developments in CHOZ.
 12. Double flag lots and SDU's are permitted to be rental units if the owner of that unit lives in the other dwelling. (Wording needs work)
- Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The seventh and eighth changes were regarding Small Lots and was a clerical & substantive category.

The Current Ordinance Text read: Small lots. ~~Smaller lots than the standard lot size required in the R-2 and R-3 zones are allowed as follows:~~

1. Such interior lots may have a width no less than 40' at the front yard setback and, if located on a corner, 50' wide.
2. Any street-facing garage shall be setback from the front face of the dwelling by at least ten feet.
3. Lots with a detached rear yard garage are required to have a minimum of twelve (12') foot side yard from the side property line, to accommodate a driveway to the required rear parking. The opposite side yard setback is a minimum of six (6) feet.
4. A minimum lot size of 3,500 square feet is required.

The suggested Proposed Ordinance Text read: Small lots:

1. Such interior lots may have a width no less than 40' at the front yard setback and if located on a corner, 50' wide.
2. Any street-facing garage shall be setback from the front face of the dwelling by at least ten feet.
3. Lots with a detached rear yard garage are required to have a minimum twelve (12') foot side yard from the side property line, to accommodate a driveway to the required rear parking. The opposite side yard setback is a minimum of six (6) feet.
4. A minimum lot size of 3,500 square feet is required.

5. ***The maximum size for a small lot is the minimum lot size in the underlying zone in which it is located.***

Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The ninth change was regarding Flag Lots and was a substantive category.

The Current Ordinance Text read: The existing front lot shall meet the required lot area, lot width, front yard, side and rear yard setback requirements for the governing zoning district in which it is located.

The proposed Ordinance Text read: The existing front lot shall meet the required lot area, lot width, front yard, side and rear yard setback requirements for the ***small lots which are permitted by this ordinance.***

Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The tenth change was regarding Subordinate Dwelling Units (SDU) (3.a) and was a

clerical category.

The Current Ordinance Text read: Standards: The following standards and conditions shall apply to all SDUs:

- a. Location: A SDU shall only be allowed as part of, or in conjunction with, a single-household dwelling, and SDUs shall not exceed 25' in height and shall have minimum side and rear yard of 5 feet or as allowed by Building Code standards. The front yard shall have a minimum of 10' unless adjacent to a street or alley, where 15' minimum is required.

The Proposed Ordinance Text read: Standards: The following standards and conditions shall apply to all SDUs:

a. Location: A SDU shall only be allowed as part of, or in conjunction with, a single-household dwelling, and SDUs shall not exceed 25' in height and shall have minimum side and rear yard of 5 feet ~~or as allowed by Building Code standards~~. The front yard shall have a minimum of 10' unless adjacent to a street or alley, where 15' minimum is required.

Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The eleventh change was regarding Subordinate Dwelling Units (SDU) (6) and was a clerical category.

- The Current Ordinance Text read: Foundation: The SDU shall be secured to a permanent concrete foundation in accordance with the international Building Code, as adopted and amended by the city

Mr Roberts suggested: This section would be removed as the building code would not permit a residence to be built without a foundation. The foundation is inspected as part of the building permit process.

Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The twelfth change was regarding Mixed-Use Buildings. (1) and was a clerical category.

- The Current Ordinance Text read: Intended for a mix of primarily residential with commercial/office or commercial and office uses required to be located on the first floor, and optional above the first floor at or near the front build-to-line with parking to the rear, underground, or podium type. No podium parking is allowed to front a street. This building type may support office, retail, hotel/hospitality or residential uses mixed vertically.
- The Proposed Text read: This building type is intended for mixed-use development that combines residential uses with commercial and/or office uses. Commercial and office uses shall be located on the first floor and may also be

located on upper floors. Buildings shall be located at or near the front build-to-line, with parking located to the rear, underground, or within a parking podium. Podium parking shall not front a street. This building type may accommodate residential, office, retail, and hotel/hospitality uses in a vertical mixed-use building.

- Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The thirteenth change was not a change but was a suggestion and was regarding Cottage Courts and was in the substantive category.

This category did not exist previously but was a suggestion for Missing Middle Housing Type:

- This is a missing middle housing type that could be added to the CHOZ.
- A small cluster of small homes around a shared green space
- Central Neighborhoods District
- Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

The fourteenth change was also not a change but a suggestion for Courtyard Apartments and was in the substantive category.

This category did not exist previously but was also a suggestion for Missing Middle Housing Type:

- This is a missing middle housing type that could be added to the CHOZ.
- A medium-to-large sized (1 to 3.5- story*) detached structure consisting of multiple side-by-side and/or stacked dwelling units oriented around a courtyard or series of courtyards.
- Transition Corridors District
- Mr. Roberts received feedback from the Planning Commission, which he would use to create the suggested changes and language and bring the information back to the Planning Commission at a later date.

5. Administrative Items:

I. City Council Communication Item

The City Council Communication Item was cancelled,

6. Adjournment:

Motion: Board Member Broughton moved to Adjournment:. Commissioner Slagowski made the second.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Commissioner Slagowski, Commissioner Jordan, Commissioner Royall, Board Member Broughton, Commissioner Goodnough. **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 5-0.

Meshelle Kijanen
Meshelle Kijanen, Administrative Assistant