

HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, UT 84032
Heber City Council Meeting
July 25, 2023

Approved Minutes 09.12.2023

6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

1. Regular Meeting:

I. Call to Order

Chairman Gunn called the Work Meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. and welcomed everyone present.

II. Roll Call

Present: **Planning Commission**
Chairman Dennis Gunn
Vice-Chairman Dave Richards
Commissioner Phil Jordan
Commissioner Robert Wilson
Commissioner Sid Ostergaard

Staff: Planning Manager Jamie Baron
Planner Jacob Roberts
Assistant City Recorder, Robin Raines
Consultant GCGarcia
City Engineer, Gordon Miner

Public: Shawn Kelly, Paul Berg

Online: N/A

III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Phil Jordan led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Recuse for Conflict of Interest

There were none.

2. Action Items:

I. Request for a Site Plan approval for Wasatch School Site, located at 300 North 1000 West (Planner Woodbury/Engineer Miner)

Planner Woodbury indicated this was for the new Wasatch High School at 200 North

1000 West. She expressed it had gone through the annexation process already, and that evening, they would be discussing the site plan. She highlighted some key features of the site, including several athletic fields. She said the building took up about seven acres, with the parking taking an additional 17 acres. Planner Woodbury added there would be surrounding wetlands, which would be protected as part of the site plan, and said there were plans to construct and preserve a trail that ran through the protected space. She indicated also there were 1,066 parking spaces, which was in compliance with the Code, and summarized the Staff recommended approval, as long as conditions were met.

Paul Berg of Berg Engineering introduced himself and said he would speak on the school's behalf. He brought up the site plan and discussed some features, namely that they had preserved the creek, wetlands, and trees that surrounded the campus. He thought the corridor was a great amenity and made it a great high school. Mr. Berg also noted having MTech as a neighbor was a great thing for the valley as a whole, as well as for the school. He noted the plan followed the City's Master Plan and said they had worked closely with the City's Engineering Department to ensure it was not only a good school site but helpful for the City as a whole. He noted there were many trails around the public and private roads, which was also a great amenity to have for the school and the city.

Mr. Berg expressed that he was aware of the conditions handed out by the City and said they were working on them. He explained the school was a three-year build and reminded the Planning Commission they had three years to work on the conditions.

Commissioner Wilson asked if they needed to have so much parking, and asked if it was a condition. He pointed out some kids might ride a bike or walk to school, and thought there would be too much traffic. He wondered if they restricted parking, it might incentivize people to find alternative ways to school. Mr. Berg acknowledged this was a good point, however, he discussed this was the third high school he had designed and said he had found that the number of drivers increased throughout the year as the sophomore class got their licenses. Mr. Berg also pointed out there were events such as concerts, plays, and games throughout the year which required much more parking than normal. Commissioner Wilson discussed how bad the traffic was at other schools in the area, and Mr. Berg indicated on the site plan how they had tried to improve traffic circulation.

Mr. Berg reviewed the lighting plan. He said they had a photometric plan and that the lights they had selected for the parking lots and athletic fields were in compliance with Heber City's ordinance. He acknowledged there had been a discussion with the City about shoebox lighting but expressed his current plan had been approved by Staff.

Commissioner Jordan asked about one of the conditions, which was to obtain a permit from UDOT for State Road 113. He asked Mr. Berg what the plan for that area was.

Mr. Berg replied the original plan was to put in a stop light, although UDOT had expressed concerns about spacing of the lights and so they had requested a

roundabout to be installed. Mr. Berg clarified that it would be a single-lane roundabout and integrated well with the surrounding roads. Commissioner Jordan expressed some surprise that was the plan they had ended up with. City Engineer Funk said he had reached out to UDOT since the traffic study they had done indicated a double lane might be called for in the roundabout given the expected traffic volume. City Engineer Funk reported UDOT had told him they were still in the process of deciding if they wanted a single or double lane. Mr. Berg commented that UDOT had cited safety as the reason for doing just a single lane, even if it would create more traffic.

Commissioner Jordan said he was not opposed to roundabouts; he thought they helped mitigate speeding issues.

Commissioner Jordan noted there were 24 conditions and asked if Mr. Berg had issues with any of the conditions. Mr. Berg thought all the conditions made sense and added he thought most of them had been resolved. He said the only things that would be further down the road were the legal agreements. He said even though the legal conditions were probably about three years out from being finalized, they had already been drafted and were in the City Attorney's hands. City Engineer Funk agreed with Mr. Berg's comments. City Engineer Funk acknowledged 24 conditions were more than normal, but noted it was a large project and echoed Mr. Berg's comment that the legal conditions were being approved by the City Attorney. City Engineer Funk summarized he was comfortable moving forward with an approval that evening, even though they typically did not proceed without approval from UDOT.

Commissioner Richards motioned to approve the site plan; Commissioner Jordan seconded the motion. The Planning Commission unanimously voted to approve the site plan. [00:22:03]

II. Request for a Conditional Use Permit to relocate a building from 1350 Industrial Parkway to 1017 East 50 North (Planner Woodbury/Engineer Miner)

Planner Woodbury said this was a request to relocate a private residence as there was another project in use which would take place on the current site of the residence. She reported Staff found this to be an appropriate site for the relocation. She said it would be set on a full basement, and a garage and a covered front porch would be added to the building. Planner Woodbury stated the building would be 26 feet tall to the roof's peak. She clarified that although the plat plan showed a 25 foot setback, that was incorrect and the actual setback would be 30 feet, lining up with the setback of other properties on the street. She added one of the conditions was that the applicant had to submit a new site plan which showed the 30 foot setback, and said the new plan would have to be approved prior to the issuance of the building permit. She said another condition was requiring a traffic plan to address the traffic when the building was moved to its new location. She indicated the proposed relocation met the Code, and Staff recommended approval of the conditional use permit as long as the following findings and conditions were met. She stated the application had to be consistent with the Municipal Zoning Code and General Plan, and said the proposed conditional use would

have to comply with Federal and State law as well as City ordinance. She added there were five conditions set forth by the City Engineer which would have to be met as well.

Chairman Gunn clarified the building would be moved in one piece and said there were no obstacles to this. City Engineer Miner confirmed it would be lifted and moved across town. He explained there would be a traffic control plan and that would be coordinated with all utility companies or any other entities which may be impacted. City Engineer Miner said the plan was to do this as soon as possible. Mayor Gunn thought this seemed straightforward.

Commissioner Wilson moved to approve; Commissioner Richards seconded. The motion passed unanimously. [00:27:19]

City Engineer Miner noted a development was replacing the existing house, so the developers offered the house to the existing resident.

3. Administrative Items:

I. City Council Communication Item (Jamie Baron)

City Planner Baron summarized the July 18th Council meeting. He noted the Council had received the same Civic Clerk training that the Planning Commission had, and said they increased the supplemental zoning requirements as well. He reported they had also reviewed the Moderate Housing Plan action items before their response was sent to the State, and said Heber City was in line with the Moderate Housing Plan requirements. City Planner Baron added there had been a discussion about the future of Animal Control and how the governments worked together. He said they planned to go over parking and architecture for Colorado City. He added they had bumped the Envision Heber conversation to another meeting, so they would have more time to go over it. He added there had been an amendment to the Highlands development in order to accommodate the road layout, and briefly reviewed the changes. Chairman Gunn asked if there would be a presentation about what the Council had been shown, and City Planner Baron thought it would be better to save a presentation until more of the Commissioners were present. City Planner Baron added it was just 10-15 minutes, and said they could add it to a future agenda to watch when everyone was in attendance.

Commissioner Jordan commented the Staff Report was great, and said it captured the objectives well. He spoke about how the downtown would grow over time, and said the groundwork they were doing now would take years to be realized. He thought one of the most important pieces of this was parking, and discussed how the Planning Commission had dealt with some difficulties with parking, especially with new cities. He said other cities had dealt with these challenges by building a parking structure, and opined parking structures were a good public and private parking structures and a helpful revenue stream for the City. He added some parking structures were subtle and it was not even obvious that they were parking structures, so there were many options for design. He added they could even consider below ground parking structures.

Commissioner Richards agreed parking would be one of the biggest roadblocks to what they wanted to see, and thought that parking and then architecture were their two biggest things to consider. Commissioner Jordan thought Mayor Franco wanted the Planning Commission to focus on architecture, so that they were set up to accommodate the kind of businesses that they wanted to attract. He added they were subject to the Code, and so as long as a business met the Code the Planning Commission could not stop them from coming in, even if the developer did not match the aesthetic preferences of the City. The Commissioners agreed architecture was very subjective, so they needed to figure out what was best for Heber City and find parameters which made it unique and special without being too specific.

Chairman Gunn wondered if they should be more proactive, and look at things beyond what Staff brought to them. City Planner Baron said the Planning Commission could be as proactive as they wanted to, and said if they came across a piece of the Code that they felt needed to be adjusted or revisited they could do so at any time, even if it was not part of a current item up for discussion. City Planner Baron reminded them that although they were not a legislative body, they were a recommending body, and if the majority of the Planning Commission thought a piece of legislation needed to be reviewed they could do that. City Planner Baron did note that this was partially subject to the workload of Staff and Council as to how much they could get done.

II. Discuss Ogden APA Attendance

City Planner Baron announced the Fall Conference was coming up soon and shared the agenda. He said there was a portion dedicated to citizen planners, and said there were some classes geared towards Planning Commission members specifically. He shared the dates and times, and indicated the City would pay for the Commissioners to attend if they wanted to. He thought there was a special rate for the Planning Commissioners as well, and encouraged them all to attend. He noted the classes counted towards the Commissioner's training requirements put forth by the State.

City Planner Baron and Chairman Gunn briefly discussed their yearly training requirements, and City Planner Baron noted there was a portion of the training which needed to be geared towards land use. City Planner Baron explained they were happy to do some of the training in-house, and then there were other things such as the APA conference and League of Cities and Towns which would also count towards their training hours. Chairman Gunn asked if they could add training into meetings that had light agendas, and City Planner Baron said he would look into doing that. Chairman Gunn commented sometimes trainings got swept too far back and he expressed it was important they got to them throughout the year.

4. **Adjournment:**

Meshelle Kijanen, Planning Admin