

**HEBER CITY CORPORATION  
75 North Main Street  
Heber City, UT 84032  
Heber City Council Meeting  
February 10, 2026**

**Approved 03.10.2026**

**6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting**

**1. Regular Meeting:**

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Phil Jordan called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:04 p.m., welcomed everyone present and congratulated Tori Broughton and Greg Royall for the new six-year appointment to the Planning Commission.

**Planning Commission Present:** Chairperson Phil Jordan  
Vice-Chair Tori Broughton  
Commissioner Dave Richards  
Commissioner Darek Slagowski  
Commissioner Robert Wilson  
Commissioner Greg Royall  
Commissioner Robert Mckinley

**Planning Commission Absent:** Commissioner Josh Knight

**Staff Present:** Community Development Director Tony Kohler  
Planning Manager Jamie Baron  
Deputy City Recorder Robin Raines-Bond  
City Engineer, Ross Hanson

**Staff Participating Remotely:**

**Also Present:** Canyon, Park Record, Richard Mendenhall and Thomas Lehnardt

**Also Attending Remotely:** Aubrey Larsen, LDI

II. Roll Call

III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Commissioner Dave Richards led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Prayer/Thought by Invitation ( )

Commissioner Broughton gave a thought on Small Towns and Growth.

V. Recuse for Conflict of Interest N/A

## 2. Consent Agenda:

### I. January 27, 2026, PC Minutes for Approval

Commissioner Broughton corrected one item in the minutes. Chairperson Jordan was absent from the meeting. Commissioner Broughton motioned to approve the minutes with the correction. Commissioner McKinley seconded the motion.

**Motion:** Vice Chair Broughton moved to approve January 27, 2026, PC Minutes for Approval. Commissioner McKinley made the second.

**Discussion:** N/A

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

## 3. Action Items:

### I. Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit approval for New London North Commercial Development Lot 1 Pad A, located at 908 North US-40 (Planner Aubrey Larsen/Engineer Ross Hansen)

City Planner Ms. Aubrey Larsen presented the Staff Report as included in the meeting materials. The project is located at 908 North, US 40, and the New London Commercial Development Lot 1 Pad A is a Commercial Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit application. The building is approximately 6,000 square feet and is a Commercial Multi-Tenant building. Included with this application is off-site utility and parking lot dry vial improvements that will also be utilized by future phases to ensure good circulation. The application is before the Planning Commission because it meets a definition in your code for Commercial Complex, Lot two pad B also meets this definition. It's defined as two or more commercial uses on a single lot or adjacent lots that share parking, circulation, landscaping, or are approved together under a Conditional Use or Subdivision application. Lot one, pad A, is a Multi-Tenant building and also meets that definition.

The General Plan designation for the site is Scenic Buffer and the zoning is Mixed-Use for Residential Commercial. The one lot is just over one acre. The adjacent lots include a vacant lot to the north, developing to the south is a commercial lot near the new Smiths, to the east is also a developing lot and to the west is Highway 40. The vicinity map shows some additional context where you can see the site location off US highway 40 and 900 north, which is also Heritage Farms Parkway, Smiths is to the south.

Additional background: Lot 1 Pad A is part of the New London North Commercial Subdivision. This is a four-lot Mixed-Use project. It is a corner site, and the building is approximately 5,584 square feet. It is a Multi-Tenant project, and it also shares parking and circulation with pad B, which is part of lot 2.

The Engineering Review for this application required several rounds of clarification and

revisions regarding site boundaries and legal descriptions, easements and utility connections, circulation and drainage. Also assuring there was consistency with plan details across all sheets. The Wasatch County Fire Review required some adjustments to the hydrant placement as well as a secondary access connection. The Planning Review focused on landscaping, site furnishings, trash enclosure details and lighting.

The applicant was asked to provide some additional information regarding lighting, including an updated photometric plan, fixture schedule, and assuring they used black fluted poles per City Standards. After multiple rounds of reviews, the site plan generally meets requirements for approval subject to findings and conditions. Ms. Larsen then went over documents that had been submitted by the applicant. Please see meeting materials with audio/video at [heberut.gov](http://heberut.gov) under Agendas and minutes.

Staff recommends that the new London North Commercial Development lot 1 pad A Site Plan be approved by the Planning Commission subject to the following findings and conditions. Findings are that the application is consistent with the Municipal Zoning Code, the application is consistent with the General Plan. Conditions include all requirements of the City Engineer be met including the applicant and the [National Association of Corrosion Engineers \(NACE\)](#) assessors. This project shall comply with all City policies, processes, ordinances, standards, and specifications. Water rights will be required for landscaping and indoor use as part of the building permit process. Subdivision plat needs to be recorded with appropriate bonding in place or fully constructed prior to any building permits being issued on this site. All other code requirements shall be met and any other conditions or changes as articulated by this body.

Ms. Larsen then highlighted the Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for New London North Commercial Development Pad B, located at 948 N US 40 combining Action Items 1 and 2. The applications were similar, so highlights were minimal. Lot B is slightly to the north of pad A, the address is 948 North, and the description is the same. It also meets the definition for a Commercial Complex and the acreage is slightly smaller at 0.92 acres. The adjacent uses are similar and also part of the larger new London North Subdivision project. Pad B has the same Zoning and General Plan Designation, with a very similar background. The Engineering Review was the same. Additionally, the site plan, plat, title, and legal descriptions, are in coordination with the approved Subdivision Plat. Plat labeling, square footage, and utility details were shown in accordance with Heber City Standard Drawings. There were some comments from Wasatch County Fire regarding hydrant placement. Elevations are similar but slightly different material composition. Staff's recommendation is identical to Pad A.

The applicant, Thomas Lehnardt explained he was from WPI which had completed a lot of Commercial Development projects up and down the Wasatch Front. Mr. Lehnardt explained they were happy to be before the Planning Commission with this application and anxious to proceed with the rest of the development as it would fill out the entirety of the New London project.

Chairperson Jordan asked the Commissioners for any comments. Commissioner Dave Richards commented about the electrical boxes that can be seen by the public as they travel to the back side of the buildings on Heritage Road, but the comment was just as a general note as Commissioner Richards understood that the applicant had met their obligations. Chair Jordan agreed that the issue was not a non-compliance issue for the applicant but asked City Manager Mr. Jamie Baron his thoughts on the 360 degree view.

Mr. Baron agreed that the current planning allows for what is proposed. However, the question is, as a Planning Commission, do you agree that we're going in the right direction or do you feel like we need to make a change to where more buildings front the street and have more of a street presence? If that's the direction you want to go, the Planning Commission just needs to let Staff and that is something we could work on.

Commissioner Richards responded that the way the traffic flow is set is great. However, we are designing buildings where everyone is going to see the backside of the building, so how do we make the backside of the buildings look more pleasing? Commissioner Richards continued, the front side looks great, all the storefronts with glass and the sides look good. Unfortunately, the side most people are going to see is the south side (back of the building), which isn't going to be the best aesthetic look. What do we do to make sure that all sides of buildings look pleasing as we move forward?

Commissioner Robert Wilson agreed with Commissioner Richards stating that was the first thing he thought of when he saw the renderings from the backside of the building which would be facing the street and realized we would have another case where the electrical boxes are seen, just as Chair Jordan had mentioned earlier. Commissioner Wilson continued that the area is a corridor view entering Heber City, and hoped that the Planning Commissioners would give the issue some thought.

Vice Chair Tori Broughton asked if the issue was coming from not having parking lots in the front. Mr. Baron responded from a design standpoint, we have parking in the rear that's generally where they put the front door. Also, when you see a building like this that has a drive-through, they usually won't put anything but maybe a service door in the rear. Mr. Baron continued, I've also seen some communities that will still put parking on the side of the rear and still require a front entrance. It does get challenging with certain uses, but this is something Staff can address as there are at least four Planning Commissioners saying this is something we want to revisit.

Commissioner Greg Royall asked if the back of the store could mimic the front of the store, showing what they were selling.

Commissioner Derak Slagowski gave an example of some buildings on main street, where they have glass in the front and then parking spaces in front of the glass. The business has blacked out the glass where they have a kitchen and the occupants enter from the other side.

Vice Chair Broughton asked about signage. Mr. Baron responded that there is typically one primary sign for the building, if that is on the front then the other side, or the back, would have a secondary sign which would be smaller in nature.

Chair Jordan asked a follow-up question about the signs, but the answer from the Applicant was inaudible.

Vice Chair Broughton asked if the applicant had any other buildings in another market that are similar that the Planning Commission could look at on Google? The Applicant again responded but again inaudible.

Commissioner Robert McKinley asked, would any degree of landscaping in any way ameliorate the problem of just the starkness of looking at backs and sides of these buildings? Applicant's response was once again inaudible. Commissioner McKinley asked a follow up question but again the applicant was inaudible.

Commissioner Richards commented that he could see the landscape drawings but mentioned it would be nice to see some elevations of what the street would look like. Commissioner Richards wanted to move forward but wanted to set a condition for a landscape plan and also elements on the elevations so the building looks more pleasing to the eye.

Chair Jordan asked if there would be a marquee sign? Mr. Baron responded that there was currently not a marquee sign but a sign would be a separate application and the applicant may ask for a marquee sign.

Chair Jordan stated that the Planning Commission is mindful that the project is located at what is considered the "front door" of the City. He expressed appreciation for the applicant's efforts to ensure the project complies with both the Commission's standards and the City's standards. He noted that the Commission is becoming increasingly sensitive to the significance of this area as infill development continues, emphasizing that these properties now represent a primary gateway into the community. Chair Jordan explained that as the Commission evaluates properties at both ends of the City's "front doors," including the south end of the City and areas extending further into the North Village. He indicated that consideration should be given to ensuring that the buildings present well and reflect positively on the City as prominent entry points.

Commissioner Richards motioned to approve two separate motions under one verbiage. The New London Lot 1A and Lot 2B as presented with the finding and conditions in the Staff Report. Presented as two findings and three conditions. Under the third condition which is any condition articulated by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission requests that the applicant present elevations of the landscape on the south side of Lot 1A. Commissioner Slagowski made a second to the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Baron asked if the Planning Commission condition needed to come back to a Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Richards clarified that the

condition only needed to be presented to Staff. There was some audible from the applicant but was inaudible.

All Commissioners said aye to the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

- II. Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit approval for New London North Commercial Development Pad B, located at 948 North US-40 (planner Aubrey Larsen/Engineer Ross Hansen)

This Action Item was discussed and motion made with Action Item number one.

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

- I. Trailhead Plaza Discussion (Development Director Tony Kohler)

Community Development Director Tony Kohler informed the Planning Commission about the three open houses for the Trailhead Plaza. He also talked about a survey, available, February 18, 2026, for the Trailhead Plaza.

##### Open Houses

Feb. 21 11-2 pm PD Community Room

Feb. 26 10-1 pm Wasatch County Rec. Center

Feb. 26 4-7 pm JR Smith Elementary

Commissioner Broughton asked about the facts of the project. Mr. Kohler would get the commission the information and main talking points.

Chairperson Jordan officially requested the information.

Mr. Kohler told the commissioners to look at the three alternatives for the Main Street Park and to consider the revenue that could be generated with the improvement for the park.

Commissioner Richards asked about the UDOT open house results. Mr. Kohler said some people do not want the bypass, but most people see the need.

Mr. Kohler shared the Park Record copy of the PowerPoint for the Main Street Park options. More improvements also mean more revenue generated. Fewer improvements cost less, but generate less income for the investment in the park.

Commissioner Royall asked who would maintain the Main Street Park. Mr. Kohler said the city would do some maintenance, and contractors would do specialty maintenance - such as the ice rink. CAMS (the Community Alliance for Mainstreet) would handle daily programming of the park and basic cleaning.

Commissioner Broughton asked how long before the park would be self-sufficient. Mr. Kohler said it depended on which plan was chosen. Commissioner Richards said it was key to bring people downtown and have them spend more money downtown. The driver for improving the park was to bring people downtown to spend their money. He asked about the fire and health requirements for the different buildings in the park.

Chairperson Jordan defined the different event permits for the park — small to large event and the risk management needed.

Commissioner Wilson asked about parking for the Main Street Park. Mr. Kohler discussed public parking areas. He talked about the areas near the park, and within the few blocks of the park — the Police Department, City Hall, purchasing the Wave and Old Heber Fire Station blocks. Long term, years down the road, there could be a parking garage.

Commissioner Wilson asked if parking and landscaping around the areas would be part of the park's cost. Mr. Kohler explained they were working on several parking solutions with neighboring businesses and residents.

Chair Jordan requested Budget initiatives and priorities for the City Council.

Mr. Kohler informed the Planning Commission that this item would be coming back to the Planning Commission with a presentation in a month.

## **5. Administrative Items:**

Chairperson Jordan asked that the Planning Commission have their annual training for public meetings compliance rules through the City Attorney Jeremy Cook. Chair Jordan also discussed a confidential form that needed to be signed and turned into the City Attorney once a year regarding potential conflicts of interest, including business's the Planning Commission are involved with and also their volunteer activities.

- I. Planning Commission Training  
<https://luau.utah.gov/>

Commissioners were encouraged to do training on the website at their own pace.

Training for open meetings requested from City Attorney Jeremy Cook.

## **6. Adjournment:**

**Motion:** Commissioner Darek Slagowski moved to adjourn, Commissioner Greg Royall made a second to the motion

**Discussion:** N/A

**Voting Yes:** 7. **Voting No:** 0. The Motion passed 7-0.

---

Meshelle Kijanen

Meshelle Kijanen, Administrative Assistant