

**HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, UT 84032
Heber City Council Meeting
August 22, 2023**

APPROVED September 26, 2023

6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

1. Regular Meeting:

I. Call to Order

Chairman Dennis Gunn called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. and welcomed everyone present.

II. Roll Call

Planning Commission Present:

Chairman Dennis Gunn
Commissioner Phil Jordan
Commissioner Josh Knight
Commissioner Sid Ostergaard
Commissioner Darek Slagowski
Commissioner Robert Wilson

Planning Commission Absent:

Staff Present:

Planning Director Tony Kohler
Planning Manager Jamie Baron
Planning Office Admin Meshelle Kijanen
Consultant Denna Woodbury with
GCGarcia.
City Engineer, Gordon Miner

Also Present:

Shelton Taylor, Kendell Crittenden, Russ
Watts, Rod Riddle, Piper Riddle, Weston
Broadbent, Ralph Ogilvie

Staff Participating Remotely: N/A

Also Attending Remotely: N/A

III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Planning Commissioner Phil Jordan led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Recuse for Conflict of Interest N/A

2. Consent Agenda:

- I. Meeting Minutes June 13, 2023, and July 11, 2023, for approval

Motion: Commissioner Knight moved to Meeting Minutes June 13, 2023, and July 11, 2023, for approval. Commissioner Jordan made the second.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Planning Commission Chairman Gunn, Commissioner Knight, Commissioner Jordan, Commissioner Wilson, Commissioner Slagowski, Commissioner Ostergaard. **Voting No:** None. The Motion Passed 6-0.

3. Action Items:

- I. Public Hearing for Celebration Workforce Housing MDA, located at approximately 300 E 1200 S

Planner Baron explained this was a public hearing considering the Celebration Workforce Housing Community. He said the questions that evening were if the City should amend the General Plan to allow for this development, or if they should use a development instead, and also if the City should allow for development within the airport overlay zone. Planner Baron then provided some background for the development and indicated it was in the C-2 zone, although Envision Heber identified this area as being suited for light manufacturing and tech businesses as well as commercial uses. He noted some of the issues were that the plan involved a density of 26.29 units per acre, although the General Plan called for less than that, and also that there was not supposed to be development within the airport overlay zone due to noise and safety issues. Planner Baron noted the apartments would be deed-restricted as affordable units and shared photos of the proposed development. He highlighted there was a hotel as well which was a conditional use, and also noted the buildings would all be three stories tall.

Chairman Gunn asked about the airport overlay zone and asked for clarification about the rule which prohibited residential housing. Planner Baron explained the airport overlay zone as well as the General Plan did not allow for residential development within the zone, so they would need to consider if they were willing to either amend the General Plan or enter into a MDA with the City to make an exception. Planner Baron elaborated the airport overlay zone was a City mandate, and not required by the FAA although it was recommended. He discussed there would need to be noticing that residents lived within the zone and the residents would need to acknowledge that they could not hold the City liable in any way. Chairman Gunn noted this was located near the Fire Station, and Planner Baron explained the Fire Station had been approved in the overlay zone since it was not considered to be residential even though some firefighters slept there.

Commissioner Knight asked if an MDA with the City opened them up to any issues, or if there were any other places a similar development could happen. Planner Baron

replied the MDA would be specific to this property, so it would not give anyone else the right to develop a similar development. Planner Baron elaborated if they did a text amendment to the General Plan then that would open them up to other similar concepts, although if they just did an MDA it would not work that way. Planner Baron explained other developers could request to do similar developments, although it would have to go through the full application process and would not be streamlined in any way if they were to move forward with this MDA. Commissioner Knight also clarified the building heights would be in compliance with what was specified by the airport overlay zone.

Commissioner Jordan asked what the rationale was, if any, behind having the units be only for rent without an option for ownership. The applicant, Mr. Russ Watts, came forward to address this question, and stated first that he appreciated the opportunity for the development to be considered by the Planning Commission. He discussed how about 70% of the people he worked with had to commute into the City, and something needed to be done to help the community. He explained he wanted to call it workforce housing rather than affordable housing, since affordable housing had connotations of being government subsidized and poorly managed. Mr. Watts expressed workforce housing helped unite a community and was important for the Valley. He clarified these units would be for lease to individuals, although major employers such as the School Board could purchase blocks of housing for their employees to rent. He emphasized it was important for people to be able to live and work in the same community and felt workforce housing was an effective way to do this. Mr. Watts expressed he was proud of the Valley and was interested to hear from a variety of entities that evening in the public hearing. He said they were trying to figure out how they could assist the City, and acknowledged that while his development would not solve everything, he felt it could help. He also cited the success of communities such as this one in other cities, including Tempe, Arizona, and he highlighted the advantage of having a walkable community.

Commissioner Jordan asked about the management plan for the rental properties. He added he was the president of his HOA which was why he was interested to know Mr. Watt's plan. Mr. Watts discussed the success of the development hinged on having master leases rather than selling the units, so his company could retain control of their ownership and management. Mr. Watts explained he wanted to have a system in place where the entities which signed master leases could have input as to the management, although at an upper level he wanted his company to retain control. He explained he did not want the uses to get away from his company, and he wanted to be able to determine who really needed the units. Mr. Watts said these were all things he was willing to have tied into the development agreement with the City. Commissioner Jordan thought this way they could have a clear hierarchy of who really needed this housing. Mr. Watts thought it was also helpful to have the master leasees have some say in the management, as this made them more involved in the project.

Planner Baron reiterated the density was higher than what was indicated in the General Plan, as it was in the range of 26 units per acre. Planner Baron advised the Planning

Commission to open the Public Hearing before they began deliberations.

Assistant Planning Office Manager, Meshelle Kijanen read aloud the regulations for the Public Hearing.

Chairman Gunn opened the Public Hearing.

Kendall Crittenden spoke on behalf of the Housing Authority and the County. He thought having the County might buy into this type of housing in the future and it could be a good thing, although he did think having an option for home ownership would be beneficial. He discussed the challenges of affording to live in the Valley and he agreed the master leases would be helpful for people finding employment within the City. Mr. Crittenden noted in regards to the airport overlay zone that the high school in the area was higher than the proposed buildings in the development, so he did not think there would be a significant issue. He hoped this could get worked out and the development could move forward.

Weston Broadbent spoke on behalf of the School District. He said the School District was the largest employer in the Valley and had a huge housing problem as far as their staffing was concerned. Mr. Broadbent discussed a program run by the high school in which students took a construction class and built a home over the course of the semester, and then sold the house at-cost to a teacher who needed it. However, he explained that last year their costs were not in-line with what teachers could afford. He said this year they were renting out a house to a teacher, and they were unsure what to do with the house long term. Mr. Broadbent expressed he was strongly in favor of the Celebration Workforce Development and said something like this would be a godsend to his teachers.

Commissioner Jordan asked if they had considered using the land that the School District owned to develop workforce housing, and Mr. Broadbent said they had had a couple conversations about this possibility, although they had not taken it further than some discussions. Commissioner Jordan noted this was something being done in other Counties, notably in South Summit. Commissioner Jordan thought it was a good case study and said there were developers out there who could get funding to do a project like that.

Piper Riddle spoke next. She said she was involved with IHC, and said she had not heard from any of the involved entities about a desire to be in the development business. She pointed out they had a valuable piece of donated land, and said IHC also had a parcel of land which needed to be developed. She expressed she wanted the Planning Commission to not miss any opportunities.

Ralph Ogilvie discussed how he had to block the point of egress from his property on school mornings due to how congested the traffic was during pick up and drop off. He worried that given the planned density for the new development that traffic would continue to be an issue, and he noted this was a significant safety concern. He

discussed he had witnessed many accidents and near-accidents due to the inundation of traffic during peak hours. Mr. Ogilvie clarified he was in support of the project overall; however, he thought the developer needed to take the flow of traffic into consideration as they moved forward. He also expressed concerns about the proposed density.

Chairman Gunn expressed how important it was to have their essential workers within Heber City. He discussed how he worked for the Fire District and it was a huge concern for them to have employees within the Valley. Chairman Gunn felt the way they were approaching affordable housing was a temporary solution to a permanent issue, and he asked all of the entities present that evening how they could fund things so people could afford to live in the Valley. He asked the audience if their teachers and Public Works employees should be paid more, and wondered if they could start some kind of fund to increase their wages so they would be able to afford to live in the area.

Chairman Gunn opined this development was something they desperately needed right now, although they needed to consider more long term solutions as well. Planner Kohler replied to these points and said they needed to do developments such as this one as well as try to find ways to increase wages.

Commissioner Ostergaard acknowledged Mr. Ogilvie's earlier comment about traffic and agreed it was very congested during the start and end of the school day. He asked if they could include a traffic study as part of the MDA, and determine if they needed to add lights or signs. Planner Baron noted it was within their purview to require a traffic study and this was something they could certainly include if they wanted to. Planner Baron acknowledged how much the traffic would increase on 1200 once the rental units and hotels went in as well. Commissioner Ostergaard commented it was important to be sensitive to the needs of Mr. Ogilvie and his neighbors who would be impacted by this development, and asked if they had final numbers yet for parking in the development. Planner Baron replied they did not have firm numbers yet, although he did not think they were overparked. Planner Baron added the concern was usually under parking if anything, and said they usually aimed to have two stalls per unit and one stall per hotel room. Commissioner Jordan also advocated they add a bus stop by the development as that would also substantially alleviate traffic concerns.

Ms. Riddle echoed the traffic concerns voiced by Mr. Ogilvie. She reminded the Commission that the School District had recently broken down on a new school site which would increase traffic as well. Ms. Riddle agreed that they needed to increase the pay for essential workers, but urged the Commission not to put the burden of this increase on taxpayers. She recalled there had been a lot of opposition to the tax increase at the recent Truth in Taxation meeting, and pointed out many wage increases were at the cost of the taxpayer, many of whom also struggled to afford the cost of living in the Valley. Chairman Gunn agreed with these points although noted Heber City was already one of the highest paying districts in the State.

Commissioner Wilson asked for clarification as to why there was a hotel as part of the workforce housing development, and inquired as to what its purpose was. He also

reiterated the sentiments about increased traffic and concerns about congestion. Mr. Watts addressed these questions, and explained the hotel was intended for people who would be working in the area for an extended period of time. Mr. Wilson clarified people staying in the hotel would have to prove in some way that they were working for a long period of time and Mr. Watts confirmed that was correct.

Chairman Gunn noted while they required each development to consider traffic, he wondered if they needed to do more as a City to manage traffic. He noted even if each development only increased traffic a little bit, all of the developments as a whole had a more substantial impact on the flow of traffic. Chairman Gunn asked what they could do as a City to study traffic increases, and Planner Baron explained traffic studies were holistic in that they considered both the development in question as well as current and planned developments in the vicinity.

Commissioner Knight asked about the master lease agreements, and he expressed curiosity about the breakdown of how the company would determine rates. He wondered what these rates would be based on, and if it would be a flat rate for all or determined by income. Mr. Watts explained he had worked with the state of Utah to come up with rates, and explained it would be based on 60% of the median income.

Mr. Watts said they were still working on developing rates and he did not have any firm numbers at this time. Commissioner Knight circled back to Commissioner Ostergaard's comments about home ownership, and acknowledged it was much more difficult to buy a home now compared to several years ago. Commissioner Knight expressed he thought 60% of median income was acceptable, and voiced agreement that they needed to pay teachers much more. Commissioner Knight confirmed this was strictly for middle working class and Mr. Watts clarified that it was. Mr. Watts agreed this would be a process and noted the interest rate was currently at 8%.

Commissioner Knight also expressed that he was happy to see Mr. Watt's company was behind the development and felt assured his team would do a good job designing the buildings. Commissioner Knight spoke about how no one could have predicted what Covid-19 would have done to the community, and thought a development such as this put them in the right direction.

Chairman expressed that he felt a lot of people had stepped up to the plate with this project and now it was the Planning Commission's time.

Commissioner Jordan made a motion to forward a positive recommendation of the Celebration Workforce development to City Council with the findings and conditions as outlined in the report, namely that the apartment rental units be deed-restricted as affordable, the streetlights be amended in order to be in compliance with their Lighting Code, and that a traffic study be required and an in-depth review of the study be considered with the understanding of the safety issues given the current population.

Commissioner Jordan added that there be new options for the master leases to be monitored and reviewed as well as that they understand there is only one property management for this development. He lastly noted that they also reach out to High

Valley for opportunities as far as transit and traffic circulation was concerned. Commissioner Knight seconded and the motion carried.

The Commissioner thanked Mr. Watts for his work and wished him good luck with the continuation of the development.

II. Request for Site Plan approval for New London South Pad, located at 900 North Highway 40 (Planner LDI/Engineer Horrocks)

Planner Aubrey Larsen explained this item was the site plan approval for a proposed development located at 900 North Highway 40. She explained the site plan, and noted this would be a multi-tenant development and oriented the Planning Commission to the location of the site on 900 North Highway 40. She noted the nearby buildings and businesses as well.

Planner Larsen recalled the site plan had first been presented at the July 12th Planning Commission meeting, and said at that time the Planning Commission and Staff had requested some revisions and clarifications, and she reported the applicant and since come back and addressed all of those things. Specifically, she indicated the applicant had clarified the use would be retail and possibly a restaurant, and had also provided justification about how many parking stalls were included, although she specified they did need additional clarification about the actual number of stalls. She also expressed the applicant had clarified some design details and had given details of the trash enclosure.

Planner Larsen summarized that Staff recommended approval as the application was consistent with the General Plan, and outlined four new findings and conditions as follows: that an updated site plan be submitted with the current number of parking stalls, all requirements of City Engineer be met, all Code requirements be met, and all stipulations put forth by the Planning Commission be met as well.

Planner Larsen shared drawings of the overall site plan and highlighted some key features, namely where parking would be located. She also shared the table from their ordinance which explained how many parking stalls were required for developments.

She also indicated the landscaping plan and and some drawings of the trash enclosure and indicated the elevations. She reiterated this was all in accordance with their Code.

Chairman Gunn invited the applicant to speak, and the applicant introduce himself although his name was inaudible. The applicant expressed confusion as to where 33 parking stalls had come from, and clarified they intended to have 19 parking stalls with the site. The applicant added they had an underlying declaration with Smith's and planned on sharing some of the parking with them.

Commissioner Wilson asked for clarification about the back entrance, and if it would be used exclusively for deliveries, to which the applicant explained it was intended to be an end-cap drive through. Commissioner Wilson mentioned that in general, the City had

not been allowing new developments to have drive-ups since they constricted traffic and he wondered if the U-shaped drive through would work since the development was located off of 40, which was a busy road. Commissioner Knight pointed out that the closest entrance and exit were farther down and did not empty out onto 40, although he agreed with Commissioner Wilson's concerns about traffic piling up due to the U drive through. The applicant clarified the U shaped drive through would only be for one business, which should prevent queuing issues.

Commissioner Jordan spoke about the architecture for the proposed development and asked if it matched the aesthetic of the surrounding area. He pointed out it was the beginning of their City and it was important to keep a cohesive design. Commissioner Knight noted that it had a similar design to the nearby Smith's market. The applicant confirmed they had pulled inspiration from Smith's in their design, and said it had been coordinated with Smith's at the time the deal had been made. The applicant continued that the concept of the architecture was to attempt to blend traditional retail frontage for signage purposes while keeping a more modern feel. The applicant added that any architecture in the future would match this design concept as well.

Commissioner Jordan then addressed drive throughs, although Planner Baron explained the C-3 zone, which was their primary downtown zone, did not allow for drive throughs. Commissioner Jordan also inquired about the front elevation, and Planner Larsen noted she could get more information for him in that regard since the presentation that evening only had a screenshot from the site plan discussing the elevations of the buildings.

The applicant also commented on the materials they were planning to use as well, and specifically noted there would be a corrugated metal panel canopy extending from the front of the buildings. Commissioner Slagowski opined he did not like how plain the back of the buildings were, though acknowledged this was standard for retail buildings and it was not a huge issue. However, Commissioner Ostergaard felt that since it was a standalone building, all four sides should be considered. Commissioner Ostergaard proposed some metal panels be added in order to break up the building and add visual interest. The Commissioners briefly discussed other buildings in Heber which were boring to look at from the back. Commissioner Wilson asked about signage, and the applicant replied they were being cognizant to keep all the signs uniform throughout the building as far as size was concerned. The applicant added they required all their tenants to submit signage plans for approval before they put anything up. Planner Baron also commented the City had a detailed sign ordinance which had standards the tenants would all have to adhere to. The applicant added that signage would only be allowed on the west side, and said there could be a separate monument sign which listed all of the tenants, if that was something the Commission wanted to include. Planner Baron noted per their ordinance, only the corner tenant would be allowed to have signage on two sides of the building.

Commissioner Knight moved to approve the request for the site plan approval as presented, with the findings and conditions as presented by Staff. Chairman Gunn

clarified that the parking stall requirement was in the condition. Commissioner Ostergaard suggested that a shared parking agreement be added to the site plan for clarity for the tenants, and Commissioner Knight added this to the motion.

Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion, and Chairman Gunn asked if there was any discussion about the motion as it stood.

Commissioner Jordan asked how outdoor seating would be addressed, and specifically asked if there was sufficient outdoor seating as they wanted to encourage people to be outside. The applicant replied they did provide some outdoor seating, particularly for the tenants on the end caps. The applicant also mentioned the U-shaped drive through included an outdoor patio.

Commissioner Knight stated his motion still stood, and the motion passed.

4. Work Meeting:

I. Discuss Master Development Agreement (MDA) proposal for the Wasatch County Event Center grounds.

Planner Kohler explained they would be discussing a new cowboy camp at the Wasatch County Event Grounds and shared the vicinity map to orient the Commission.

He explained there were some noncompliance issues with various aspects of the Event Center, and so the City had decided to form an MDA with them which recognized the nonconformity to the City Code. Planner Kohler listed the issues as follows: the street cross section did not include an eight-foot planter, the fence along 650 South did not include a transparent section for visibility, the masonry fence in the right of way was only six feet rather than the required eight, the internal roads were not hard surfaced, and it was unclear if it was Dark Sky compliant.

Commissioner Knight asked if there had been communication between the City and County about this, and Planner Kohler summarized that there had not been much communication due to the County having to meet a tight deadline to get the Event Center completed in time for a rodeo. Planner Kohler added that while he imagined the County had good reasons for rushing construction as they had, the City had adopted the Public Facility Zone with certain standards and assumed the County would eventually comply, though they had not. Planner Kohler hoped the County would better comply with their standards in the future. Chairman Gunn opined he was not upset about the fencing since it was temporary, although he thought the County should do a better job in complying with landscaping standards. Planner Baron agreed, and expressed he was hoping for an eight-foot planter and a five-foot sidewalk with some trees. Planner Baron specified the City had been intending for the County to match how they had landscaped the surrounding roads.

Planner Kohler summarized that he thought retroactively asking for compliance would not be successful, but thought they could at least do some mitigation now. Chairman Gunn requested they show a plan view and Planner Baron pulled up a visual. Chairman Gunn thought the project looked incomplete. Planner Baron expressed the

Planning Commission should come up with a list of questions for the County for when County representatives came to the Commission meeting, and he added his main concerns were about safety issues in regards to the train tracks. Planner Baron clarified the train was actually managed by UDOT. Commissioner Wilson added the visibility concerns at the Event Center were not just for traffic, but pedestrian visibility as well as people walked back to their cars after large events.

Planner Kohler discussed the meetings he had held with the County, and recalled that at their last meeting he and the City Manager had walked the County representatives through their standards and explained how the center did not comply with them.

Planner Kohler reported that at the time of that meeting, which he thought was around May of that year, the County representatives had expressed concerns about not being done with construction in time for the rodeo, and so that had been when they had come up with the idea for an MDA which acknowledged the nonconformity to Heber's Code.

Planner Kohler added both the City and the County had expressed their intention to work on having better communication in the future, and he briefly discussed the challenges of having so many different entities having the jurisdiction to do construction. Chairman Gunn commented that life safety issues were important, and he felt since the County had violated their Code, this was a matter for the City Attorney.

Planner Kohler replied that the City Attorney had actually been present at the May meeting, and he reported the stance of the City Attorney had been to sign an MDA as well. Chairman Gunn acknowledged this point, but still thought they should work with the City Attorney as far as their risk was concerned.

Planner Kohler agreed life safety issues were paramount and said they could push for compliance on those points. Chairman Gunn pointed out Heber City had protected itself from litigation in the future in case someone did get hurt at the Event Center, and said since the MDA acknowledged the issues and noncompliance it would keep the City from being sued. Chairman Gunn continued to discuss that no entities, however large, were entitled to break the law when it came to public safety, and voiced the opinion public safety was always paramount. Planner Kohler noted since Heber had extended the County a lot of grace in their violations of their Code, the City could push this point to their advantage when it came to getting other things that they needed cooperation from the County in order to get accomplished.

-

II. Presentation of Findings from Colorado Cities Tour (Jamie Baron, Planning Manager) - 10 min

Planner Baron presented a slideshow with information summarizing their findings from a recent tour of several Colorado cities that he, as well as some other members of City Staff and Planning Commission had participated in. Planner Baron explained the tour had focused on the design of downtown centers, and particularly their main plazas. He said they had visited Glenwood Springs, Boulder, Fort Collins, and Steamboat Springs over the course of three days.

Planner Baron said they had first gone to Glenwood Springs, and reported their main

takeaways had been the architecture as well as limited parking requirements. He explained how I-70 ran through the town, and noted some of the ways Glenwood Springs handled this to make that thoroughfare more appealing. Planner Baron spoke about how the City had revitalized their downtown area, and indicated a curbsless main street, which they referred to as a Festival Street. He commented they had removed any restrictions on usage in the main downtown area, and had a height restriction in place for the buildings of 40 feet. Commissioner Jordan asked about setbacks, and Planner Baron replied there was not a requirement for setbacks for the buildings on their main street.

Planner Baron shared photographs of Glenwood Springs' Grand Avenue, and noted the mix of materials used. He commented the materials were primarily masonry and brick, and he thought the most important part was the finish, as they had found that some of the brick buildings had looked bland and unappealing, although other brick buildings featured more detail and were very aesthetic. Planner Baron also highlighted the awnings on the buildings, which he explained added an outdoor roof of sorts and made the City more walkable. Planner Baron specifically noted they had been very impressed with the architecture of a large parking garage, and expressed that they had been impressed with the amount of murals throughout the City as well.

Planner Baron reported that next, they had visited Boulder and specifically their famous Pearl Street, which had been a popular pedestrian area for decades. He explained how Pearl Street was partitioned off from the drivable roads, and said Heber wanted to do something similar to this. Beyond Pearl Street, he said their main findings there were the architecture, pedestrian streets, and prioritizing pedestrian traffic. Planner Baron clarified they had visited early in the morning, which was why there were not a lot of people walking around in their photographs. Planner Baron presented some photographs and indicated some key architectural features which they had liked.

Planner Baron said Fort Collins had yielded significant finds for them, and noted particularly their downtown center, which featured a splash pad and string lighting. He discussed how downtown development planning took a lot of time, and said this would be important to keep in mind as Heber developed their downtown. Planner Baron elaborated they had really enjoyed Fort Collins and spent most of their day exploring the City. He highlighted the ways in which Fort Collins blended their old buildings with newer developments, and noted that they also had a main street which was curbsless and used for festivals and events. Planner Baron thought Fort Collins had good examples of pedestrian walkways as well, and commented how Heber could integrate some of these concepts into their own City.

Planner Baron moved on to Steamboat Springs and discussed traffic. He said Highway 40 was the only route into the City, and although there was only one way in and out, they had not noticed much truck traffic on their way in. He reported Steamboat Springs had been vibrant and busy, with a bustling downtown. He shared photographs of their farmer's market, and felt this had been very well done and a high point of their visit to Steamboat Springs. He also noted there was a lot of rooftop dining, which he thought

was great as everyone wanted to be outside and this was a cheap way to have downtown outdoor dining options. Planner Baron opined that they should push for more rooftop dining in Heber's downtown area. Again, Planner Baron reported they had found the finish of the buildings more significant than materials used when it came to architecture, and shared some photographs which illustrated this point. Planner Baron also commented on their art and shared that utility boxes had been painted and there were many murals throughout the City. He added this had the added benefit of cutting their graffiti down as well.

Planner Baron reiterated time was of the essence for Heber, and said building up their downtown in the way they wanted it to look would take a lot of time. He summarized some key points and said that they needed to reduce parking restrictions, integrate a seamless transition from festival streets to regular streets, and prioritize pedestrian traffic. Chairman Gunn added that the idea of an outside community was important, and pointed out having things like shaded areas and benches was significant. Planner Baron thought parking limitations and parking garages were going to be their biggest hurdle, and he also thought they needed to address architecture in Heber sooner rather than later, so that as they found people to invest in Heber it already had the architectural standards that the Planning Commission wanted to see. Planner Baron added that Roger Brooks had also recently visited and given some recommendations for developing Heber.

Commissioner Jordan wondered how to increase public involvement in these efforts, and specifically asked how they could increase engagement with high school students.

Commissioner Jordan thought Heber City needed to cultivate their identity; decide who they were and who they wanted to be. Chairman Gunn also extended thanks to City Staff for coordinating this trip and expressed he had gotten a lot out of it. Chairman Gunn specifically expressed how much he liked Fort Collins and hoped Heber could draw inspiration from them. He emphasized how important it was for them to get a parking garage downtown. Planner Baron recalled Roger Brooks had told him "parking doesn't have to be free, it just has to be worth it," and explained this meant they did not have to provide free parking, but they did have to have a structure which was nice enough that people were willing to pay for them. Commissioner Jordan pointed out the Planning Commission needed to be the entity to "bang the drum," so to speak, and entice developers and investors to come into their downtown area.

The Commissioners agreed they needed to extend a lot of focus to downtown development, and proposed a joint session be held with City Council to establish a framework moving forward. Planner Baron agreed they needed to act as soon as possible.

5. Administrative Items: N/A

6. Adjournment:

Trina Cooke, City Recorder