

**HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, UT 84032
Heber City Council Meeting
January 14, 2025**

Approved 02.11.2025

6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

1. Regular Meeting: Amended

I. **Nominate a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for a two-year term**

II. Call to Order

Chairman Phil Jordan called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone present.

III. Roll Call

Planning Commission Present:

Chairman Phil Jordan
Vice-Chairwoman Tori Broughton
Commissioner Dennis Gunn
Commissioner Josh Knight
Commissioner Dave Richards
Commissioner Darek Slagowski

Planning Commission Absent:

Commissioner Robert Wilson

Staff Present:

Planning Manager Jamie Baron
Planner Jacob Roberts
Planning Office Admin Meshelle Kijanen
City Engineer Ross Hansen

Staff Participating Remotely:

N/A

Also Present:

Kent Shelton, Richard [Briegtenbecker](#),
Layson Quick, Luke Searle

Also Attending Remotely:

Signed in as: EDA, Robert, Z, Luke S,
Dustin Grabau

Chairman Jordan invited the newly nominated alternate member of the Planning Commission Robert McKinley to sit on the Dias. Commissioner McKinley joined the other planning commissioners but was told he could not participate in motions as the required one hour of training had not happened. Chairman Jordan asked Commissioner McKinley to introduce and explain where he is from and how he came to join the Heber City Planning Commission.

IV. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Commissioner Gunn led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

V. Prayer/Thought by Invitation ()

Commissioner Richards shared a thought and Prayer

VI. Recuse for Conflict of Interest N/A

A discussion regarding Recusing one's self for a Conflict of Interest ensued.

2. Consent Agenda:

Commissioner Dave Richards nominated Commissioner Phil Jordan for the position of Chairperson, and Commissioner Tori Broughton for the position of Vice-Chairperson. Commissioner Richards expressed that this was intended to be a vote of confidence in both Commissioner Jordan and Commissioner Broughton. Commissioner Broughton commented that she was very dedicated to the Planning Commission and would always be at the meetings.

Voting Aye: Commissioners Richards, Jordan, Broughton, Darek Slagowski, and Josh Knight.

Voting Nay: None.

Motion passed and Chairman Jordan and Commissioner Dennis Gunn switched seats on the dias.

Planning Manager Jamie Baron clarified that Commissioner McKinley was welcome to sit with the Commission, but could not be a voting member of the Commission until he completed the mandatory training session.

Chairman Jordan thanked the Commission for their vote of confidence and expressed that he was grateful to all of them. He said that the Planning Commission's job was to represent the public in the interest of planning the City, and he thought that all the Commissioners did a great job of doing so with their various backgrounds.

Chairman Jordan introduced Commissioners Richards, Slagowski, Knight, Gunn, and Broughton, and then introduced Robert McKinley, who was their newest member.

Commissioner McKinley shared a little bit about his background, and noted he had lived in Heber City for about a year and a half. He said he had spent most of his career in Kansas City, where he worked in labor and employment law. He said that he originally had intended to retire, but he had been recruited to be a judge, which was his current role. He said that when he lived in Missouri he had worked as legal counsel for several municipalities, and so he had knowledge of the process from both ends.

Commissioner McKinley stated that he had expertise in this area and would be able to serve the public through serving on the Commission, though he also intended to mostly listen in the beginning and observe how the Commission operated.

Motion: Commissioner Gunn moved to approve the items on the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Knight made the second.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Commissioner Gunn, Commissioner Richards, Commissioner Slagowski, Commissioner Knight, Chairman Jordan, Vice-Chairwoman Broughton. **Voting No:**

None. The Motion Passed 6-0.

- I. Approval of 12.10.2024 PC Draft Minutes
- II. Approval for the 2025 Planning Commission Schedule

3. Action Items:

- I. Consider a recommendation for the Red Rock Annexation, located at 2276 S DANIEL RD (Jamie Baron)

Planning Manager Baron provided an overview of this item and indicated that a representative of the applicant, Robert Hicken, was present that evening to speak to the Commission. Planning Manager Baron indicated the location of the property and explained the applicant wanted to annex their property into the City as an industrial use. Planning Manager Baron then went over the petition process and stated they had completed the 30-day period for certification and protest, and were currently under review and recommendation from the Planning Commission before the item passed to the City Council for a final decision.

Planning Manager Baron said that the General Plan did identify this area as industrial, although it was intended for more business-type storage rather than heavy industrial. He added that the application was within the policy plan. He also shared images of the actual plat and indicated where the City's easements were located on the parcel. He shared that further in the future, if the parcel was annexed, the City ultimately would want to put a road on the property to ensure better access. Planning Manager Baron added that the City wanted to have the Daniels Road right-of-way dedicated to Heber, and have Daniels Road upgraded to be a major collector road if the property was annexed. Planning Manager Baron also expressed that the City would have to work with Daniel Township to determine the maintenance of the property. He asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Jordan asked if the applicant wished to speak. Mr. Hicken shared an overview of his plan.

Commissioner Richards asked for clarification of the lot size and Mr. Hicken replied it was 31 acres.

Commissioner Richards expressed that Mr. Hicken's company was a great asset to the Valley and said he employed a lot of people in the community, so he wanted to be able to help them out as much as possible. Commissioner Richards recalled when they had previously discussed this issue, there had been some concern about industrial areas in Daniel. Commissioner Richards asked if those concerns had been addressed for the residential neighbors that were located adjacent to the property.

Planning Manager Baron replied that Daniel was developing more industrial areas, including the CMC plant. He added there were some neighbors who might have an issue with more industrial areas coming in, although if the applicant wanted to build anything that was outside of the zoning guidelines then they could have a conversation about that. Commissioner Knight noted that the applicant had done a lot of landscaping work in the front of the building, including planting native grasses and

trees. Commissioner Knight asked what the current zone for the property was in the County and Planning Manager Baron stated it was industrial. Planning Manager Baron elaborated that currently, the property used a septic system and a well, so in the future they would be limited with how much they could do unless they sought City services. Planning Manager Baron explained it would be advantageous for the property to utilize City services so that they could continue to expand.

Mike Johnston introduced himself as a civil engineer for a company called Atwell. He clarified that he was not speaking on behalf of the City Council and expressed he had great respect for the Planning Commission and their recommendation on this item. He stated that he had recused himself from this item every time it had come before the City Council since the applicant was a friend of his. Mr. Johnston stated that he wished to offer his thoughts as an engineer who was interested in Heber City. Mr. Johnston explained that the applicant wanted to expand and add a corporate office, and he recounted how he had counseled the applicant to seek annexation into Heber since it would be both cost-effective for the applicant and provide valuable land to the city. Mr. Johnston opined this land was important to improve the frontage of Heber City, and he noted there was already a sewer main and a water main that serviced fire protection for the property, so it made sense to ask for annexation now. He added this was a huge employer in the County, so the benefit to the City from annexation would be property tax and sales tax.

Commissioner Richards stated that he wanted to meet with Heber City's Engineering department and asked City Engineer Ross Hansen for his thoughts. City Engineer Hansen said that he wanted to go through the comments list, since he had not yet been able to view those comments. There was a brief conversation about which items on the comments list were of interest to the Commission and the Engineering department. Mr. Johnston identified number four on the list, which stated that the owner possibly needed to engage Daniel into an operation and maintenance agreement, and questioned if that made sense. He also questioned the advisability of item number five, which called for a connector road between Daniels Road and 390 West. Planning Manager Baron clarified that the document was a list of Staff's recommendations, not their requirements. Planning Manager Baron elaborated that the Staff's recommendation was that there be a connecting road in the future if the property was to be annexed.

Mr. Johnston recalled that there was a 16-foot strip that connected Power Industrial to Daniels Road, and stated that when the City had acquired Power Industrial their acquisition included that strip, which he clarified was 16-feet wide and 1300-feet long.

Mr. Johnston said that the City had not turned that strip into a road, although they owned it. City Engineer Hansen replied that he did not know the history of that particular parcel and if it was ever intended to be a road, but said the concern with the current property in question was that the City owned a strip of land that ran directly through the applicant's property and could accommodate a road. Planning Manager Baron provided more context about the history of the 16-foot wide parcel that Mr. Johnston had discussed, and said at the time that the City had purchased Power Industrial in 1999, there had been no need for a road, and he said that he had experienced difficulty in resolving the issue over the years.

Mr. Johnston stated that the City should not have a requirement for the applicant to

build a public road; rather, he thought the road should be built at the applicant's discretion if and when he needed it. Commissioner Broughton asked how far the property extended and Mr. Johnston clarified the parameters of the property. Mr. Johnston emphasized that there was no current need for a road; the only reason there would be a road would depend on what the applicant chose to do with his subdivided lots. Planning Manager Baron explained that the City only wanted the applicant to build a road as the area developed. Mr. Johnston asked how the City planned to clarify that and Planning Manager Baron replied that they could include quantifiable language in the requirements. Chairman Jordan added that they could include language in the motion that stipulated that the Planning Commission would work with the applicant as the parcels were subdivided and developed.

Mr. Johnston summarized that overall, he was fine with the list but had wanted to go through the recommendations in public with the Planning Commission since some of the items on the list were new compared to the original findings and conditions.

Commissioner Gunn expressed that the Planning Commission did not want to throw anything on them that they were not prepared for, and said they usually went through a different process of gathering feedback from all the involved parties.

City Engineer Hansen commented that all the recommended items on the list had been added to CityWorks two weeks prior. Commissioner Gunn noted that CityWorks was a new platform that the City was using, and opined that the onus was on the City to inform the applicant about how they could have found those comments. There was a brief conversation about the appropriateness of posting City comments on CityWorks in which Commissioner Gunn reiterated his position that the City should make clear to their applicants when they changed their formats. Chairman Jordan asked if the City would be doing internal reviews rather than contractor consultants moving forward, and Planning Manager Baron replied that for the past year, most of their reviews had been done internally. Planning Manager Baron said that using this new format was easier for the City to manage. Commissioner Gunn replied that made sense, but still felt that there should be an easy way for the applicant to access the comments prior to the meeting.

Mr. Johnston stated that he had not received the comments from CityWorks prior to the meeting. Planning Manager Baron said that the main concern was determining the parameters that would necessitate a road. Chairman Jordan said they would add language about that in the motion that evening. Chairman Jordan also clarified the process as to how the applicant would access notes in CityWorks, and said it seemed to him that the part which was lacking was an official report from the City to the applicant. City Engineer Hansen explained how the applicant could access comments within CityWorks and said the Engineering department could send out a more official report with the same information, if that was something the Planning Commission wanted. Chairman Jordan did not think that was necessary. Commissioner Gunn said the City just needed to ensure that applicants were aware of any updates to the format.

City Engineer Hansen asked if the Planning Commission wanted to see comments from all the departments, or just from Engineering. Commissioner Gunn said he did not think they needed all departmental comments, but explained that the Planning Commission

was used to having a summarized report from Engineering, which was important because the Commissioners referenced that report when they made their motion.

Commissioner Gunn said due to that, it was important that the applicant have access to the Engineering requirements prior to the Commission meeting. Commissioner Gunn and Planning Manager Baron continued to discuss how they needed to have clear communication before the meeting so that all parties- the Commission, applicant, and Staff- were on the same page.

Motion: Commissioner Gunn made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for approval for the annexation of Red Rock Annexation, located at 2276 S Daniel Road, subject to the findings and conditions in the Staff report and the comments from the Engineering Department, and subject to the wording on the road being worked out with the property owner and City in the future.

Commissioner Knight asked if that was okay with Mr. Johnston and seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioner Slagowski asked if they needed to include the point about not having to contact Daniel Township about the road, and Commissioner Richards noted that was included in the comments under item number four. Commissioner Richards read item number four.

Chairman Gunn asked if Staff had comments about that amendment and Planning Manager Baron noted that Daniel owned a portion of the road, which was why there was language in the item stating that the City and property owner needed to engage Daniel in the process of developing the road. Mr. Johnston felt it was more complicated than that, and asked if Heber would be operating and maintaining the road even though it was under the jurisdiction of Daniel. Commissioner Richards stated that the item just stated that the property owner needed to engage Daniel, and felt there was no question that Daniel and Heber would need to work together. Planning Manager Baron replied that he thought if someone wanted to annex into the City, the onus was on the applicant to work out the issues, not the City. Planning Manager Baron pulled up the map to indicate the boundaries of Heber and Daniel Township.

Commissioner Richards clarified that Planning Manager Baron was requesting that the applicant work with Red Rock and Daniel for the road, and Planning Manager Baron replied that the City suggested that the applicant needed to facilitate discussion there in order to get the annexation to function properly. Planning Manager Baron said he did not feel that work should be the responsibility of Heber City Staff.

Commissioner Gunn asked why Heber would maintain the road, if the road was not being annexed into the City. Planning Manager Baron replied that the parcels owned by Heber extended into the middle of the road, per the County maps. Commissioner Richards said that on their maps, it looked like the parcels extended all the way to the end of the road, but expressed he was not sure what was correct.

City Engineer Hansen stated that the parcels being annexed into Heber extended into Daniel territory. He added that the parcel boundary was different than the annexation boundary because the City could not incorporate land that was part of Daniel corporation. He said that regardless of the annexation boundary, the deed of the parcel itself extended to the end of the road. Commissioner Richards said that he

understood the issue, but felt that there needed to be a counsel with Daniel involved to figure out the issue, since neither the applicant nor the City Staff were sure of what the right way to resolve the issue was. Commissioner Gunn thanked Commissioner Richards for his comments, and added that it seemed to him that Daniel should be responsible for the road.

Chairman Jordan confirmed that the requirement for the applicant to meet with Daniel to determine the road maintenance was included in the comments.

Commissioner Gunn confirmed with Planning Office Admin Kijanen that he did not need to repeat his initial motion, and stated that he wished for his motion to stand, plus the amendment which omitted the portion about the road maintenance.

Commissioner Knight stated that his second of the motion still stood.

Voting Yes: Vice-Chairwoman Tori Broughton, Commissioner Dennis Gunn, Commissioner Josh Knight, Commissioner Dave Richards, Commissioner Darek Slagowski

Voting No: none.

The motion passed 5-0.

II. Consider a recommendation for the Wasatch County Administration Building Annexation, located at 3725 Lake Creek Rd. (Jacob Roberts)

Commissioner Knight was excused from this item.

Planner Roberts led this agenda item and introduced Mr. Richard Briegtenbecker, who was there on behalf of the County. Planner Roberts stated this was a recommendation for the Wasatch County Administration Building to be annexed, located at 3725 Lake Creek Road and shared some visual aids to orient the Commissioners. Planner Roberts reported that the General Plan designation for the area was agricultural preservation and open space, though the General Plan did not consider locations for future public facilities. Planner Roberts added that the proposed zone for the area made sense, if it were to be annexed into Heber City. Planner Roberts also indicated that this parcel would potentially be affected by the planned bypass road.

Mr. Briegtenbecker expressed he was happy to discuss any questions or comments that the Planning Commission had. Commissioner Richards stated he did not have access to a comment summary about this item, and there was a brief conversation about how the comments could be accessed. Mr. Briegtenbecker said that he had seen the summary and did not have a substantial issue with any of them, but expressed confusion as to if they were recommendations or requirements from the City. Mr. Briegtenbecker said that the County's preference would be to agree to discuss the items in the future, but he did not want to commit to specific things at this time.

Commissioner Gunn said that the Planning Commission would just need an agreement from the applicant that they would work with the City on the identified issues in order for the Planning Commission to issue a positive recommendation.

City Engineer Hansen offered the Engineering Department's reasoning for the items listed in the comment summary. He said that the applicant could work with the City Staff during the MDA process. Planner Roberts added that he understood the Engineering Department wanted to identify the issues as early as possible; it did not necessarily mean that every issue needed to be resolved prior to annexation.

Commissioner Gunn agreed and stated that the Planning Commission always wanted

to back up the recommendations of Staff, but expressed how important it was that the applicant have access to all of the comments prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Broughton asked about discrepancies in the site plans and Mr. Briegtenbecker replied that they had not yet finalized their site plan, in part because they were trying to ensure that they accommodate UDOT.

Mr. Luke Searle commented about the building and explained that it was being designed to accommodate new Council chambers.

Mr. Briegtenbecker added that they had also included plans for more parking, but needed to coordinate with UDOT because the planned realignment of the adjacent road might impact some of the parking lot. He said they would also have to ensure that there were safe ways for pedestrians to cross the road.

Commissioner Gunn asked if the County would be willing to work with Heber on their CRA, or had any interest in supporting some of the initiatives that Heber was working on in their downtown area, if Heber City annexed this land. Planner Roberts pointed out that this administrative building would be beneficial for all parties involved, and said the main advantage for Heber City was that it would align with their Envision Heber plan. Planner Roberts elaborated that although there were not immediate tax benefits for the City, the annexation would facilitate their long-term goals.

Commissioner Gunn spoke about the need for more parking, particularly in light of the Winter Olympics that would be held in 2034. Planner Roberts agreed they would have to come up with some creative solutions for the parking that they would need to provide. Commissioner Gunn said that both Heber City and Midway would benefit from having a festival parking area, and thought that was a conversation they needed to have with UDOT.

Commissioner Broughton asked what the number of parking spaces currently were.

Mr. Briegtenbecker said there was a traffic study which provided some sense of the number of parking spaces, but he did not currently have a final number since the building layouts were not finalized. Commissioner Broughton also asked what the plans for the rest of the property were and Mr. Briegtenbecker said that they were still pursuing several options and did not have a specific plan for the area yet.

Commissioner Broughton also asked about open space and Mr. Briegtenbecker said he did not know how much open space there was.

Commissioner Broughton asked Planning Manager Baron if there was a way to tie the agreement to the fire and utilities station, and Planning Manager Baron said he did not know if that would be possible. Commissioner Broughton clarified that the annexation would give the land to Heber City, though the County would own the physical building and Planning Manager Baron said that was correct. Planning Manager Baron said the City Staff had also raised this point to the County and there had been discussions about what was best to do with the ownership of the building. Commissioner Broughton also asked why there was not an existing MOU or MDA with the County for this land and Planning Manager Baron explained that this was land that the County had not yet purchased.

Commissioner Gunn noted that the plan was to move some County offices to another site, and asked if the County would consider selling the the current County courthouse site to Heber City. Planning Manager Baron said that was something they could

negotiate with the County, and possibly include a first right-of-refusal clause. Planning Manager Baron said the details of that agreement would be legislative, however, so he could not provide more detail about that option and added that it would be unorthodox that language into the actual MDA.

Commissioner Gunn said it was his understanding that the conversation about that had already started with the Council and Planning Manager Baron said that it had.

Commissioner Broughton said her recommendation to the City Council would be to continue that conversation, but it would not be a stipulation or requirement from the Commission.

Commissioner Broughton expressed that she appreciated the idea of moving the land to either open space or farmland, and thought it was important that Heber City stay true to their agricultural roots.

Mr. Briegtenbecker then discussed their finance plan and indicated that they anticipated funding from IDA, which would allow them to avoid having to add to the property tax burden on Heber City taxpayers. Commissioner Gunn thought this was a much needed building and expressed the opinion that this was a win-win for the County and City.

Planning Manager Baron recommended that the Commissioners include language about first right-of-refusal in the motion. There was a short discussion about if this was appropriate, and Commissioner Gunn reminded the Commission that they were just a recommending body, so it would be okay. Mr. Briegtenbecker asked if that could be listed as an item to be resolved in the MDA. Commissioner Richards said the City wanted the opportunity to negotiate the sale, but he did not want the City to be saddled with the right of first refusal since that could impact the price of the sale of the property.

Motion: Commissioner Gunn made a positive recommendation to the City Council for the annexation of the Wasatch County Admin Building, subject to all findings and conclusions outlined in the Staff report, as well as the condition that the County and City work toward the City being given the opportunity to purchase the property as well as the property to the west, where the Council chambers were located.

Commissioner Slagowski made the second.

Discussion: Chairman Jordan noted that a member of the public had raised their hand. The member of the public made a comment, but it was unintelligible due to their distance from the microphone. Chairman Jordan thanked them for their comment.

Voting Yes: Vice-Chairwoman Tori Broughton, Commissioner Dennis Gunn, Commissioner Josh Knight, Commissioner Dave Richards, Commissioner Darek Slagowski

Voting No: none.

The motion passed 5-0.

- III. Removed from Agenda Public Hearing for proposed amendment to the Annexation Policy Plan (Tony Kohler)

4. Work Meeting:

- I. Telecommunications Text Amendment (Jamie Baron)

Planning Manager Baron introduced this item and explained that the purpose of this evening's discussion was to solicit feedback from the Planning Commission so that they could move to a public hearing.

Planning Manager Baron listed the proposed modifications, including that the cell tower footage be modified from 35 feet to 120 feet. He elaborated that the greater height would positively impact the tower's ability to broadcast and give it a wider radius. He reported that the City Council had held a discussion about this and were in favor of a height of 60-80 feet. Planning Manager Baron explained that the advantage of the taller tower would also allow for multiple providers to be on the same tower.

Planning Manager Baron added that another proposal the applicant made was to permit mono-poles in all zones, and explained they were currently not permitted in residential zones. Lastly, the applicant wanted to allow for up to three providers on a single tower, although the Heber City Code currently allowed for only two providers on a tower.

Planning Manager Baron explained the locations that the applicant was hoping to reach and noted that there were some parts of Heber City that did not have cell service.

Mr. Larson Quick introduced himself and identified that he was a developer who was there to represent the cell tower company. Mr. Quick explained that the goal was to provide options other than stealth sites, which was the reason that they had suggested mono-poles be allowed as that would be less limiting than only permitting stealth sites.

He also explained the advantage of having greater heights on the poles, which would allow for farther reach.

Commissioner Richards asked about an 80-foot tower and Mr. Quick said that was a general baseline, and would generally allow for reach over tall buildings, trees, and other obstacles. Commissioner Richards asked about dropping the height from 120 feet to 80 and Mr. Quick replied he was not sure of the change to the coverage, but expressed that the main issue would be that less providers could go on the towers. Mr. Quick elaborated that each provider had their own antennas on the tower, which was the reason that the tower would need additional height.

Commissioner Gunn opined that a 120-foot tower was not an issue with him, as long as it was located out of the way of the downtown area. He expressed that it was more important to him where the towers were going to be located. Commissioner Richards asked if towers that were located at higher elevation needed to be 120-feet as well, and Mr. Quick explained that they did not need all towers to be 120 feet; they just needed that to be the maximum height. Mr. Quick confirmed that towers positioned at higher elevation did not need to be as tall.

Commissioner Richards clarified that not all towers would be 120 feet and asked if the Commission would be able to negotiate the height of individual towers. Planning Commissioner Baron said that they could not control that, and said if the City allowed

for a maximum height of 120 feet for the towers then they could be placed anywhere in the City.

Commissioner Gunn asked if they could prohibit the 120-foot towers in only the C-3 zone. Commissioner Richards agreed there had to be language which could limit towers in certain areas. Planning Manager Baron said they could regulate tower height by zone, or another option would be to regulate tower height by proximity to certain areas, such as the airport. Commissioner Gunn thought they should not allow towers to be located too close to the downtown area.

Commissioner Gunn clarified that the taller each pole was, the less poles overall would be needed in the City since taller towers could accommodate more providers.

Commissioner Richards expressed caution that the residents whose view was taken up by 120-foot towers could be unhappy.

Commissioner Gunn opined that the stealth trees were not fooling anyone anyway, and felt that they might as well just have the towers out in the open since everyone knew what the stealth trees were hiding. Mr. Quick said that their proposal did not specify which areas would have stealth trees and which areas would have mono-poles, the applicant just wanted to have the option to do both. Commissioner Richards asked how the City could regulate what parts of the City had stealth trees and Commissioner Gunn asked Planning Manager Baron if there were other Cities that dictated location of stealth trees. Planning Manager Baron replied he was not sure, but would assume that Park City had stealth requirements. Commissioner Richards pointed out that the height and design of the poles were not only aesthetic choices, but there was a safety element to consider as well.

Commissioner Broughton asked if some form of poles were allowed in all zones of the City. Planning Manager Baron replied that towers were allowed in all zones, but there were different requirements depending on the zone, and gave the example that poles could only be placed on public lands in residential zones. Commissioner Broughton asked how this permission would not turn into a race for companies to place as many poles as they could and Commissioner Gunn noted that there would be financial constraints that would inhibit the companies from placing too many poles, and did not think that excessive development would be an issue.

Commissioner Richards commented that going forward, wireless connections would become more and more popular and mentioned that was already popular in California.

Commissioner Broughton asked if oversaturation would be an issue and Planning Manager Baron replied that it was possible, but unlikely since most carriers preferred to not have to build their own towers and generally added antennas to an existing tower since it was more financially viable.

Commissioner Broughton asked if there were any safeguards to prevent Mr. Quick's company from having the only access to an area. Planning Manager Baron replied that he did not think they needed to get into 'who' was leasing out the towers, as long as the towers were located in the right place. Commissioner Gunn added that another way to avoid that was if the City owned the towers, at least just in the downtown area.

Commissioner Broughton asked if there was compensation for private landowners who had antennas on their property and Mr. Quick replied that the company did pay them.

Commissioner McKinley commented that this proposal was very different than what the City had done in the past and noted that some members of the City Council were in

favor of stealth poles. Commissioner Richards noted that at this stage, the Commission just needed to be prepared for a public hearing on the issue, which he felt that they were. Commissioner McKinley agreed, although he noted that the applicant needed to modify their plan to some extent since the City Council was not supportive of it, so regardless of the Planning Commission's recommendation the proposal would likely not be approved by the Council. Commissioner Richards said they needed to think about their language so that they could move this proposal forward.

Commissioner McKinley asked about the future and longevity of this technology, and asked if and how it was going to change. He pointed out that the poles would be in place for the next 20, 30 years. Mr. Quick replied that cell towers had been in use for decades, so he did not think that they were going away any time soon. Mr. Quick spoke about how in larger cities like Salt Lake, there were smaller 5G towers in addition to regular cell towers, though noted that traditional towers provided for a wider range of coverage.

Commissioner Gunn opined that looking at the numbers of the cell tower heights would likely freak people out, so he directed the applicant to provide a visual representation of what a 120-foot tower would look like. He said that people needed an image so that they could conceptualize what the tower would look like. Mr. Quick said he actually had some images prepared and indicated that he could share them at the public hearing. Commissioner McKinley anticipated that most of the pushback that they would receive from the public would be from those who lived in residential areas, and thought if there were photographs that showed what the towers actually looked like it would assuage their concerns.

Commissioner McKinley circled back to the saturation question and asked how many towers were needed for Heber City. Mr. Quick said he did not know exactly, but estimated at least two more towers were needed right now. Mr. Quick said that generally, there needed to be one tower placed for every one to two miles, though this depended on how densely populated the area was and how much data they used.

Commissioner Gunn asked why C-3 had been excluded in the past and Planning Manager Baron said that had been the decision of City Council, and explained their rationale was to preserve the character of historic downtown. Commissioner Slagowski said that the advantage of placing towers downtown was that they would be concealed by buildings. Commissioner Broughton pointed out that the 50-foot base at the bottom could be a hindrance, and Mr. Quick replied that the 50-foot base was an estimate and said they did not all have to be so large. Commissioner Slagowski commented that the downtown area would also require 5G, going forward.

Commissioner Richards summarized the Planning Commission's stance and said they had enough consensus for Planning Manager Baron to draft language so they could move forward to the public hearing.

5. **Administrative Items: N/A**

6. **Adjournment:**

Commissioner Broughton motioned to adjourn.

Meshelle Kijanen
Meshelle Kijanen, Administrative Assistant