



HIDEOUT, UTAH PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

July 18, 2024

Agenda

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of Hideout, Utah will hold its Regular Meeting electronically and in-person at Hideout Town Hall, located at 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout Utah, for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, July 18, 2024.

All public meetings are available via ZOOM conference call and YouTube Live.

Interested parties may join by dialing in as follows:

Zoom Meeting URL: <https://zoom.us/j/4356594739>

To join by telephone dial: US: +1 408 638 0986

Meeting ID: 435 659 4739

YouTube Live Channel: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCKdWnJad-WwvcAK75QjRb1w/>

Regular Meeting

6:00 PM

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Meeting Minutes
 1. [June 18, 2024 Hideout Planning Commission Meeting Minutes DRAFT](#)
- IV. Administrative Items
 1. [Presentation and discussion of a concept plan on parcels 00-0020-8182 and 00-0020-8184 \("the Salzman Property"\)](#)
 2. Presentation and discussion of Hideout's General Plan (*discussion only - no action will be taken*)
- V. Meeting Adjournment

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Mayor or Town Clerk at 435-659-4739 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

File Attachments for Item:

1. June 18, 2024 Hideout Planning Commission Meeting Minutes DRAFT

1 **Minutes**
2 **Town of Hideout Planning Commission**
3 **Regular Meeting (Rescheduled)**
4 **June 18, 2024**
5 **6:00 PM**
6
7

8 The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in Regular Meeting on June 18, 2024
9 at 6:00 PM in person and electronically via Zoom meeting.

10
11 Regular Meeting

12
13 **I. Call to Order**

14 Chair Tony Matyszczyk called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM and reminded participants that this
15 was a hybrid meeting held both electronically and in-person.

16
17 **II. Roll Call**

18 **Present:** Chair Tony Matyszczyk
19 Commissioner Joel Pieper
20 Commissioner Glynnis Tihansky
21 Commissioner Donna Turner

22
23 **Attending Remotely:** Commissioner Rachel Cooper
24 Commissioner Chase Winder (alternate, joined at 6:07 PM)

25
26 **Excused:** Commissioner Peter Ginsberg (alternate)

27
28 **Staff Present:** Alicia Fairbourne, Recorder for Hideout
29 Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Recorder for Hideout

30
31 **Staff Attending Remotely:** Polly McLean, Town Attorney
32 Thomas Eddington, Town Planner

33
34 **Public Attending Remotely:** Tim Schoen, Diane Schoen, Richard Otto, Jerry Crylen, Jeff
35 Johnson and others who may not have signed in using proper names in Zoom.

36
37 **III. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

38 **1. May 16, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes DRAFT**

39 There were no comments on the May 16, 2024 draft minutes.

40 ***Motion: Commissioner Tihansky moved to approve the May 16, 2024 Planning Commission***
41 ***Minutes. Commissioner Pieper made the second. Voting Yes: Commissioner Cooper, Chair***
42 ***Matyszczyk, Commissioner Pieper, Commissioner Tihansky and Commissioner Turner. Voting***
43 ***No: None. Absent from Voting: Commissioner Ginsberg, Commissioner Winder. The motion***
44 ***carried.***

1 **IV. Agenda Items**

2 **1. Discussion of an updated concept plan for a potential development Hideout**
3 **Pointe/Wildhorse (Parcel 20-8164)**

4 Town Planner Thomas Eddington provided an overview of this item and reminded the Planning
5 Commissioners the original concept plan for this project had originally been presented a year ago.
6 The property under discussion was located between the Woolf property and Klaim subdivision on
7 the eastern side of SR-248. The updated concept plan was focused on approximately two acres of the
8 Applicant's 15.19-acre parcel and would include a brew pub and restaurant as well as other
9 commercial space. The Applicant would come back at a future date with a separate application
10 regarding the remaining 13-acres which might be proposed for residential development.

11 Mr. Eddington noted the proposed entrance and exit road location was still under review with the
12 Fire District. In response to a question from Commissioner Joel Pieper, Mr. Eddington replied a
13 second road accessing SR-248 was not required and would be too close to the existing entrance to
14 Klaim.

15 Mr. Eddington discussed the Staff Report, which was included in the meeting materials, and noted
16 several items which needed to be worked out in more detail. He noted the Planning Commissioners
17 were not being asked for a formal vote on this concept plan at this time, but rather to provide
18 feedback to the Applicant.

19 The Applicants Tim and Diane Schoen, and architects Rick Otto and Jeff Johnson were introduced.
20 Mr. Johnson reviewed the proposed plans and answered questions from the Planning
21 Commissioners. The proposed plan would include upgrading the existing driveway to the Woolf
22 property to a street which would meet Town standards and reconfiguring the intersection of the
23 Woolf driveway (Gray Woolf Road) and Miner Way to a 90-degree intersection. Mr. Schoen noted
24 his team had met with the owners of the Woolf property.

25 Commissioner Rachel Cooper asked if a traffic light would be necessary at the SR-248 entrance. Mr.
26 Eddington replied that would be the decision of UDOT. He then reminded the Planning
27 Commissioners that a flashing light would likely be installed at the future fire station exit on SR-248
28 (just north of the Woolf property).

29 The Planning Commissioners were polled for their feedback, and no objections were made to the
30 proposed plan. Mr. Schoen introduced Mr. Jerry Crylen who was working as a development advisor
31 on the project. In response to a question from Chair Matyszczyk, Mr. Schoen stated he would hope
32 to begin construction within the next 18 months.

33 Commissioner Glynnis Tihansky asked what the plans were for the future residential phase. Mr.
34 Crylen responded the team was working with a civil engineer to create ten one-acre lots for a gated
35 community above the commercial development.

36 Commissioner Pieper asked if trails would be included in the plans; Mr. Schoen replied yes.

37 There being no further questions from the Planning Commissioners, the Applicants and their
38 representatives were excused and left the meeting at 6:46 PM.

1 **V. Meeting Adjournment**

2 Commissioner Tihansky asked whether there was any follow up from last meeting regarding an
3 update to the Town’s General Plan. Mr. Eddington responded that would be included in an future
4 meeting. Chair Matyszczyk suggested a future review of the Annexation Agreement for the
5 Richardson Flats project would be helpful to provide background for the new members of the
6 Planning Commission.

7
8 There being no further business, Chair Matyszczyk asked for a motion to adjourn.

9 ***Motion: Commissioner Tihansky moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Pieper made the***
10 ***second. Voting Yes: Commissioner Cooper, Chair Matyszczyk, Commissioner Pieper,***
11 ***Commissioner Tihansky, Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Winder. Voting No: None.***
12 ***Absent from Voting: Commissioner Ginsberg. The motion carried.***

13
14 The meeting adjourned at 6:49 PM.

15
16
17
18
19
20

Kathleen Hopkins
Deputy Recorder for Hideout

File Attachments for Item:

1. Presentation and discussion of a concept plan on parcels 00-0020-8182 and 00-0020-8184 ("the Salzman Property")



Staff Report for Elk Horn Springs – Concept Plan Review

To: Chairman Tony Matyszczyk
Town of Hideout Planning Commission

From: Thomas Eddington Jr., AICP, ASLA
Town Planner

Re: The Elk Horn Springs Concept Plan for the Salzman Property

Date: Prepared for the July 18, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting

Submittals: Concept Plan Application and Concept Master Plan, both dated July 2024

Introduction and Background

The Salzman property is familiar to the Planning Commission since both The Boulders and The Bloom developers submitted a Concept Plan application in 2022, and 2023 respectively. Both of those applications were ultimately withdrawn by the Applicants and a final vote was never made by the Planning Commission.

The current proposal is for the same property, excluding the +/-40 acres that the existing house and pond sit upon. This Concept Plan proposes significantly less density than the prior two proposals – generally a mixed-use development that is primarily made up of a mix of single-family homes, townhomes, and some commercial space.

Site Characteristics

Total Acres of Site: +/-72 Acres


Current Zoning: Mountain (M)



- Allowed Density: One (1) unit per acre or approximately 60 - 65 units after road infrastructure is built and steep slopes preserved
- Concept Density: +/-164 units primarily concentrated on the +/-72 acres that make up the eastern part of the site. 15,000 – 20,000 SF of neighborhood commercial space is also proposed. The units are generally designated as the following use or housing types:
- Neighborhood Commercial: 15,000 - 20,000 SF
 - Townhomes: 61 units
 - Single-Family Lots: 54 lots
 - Cabin Single-Family Units: 11 lots
 - Mountain Estate Single-Family Units: 38 lots
- General Uses: The Applicants are proposing a development concept that includes a variety of residential building typologies and neighborhood commercial uses.

Site Location (proposed site in red outline - +/-72 acres)

Town of Hideout Planning Map




Planning map for the Town Of Hideout

0.6km

Source: Esri, Maxar, Earthstar Geographics, and the GIS User Community | Utah AGRC

The Elk Horn Springs Concept Plan (July 2024)



Planning Issues & Concerns for Discussion

Density: The proposed density is +/-200% of what is currently allowed per the Mountain (M) residential zoning designation. Where +/-60 - 65 single-family units are permitted on one-acre lots, the Applicants propose +/-164 units. The proposed Concept Plan has clustered all development on the eastern portion of the site. The prior two Concept Plans (in 2022 and 2023) for this site proposed a density that was a 500%+, and 300%+ increase beyond existing allowances.

This project requires a rezoning application which lends itself to a thorough discussion of the benefits and impacts associated with a conceptual up-zoning. A re-zone is a



legislative decision by the Town which gives the Town discretion to grant it or not based on benefits and impacts to the community.

Uses:

The proposed commercial area will provide the local/neighborhood commercial opportunities that are currently missing in the community and frequently requested by residents. The Applicant has not indicated the types of commercial tenants that would likely occupy these spaces, but special consideration should be given to uses such as a coffee shop, restaurants, a fitness/wellness studio, etc. neighborhood commercial amenities. A Master Development Agreement (MDA) will be necessary should this project proceed to a rezoning application. Staff recommends limiting all first floor uses to uses such as a coffee shop, restaurants, a fitness/wellness studio, etc. to prevent real estate offices and similar in those spaces, thus eliminating the neighborhood character/needs.

In addition, the Applicant and Planning Commission should consider increasing the amount of square feet for commercial space – perhaps up to 20,000 or 25,000 SF.

The Applicant proposes a community center with a pool and three indoor pickleball courts. The Applicant has discussed increasing the number of courts. While all residents of the Elk Horn Springs community will have access to this facility, the Developer proposes to offer residents of Hideout an option to purchase an annual pass.

The Applicants should be prepared to discuss these uses in more detail.

Layout/Design: The following are some ideas/revisions for consideration that staff has briefly discussed with the Applicants:

- The amphitheater could be changed to a green gathering, or park area, for the community. An amphitheater is currently proposed for Phase 4 of the Deer Springs development and Phase 4 or Phase 9 of Shoreline development. A more universal gathering space will likely prove more useful to the residents.
- The neighborhood commercial development could flank this park thus activating the space and drawing more residents and visitors alike to the unique setting.
- The parking for the Townhouse units on the main entry street is proposed to be under the units, allowing parking spaces along the street to be used for the commercial space.
- There may be an opportunity for workforce housing units above the proposed commercial space.

- The existing emergency access road from SR 248 to Golden Eagle bifurcates this property and the Applicant is proposing to generally use this as the main spine road for the development – in effect upgrading the road from its current road base conditions. There are some areas where the existing road is proposed to be moved outside of the easement that exists on the plat. The Applicant will need to coordinate this with Mustang Development (the entity who negotiated the easement) and the Town.

Parks: The parks, trails and open spaces, as proposed, are open to all residents of Hideout as proposed.

The Applicant proposes to donate approximately 15 acres, situated in the southeast corner of the property, to the Town of Hideout for use as a regional park or similar.

Access: There is only one ingress/egress proposed from SR 248 – approximately along the existing emergency access road leading up to Golden Eagle. A road, or stub, will also be required on the eastern property line to provide a connection to possible future development.

Open

Space/Buffers: The proposed development has clustered areas with open space buffers providing park/trails proposed. Additional detail should be provided: type of trails, surface treatment, etc.

Sensitive Lands: Per the Town’s updated Zoning Code, areas with greater than 30% slopes Slopes, must be preserved – development activity including buildings and roads and vegetation: must be moved to areas with less than 30% slopes. Major drainage ways - valleys and ravines - must also be protected from development to the greatest extent possible. If this project moves forward, a grading plan with cut and fill clearly indicated will be required for review.

Connection

to Town: The Town is disconnected as a result of SR 248 – it creates a very real and dangerous barrier for pedestrian and bike connectivity in particular. A connection to the south side of SR248 has been a goal of the Town

Planning Commission and Town Council since the completion of the Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) Plan in 2019. A partnership approach to address this disconnect should



be pursued as part of any project on this site -whether an at-grade crossing with a light or the more costly options: an underground tunnel or bridge.

With the ongoing development of Deer Springs on the north side of Town and this proposed development, the developer should consider coordinating with the Town to think about new “Welcome to Hideout” signage along SR248.

Infrastructure: Issues regarding water rights and availability must be addressed. Additionally, it is assumed all road infrastructure will be financed by the developer. Will the roads, upon completion, be maintained by an HOA? A phasing plan should ultimately be presented. Is a traffic signal proposed at the entry road and SR248?

Zoning: As the Applicant and the Planning Commission review the Concept Plan and additional detail is ultimately provided, staff will assess how/whether the proposed Concept Plan will meet Town Code and determine if any variances are necessary.

Next Steps

The Planning Commission should review the Proposed Concept plan and provide input to the Applicant. A Concept Plan application is an opportunity for the Planning Commission to provide input and weigh the anticipated benefits and impacts associated with the proposed development. The Planning Commission should be prepared to provide direction to the Applicant. How can the project help the Town ensure amenities are located in the heart of the town or increase the tax base (beyond the minimal property taxes the Town collects from residential development) from the last large piece of undeveloped (and unentitled) property? Any up-zoning must be consistent with the principles articulated in the General Plan. The Planning Commission should relay all concerns, general input and ideas so the Applicant has solid direction. If the Planning Commission is generally supportive of the Concept Plan, all input can be provided to the Applicant so they may proceed to the next step in the process – rezoning application. After that, a preliminary, then final, subdivision would be the next steps.