

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Town Council Special Meeting and Continued Public Hearing
May 04, 2022

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in Regular Meeting and Continued Public Hearing on May 04, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. electronically via Zoom Conference call due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Regular Meeting and Continued Public Hearing

I. Call to Order

1. No Anchor Site Determination Letter

Mayor Rubin called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and reminded participants there was no physical anchor site due to the ongoing COVID-19 threat.

II. Roll Call

Present: Mayor Phil Rubin
Council Member Chris Baier
Council Member Sheri Jacobs
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Bob Nadelberg
Council Member Ralph Severini

Staff Present: Town Attorney Polly McLean
Town Administrator Jan McCosh
Town Planner Thomas Eddington
Director of Engineering and Public Works Timm Dixon
Director of Public Works Daniel Allen
Town Engineer Ryan Taylor
Town Engineer Dillon Bliler
Town Clerk Alicia Fairbourne
Deputy Town Clerk Kathleen Hopkins

Others Present: Harrison Littleddyke, Mary Freeman, Rachel Cooper, Todd Ambery, McKay Christensen, Jack Walkenhorst, Sean Philipoom, Carol Tomas, Lars Anderson and others who may have logged in using a partial name or using only a phone number.

III. Continued Public Hearing Items

- 1. Continued discussion and possible approval regarding an amendment of the official Town of the Hideout Zoning Map to rezone parcels 00-0020-8181, 00-0020-8182, 00-0020-8184, and 00-0020-8185 (the “Boulders at Hideout Development”) from Mountain (M) zone to Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU), and R6 (Residential 6) in accordance with the proposed zoning map**

2. Continued discussion and possible approval of a Master Development Agreement (MDA) regarding the Boulders at Hideout Development

Clerk's note: Agenda items #1 and #2 were discussed together in a broad overview of The Boulders project.

Mayor Rubin announced the discussion was a continued Public Hearing from the March 29, 2022 Special Meeting which was further continued at the April 14, 2022 Regular Meeting, and potential approval of an amendment to the Official Zoning Map related to the proposed development of The Boulders. There was also a discussion and possible approval of a Master Development Agreement (MDA) for the Boulders Development.

Town Planner Thomas Eddington initiated the discussion and presented the staff report. Updates were provided, indicating that the applicants were still preparing requested materials for Council's review, some completed while others were in progress. The opportunity was presented to review the project and address any inquiries or provide direction. Mr. Eddington also noted that an open house had been held on April 27, 2022 introducing the project to the community and external parties with successful attendance.

The process of finalizing a community survey was highlighted, aimed at gathering general planning input unrelated to this specific project. The intention was to obtain insights on the future direction of land use within the community. Mr. Eddington suggested the Town provide the community with a clear timeline for upcoming meetings, mentioning the possibility of a meeting on May 12, 2022, and the importance of communicating any changes promptly. He noted the applicants had prepared a 3D model, which was presented during the April 27 open house. He gave the option to present and discuss it further during the meeting if Council desired.

Mayor Rubin and Mr. Eddington discussed the relevance of the 3D model in addressing identified topics. Mr. Eddington suggested moving forward with it if the model aided the discussion. Following this, he presented a map outlining existing subdivisions, approvals, and entitlements within the community. This map encompassed various projects, including the Hideout Canyon MDA (Shoreline, Golden Eagle, and Soaring Hawk), Deer Waters, Deer Springs, Lakeview, and Klaim, accounting for around twenty-five hundred (2500) units in total. The spatial layout of these developments, both recent and older, was explained, highlighting their distribution across the Town.

Mr. Eddington also noted the Richardson Flats annexation proposal from 2019-2020, which covered about three-hundred fifty (350) acres, one hundred thousand (100,000) square feet of commercial space, and six-hundred twenty-five (625) units, and showed the location of the Boulders Development, which proposed one-hundred twelve (112) acres, approximately six-hundred ten (610) residential units, hotel, bed and breakfast, and commercial development.

A fiscal analysis was prepared by the applicants during the prior meeting, which had been updated at the Council's request to include expenditures, expenses, and revenues. The updated analysis had been presented to the Economic Development Committee (EDC), and Council Member Severini prepared and presented a summary of the analysis, outlining key points and revenue distribution. The analysis projected that in the sixth year of the project, approximately \$1 million in additional taxes could be generated for the Town. These taxes were expected to come from property tax (32%), sales tax (23%), and transient room tax (40%).

The analysis also discussed the estimated costs associated with maintaining the Boulders within the Town, including road maintenance, amounting to about \$380,000 annually. This expense was factored into the financial calculations. The net increase in net revenue for the Town, after deducting expenses, was projected to be around \$660,000 if The Boulders were approved.

There was a discussion about whether the developer fees were a revenue stream or an offset for associated development costs. It was emphasized that these fees were directly related to the cost of permits.

The presentation also addressed the potential impact of further development on the analysis. The financial implications for homeowners were considered based on assessed home values, and questions were raised about how these estimates might change with the growth of additional homes.

Overall, the presentation provided a summary of the financial analysis, highlighting the projected additional taxes and their potential effects on the Town's budget. The Council Members expressed the need for more details and a deeper dive into the assumptions and formulas behind the analysis. The analysis was expected to be further discussed in future meetings to ensure a comprehensive understanding of its implications.

There was a discussion about the commercial development component of the proposed project. Mr. Eddington introduced the topic, highlighting the importance of understanding the amount and timing of commercial development, especially in relation to potential tax revenues.

The commercial development plan included various components such as a restaurant and retail spaces within the hotel, retail space in the renovated bed and breakfast house, a proposed clubhouse, and a retail pad. Additionally, there was a recommendation for additional commercial square footage in the Big House Condos.

The Council Members discussed the significance of having a hotel on the site and the potential impacts if a hotel could not be secured. Concerns were raised about the financial model and whether it would collapse without a hotel, given that the transient room tax was a significant revenue generator. The Council expressed a need for strict, measurable performance requirements to ensure the hotel's presence within a certain timeframe.

Questions were raised about the potential timeline for achieving a hotel development and the possibility of the land remaining vacant if a hotel wasn't built. The concept of the town potentially intervening to take ownership of the land if no hotel development materialized was also discussed.

There were concerns about the financial implications if the commercial component didn't generate the expected tax revenues. It was highlighted that the financial model depended on generating additional revenue to help offset the increasing costs associated with the Town's growth.

The discussion emphasized the need for specificity in terms of the commercial development, timelines, and revenue expectations. The potential impact on the Town's budget and identity were considered key factors in determining the appropriate course of action.

The Council Members discussed the importance of having clear expectations and requirements for the commercial development component of the project, especially in relation to generating tax revenues that would support the Town's financial needs and growth plans.

The discussion centered around the phasing plan for the proposed development. Mr. Eddington introduced the idea of having a phasing plan in the MDA to outline the timeline for different

aspects of the project's completion. The Council Members agreed having a clear phasing plan in the MDA was important, as it provides certainty and expectations for both the Town and the Developer. The concept of having a completion date and a rough timeline for the hotel and other components of the project was emphasized.

The idea of modifying the fiscal analysis based on different completion timelines was mentioned, as well as the need to adjust the revenue generation projections if the phasing plan changed. The Council Members expressed interest in discussing the phasing plan in more detail and receiving input from the Developers regarding their perspective on the timeline and phasing.

It was noted that the initial proposal showed nine (9) phases, but it was important to have more specific details, and Council Member Haselton stated the hotel should be part of one of the early phases. Council Members emphasized the need for transparency and clear expectations in the MDA regarding the phasing of different project components.

The developers expressed their concerns about the feasibility of implementing a strict phasing plan that mandated the construction of an \$80 million hotel by a specific timeline. Developer McKay Christensen emphasized that the market conditions and demand for hotel properties play a significant role in determining the feasibility of such a project.

Mr. Christensen highlighted that the financial investment required for land acquisition, water, infrastructure, amenities, and other aspects of the development added up to around \$100 million. He explained that the ability to repay this debt and equity relied on the revenue generated by the hotel, which would require proper market demand to operate successfully. He questioned the practicality of securing financing and investors for a project that imposed such strict requirements without considering market conditions.

Council Members raised concerns about the changing narrative from the initial proposal, where the hotel and commercial components were emphasized. Mr. Christensen clarified that they were not opposed to the hotel, but that its viability is subject to market demand and the financial feasibility.

Council Member Jacobs pointed out that the Council's concerns stemmed from wanting to ensure a clear timeline and commitment to the hotel's construction, rather than completely dismissing the hotel component.

Council asked the developers to provide a more detailed estimation of the phasing timeline and their considerations for constructing the hotel. They sought a better understanding of the potential timeline that took into account current economic conditions and market dynamics.

The conversation revolved around the developers' perspective on the project's phasing plan, specifically regarding the hotel and other components. Developer Todd Ambery clarified that the phasing plan mentioned in the recent communications was specifically related to the Public Infrastructure District (PID) infrastructure, and there was a distinction between the timing of infrastructure installation and the construction of various residential and commercial components.

Town Attorney Polly McLean raised a question about the clarity of the phasing plan and pointed out that the Letter of Intent referred to a phasing plan in the MDA, but there was a lack of detail in that regard. She inquired about the specific phasing for different components of the project, such as the condo, single-family homes, townhomes, and bed and breakfast. Town Engineer Timm Dixon stated an updated plan set had been received but needed further clarification regarding the timeline.

Council Member Severini requested the developers to provide insights into their financial projections for the next five (5) to seven (7) years, focusing on how they envisioned the project's cash flow, given various assumptions and conditions. He emphasized the importance of understanding how the developers foresee the development unfolding over time.

Messrs Christensen and Ambery responded by reiterating the crucial role that residential sales play in driving demand for amenities and creating a sense of place, which in turn attracts the interest of hotel operators. They highlighted that success begets success, with amenities being the anchor that fuels the project's appeal and drives demand. They explained that they needed some flexibility in the timeline for the hotel's development to ensure they secured the right operator. They further noted a certain amount of infrastructure would need to be in place prior to vertical development.

Mayor Rubin acknowledged the developers' explanations and encouraged them to further analyze their phasing plan and come back with a more concrete timeline for various project components, considering the expectations of homebuyers who were attracted to specific amenities and offerings. He also emphasized the importance of delivering on promises to potential buyers.

Council Member Severini echoed the need for more details in the developers' financial analysis and assumptions, which would help Council better understand their perspective and approach to the project's development timeline.

In response, Mr. Christensen expressed willingness to work with the Town and hotel operator to assess a realistic timeline for the hotel's development. He suggested that a collaborative effort between the developers and the hotel operator could yield a more feasible and accurate timeline projection.

Mayor Rubin acknowledged that there was still more to discuss and that the Council had received valuable input and feedback. Mr. Eddington reiterated the need for an overall phasing plan that would connect the timing of development with the implementation of amenities. Mayor Rubin noted as part of the infrastructure, the developers would need to invest in obtaining enough water shares for the project.

The discussion then shifted to the proposal's inclusion of an amphitheater. Mr. Eddington noted there were two other amphitheaters proposed in the Deer Springs and Shoreline developments. Mayor Rubin expressed the need to evaluate these plans and ensure that the recreational components would be diverse and aligned with the Town's needs.

Council Member Haselton emphasized the need for a community center and Town Hall, mentioning the challenges of holding virtual meetings and the lack of a suitable gathering space. She questioned the continued reliance on Zoom meetings and called for attention to be given to constructing a proper Town Hall.

The conversation evolved to touch on concerns about safety and wildlife corridors, with Council Member Baier and others expressing the importance of addressing these issues within the proposed development. The term "pavilion" was used to describe a building intended to serve as a meeting space but not dedicated exclusively to the Town. Some Council Members expressed the need for a true community center and Town Hall.

Messrs Ambery and Christensen responded by highlighting their efforts to address various concerns and suggesting that the proposed pavilion could be used for a Town Hall if desired. They mentioned they were donating \$2.5 million to the Town which could be used for a dedicated

Town Hall, or for an over or under pass on SR-248. They reiterated the financial commitment they were making to ensure the project's success and encouraged a balanced and reasonable approach to addressing the Town's needs within the development.

Mayor Rubin acknowledged the need for a more holistic review of existing agreements to ensure that the development's amenities and commitments aligned cohesively with the Town's overall vision. He emphasized that various parties, including the Council, developers, and other stakeholders, would collaborate to achieve an integrated approach.

Council Member Severini brought up the idea of conducting a survey to gather input from the community about trade-offs between connectivity and investing in a Town Hall or a more controlled pavilion. He acknowledged that choices come with trade-offs and emphasized the importance of community input, especially since the Town has been evolving with new developments.

Council Member Haselton inquired about the design of the proposed pavilion, expressing her understanding that it might be an outdoor building with a roof, possibly suitable for events like weddings. Mr. Christensen acknowledged that they had not adequately illustrated the pavilion's design. He reiterated that they had a 3D model with images that could help convey their architectural direction and purpose for the building.

Council Member Jacobs also expressed interest in viewing the images but mentioned difficulty in accessing the files previously sent. She asked for the renderings to be sent again in a different format. Mayor Rubin thanked everyone for their input and directed the discussion back to the main agenda.

The discussion moved to the topic of the developer's need for an exemption of public space, specifically related to the current Hideout Municipal Code requirement of providing three (3) acres of public space per one hundred (100) units of density. Mr. Eddington pointed out the need to ensure that the proposed development adhered to this requirement, considering the higher density of the development in question (about 600 units) and the related need for eighteen (18) acres of public space in addition to the trail connections.

Ms. McLean clarified the Hideout Municipal Code Section 10.08.34 that outlined the requirements for public space and recreational amenities. She explained that the term "public space" encompasses areas like parks, playgrounds, and recreational spaces, which needed to be reserved and marked on the plat as such. Mr. Christensen mentioned that they had planned for more open space and amenities than the code required. However, there was a need for clarity on how the proposed amenities fit into the requirement of eighteen (18) acres of public space.

Mayor Rubin highlighted the importance of designating areas like the pond, amphitheater, and the pavilion building as public space and ensuring that it aligned with the Town's requirements. The conversation focused on clarifying the different categories of space and their compliance with the Code's stipulations. It was agreed that further discussions and adjustments would be made to ensure that the proposed development met the necessary criteria for public space.

Mr. Eddington introduced item number five, requesting relief from certain requirements in the Code. Mr. Christensen was asked to explain the specifics. The requested waivers included various aspects like road rights-of-way, sensitive land development, stormwater basins, retaining wall heights, visitor and bicycle parking, and setback requirements.

Council Member Severini expressed concerns about three specific aspects. First, he raised questions about road width, considering the importance of emergency safety standards and vehicle access. Second, he discussed retaining wall heights, questioning the need for taller walls when lower walls with breaks could be aesthetically pleasing and less disruptive. Finally, he voiced reservations about setback requirements, noting that maintaining adequate view sheds and preventing a loss of sight had been a priority for the Town.

Mr. Christensen addressed Council Member Severini's concerns by providing further explanations. He explained that the proposed road cross sections aimed to balance road width requirements, emergency vehicle access, and minimizing disturbance to open spaces. The design involved variations in utility easements on the sides of the roads. In terms of retaining wall heights, he emphasized that the goal was to reduce ground disturbance by using taller walls with step backs rather than extensive grading. He presented the concept that taller walls with breaks would disturb less ground and contribute to a reduced footprint. This concept aligned with the Town's goals of preserving natural areas, however, was not cohesive to the current Town Code, which only allowed for a maximum height of ten (10) feet with a terraced step back at five (5) feet.

Council Member Severini acknowledged the trade-offs involved with retaining wall heights and expressed interest in finding a possible compromise. He suggested exploring alternatives that might involve wall heights between six (6) and ten (10) feet with appropriate setbacks.

The main points of discussion were related to proposed changes to the Town's code, specifically regarding retaining walls, road cross sections, and setbacks. The developers expressed their need for modifications to the code to accommodate their development plans due to the site's topography. They argued that the current Code's limitations would hinder their ability to responsibly develop the site and achieve the desired density.

Key points of the conversation included:

1. The developers' request for modifications to retaining wall heights, road cross sections, and setbacks to, from the developer's standpoint, allow for more flexible and responsible development.
2. Discussion around the height of retaining walls, where the developers expressed that the current Town Code's ten-foot (10') limit for retaining walls was inadequate for their plans.
3. Concerns about maintaining safe conditions for vehicles and addressing potential issues with cars protruding onto roads due to steep driveways.
4. Differences of opinion on the necessity and design of curb and gutter, as well as drainage swales, with the developers indicating they preferred alternatives.
5. A reminder that any changes to the Code would likely require going through the Planning Commission for review and potential approval.
6. Input from Town Engineers Timm Dixon and Ryan Taylor, about the importance of addressing issues related to steep slopes, drainage, and erosion.

The conversation indicated that both sides acknowledged the need for further discussions and potential adjustments to specific aspects of the proposed development and Code modifications. It was also suggested that the developers provide more detailed information about the proposed variations in retaining walls, road sections, and setbacks, along with their rationale.

The Council Members expressed the need for a more detailed review of the proposed changes, potential impacts, and potential alternatives before making any decisions.

Discussion ensued regarding design standards for a development project. The issue of submitting design guidelines and standards was raised, which had been a customary practice for the Town Council in past similar projects. It was mentioned that these standards were usually requested along with the submission of an MDA, and the involvement of the Town Planner, Planning Commission, or Council Member as part of the Design Review Committee (DRC) was anticipated. However, it was noted that no design guidelines or standards had been submitted for the current project.

Mr. Christensen shared that creating architectural design guidelines is a comprehensive process that involved architects, marketing teams, branding teams, and architectural teams working together to establish the theme and style of the development. This process was usually extensive and expensive and was integrated into the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R's) of the project. He indicated that, at the current stage, they hadn't delved into this aspect of the project due to the time and complexity involved.

Mr. Eddington proposed the idea of making the submission of architectural guidelines a condition of MDA approval. This would ensure that the design standards were established before proceeding with the project's further stages, such as preliminary or final plat approvals. Mr. Christensen then suggested making the submission of these guidelines a condition for recording the first plat. He explained that this would mean the development couldn't proceed until the architectural guidelines were in place, giving the Council control over plat approvals.

The Council Members expressed their perspectives. Some highlighted the importance of having a clear understanding of design standards upfront, while others mentioned that it need not be detailed architectural rendering but could include precedent images and simplified concepts. There was a discussion about the timing of the submission and a need for clear definitions. Council Member Severini emphasized the necessity of establishing a timeline that allowed for adequate review by the Council, given the late submission of the materials from the developers.

Mr. Eddington agreed that providing a timeline for upcoming meetings and material presentations was essential for transparency and community involvement. He also acknowledged the need to include the designer in discussions.

The discussion moved on to the topic of developer contributions to the Town. The proposal involved contributing \$2.5 million for a pedestrian tunnel, with \$500,000 to be paid annually for the first five years. In addition to this, consideration was given to the conveyance of rights of way to the community, which would come with commitments for Town Staff, such as snowplowing, maintenance, and road repair. The developer suggested a commitment of five hundred dollars (\$500) of every building permit to be set aside for snow maintenance and snowplow equipment.

Mr. Eddington sought Council's input on whether they found this proposal acceptable and a potential compromise. Clarifications were made regarding the \$500 payment per building permit and the intention of this fee to offset maintenance costs. The conversation touched on the need to address maintenance expenses upfront, the potential for private road maintenance, and the ongoing nature of maintenance costs over the years. Council members raised concerns about the calculation of the proposed numbers and how they align with the Town's needs.

Mr. Dixon shared his concerns about playing catch up with maintenance expenses after roads were installed. Ms. McLean emphasized the possibility of having the HOA take over maintenance responsibilities to alleviate costs for the Town.

The discussion continued with considerations about the formula for affordable housing and the percentage of units dedicated to this purpose. Mr. Eddington explained the lack of a specific requirement for affordable housing but indicated that twenty-eight (28) affordable housing units out of five hundred ninety-nine (599) units seemed reasonable based on a percentage comparison. It was agreed to refine the numbers and provide a clearer breakdown of unit types and their allocation in the project.

Mr. Eddington addressed an issue concerning undisturbed land. He clarified that undisturbed land referred to land that remained untouched, with vegetation, grading, and landscaping intact. He highlighted that there had been some confusion regarding the definition of undisturbed land and the need for further grading due to the proposed density. The conversation led to a discussion about open space versus undisturbed land. Mr. Christensen, in response, acknowledged the confusion and explained that they had provided necessary documentation, including a concept map and rezoning application, as per the public notice requirements. He described their plans for preserving undisturbed land at approximately fifteen percent (15%) of the site and addressed the mistaken impression that forty-five percent (45%) of the site would be undisturbed. Mr. Ambery further clarified the distinction between undisturbed land and traditional open space and noted that their plans had been adapted to meet Planning Commission and Council requests. Mr. Eddington acknowledged the misunderstanding caused by the map and invited Council members to provide input regarding the lower percentage of undisturbed land than originally thought.

Council Member Baier expressed the need to return some details, particularly those related to undisturbed land and other planning aspects, to the Planning Commission for further consideration. She believed that certain issues were more suitable for the Planning Commission to handle and didn't want these discussions to hinder the Council's regular business. Council Member Severini and Council Member Haselton shared their agreement with this approach and mentioned interactions with Planning Commission members who felt the same. Council Member Jacobs also supported seeking Planning Commission's opinions on certain matters. Council Member Nadelberg added that public opinion should be considered through a survey before making any decisions and expressed his skepticism about the proposed development, suggesting that it might not benefit the town.

The discussion shifted to polling the town constituents, with Town Administrator Jan McCosh noting that a survey would be sent via SurveyMonkey soon. Council Member Severini recommended waiting until after the next Planning Commission meeting to release the survey, allowing their input to be factored in. Council Member Nadelberg emphasized the importance of seeking the townspeople's opinions and suggested waiting to gather more clarity on the Richardson Flats area's development before making a decision. Ms. McLean provided an update on the Richardson Flats area, explaining that the annexation had been deemed void by the Fourth District Court and that an appeal was planned after a final judgment was entered.

It was noted that at some point, Mayor Rubin had dropped off the call, and therefore, Council Member Baier would be conducting as Mayor Pro Tempore.

Mr. Eddington concluded by summarizing the remaining points of discussion. He mentioned that most of the report had been covered and would continue working on connectivity with Mr. Taylor,

who had to leave the call. There was a proposed connection to Golden Eagle, which involved a main access road passing through private property, leading to challenges that needed resolution with the collaboration of various parties. Regarding the delineation of housing types and numbers, he noted that earlier discussions had addressed the breakdown of single-family lots, Casitas, villas, and townhouses. Messrs Ambery and Christensen had committed to providing more detailed figures for these housing types to the Town Council in the near future.

There being no further items on the staff report and no further questions from Council, Mayor Pro Tempore Baier opened the floor for public input at 9:37 p.m.

Carol Tomas expressed several concerns during the meeting. She brought up the issue of undisturbed land and questioned its definition, particularly in relation to the potential masquerading of areas similar to Lakeview Estates and Deer Springs. She sought clarification on the concept of undisturbed land and the impact of retaining walls. She also expressed worries about water availability, considering the current state of the reservoir level and the water demands posed by over six hundred (600) housing units. She questioned the necessity of multiple amphitheaters and suggested that some areas might be better suited for open space. The topic of the hotel was also raised, with Ms. Tomas referencing the Black Rock Resort Hotel off SR-248 and inquiring about its occupancy rates and potential implications for the proposed development.

Mr. Eddington clarified Ms. Tomas' concern about undisturbed land. He explained that undisturbed land referred to untouched and native landscape where the vegetation remained intact. He assured that the definition would be defined clearly and indicated on a map in collaboration with Messrs Ambery and Christensen.

Ms. Tomas expressed her concern about the potential impact of reducing undisturbed land from forty-five percent (45%) to five to fifteen percent (5-15%). She mentioned her personal experience with an area designated as open space but rendered unusable due to its steep grade. She worried that if undisturbed land was reduced and replaced with artificial grass that may not thrive in the local drought conditions, it could affect the natural appearance of the environment and the appeal of the area to residents. She urged everyone to consider these factors when making decisions.

There being no further public comment, Mayor Pro Tempore Baier closed the public input portion at 9:43 p.m.

Mr. Christensen shared his perspective on the open house held in April, noting that the event received a positive response from attendees who expressed enthusiasm about the project. He mentioned that the project's vision might become clearer when viewing the site in person. Mr. Ambery added that the open house had gone well, and the feedback received was largely positive.

Council Member Severini expressed his desire for more diverse public input and mentioned that any positive responses might have been influenced by the audience at the open house. He also emphasized the significance of hearing from a broader range of residents.

Council Member Nadelberg provided a contrasting viewpoint, stating that while the project might seem attractive in isolation, there were concerns about its overall benefits and density for the Town.

Council Member Haselton shared the concerns she had heard from residents at the open house, which included worries about water availability, the density of the development, access to amenities, and the impact on the Town's character.

The Council proposed a schedule for further deliberations and decision-making regarding the development project. Council Member Baier suggested that the Planning Commission should review the current plan during their next meeting, which was on May 19, 2022. After that, the Council would aim to have a follow-up meeting on June 2, 2022 to continue discussing the project. The Council agreed on the idea of having the Planning Commission review specific sections and changes related to planning aspects during their next meeting. The goal was to ensure that the Planning Commission's and Council's reviews would align and provide clarity for further decision-making.

At 9:50 p.m., Mayor Rubin rejoined the call.

Council Member Severini emphasized the need for specificity in the project's details and requested that the Planning Commission review the specific variances and changes being proposed. Council Member Baier agreed and suggested that the Council should focus on specific Code sections, and Section five (5) and eight (8) of the staff report, and potentially others relevant to the proposed changes. Mayor Rubin noted the importance of having the Planning Commission focus on planning-related aspects during their review.

Council Member Severini raised questions about the legal aspects of the MDA, and whether Ms. McLean needed specific clarifications and responses to her comments in the MDA before proceeding. He expressed concern about the potential complexity of the MDA discussions and wanted to ensure that the Planning Commission's focus would be on key points.

Council Member Baier supported the idea of focusing on specific sections for the Planning Commission's review and agreed that highlighting the relevant changes and differences for the Planning Commission would be helpful.

Mayor Rubin suggested that the Planning Commission Chair should be informed of the specific sections that they need to focus on to avoid any confusion or unnecessary discussions. The goal was to streamline the Planning Commission's review and ensure that their recommendations aligned with the Council's intentions.

Council Member Severini also asked about the timing of sending materials to the Planning Commission. Polly McLean mentioned that it would be ideal to provide the materials as soon as possible to give the Planning Commission adequate time for review before their next meeting on May 19. She suggested sending the relevant sections of the Council packet that related to the Planning Commission's focus areas, along with any necessary explanations.

Council Member Severini inquired about the process of voting on the project and related actions. He sought clarification on whether these actions would be voted on together or separately. Ms. McLean explained that the current plan involved three separate actions: approving the MDA, approving the zone change, and approving the Letter of Intent for the PID. Each of these actions would have its own resolution associated with it.

Council Member Severini also asked about the order of these actions. Polly McLean suggested that it would likely make sense to discuss and vote on the MDA first, followed by the Letter of Intent and the zone change. The conversation indicated that these actions are interconnected and needed to be addressed separately but as part of a comprehensive process.

IV. Meeting Adjournment

There being no further discussion, Mayor Rubin asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Council Member Nadelberg moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Severini made the second. Voting Yes: Council Member Baier, Council Member Haselton, Council Member Jacobs, Council Member Nadelberg, Council Member Severini. None opposed. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10:19 p.m.



Alicia Fairbourne
Alicia Fairbourne, Town Clerk

APPROVED