

Town of Hideout
10860 N. Hideout Trail
Hideout, UT 84036
PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING
October 1, 2020
6:00 p.m.

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in Special Meeting on
October 01, 2020 at 6:00 PM via Zoom meeting.

Special Meeting

I. Call to Order and No Anchor Site Determination Letter Reading

Acting Chair Ralph Severini called the meeting to order at approximately 6:09 p.m. and read the No Anchor Site Determination letter in its entirety. All attendees were present electronically.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT:

Acting Chair Ralph Severini
Commissioner Bruce Woelfle
Commissioner Tony Matyscyk
Commissioner Donna Turner (Alternate) (joined the meeting at
approximately 6:15 p.m.)

TOWN STAFF:

Thomas Eddington, Town Planner
Polly McLean, Town Attorney
Ryan Taylor, Town Engineer

Alicia Fairbourne, Town Clerk
Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Nate Brockbank, Doug Bacon, Brad Cahoon, Chris Bender, Eric Langvardt, John Phillips, Kim Carson, Tom Kelly, Caleb Payeur, Todd Hollow, Roger Armstrong, Kurt Shadle, Sean Philipoom, Alexander Cramer, Linda George, Linda Smith, Lynn Ross, Mary Christa Smith, Katie Sharp, Angela Moschetta, Carol Tomas, Juan Lee, David Bennett, Scott Bigger, Bret Rutter, Margaret Olson, Rebecca Ward and others who may not have signed in using proper names via Zoom.

III. Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

Acting Chair Severini proposed that the approval of the minutes of the September 17, 2020 Planning Commission meeting be tabled until the next regular meeting in order for all the members to provide their comments, as well as to maximize the time spent on the main agenda item of this meeting.

Commissioner Woelfle moved to table the approval of the September 17, 2020 minutes until the next regular meeting; Commissioner Matyscyk made the second.

IV. Agenda Items

Continued discussion of the Potential Annexation Master Development Agreement for the land subject to Resolution 2020-09 (Resolution of Intent to Annex)

Acting Chair Severini outlined the planned discussion, noting it as a continuation from the last presentation made by Mr. Nate Brockbank and his team regarding the proposed Richardson Flat development, as well as modifications to plan as being presented at this meeting. Acting Chair Severini reported that the discussion would begin with environmental topics. Mr. Brad Cahoon, environmental attorney working for Mr. Brockbank, and Mr. Doug Bacon, from the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), were introduced.

Mr. Cahoon provided some of his professional background, noting that he is an environmental land use attorney practicing for 30 years, and with much of that practice in Park City and the Summit County area. He noted his experience with brown field developments involving both Super Fund sites and other impacted properties around the country, and highlighted his experience in the Park City area dealing with the leftovers from historic silver mining activity, as well as voluntary and other cleanups of mines in the Park City area. Regarding the questions pertaining to this particular property identified for the annexation, he reported that these Mayflower properties have undergone Phase I environmental site assessment testing by CMT and there were no recognized environmental conditions identified in those reports for these particular parcels. They looked at the Richardson Flat Super Fund site, which is not on these properties, but is considered within the review area, but all the reports concluded that the Richardson Flat area would not be a recognized environmental condition for the Mayflower properties. The reports confirm that these parcels are historically undeveloped, not subject to historic mining activity, and show no surface evidence of any mining activity, piling or disturbed vegetation. These properties under consideration for the annexation should not be viewed as environmentally impaired for that purpose or evaluation.

Regarding the Richardson Flat area, Mr. Cahoon noted that it is located at a lower elevation, and as a Super Fund site, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the lead agency responsible, with the DEQ also involved to coordinate with the EPA. It was his understanding that long-term, the Richardson Flat repository will undergo a permanent closure. The site is impacted by historic mine tailing. As background, Park City has had a soil management ordinance in place for many years, which has avoided Super Fund site designations of areas including Empire Canyon and above Old Town, which had been impacted by silver mining. In coordination with EPA and DEQ, Richardson Flat was the designated site to receive impacted soils from these Park City silver mining areas. Until 2008, Richardson Flat was used for impounding these soils impacted with arsenic and lead; since 2008 those types of impacted soils have been directed to other

permeated landfills. Long-term, the Richardson Flat site will need to be closed, and in the interim, the Park City ordinance requires that if impacted soil is identified on a property, it needs to be covered with clean soil and landscaping so that impacted soil is not at the surface. It was Mr. Cahoon's understanding that Richardson Flat currently has an interim cover to prevent wind blown tailing, and long term, it will receive a permanent cover and be repurposed to most likely become a park or recreation area. As far as developing in the Mayflower area, Mr. Brockbank's team has retained an environmental consultant who understands the precautions that need to be undertaken during construction activities and in the unlikely event that impacted soils are identified, there is a protocol in place so that soils are identified, sampled and properly managed. This is typical for the Park City area and contractors are used to dealing with those types of impacted soils and have protocols to properly manage the soil for the protection of health and environment. Those protocols would be followed for this development. Mr. Cahoon stated that he does not believe there to be an environmental concern about annexing these particular parcels into the town.

Acting Chair Severini stated that he read the 2018 Five Year Report on the Richardson Flat Super Fund site authored by the EPA in conjunction with work done by DEQ, and noted that with the Richardson Flat land being in close proximity to the proposed annexation, the Planning Commission wanted to make sure the proposed annexation is clear of any environmental concerns. He invited Mr. Bacon from DEQ to comment and ask any questions of Mr. Cahoon.

Mr. Bacon stated that he is somewhat new to the team overseeing the Richardson Flat Super Fund (OU1) site, having assumed his role in January 2019. He noted that he has extensive background in mining waste, including management of the Kennecott copper mining site for over 20 years. Mr. Bacon asked Mr. Cahoon about the distance from the proposed development and the Richardson Flat Super Fund site. Mr. Eric Langvardt, engineer for the development team, did not have those exact measurements at hand, but estimated it to be approximately 1,000 feet. Mr. Bacon asked if any of the proposed lands for annexation are part of Parcel SS87 (per Summit County parcel registry). Mr. Brockbank answered no.

Mr. Bacon noted that the Richardson Flat OU1 site is predominately comprised of Parcels SS87 and SS88 in the Summit County parcel identification registry. The repository sits on a good portion of SS87, with a small portion (mostly north and western end near its embankment) near the Silver Creek channel within SS88. The properties were cleaned up in terms of removal action, primarily in the mid-1990's. The material that was removed from the broader portions of the OU1 site were consolidated into the existing repository at the time, and the existing repository was reconstructed with a reinforced embankment so it would not slough to the west into Silver Creek. Drainages were cleaned up that were diverting water around the repository. Portions that are south and north of Richardson Flat Road were cleaned up as part of SS88 and SS87. Mr. Bacon's understanding, based on the 2018 5 Year Review (work which pre-dates his tenure on the project), was that those areas were sampled after the removal actions, and that the sample data (to which he did not have access) attested to those locations being below 500 parts per million for lead which was the action level for that clean up around the repository. As Mr. Cahoon had stated, the repository is currently capped on an interim basis, but it can still receive material from cleanups pending within the Silver Creek channel. Thus it will be some time before the repository receives a final cap. Also as Mr. Cahoon had stated, the land can ultimately be managed for recreation use such as trails, but is not to be developed for other purposes such as residential. Under EPA Selected Remedy for OU1, there is a requirement to get institutional

controls in place to restrict the development of ground water resources. There are shallow ground water impacts, and the extent of any impacts to shallow water and the deep-water aquifer is still being investigated. This was the summary of the Richardson Flat OU1 site.

Mr. Bacon did not know the extent that the Richardson Flat OU1 site would have caused any impacts between it and the Mayflower properties in question. He would have to speak with the EPA and his colleague at DEQ Rob Parker to determine what data is available. He was aware of one data point from south of the repository site, but did not currently have access to those test results. Mr. Bacon offered to reach out to the EPA to access test results pertaining to the Richardson Flat OU1 site. This information is publicly available but the EPA manages the database (not DEQ).

Acting Chair Severini thanked Mr. Bacon for his report and noted that there is a lot of information to understand. Acting Chair Severini shared his concerns for potentially moving forward with the annexation and whether there are impediments that may not be directly on the property in question but that could infringe. He asked whether a permanent cap would resolve risks in a scenario of a catastrophic failure.

Mr. Bacon responded that with regard to the integrity of the repository and permanent sequestration and capping, the removal and response work that was done early on stabilized the repository on its northern and western end (the face of the repository above Silver Creek). There had been sloughing, the embankment was mobile to some point. During the removal work, United Park City Mines (UPCM) created a new embankment face and stabilized it so it would not move and slough into Silver Creek. There are lower spots immediately adjacent to the southern, eastern and western ends of the repository, and a final cap is intended to insure 1) that the material does not leave the footprint of the repository and 2) depending on the need, adding an evapo-transitive cover to assist with the re-vegetation and so that the vegetation takes up any water precipitation and snow melt that hits the repository over time and transpires it and off gases to the atmosphere, rather than filtering water through the repository. It will take time to get to this point. The current cover prevents wind blown dust. The final cover has yet to be built.

Mr. Cahoon added that these interim covers and the ultimate cap are engineered to last a long time, and there will be ongoing operation and maintenance required in perpetuity to insure the integrity of the cap. He also emphasized that the Mayflower properties under consideration are at a much higher elevation, above the Richardson Flat Super Fund site, which minimizes the risk of any impact from the Richardson Flat area. Mr. Cahoon further emphasized that it is common for development to occur around sites similar to this one. He cited the examples in the Salt Lake Valley, (in Midvale, the Sharon Steel Super Fund site) which is a capped property that is currently undergoing redevelopment. This includes Bingham Junction, which has undergone complete mixed-use redevelopment in conjunction with the EPA and DEQ.

Mr. Bacon added examples of redevelopment projects that he has worked on, and the controls that are put in place to make sure that development takes care of residual wastes appropriate to what is being proposed for development. He added that a Super Fund site does not necessarily preclude development, but management of the materials does become a consideration during the development. It sounded to him like the Richardson Flat site is a distance away from the development properties, and there is a temporary wind cover currently in place. The potential catastrophic failure scenarios could include flood or earthquake, and when the site is ultimately capped, the engineering would be intended to insure that the cap stays in place.

Mr. Cahoon shared maps of the proposed annexation, which provided views of the development's proximity and elevations relative to the Richardson Flat repository site. Mr. Bacon concurred that the area under consideration for development appears to be above the repository, and once it has its final cap, it should not move. Commission Woelfle noted that the rail trail and parts of the proposed Town Center appear to be somewhat lower spots, but seemed to be higher than the repository site.

Mr. Cahoon explained the protocols that would be followed if impacted soil was found during construction, including sampling and testing levels, excavation and disposal of impacted soil, and confirmation sampling to insure standards are met. He also noted that the environmental engineer working with Mr. Brockbank has experience with several development projects in this area.

Mr. Cahoon also shared a map of the Geneva Steel site development, as an example of a similar development project, and discussed the process involved in clean up of the historic steel mill locations, remaining capped repositories and the completed and planned development projects ranging from residential, commercial and recreational uses. This development is one of the fastest growing towns in Utah, and is a good example of a brown field development built in conjunction with the community, EPA, DEQ and the developer.

Mr. Cahoon walked through Google Earth views of the proposed annexation property, noting elevations above Richardson Flat Road and the repository area. He noted the non-distressed appearance of vegetation in the photographs, which typically indicates non-impaired soil.

Acting Chair Severini asked if testing would be conducted of these adjoining areas. Mr. Cahoon responded that because the Phase 1 testing did not identify any recognized environmental conditions within the Mayflower properties, no further testing is required. He added that as a rule of thumb, contractors will look for indicators of impairment such as odor, soil discoloration and the health of vegetation which are easily spotted, and follow testing protocols as required. Mr. Cahoon further noted that vegetation will not grow if excess arsenic is in the soil.

Mr. Bacon noted the Richardson Flat site's 2018 5 Year Review report, which showed the boundaries around the Richardson Flat OU1 site. These boundary lines, which are drawn based on data, represent the area which the EPA and DEQ believe are impacted. He noted that there is no knowledge of any mining activity south of the repository site. He further noted that sampling has been done in lower Silver Creek and that DEQ is working on additional sampling to fill in some data gaps. Any impaired soil found in these samples would be taken to the Richardson Flat repository (which is why the site remains open awaiting a final cap).

Commissioner Woelfle asked what the Phase 1 report entailed and what would a Phase 2 test consist of for the Mayflower property. Mr. Cahoon explained that Phase 1 is a report governed by an EPA Rule and standard for conducting all appropriate inquiry for property to be purchased. The reason to conduct Phase 1 reporting is to qualify for a buyer protection under the Super Fund program and is a review of government records, interviews with government regulators with knowledge of the site, review of other publicly available information, and includes a site visit. It does not include sub-surface sampling of soil or ground water. If Phase 1 does not identify any recognized environmental conditions, based on the review of records and site visit, then all appropriate inquiries into past use and investigation of the property have been completed. If there are recognized environmental conditions identified, then a Phase 2 report could be required. Phase 2 would include sampling of soil and ground water in the area. In this case, the parcels

were all reviewed under Phase 1 protocol by an environmental professional firm (CMT) whose conclusion was that there were no recognized environmental conditions, so no further sampling was conducted.

Commissioner Woelfle asked for confirmation that no soil or water testing was done in any of these low-lying areas in the property under consideration for annexation. Mr. Brockbank noted that his team took over 80 samples for a geotechnical testing. These tests went down 3-13 feet, and while these tests were not looking for contamination, the professionals conducting the geotechnical reports are trained and would have spotted signs of contamination.

Mr. Cahoon added that the geotechnical reports identify the types of soil in the testing samples, including mine tailing. This testing is done to insure that the site is stable for building construction. Mine tailings do not have proper geotechnical properties for building, and would have been noted in the reports.

Commissioner Woelfle asked whether the geotechnical testing measured water depths or capillary action that could bubble up. Mr. Brockbank did not recall hitting water in any of the samples, given the elevations of the property. Mr. Brockbank also stated that the geotechnical reports were provided to the town of Hideout last month and he volunteered to send them to Mr. Severini to share with the other members of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Woelfle noted that Mr. Cahoon is working for Mr. Brockbank, as is the environmental engineer who will be on site during all excavation. He asked if there is an independent resource that could provide an independent view of the environmental issues. Acting Chair Severini responded that he invited Mr. Bacon to join the meeting for just that purpose, and that he had also invited Rob Parker (Mr. Bacon's counterpart in managing the Richardson Flat Super Fund site and a co-author of the 2018 5 Year Review report,) as well as the original author of the EPA report Mr. Mo Slam (who has since retired) and Catherine Jenkins from the EPA. These individuals were not able to attend this meeting. Acting Chair Severini added that it might be possible to receive input from TO Engineering, the town engineer, although he was not sure if they have an environmental engineer on staff.

Mr. Bacon offered his and Mr. Parker's assistance for any follow up questions from the Planning Commission and committed to provide data on the soil sampling performed to-date on the property south of the Richardson Flat OUI site. He noted the area on a map where the last removal was completed and the southern boundary of the area that has been sampled.

Commissioner Woelfle noted wetlands in this area and asked about the safety and quality of the water in these wetlands. Mr. Bacon responded that the wetlands were part of the original diversion ditches that were used to bring material down to the repository, and which now mostly carries Silver Creek water. He stated that he would have to look into the amount of annual water flow and other information related to this water.

In answer to Commission Woelfle's question regarding the safety of this water, Mr. Bacon responded that while he did not have specific data available on this water, given that the water source to these wetlands is not a drinking water source, he would think that it is probably not safe as drinking water. The land was listed by the EPA as usable for future recreation, such as trails and parks. He noted that structures such as bathroom facilities and parking lots might not be feasible in this area as the land may not be structurally sound for building purposes.

Before Mr. Bacon left the meeting at 7:19 p.m., he repeated his offer to answer any follow up questions and he will send the data on samples as discussed. Mr. Cahoon also left the meeting at this point.

Acting Chair Severini turned the discussion over to Mr. Brockbank and Mr. Chris Bender of the traffic consultant Fehr & Peers, to discuss the traffic study. Mr. Bender reviewed this report, which is the third iteration of the traffic study conducted at the intersections of SR 248 and Richardson Flat Road, SR 248 and Browns Canyon Road, and Richardson Flat Road and Jordanelle Parkway. The study also looked at one proposed access point to SR 248 north of the proposed project site. The study looked at existing conditions and found that both the intersections of SR 248 and Richardson Flat Road, as well as SR 248 and Browns Canyon Road, are currently operating at failing conditions. He noted his understanding that both of these intersections are in the process to be signalized. The study data was collected 1-2 months before COVID 19, during peak ski season. Once those two intersections are signalized as planned (by Park City or the County), they are likely to operate at an acceptable level of service. He noted that the Jordanelle Parkway intersection is currently operating at an acceptable level of service.

Looking forward to completion of the proposed Richardson Flat development and additional traffic resulting from that, Mr. Bender described the modeling used for the study. The study looked at 2025 and 2040 horizon years, and used travel demand models in the area to project traffic volumes based on planned developments in the area, existing population and traffic growth, and projected volumes in the estimated numbers of trips to be generated from the project.

The results of the study indicate that the three intersections noted above are expected to operate at acceptable levels for both horizon years 2025 and 2040, under both scenarios of the completion of the Richardson Flat development and without such development. The study also looked at the best way to implement a new project driveway on SR 248. The results indicated that it is likely that the driveway for the project will need require a merging lane. The two-way left turn lane at Browns Canyon Road will need to be extended back and used to allow merging of traffic from the north to west bound. With this merge lane the driveway would be expected to operate at acceptable levels of service.

Mr. Bender noted that the data was compiled from the traffic models, and the report would be available next week.

Acting Chair Severini asked how Richardson Flat Road will sustain additional traffic once Jordanelle Parkway is completed, and considering traffic expectations coming from surrounding areas. He also asked about the impact on feeder roads into the area. Mr. Bender responded that that this had not been a primary focus in the traffic study. He added that the study of intersections was the focus of the study as they tend to be the limiting factors and are where bottlenecks occur.

Acting Chair Severini asked whether sidewalks and pedestrian traffic were considered in the study. Mr. Bender responded that no, these are not typically part of traffic impact studies. They do look at safety and crash trends and if they do observe problematic intersections with pedestrian incidents, they will be noted. Given the low overall volume of pedestrians and cyclists in the intersections studied, they have not seen any noteworthy trends to be addressed.

Acting Chair Severini asked if the report would comment on public transit. Mr. Bender responded that public transportation is planned and is therefore taken into consideration for estimating the expected numbers of passenger vehicles in the modeling.

Acting Chair Severini asked if the report would take into account the planned commercial development; Mr. Bender confirmed that yes, it will.

Acting Chair Severini asked if the report will comment on hazardous road condition areas to which Mr. Bender responded that yes, it will.

Regarding the data, Commissioner Woelfle asked how the increased traffic expected from all the development around the Jordanelle Reservoir and the completion of Jordanelle Parkway was reflected in the 2020 baseline numbers. Mr. Bender explained how the models look at planned projects and roadway improvements to determine how people will change driving behaviors in the future. He also noted that growth in the Mayflower area was factored in to the travel demand model.

Commissioner Woelfle asked how baselines and growth are created when starting from zero, for example creating growth assumptions for the planned commercial, school and recreational development. He stated his desire to understand these methodologies, and if he had further questions after reading the report, it was agreed that Mr. Bender would be available to provide further details.

Mr. Bender reviewed a map to explain the study area, noting the areas that are expected to see increased traffic over time, and what the changes in traffic will likely be. He pointed out examples of intersections that have little traffic now, but are expected to increase with the planned development and population growth.

Commissioner Woelfle asked to what extent the size of roads are considered. For example, Richardson Flat Road is not currently a very wide road. He asked who would be responsible for expanding it if necessary. Mr. Bender responded that it would probably be whoever has current responsibility for maintenance (UDOT or Summit County).

Acting Chair Severini asked whether the developer would be responsible for the expense of widening the road if the annexation proceeds. Mr. Brockbank responded that the developer probably would be responsible. Acting Chair Severini requested that the traffic report include commentary of the impact on Richardson Flat Road, including the potential need for its widening to accommodate the development plan.

Commissioner Turner asked about the need for any additional proposed traffic lights. Mr. Bender noted that new traffic lights at the intersections of SR 248 and Richardson Flat Road, and SR 248 and Browns Canyon Road are already in process. He stated that the study did not show the need for a traffic light at the intersection of Richardson Flat Road and Jordanelle Parkway. He also noted that with the smaller planned development (relative to the initial annexation plan), there is not a need for a traffic light at the driveway to the Richardson Flat development.

Mr. Eddington, Town Planner, noted that he expected to have questions upon reading the report. He asked about other ideas for connectivity for the community beyond vehicles, including ideas for a lift system to connect with trails. Mr. Bender noted that these types of questions would be better addressed as part of a master planning study, not as part of this traffic impact study.

Commissioner Turner asked whether the study took into account potential increased public transit, including the frequency of bus service. Mr. Bender responded that public transportation is not accounted for as part of the traffic impact study, but would also be better covered in a master planning study.

Mr. Bender left the meeting after answering all questions from the Planning Commission. Acting Chair Severini called for a five minutes break at approximately 7:49 p.m.

The meeting resumed at approximately 7:56 p.m. Acting Chair Severini asked Mr. Brockbank and Mr. Langvardt to discuss their plans for the development. Mr. Langvardt, development planner, provided an overview and reviewed a map detailing the proposed development. The project is set on 348 acres and envisions three villages: 1) the Town Center Village to be situated along Richardson Flat Road; 2) the Meadow Village to include a variety of residential options, parcels for a school and church, park and recreational areas as well as open space; and 3) the Saddle Village with residential areas. The plan maintains approximately 59% open space.

The core of the project is the town center. It will be on relatively flat land, next to the rail trail and centered around a 4-way intersection. Features of the town center include:

- 80,000 square feet of retail space with angled on-street parking
- Retail area centered around a lift to Richardson Peak, and adjacent to trails
- Retail to include restaurants, boutique shops, a 24,000 square foot grocer with a cafe and spill out seating
- Angled on-street parking designed to slow traffic and make the area pedestrian friendly
- Potential police and fire station
- Hotel with structured parking underneath
- Condominiums above retail space with structured parking underneath
- Assisted living facility close to the town center, but far enough away from activities and quiet.

The proposed Meadow Village would include some affordable housing (multi-family, stacked condominium townhouses with front doors open to street), and surrounding single-family homes that fall within Hideout's existing zoning. Parcels for a school (5 acres) and a church would be in this village center.

The Saddle Village would also have a village green, town homes and single-family homes.

The development would include a trail system to connect with existing area trails, and with a trailside park.

Acting Chair Severini asked about density considerations, noting that the plan appears to be more dense than originally anticipated. Mr. Langvardt shared views of the plan in Google Earth to give various perspectives of the project from multiple points.

Acting Chair Severini asked if the developer envisioned connectivity with surrounding Mayflower and Deer Valley resorts, and whether there was discussion for a shuttle system or other mass transit solutions to help reduce traffic. Mr. Langvardt responded that these would be important considerations in the plan.

Mr. Langvardt stated that the school would require coordination with the Park City school system. Mr. Brockbank stated that the HOAs for the retail area would be responsible for managing and the maintenance of the lift.

Commissioner Turner asked for clarification on the definition of a passive park. Mr. Langvardt explained that such a park would not have play equipment. It would be a flat area, with some benches and gathering area accessed from a trail (not from a road). He also noted the potential for nice viewing areas along the trail at the peaks, perhaps to include some signage with information on area history and the views.

Acting Chair Severini asked whether there would be any dedicated recreation areas or parks. Mr. Langvardt stated that the Village Green is large enough for a play area and is centralized. There could also be a shared use agreement with the school to allow for community use of a playground.

Mr. Eddington stated that he would want to hear more on the proposed layout and features of homes in general and density considerations.

Commissioner Woelfle noted he sees both positives and negatives in the plan. He noted the proposed 80,000 square feet of retail space, of which 24,000 square feet being dedicated to the grocer, and asked about the sizes and mix of businesses that will make up the balance of the retail space. Mr. Langvardt noted that retailers need population to support their businesses and believes that the attraction of the lift will help with that, as well as by having residential units (condominiums or apartments) above the retailers. He does not see big retailers in the development, but rather smaller shops and restaurants.

Commissioner Woelfle stated that he would generally like to see wide sidewalks and more outside seating, pedestrian friendly spaces and plazas surrounded by streets. Mr. Langvardt explained that retailers will want street views with convenient parking, which can be a tricky balance. The plaza will be oriented to southern and western exposures for best sun and outdoor use, and the retail spaces will have 15-20 feet or more of pedestrian space to accommodate spill out dining options. Mr. Langvardt also noted that the retail development would be most likely be completed in phases, perhaps beginning with lift and grocer to serve as the anchor to attract customers and additional retailers.

Acting Chair Severini asked about architectural design concepts. He also noted that current retail trends are tough. He asked if a store such as a Trader Joe's might come in as an anchor retailer, or would that be conditional on completion of some level of residential building. He noted that current Hideout residents are already looking for the convenience of closer amenities.

Mr. Brockbank noted that his team would be working on architectural renderings in time. He also stated that he cannot talk to retailers prior to the annexation being approved so he does not have any active retail interest at this point. Additionally, the Master Development Agreement will set the terms and schedule for building, and he noted that some level of commercial development would come before residential. Mr. Brockbank recognized that the development is meant to serve the existing residents as well as future.

Mr. Langvardt stated that Richardson Flat Road would be widened to accommodate the on-street parking and drainage needs as of the development. Ms. McLean asked about the right of way along Richardson Flat Road. Mr. Langvardt stated that it is approximately 20 feet on each side. Mr. Brockbank stated that he put stakes on the property to mark off right of way if anyone wanted to see them. Acting Chair Severini noted that Richardson Flat Road will require a lower speed limit as the new development is completed.

Commissioner Turner asked if the rail trail could go under the road for more pedestrian and cyclist safety. Mr. Brockbank noted that the current plan has a tunnel running under Jordanelle Parkway, and that he will work on adding one under Richardson Flat Road as well.

Acting Chair Severini asked if the rail trail could be made multi purpose, perhaps to consider a rail or PRT system to connect with area communities. Mr. Brockbank noted that he has begun looking into other forms of transportation along the existing rail trail, although Ms. McLean noted that there might be restrictions that limit uses of the Park City rail trail which should be investigated.

Mr. Brockbank reported that if the annexation were approved, he would hold several open houses with the community to hear people's thoughts and wishes for the development of retail and housing.

Acting Chair Severini shared some feedback he has received from the community regarding the excess of townhomes in Hideout. He noted a general preference for more single-family homes on larger lots as opposed to stacked multi-family homes. He asked Mr. Brockbank to explain the reasoning behind the mix of home types in the current plan.

Mr. Brockbank noted that the proposed development would have more than 200 acres of open space of the 300+ acre development. He had not initially planned on the affordable housing component, but has now included in response to feedback from the mayor and town council. The original plan envisioned 500 homes and townhomes; he has added 108 affordable town homes, some of which will be priced for 60% AMI for work force housing.

Mr. Langvardt walked through the mix of proposed home types. The current proposal consists of 534 single family and town homes outside the town center (increased from 497 previously). Mr. Brockbank noted that this number could be reduced a bit and provide for some larger lots. The plan includes 108 affordable homes near the school, and 194 condominiums or apartments within the town center, including above the retail area. Mr. Brockbank stressed that housing within the town center will add vibrancy to the community and support the proposed amenities.

Acting Chair Severini asked about the proposed town homes in the two residential villages, and what structures are contemplated for them. Mr. Langvardt noted 182 town homes (approximately one third of the development), which could be 3- to 6-plex structures. He noted the concept to be similar to Silver Creek Village near Home Depot although the proposed development would have two car garages w two car driveway parking.

Mr. Brockbank stated the desire for various home price targets. He would like to be able to offer prices beginning at \$500,000 for town homes.

With an eye to reducing density, Acting Chair Severini requested altering the plan to include more enlarged single-family homes, and reduce the 6-plexes structures. Mr. Brockbank stated that he would be amenable to re-working the plan to replace 6-plex units with 3-plex units in Saddle Village. Acting Chair Severini noted that some of the open space could be sacrificed in order to reduce some of the multi-family units.

Mr. Eddington asked about the square footage of the town houses, and inquired if small cottages might be designed for work force/deed restricted properties. Mr. Brockbank stated the town homes would range from 1,400 to 2,400 square feet, and he would be open to exploring this idea which may require some zoning changes.

Acting Chair Severini noted that this plan is still in a conceptual phase, and the Planning Commission will need to get more details on services and costs should the annexation move forward. He recognized that the developer is not in a position to get commitments from anchor tenants at this early stage.

Acting Chair Severini asked Ms. McLean for guidance on what the Planning Commission should produce from this meeting, given the short timeline. Ms. McLean stated that this review was based on mayor's proposal and within the proposed annexation timeline. She suggested that it would be helpful for the Town Council to hear what the Planning Commission thinks about the plan and share its potential areas of concern.

Mr. Brockbank requested that the Planning Commission members send any follow up questions and comments (via Mr. Eddington) prior to the next Town Council meeting, and he will try to incorporate what is possible before that meeting.

Acting Chair Severini noted the importance of maintaining transparency in this review process, and asked to schedule another workshop to discuss what has been presented thus far on the annexation plan in order to develop a recommendation to the Town Council, which reflects the collective thoughts of the Planning Commission. It was agreed to schedule another Planning Commission special meeting for Monday, October 5, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. to continue this discussion and prepare a recommendation to send to the Town Council prior to its meeting on Tuesday October 6, 2020.

VI. Meeting Adjournment

There being no further business, Acting Chair Severini called for the meeting to be adjourned.

Motion: Commissioner Matyszczyk made the motion to adjourn. Commissioner Woelfle made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Woelfle, Turner and Matyszczyk. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9.25 pm




Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk