



**HIDEOUT, UTAH PLANNING
COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
May 20, 2021
Agenda**

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of Hideout, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting electronically for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, May 20, 2021

This meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location pursuant to Planning Commission Chair Anthony Matyszczuk May 7, 2021 determination letter (attached)

All public meetings are available via ZOOM conference call and net meeting.
Interested parties may join by dialing in as follows:

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

1. [May 7, 2021 No Anchor Site Determination Letter](#)

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes

1. [April 15, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes DRAFT](#)
2. [April 28, 2021 Planning Commission Special Meeting and Public Hearing Minutes DRAFT](#)

IV. Agenda Items

1. [KLAIM – Update and Planning Commission input on proposed retaining wall and signage](#)

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. May 7, 2021 No Anchor Site Determination Letter



May 7, 2021

DETERMINATION REGARDING CONDUCTING TOWN OF HIDEOUT PUBLIC MEETINGS
WITHOUT AN ANCHOR LOCATION

The Planning Commission Chair of the Town of Hideout hereby determines that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location pursuant to Utah Code section 52-4-207(5) and Hideout Town Ordinance 2020-03. The facts upon which this determination is based include: The seven-day rolling percent and number of positive COVID-19 cases in Utah has been over 6.48% of those tested since May 4, 2021. The seven-day average number of positive cases has been over 342 since May 5, 2021.

This meeting will not have a physical anchor location. All participants will connect remotely. All public meetings are available via YouTube Live Stream on the Hideout, Utah YouTube channel at: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCKdWnJad-WwvcAK75QjRb1w/>

Interested parties may join by dialing in as follows:

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

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

Meeting ID: 435 659 4739

This determination will expire in 30 days on June 6, 2021.

BY:


Tony Matyszczyk,
Planning Commission Chair

ATTEST:


Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk



File Attachments for Item:

1. April 15, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes DRAFT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Planning Commission Regular Meeting
April 15, 2021
6:00 PM

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in Regular Meeting on April 15, 2021 at 6:00 PM electronically via Zoom meeting due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Regular Meeting

I. Call to Order and Reading of Chair Matyszczyk's No Anchor Site Determination Letter

Acting Chair Bruce Woelfle called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM and read the no anchor site determination letter in its entirety. All attendees were present electronically.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT: Acting Chair Bruce Woelfle
Commissioner Ryan Sapp
Commissioner Glynnis Tihansky
Commissioner Donna Turner
Commissioner Rachel Cooper

EXCUSED: Chair Tony Matyszczyk

STAFF PRESENT: Thomas Eddington, Town Planner
Polly McLean, Town Attorney
Ryan Taylor, Town Engineer
Alicia Fairbourne, Town Clerk
Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk
Kent Cuillard, Public Works

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Kurt Shadle, Dillon Bliler, Carol Tomas, Jack Walkenhorst, and others who may not have signed in using proper names via Zoom.

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes of the March 18, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion: Commissioner Turner made the motion to approve the March 18, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes. Commissioner Tihansky made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Cooper, Sapp, Tihansky, Turner and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

IV. Agenda Items

1. Deer Springs (Phase 2, 3, & 4) – Work Session Discussion

Mr. Thomas Eddington, Town Planner, reported the developer was not ready to present on this matter and requested it be continued to a Special Meeting on April 28, 2021. The Commissioners agreed to this request.

2. Shoreline Phase 2 Amended and Phase 3: Consider Final Subdivision Approval

Town Attorney Polly McLean reported the discussions with the Shoreline developer team and town staff was not complete, and she requested discussion and potential approval of this matter be continued to a future Planning Commission meeting.

The Commissioners were amenable to postponing this matter but asked for several items to be addressed in a future meeting.

Commissioner Glynnis Tihansky asked for clarification on the map submitted in the meeting materials which Mr. Eddington and Town Engineer Ryan Taylor addressed. Acting Chair Woelfle requested copies of before- and after- maps and drawings of the Shoreline development be included with the materials for the next meeting.

The Commissioners confirmed their availability for the April 28, 2021 Special Meeting date.

Ms. McLean noted she had requested the postponement of this agenda item to provide more time to understand the developer GCD's responses to the prior Planning Commission and Public Hearing comments. She stated she, Mr. Eddington and Mr. Taylor were in ongoing discussions with the GCD team and suggested this item could potentially be included on the agenda for the proposed Special Meeting on April 28, 2021 to discuss the Deer Springs development. Ms. McLean also suggested the Commissioners route their questions to Mr. Eddington to have them addressed in advance of the next meeting with GCD.

Acting Chair Woelfle and Commissioner Tihansky asked for details on all the remaining Shoreline phases in order to understand the developer's intentions and schedule for the entire development. Mr. Eddington agreed to discuss this with the developer and noted the original plan and Master Development Agreement (MDA) were approved in 2016 and set the requirements for the Shoreline development.

Commissioner Tihansky asked for details on the proposed visitor parking spaces the developer would include in the plan, details on the open space calculations under the Master HOA, layout of the properties under consideration for approval and clarification on the RSPA zoning map and density pod areas in the Master Plan document. The Commissioners also requested a better color-coded density map be included in the materials for the upcoming discussion.

Acting Chair Woelfle asked for a motion to continue this item to the April 28, 2021 Special Meeting.

1 *Motion: Commissioner Tihansky made the motion to continue until the April 28, 2021 Special*
2 *Meeting the discussion and potential approval of the Final Subdivision Approval of Shoreline*
3 *Phase 2 Amended and Phase 3 in addition to the Deer Springs items previously noted.*
4 *Commissioner Cooper made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Cooper, Tihansky, Turner,*
5 *Sapp, and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.*

6
7 **VII. Meeting Adjournment**

8 There being no further business, Acting Chair Woelfle asked for the meeting to be
9 adjourned.

10 *Motion: Commissioner Tihansky made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Turner*
11 *made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Cooper, Tihansky, Turner, Sapp, and Woelfle.*
12 *Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.*

13 The meeting adjourned at 6:42 PM.

14
15
16
17

Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk
18

File Attachments for Item:

2. April 28, 2021 Planning Commission Special Meeting and Public Hearing Minutes DRAFT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Planning Commission Special Meeting and Public Hearing
April 28, 2021
6:00 PM

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in Public Hearing and Special Meeting on April 28, 2021 at 6:00 PM electronically via Zoom meeting due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Regular Meeting

I. Call to Order and Reading of Chair Matyszczuk's No Anchor Site Determination Letter

Chair Anthony Matyszczuk called the meeting to order at 6:02 PM and read the no anchor site determination letter in its entirety. All attendees were present electronically.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT: Chair Tony Matyszczuk
Commissioner Ryan Sapp
Commissioner Glynnis Tihansky
Commissioner Donna Turner
Commissioner Rachel Cooper (alternate)

EXCUSED: Commissioner Bruce Woelfle

STAFF PRESENT: Thomas Eddington, Town Planner
Polly McLean, Town Attorney
Ryan Taylor, Town Engineer
Alicia Fairbourne, Town Clerk
Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk
Kent Cuillard, Public Works

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Nate Brockbank, Mark Garza, Tyler White, Patrick Todd, Glen Gabler, Wade Budge, Dillon Bliler, Sean Philipoom, Jared Fields, Jeff Bawol, Bryan Link, Bret Rutter, Carol Tomas, Jack Walkenhorst, Patricia Bidwill, Martina Nelson, and others who may not have signed in using proper names via Zoom.

III. Public Hearings

Chair Matyszczuk stated the public hearing portion of the meeting would cover only the Deer Springs items as noticed, and not the Shoreline matters. He also announced that going forward, all agenda items and materials from developers must be received by the Town Clerk two weeks prior to the Planning Commission meeting in order to be included on the agenda.

1 **1. Public Hearing for Deer Springs Phase 2 and 2B Final Subdivision – Discussion and**
2 **Consider Final Subdivision Approval**

3 Mr. Thomas Eddington, Town Planner, provided an overview of the Deer Springs Phase 2 and 2B
4 Final Subdivision which were submitted for final approval. He noted the preliminary approval for
5 Phase 2 had been received previously and the parcel was now split into two parcels re-named Phase
6 2 and 2B for this final approval. He reviewed the map of the entire subdivision which included the
7 completed Phase 1 and proposed Phase 2 and 2B areas of the subdivision. Mr. Eddington highlighted
8 various items discussed in the Staff Report distributed prior to the meeting. He noted areas which the
9 developer had re-designed to meet current health and safety standards of the Town Code, even
10 though the development was covered under a Master Development Agreement (MDA) and had
11 received preliminary approval based on prior Town Code. Mr. Ryan Taylor, Town Engineer reported
12 on the status of the retaining walls and road design and noted all earlier concerns had been resolved.

13 Mr. Tyler White, a member of the developer's engineering team, discussed the proposed plan and
14 shared maps of the original and currently proposed development. He noted the steepness of the site
15 and the new road design which was able to maintain a 10% grade in most sections, with just one
16 section to have a slightly higher 10.25% grade. He also noted areas where some tiered retaining
17 walls were eliminated and the planned connection to Jordanelle Parkway.

18 Commissioner Glynnis Tihansky asked about road widths and setbacks. Commissioner Donna
19 Turner asked about the area's steepness and orientation of the homes. Mr. White answered these
20 questions and noted the heights of retaining walls would vary with the topography.

21 Commissioner Ryan Sapp asked about the timing and process for obtaining the easement to connect
22 with Jordanelle Parkway. Mr. White responded easements were obtained from the appropriate
23 entities.

24 Mr. Nate Brockbank, developer, noted based on the strong market interest in the development, he
25 was anxious to obtain this approval in order to begin construction of the Jordanelle Parkway
26 connection this year, rather than at the later date originally planned. He also noted the current plan
27 had eliminated 50-60% of the retaining walls and reduced the steepness of the road from the original
28 plan.

29 In response to a question from Commissioner Turner regarding electric/utility lines, Mr. Brockbank
30 responded all new power lines in the development would be located underground in the easements.
31 Commissioner Tihansky asked about the proposed architectural design, to which Mr. Brockbank
32 responded these buildings would be similar to those already constructed in Phase 1.

33 Commissioner Turner asked about the development's density and stated her preference for duplex or
34 triplex units rather than four-plex structures in this relatively small area. Commissioner Tihansky
35 asked about the number of proposed units and if the frontages of the buildings would be staggered to
36 vary the layout and appearance. Mr. White explained unit counts between Phase 2 and 2B and noted
37 the orientation of the proposed building units was impacted by the property's steepness and
38 attempted to minimize the heights of retaining walls. He also noted the building front setbacks could
39 be staggered between 22- and 26- feet to reduce a monotonous appearance.

40 Mr. Brockbank noted the different building dimensions and heights at changing elevations would
41 provide variety to the overall appearance. He also stated they would build with the site's slopes
42 rather than level the entire site prior to construction.

43 Discussion ensued regarding options for replacing any of the four-plex units with duplex units. Mr.
44 White stated some of the density originally proposed for Phases 2 and 3 had been moved to Phase 4
45 to provide more open space while maintaining the overall density. Mr. Brockbank added the
46 proposed plan would result in 2.3 units per acre over the 90-acre development. He also noted the

1 expected price points of \$650- \$700,000 for these units were expected to be more affordable than
2 other phases of the development. Mr. Brockbank noted the entire development would ultimately
3 include 60 single family homes (scheduled for future Phases) with lake views while these town
4 homes would be oriented to mountain views.

5 Commissioner Turner left the meeting at 6:45 PM. A quorum was maintained.

6 In response to a question from Commissioner Tihansky, Mr. Patrick Todd, from the Holmes Homes'
7 sales team, stated the footprints and square footage of these units would be comparable to those in
8 Phase 1. He noted there would be variation between the uphill and downhill facing units, with square
9 footage ranging from 1,800 to 2,500 square feet.

10 Commissioners Cooper and Tihansky asked several questions regarding open space, retaining walls,
11 additional guest parking and the schedule for construction of the park. It was noted the amended
12 MDA required the park to be constructed simultaneously with Phase 3 and to be completed before
13 any sales of Phase 3 units.

14 In response to a question from Town Attorney Polly McLean, Mr. Taylor explained the reason to
15 amend Phase 2 and split it into A and B pieces was to allow the infrastructure construction to be
16 completed in phases before the building construction commenced. Ms. McLean noted the MDA
17 would need to be amended to reflect these amendments and phasing plans.

18 Mr. Eddington asked about trail connectivity to which Mr. Todd responded the trails would be
19 completed along with other construction.

20 There being no further questions from the Commissioners, at 7:00 PM Chair Matyszczyk opened the
21 meeting for public comment.

22 Ms. Carol Tomas, Hideout resident, shared her concerns with the development potentially appearing
23 too "tract-like" and noted the need to address larger town-wide infrastructure needs such as a fire
24 station and schools as part of the planning process. Chair Matyszczyk noted the Wasatch County
25 Fire District controlled the building of new fire stations and added the Fire Marshall was required to
26 approve all final subdivision plans, including review of emergency access roads. Ms. Tomas also
27 stated her concerns with increased traffic resulting from additional development, especially around
28 the Ross Creek recreation area. Chair Matyszczyk responded resolution of such traffic concerns was
29 predominantly under the control of Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT); Mr. Taylor added
30 plans for future traffic lights, for example, would be based on traffic studies conducted by UDOT
31 and would not typically be installed prior to actual increased traffic levels. Commissioner Tihansky
32 asked if lowering the speed limit along SR 248 might help address these potential problems.

33 Mr. Bret Rutter, Hideout resident, stated while UDOT controlled certain issues regarding roads and
34 traffic, the Town and Planning Commission had a responsibility to partner with UDOT to ensure
35 road infrastructure was sufficient to support continued development. He asked if, with the increased
36 density and building construction, whether emergency response time would be timely, and if the
37 additional development would further strain resources to address increased potential fire risk. He
38 asked if existing homeowners were at increased risk of danger, whether from more traffic or fire
39 risk, as examples. Commissioner Sapp acknowledged these concerns and noted with the planned
40 access from Jordanelle Parkway, a fire station would be several minutes closer to Hideout.
41 Commissioner Tihansky noted the density levels had been previously approved and were for the
42 most part, out of the Planning Commission's control at this point.

43 Mr. Brockbank stated the density had been approved several years ago, and he was in ongoing
44 discussions with the Fire Department on the emergency road access issues. He added the potential
45 Richardson Flats annexation could provide sites for a fire department and school.

1 Mr. Rutter stated while he understood the issues with prior approvals for development, he asked if
2 the development process should be slowed down to ensure broad health and safety matters were
3 properly factored into plans. He noted a potential shortage of water could impact development
4 regardless of approved density and felt these other health and safety matters should also be
5 evaluated.

6 Mr. Brockbank stated he was required to purchase water shares for his developments to ensure
7 adequate access to water for his planned level of development. Ms. Patricia Bidwill, a new Hideout
8 resident, asked about water shares, to which Mr. Brockbank provided background on the
9 requirements for developers to purchase water shares from the state which are turned over to the
10 water company (JSSD) as water rights based on the number of units to be built.

11 Commissioner Rachel Cooper asked if the new connection from Jordanelle Parkway would lead to
12 increased traffic problems in the Hideout neighborhoods. Chair Matyszczyk noted the sheriff was
13 patrolling the town and making traffic stops which he expected would continue. Mr. Brockbank
14 added the curved road design would also help minimize speeding.

15 There being no further public comment, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:22 PM.

16 Mr Eddington discussed the draft ordinance included in the meeting materials which reflected the
17 Staff Report comments. He noted this draft would be updated to reflect the points agreed to at this
18 meeting and prior to the matter being presented to Town Council for approval. In response to
19 Commissioner Tihansky's comment regarding her preference to see few four-plex units in the plan,
20 Mr. Eddington agreed to work with the developer team to see if this could be addressed.

21 ***Motion: Commissioner Tihansky moved to make a favorable recommendation to approve Deer***
22 ***Springs Phase 2A and 2B final subdivision in accordance with the findings of fact, conclusions of***
23 ***law and conditional approvals noted in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Sapp seconded the***
24 ***motion. Voting Aye: Commissioners Cooper, Matyszczyk, Tihansky and Sapp. Voting Nay: None.***
25 ***The motion carried.***

26 27 **IV. Agenda Items**

28 **1. Shoreline Phase 2 Amended and Phase 3 Subdivision – Consider Final Subdivision** 29 **Approval**

30 Mr. Eddington, offered to provide an overview of the issues outlined in the Staff Report. Chair
31 Matyszczyk asked if the issues previously identified had been addressed, to which Mr. Eddington
32 replied they had not yet been addressed. Mr. Wade Budge, attorney for the developer GCD, stated he
33 disagreed with the staff report and noted the developer had addressed open issues including
34 additional visitor parking, details on the trail system and details on the retaining walls. He noted the
35 two public hearings required under the MDA had been exhausted and the developer would need to
36 move on if they could not meet the comments in the staff report, regardless of whether the Planning
37 Commission made a favorable or unfavorable recommendation. He stated the staff report contained
38 unrelated issues regarding the Master Developer which were outside the scope of this application
39 and which he felt could not be properly addressed at this meeting.

40 Chair Matyszczyk asked if Mr. Budge was suggesting putting the matter to a vote without discussion
41 to which Mr. Budge replied yes, given the extent of the matters discussed in the Staff Report,
42 particularly regarding density, which he believed were outside the scope of this application.

43 Chair Matyszczyk asked if the issue of the required secondary emergency access road had been
44 resolved with the Wasatch County Fire Marshall. Mr. Budge stated this was addressed and the
45 developer had made improvements to the secondary road access which were in place. He also

1 reported a third-party mediation had been scheduled to address differing opinions on road width
2 compliance with town code and state fire code. Mr. Taylor noted the road safety issues in Phase 2
3 had been addressed but not in Phase 3.

4 Ms. McLean stated it was probably not fruitful to discuss the main disputed issues regarding planned
5 density and road widths at this time, but if the Commissioners had other outstanding questions, they
6 should raise them as this was the last time the Planning Commission would have an opportunity to
7 provide input to the Town Council on this matter.

8 Commissioner Tihansky asked about soil testing and compaction reports, and if additional soil
9 samples should be taken after grading and moving any soil. Mr. Glen Gabler, developer, noted
10 dozens of compaction tests on all phases, including Phase 3, had been conducted and certified by his
11 geo-tech engineer and reports were provided to the Town Engineer. Mr. Taylor stated he was
12 awaiting some reports on testing but had received some documentation on this matter. Commissioner
13 Tihansky asked if there were limits on the amount of soil which could be moved. Mr. Gabler
14 explained the work conducted by geo-tech engineer IGS and the soil testing conducted by Epic
15 Engineering. He stated there were no specific limits on the amounts of soil which can be moved if
16 they are tested and within the recommendations of the geo-tech engineer.

17 Commissioner Tihansky asked if the Parks, Open Space and Trail Committee (POST) had reviewed
18 and signed off on the open spaces and trails plan. Mr. Gabler responded he had supplied landscape
19 plans to staff, added the trails to the plat, and that landscaping work was underway for Phase 2 and
20 the park. Mr. Gabler offered to coordinate with the POST Committee to add trails if suggested.

21 In response to a question from Commissioner Tihansky regarding current secondary access gravel
22 road, Mr. Gabler stated upon completion of the roads in Shoreline Phase 3 and Lakeview Estates, the
23 existing gravel road would be returned to topsoil or converted to a trail.

24 Commissioner Tihansky shared her concerns with the overall row-home appearance of the plan. Mr.
25 Gabler discussed the orientation of the buildings and noted there would be varying elevations and
26 color schemes to break up the appearance. Commissioner Tihansky shared her concerns with
27 obstructed views and asked if the plan could mix up the duplex and four-plex units to add more
28 variety. Mr. Gabler explained the road grades and utility layouts were factors in the site design. He
29 also noted the driveways and setbacks would vary, as well as the design of front porches and decks
30 would add variety to the streetscape.

31 Commissioner Cooper asked about the square footage of the proposed units to which Mr. Gabler
32 responded they would be larger than the Phase 2 units, with between 3,500 and 3,800 square feet. He
33 noted these units would be different than the Phase 1 twin-homes and will have large glass walls to
34 maximize views and entirely different floor plans.

35 Commissioner Cooper asked about the comments in the staff report pertaining to retaining walls. Mr.
36 Gabler stated he had submitted plans with 5- to 8-foot height variations and which would be
37 inspected by the geo-tech engineer throughout the construction process. Mr. Eddington stated he had
38 not seen the detail on wall location or cross section design which Mr. Gabler referenced.

39 Mr. Gabler reviewed an additional presentation which had not been included in the meeting
40 materials. (Clerk's Note: this presentation was subsequently added to the posted public materials).
41 Mr. Gabler reviewed maps of the entire proposed Shoreline development and noted the mix of
42 single- and multi-family homes in future phases would be dictated by market demand at that time.
43 He stated the overall plan included the same number of units as initially approved.

44 Mr. Gabler discussed additional guest parking stalls proposed for Phases 2 and 3 and stated he was
45 amenable to adding more where grades permitted. He also discussed landscaping plans and noted
46 there would be more landscaping beyond the re-vegetation originally noted.

1 Mr. Eddington asked about slopes and raveling issues. Mr. Gabler agreed to meet separately to
2 discuss this in more detail. Mr. Gabler highlighted the revised architectural design for Phase 2A
3 which would replace the originally approved 3-story structures with a 2-story design to preserve
4 neighboring views in Phase 3.

5 Mr. Budge stated if the application was weighed against standards in the Town Code, he believed the
6 standards were met. He also stated his opinion that the staff comments were outside the scope of the
7 application. He added the developer would continue to engage with staff in advance of the next
8 Town Council meeting when they would seek final approval.

9 Chair Matyszczyk stated given the outstanding issues noted in the Staff Report which had not been
10 addressed, he was not supportive of recommending this matter to the Town Council. Commissioner
11 Tihansky stated she was encouraged by the developer's willingness to continue working with staff to
12 resolve the outstanding issues.

13 Mr. Gabler noted there were two separate items for consideration: 1) the Phase 2a amendment to
14 change the footprint of the buildings and vacate lots 1-16 into the Phase 3 plat and 2) Phase 3 where
15 most of the unresolved issues existed. Mr. Eddington agreed and stated he had reviewed both items
16 together in the Staff Report from both a Town Code perspective as well as from the vested Master
17 Development Agreement perspective.

18 Mr. Budge stated he expected to make progress to resolve the outstanding issues prior to the Town
19 Council meeting where they would request final approval. Discussion ensued regarding whether the
20 Planning Commission would vote on two separate proposals at this time.

21 Ms. McLean asked for confirmation on the exact plats submitted for consideration. Mr. Gabler
22 replied the plats consisted of 2A amended where lots 2-16 were to be vacated and 3 which would
23 now include lots 2-16. Mr. Gabler stated Phase 2A was previously approved, with all homes, with
24 the exception of lots 2-16, now built and occupied. With the change in road design, it was requested
25 the units on these lots be re-oriented to the new road and aligned with the units proposed in Phase 3.

26 Mr. Budge requested a positive recommendation on Phase 2A so it would not be held up due to the
27 outstanding issues with Phase 3.

28 After further discussion on specific plats under consideration, it was agreed to consider the motions
29 separately.

30 ***Motion: Commissioner Tihansky made the motion for a positive recommendation to the 2A plat***
31 ***which vacated 16 units. Commissioner Sapp made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners***
32 ***Cooper, Matyszczyk, Sapp and Tihansky. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.***

34 ***Motion: Commissioner Tihansky made the motion to negatively recommend Phase 3 in***
35 ***accordance with the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the prepared Ordinance by staff.***
36 ***Commissioner Cooper made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Cooper, Matyszczyk, Sapp***
37 ***and Tihansky.***

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

V. Meeting Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Matyszczyk asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Commissioner Tihansky made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Sapp made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Cooper, Matyszczyk, Sapp and Tihansky. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM

Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk

File Attachments for Item:

1. KLAIM – Update and Planning Commission input on proposed retaining wall and signage

Staff Review of Proposed Changes to Retaining Walls

To: Planning Commissioners
Town of Hideout

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

Re: KLAIM

Date: May 18, 2021

Materials: The Applicant met with the Town Engineer and Planner on site (in early March 2021) to discuss the proposed changes to the retaining walls; photos included from that visit. The Applicant coordinated updated design renderings with his Landscape Architect and submitted them on May 10, 2021.

Prior Report Intro (March 16, 2021)

The Applicant is requesting a change to the retaining walls for the KLAIM project – from stacked rock to gabions with rock. The Town Planner and Engineer agree that this proposal meets the intent of the original approval but determined the change warranted an update to the Planning Commission. The Town Planner and Engineer met with the Applicant and his team (including the structural engineer) on site in February to ensure the proposed wall meets all structural requirements of the Town Code as well as to ensure the aesthetic character of the Town is maintained.



Updated Design Proposal

Per Planning Commission input from the March 18, 2021 meeting, the Applicant has updated the proposed retaining wall system to include a significant amount of landscaping including grasses and native plants on the horizontal terracing between walls and trees along the front of the walls to help soften the overall appearance.

Additionally, the proposed site signage has been integrated into the site using the same materials.

The following pages contain a series of renderings to help the Planning Commission fully understand the proposed retaining walls, landscaping and signage.

The Applicant indicated the walls, signage and landscaping should be complete by Fall 2021.

While there is no formal vote required of the Planning Commission, the Applicant, the Town Planner and Town Engineer would appreciate input on this project.



KLAIM





KLAIM











KLAIM





