

HIDEOUT, UTAH PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING January 20, 2022 AMENDED Agenda

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of Hideout, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting and continued public hearings electronically for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, January 20, 2022

This meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location pursuant to Planning Commission Chair Anthony Matyszczyk's January 8, 2022 No Anchor Site determination letter.

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

Meeting URL:
Meeting ID:https://zoom.us/j/4356594739To join by telephone dial: US: +1 408 638 0986Meeting ID:435 659 4739YouTube Live Channel:https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCKdWnJad-WwvcAK75QjRb1w/

Regular Meeting and Continued Public Hearings 6:00 PM

- I. Call to Order
 - 1. January 8, 2022 No Anchor Site Letter
 - 2. Swearing in of reappointed Planning Commissioners whose terms expired January 1, 2022
 - 3. Introduction and swearing in of Second Alternate Planning Commission Member, Jonathan Gunn
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Meeting Minutes
 - 1. December 16, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes DRAFT
- IV. Public Hearings
 - 1. <u>Continued review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding the final</u> <u>KLAIM Phase 3 Subdivision</u>
 - 2. Continued review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding Subdivision/Lot Amendment to Hideout Canyon Lot 37 – CONTINUED TO A DATE UNCERTAIN
 - 3. Continued review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding Subdivision/Lot Amendment to Hideout Canyon Lot R-3 – CONTINUED TO A DATE UNCERTAIN
- V. Agenda Items
 - 1. Follow up presentation and discussion of the concept plan and potential rezoning for a planned community development project on the Salzman property
- VI. Meeting Adjournment

1. January 8, 2022 No Anchor Site Letter



January 8, 2022

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

The Mayor 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 35.49% of those tested since January 6, 2022. The seven-day average number of positive cases has been, on average, 6504 per day since January 7, 2022.

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: <u>https://zoom.us/j/4356594739</u> To join by telephone dial: US: +1 408-638-0986 Meeting ID: 4356594739

Additionally, comments may be emailed to <u>hideoututah@hideoututah.gov</u>. Emailed comments received prior to the scheduled meeting will be entered into public record.

This determination will expire in 30 days on February 7, 2022.

BY:

Tony Matyszczyk, / Planning Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk



1. December 16, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes DRAFT

1						
2		Minutes				
3	Town of Hideout					
4	Planning Commission Regular Meeting					
5	December 16, 2021					
6	6:00 PM					
7						
8						
9 10		Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in Regular Meeting on December 16, ly via Zoom meeting due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.				
11		Ty via Zoom meeting due to the ongoing CO viD-19 pandemic.				
12						
13	Regular Meeting					
14	I. <u>Call to Order</u>					
15 16		ed the meeting to order at 6:02 PM and referenced the current No Anchor d in the meeting materials. All attendees were present electronically.				
17						
18	II. <u>Roll Call</u>					
19	PRESENT:	Chair Tony Matyszczyk				
20		Commissioner Ryan Sapp				
21		Commissioner Glynnis Tihansky Commissioner Donna Turner				
22 23		Commissioner Bruce Woelfle				
24		Commissioner Rachel Cooper (alternate)				
25						
26	STAFF PRESENT:	Thomas Eddington, Town Planner				
27		Polly McLean, Town Attorney				
28 29		Jan McCosh, Town Administrator Alicia Fairbourne, Town Clerk				
29 30		Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk				
31		Tauncen Tophins, Deputy Town Clerk				
32	OTHERS IN ATTE	ENDANCE: Mark Garza, , McKay Christensen, Todd Amberry, David				
33		e, Jack Walkenhorst, Martina Nelson and others who may not have signed in				
34	using proper names in Zoom.	•				
35						
36	III. <u>Approval of Meeting N</u>	<u>/linutes</u>				
37 38 39		s of the November 18, 2021 Planning Commission meeting reflected the nissioner Bruce Woelfle prior to the meeting. There were no further				
40	Motion: Commissioner Tu	Irner made the motion to approve the November 18, 2021 Planning				
41		nmissioner Tihansky made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners				
42		ner, Sapp and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.				
43	· · · · · · ·					
44						

1 IV. Public Hearings

2 3 4

1. <u>Review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding an amendment to the</u> <u>Master Development Agreement for the Deer Springs Community</u>

5 Mr. Thomas Eddington, Town Planner provided an overview and noted the development had been 6 approved on August 6, 2018, and the Master Development Agreement (MDA) was approved in 7 August of 2020. He explained the MDA amendment under discussion included an update on the 8 development's phasing schedule, details on parks and trails, and details on the timeline of payments 9 to be made to the Town by the developer. He stated \$60,000 had been paid to the Town thus far and 10 the balance of the total \$600,000 would be paid by February 15, 2022. Mr. Eddington referenced the Staff Report included in the meeting materials which included full details of the proposed 11 12 amendment, and introduced Mr. Mark Garza, representative of the developer, who could answer additional questions. 13

Commissioner Glynnis Tihansky asked if the payments owed to the Town were attached to each phase of the development. Mr. Eddington noted the balance had been intended to be paid already, but with COVID-related construction delays, was held back. He stated the February 2022 date was considered a fair date for payment by Staff and the developer. Mr. Garza stated he agreed with this.

Commissioner Woelfle asked in which Phase the road connecting to Jordanelle Parkway would be completed. Mr. Garza replied construction had commenced and was expected to be completed in the spring of 2022. Mr. Garza also noted water and sewer construction in Phases 2A and 2B would commence in the spring of 2022. Commissioner Woelfle asked when the road would be open for public use; Mr. Garza responded it should be open once the road was paved in the spring of 2022.

- Commissioner Woelfle asked if construction of Phases 2A and 2B would occur simultaneously; Mr.
 Garza responded yes.
- Chair Matyszczyk opened the floor for public comments at 6:14 PM. There being no public comment,
 Chair Matyszczyk closed the public hearing and asked for a motion to recommend to Town Council
 the proposed amendment to the MDA for the Deer Springs Community as discussed.

28 Motion: Commissioner Tihansky moved to recommend to Town Council the proposed amendment 29 to the MDA for the Deer Springs Community with Staff comments as discussed. Commissioner 30 Turner made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Matyszczyk, Tihansky, Turner, Sapp 31 and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

- 32
- 33 34

35

36 37

38

2. <u>Review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding the final KLAIM Phase</u> <u>3 Subdivision</u>

Mr. Eddington stated the developer had not submitted materials in time for Staff to properly review them and requested this item be continued to the January Planning Commission meeting when the Staff could provide a thorough report.

Motion: Commissioner Woelfle moved to continue to the next Planning Commission meeting the
 review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding the final KLAIM Phase 3
 Subdivision. Commissioner Tihansky made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners
 Matyszczyk, Tihansky, Turner, Sapp and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

43

1 2 2	3. <u>Continued review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding</u> <u>Subdivision/Lot Amendment to Hideout Canyon Lot 37</u>
3 4 5	Mr. Eddington reported Staff had not received an update from the applicant on this matter and requested this item be continued to the January Planning Commission meeting.
6 7 8 9	Motion: Commissioner Woelfle moved to continue to the next Planning Commission meeting the review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding Subdivision/Lot Amendment to Hideout Canyon Lot 37. Commissioner Tihansky made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Matyszczyk, Tihansky, Turner, Sapp and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.
10 11 12 13 14	 Continued review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding Subdivision/Lot Amendment to Hideout Canyon Lot R-3 Mr. Eddington reported Staff had not received an update from the applicant on this matter and
15 16 17 18 19	requested this item be continued to the January Planning Commission meeting. Motion: Commissioner Woelfle moved to continue to the next Planning Commission meeting the review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding Subdivision/Lot Amendment to Hideout Canyon Lot R-3. Commissioner Turner made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Matyszczyk, Tihansky, Turner, Sapp and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.
20 21	V. <u>Agenda</u>
22 23	1. <u>Presentation and discussion of an initial concept plan of a planned community</u> <u>development project on the Salzman property</u>
23 24 25 26 27 28	development project on the Salzman property Mr. Eddington provided an overview of the Skyhawk project plan under consideration for the Salzman property and stated the Planning Commission was only being asked for input on the concept at this meeting. He referred to the Staff Report included in the meeting materials and noted the 107- acre property was currently zoned as Mountain Residential. Commissioner Woelfle asked if there
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	 development project on the Salzman property Mr. Eddington provided an overview of the Skyhawk project plan under consideration for the Salzman property and stated the Planning Commission was only being asked for input on the concept at this meeting. He referred to the Staff Report included in the meeting materials and noted the 107-acre property was currently zoned as Mountain Residential. Commissioner Woelfle asked if there was one existing single-family home on the property; Mr. Eddington responded yes. Commissioner Rachel Cooper asked about the steepness of the property and whether it could be developed. Mr. Eddington replied there were some relatively flat areas and a slope analysis was

Economic Development Committee to consider the creation of a Public Improvement District
 related to this project.

3 4

5

6 7 Commissioner Rachel Cooper asked about potential tax revenue for the town from any commercial development. Mr. Eddington noted this was not part of MIDA so all related tax revenue could be available for the town.

Messrs. Christensen and Amberry discussed the proposed project and noted the hotel could range
 from 120 to 160 beds. Mr. Christensen noted they had been working on this project for over a year
 and hoped to provide the town with commercial tax revenue and improved amenities while building
 a community with a variety of home types, hotel and some commercial spaces.

- Commissioner Donna Turner stated she liked the potential hotel and restaurant tax base, but requested the project contain more retail space. Commissioner Tihansky noted the requested level of increased density would need to be balanced with more commercial space. Commissioner Woelfle stated he liked the hotel and condo unit proposal in concept but would like to see five- to ten boutique shops also be included, all with a design concept complimentary to the town. He asked to developers to consider year-round recreation amenities such as cross-country ski trails and ice skating and stated his concerns with the overall level of proposed density.
- Discussion ensued regarding access points from SR 248 and potential locations for future traffic
 lights. Mr. Christensen noted given the topography of the property, it may not be possible to align
 the development's entrance with Hideout Trail. The Commissioners asked the developers to research
 options for street and trail connectivity to Golden Eagle and Soaring Hawk developments.
- The Commissioners asked the developers to consider locating the hotel and commercial buildings to be visible from SR 248. Mr. Christensen noted challenges given the property's topography. He also stated any commercial development would require sufficient population to support it. He indicated that certain commercial components such as a coffee shop, post office and club house sounded like reasonable requests. Mr. Eddington stated he and the town engineering team would work with the developer on additional small-scale additions, perhaps to include a town square, library and additional commercial development.
- Ms. McCosh noted the attractiveness of this type of destination development which could increase sales tax revenues to the Town without necessitating the same level of infrastructure and resource commitment as more residential development might require. She added this project was just one piece of a bigger plan under discussion with Town staff, other developers and MIDA.
- Mr. Christensen invited the Commissioners to visit the property for an onsite tour. Commissioner Turner noted Tuhaye residents may not have interest in the proposed restaurant and other amenities which they already have, but she noted a small grocery store such as a Trader Joe's might be attractive to neighbors beyond the Hideout town limits. Commissioner Woelfle requested specialty retailers such as a fish, cheese and butcher shop be considered.
- Commissioner Woelfle asked for more detail on the proposed casitas. Mr. Christensen explained they
 would be smaller HOA-maintained single family detached homes, similar to the Promontory
 development's Trapper Cabins. Mr. Amberry added the plan was to provide a variety of home types
 and sizes.
- 43 Ms. McCosh asked if the proposed amenities would be available to all Hideout residents. Mr. 44 Christensen said yes and noted an idea for a gazebo which could be a venue for small concerts and 45 picnicking. Commissioner Turner noted a hotel could also provide a much-needed wedding venue 46 for the community. Commissioner Cooper asked whether a liquor store might be considered and 47 whether it would generate additional tax revenues for the town. Town Attorney Polly McLean noted

1 2	liquor stores were approved by the State and she was not sure how difficult the approval process was or how much liquor tax would go to the Town.
3 4	Mr. Eddington thanked the Commissioners for their feedback and stated he and Town Staff would work with the development team to create a revised plan and requested zoning change.
5 6	There being no further discussion on this topic, Messrs. Christensen and Amberry were excused from the meeting.
7	
8 9	2. <u>Consideration of establishing the 2022 Planning Commission meeting schedule</u>
10 11	Chair Matyszczyk suggested the Planning Commission continue to meet on the 3 rd Thursday of each month and referenced the proposed 2022 meeting dates included in the meeting materials.
12 13 14	Motion: Commissioner Turner moved adopt the 2022 Planning Commission meeting schedule as presented. Commissioner Tihansky made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Matyszczyk, Tihansky, Turner, Sapp and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.
15	
16	VI. <u>Meeting Adjournment</u>
17	There being no further business, Chair Matyszczyk asked for a motion to adjourn.
18 19 20	Motion: Commissioner Tihansky moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Turner made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Tihansky, Sapp and Woelfle. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.
21	The meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.
22 23	
24 25 26	Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk

1. Continued review and possible recommendation to Town Council regarding the final KLAIM Phase 3 Subdivision



Staff Report for KLAIM Subdivision – Phase 3

То:	Chairman Tony Matyszczyk Town of Hideout Planning Commission
From:	Thomas Eddington Jr., AICP, ASLA Town Planner
Re:	KLAIM Phase 3 – Final Subdivision Review
Date:	15 January 2022
Submittals:	Subdivision Plat for KLAIM Phase 3

Background

The KLAIM subdivision received Final Plat Approval on December 14, 2017 for the full subdivision (all four or five phases; the exact phasing plan was not fully defined at the time). The project was delayed due to negotiations with UDOT regarding right-of-way issues, etc. and the Applicant appeared before the Planning Commission to request an extension for Final Subdivision Approval on November 19, 2020. That extension was granted by the Planning Commission at that time.

At the December 14, 2017 meeting (and at the prior week's meeting - December 7, 2017 Planning Commission meeting) a site plan was provided but there was never a Subdivision Plat which was in a form which could be recorded. As such, while the minutes of the December 14, 2017 meeting indicate Final Subdivision Approval, technically a complete plat must be submitted. This approval process is required to ensure the Planning Commission and Town Council review a completed plat for all phases of the KLAIM subdivision. At this time, the Applicant effectively has Preliminary Subdivision approval for all phases, but each phase of the complete project will require Planning Commission approvals.

Project Details:	

KLAIM Total Units:	88 attached units
Total Project Area:	58.95 acres (42.73 acres preserved as open space/untouched land)

Current Proposal

The KLAIM Phase 3 subdivision is comprised of two parts:



- A section that includes 14 lots that would essentially extend the completed Phase 1 buildings further south. The proposed design and general attributes heights, building materials, colors, dimensions, etc. will be the same as Phase 1.
- A second section that includes 12 lots that are located at the north portion of the project site.

This Preliminary Subdivision project is generally vested per the Master Development Agreement (MDA) that was signed on June 27, 2019. The Zoning Code that was in place at that time was updated in November 2020. Section 3.2.7 of the MDA allows the Town to require the Applicant to adhere to new planning and zoning modifications that generally address design, setbacks, and similar item provided allocated density is not reduced. The Applicant has generally committed to coordinate future improvements in compliance with the Town's updated Zoning Code.

The new Town Code has updated Building and Development Standards (new Section 10 of the Town Code as of November 2020) that the subdivision must meet. The following are the areas of the Zoning Code that contain requirements Town Staff have determined as applicable planning/design sections for this project to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the residents:

- <u>11.07.101 Zoning: Mountain (M)</u>: w/ a Planned Performance Development Overlay allowing deviation from setbacks.
- <u>10.08.06.C General Standards-Monotony Clause and 1008.08 Design Standards:</u> Major Subdivisions (6 lots or more) shall not have greater than twenty (20%) of the structures with the same elevation and, in no case, shall any two (2) similar structures be located adjacent to each other or directly across the street. The differentiation of each structure shall be a combination of unique roof lines, garage step-backs, entry/porch location and canopy, fenestration, building materials, and colors.
 - The Applicant has coordinated with the Design Review Committee (DRC) one Town Council member (R. Severini) and one Planning Commissioner (B. Woelfle) and the Town Planner - to review the submittals for Phase 3. While lower Phase 3 will generally match Phase 1 and will appear as an extension of the existing buildings, DRC will work with Chris Ensign and the architect to integrate differentiating materials, design, building lines, colors, alternating setbacks, etc. into subsequent phases to ensure general compliance with the intent of this section of the Town's Zoning Code.







- <u>10.08.14 Roads and Road Requirements:</u>
 T-O Engineering reviewed the roads and confirmed the Applicant meets the Town's new road requirements (26'-0" of pavement width).
- <u>10.08.20 Drainage and Storm Water Facilities</u>
 T-O Engineering reviewed the proposed stormwater infrastructure and confirmed the Applicant meets the Town's new requirements.
- <u>10.08.34 Public Space Requirements:</u> More than 42 acres of the 58+ acre site is proposed to be preserved as undisturbed open space with only trails allowed to be installed. The following is required:



- A final Overall Project Site Plan must be submitted prior to Town Council review to understand the final layout of buildings:
 - This plan must include topo and stormwater retention/detention basins
- A final landscape Plan for Phase 3 is required and should relate to the approved Landscape Plan for Phase 1 (by Seth Bockholt Design). This should also be provided to the Town Council for their review:
 - This plan must include the location of all retaining walls with top-of-wall and bottom-ofwall elevations, width dimensions, landscaping at top and bottom (and in terracing where allowed and applicable), etc.
- A final trail and recreational amenity plan must be submitted and approved by the POST Committee. All trails must be open to the public and this note should be included on all plats for KLAIM.
- The Applicant shall confirm whether a Conservation Easement is proposed to protect these 42 acres. At minimum, the Plat must indicate that no improvements (other than trails) will take place on these acres. This open space should be noted on the Plat for the final phase.
- <u>11.02.14 Construction Mitigation Plan:</u>
 - There have been some concerns forwarded to Town Hall by residents concerning the scale and appearance of the immense 'dirt pile' located just north of the KLAIM subdivision. This is the site that is accepting the excavated soil/debris from the KLAIM site that is not proposed to be reused on site. Town staff also has concerns regarding the scale of the site, the erosion into the stream adjacent to the site and the appearance of terra-forming as viewed from SR 248.
 - The Applicant shall provide details related to the final scale (size and dimensions), proposed vegetation, whether additional phases to KLAIM will also be allowed to deposit excavation debris there, etc.
 - A SWPPP Plan should be submitted to the Town Engineer and Planner for review and approval. Proposed elevations indicating depth of fill should also be provided and no slope shall exceed 1:1. Currently the slopes appear to exceed 1:1.





Recommended Conditions of Approval

Planning Conditions:

- 1. CC&Rs must be recorded.
- 2. Secondary access must have four season access.
- 3. Submittal of an overall Site Plan
- 4. Submittal of a Final Landscape Plan
- 5. Submittal of a final design and engineering specifications (and materials) for the retaining walls
- 6. Inclusion of a plat note indicating when trails and recreational amenities will be completed.
- 7. Submittal of detailed trail dimensions, materials, associated landscaping, etc.
- 8. Delineate future visitor parking for the complete KLAIM project; layout must be approved by the Town Planner and Engineer.

Engineering Conditions:

1. T-O Report to provide details, if any.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the subdivision (attached) and forward a positive recommendation subject to the conditions outlined in this Staff Report for the KLAIM Phase 3 Subdivision to the Town Council.



			JINT TABLE	P										·			
PINT NO	DN	DESCRIPTION	EASTING	NORTHING	PINT												
23 740	17	NE COR SEC 1	1669320.93	7406748.12			CURVE TABLE					CURVE TABLE					
24 740	; 17	NW COR SEC 1	1663993.79	7406708.13		CHORD	BEARING	DELTA	LENGTH	RADIUS	CURVE	CHORD	BEARING	DELTA	LENGTH	RADIUS	CURVE
25 740		BLDG PAD	1667564.22	7405405.24	10	383.50'	N30°00'49"W	59°44'32"	401.44'	385.00'	C19	52.48'	S27°38'50"E	39°51'07"	53.56'	77.00'	C1
27 740	╧┫┠	BLDG PAD	1667526.78	7405364.28	11	23.18'	S5°40'06"W	48°53'38"	23.89'	28.00'	C20	21.51'	S53°52'25"E	12°36'03"	21.55'	98.00'	C2
28 740		BLDG PAD	1667600.10	7405297.26	12	19.66'	S39°19'54"E	41°06'22"	20.09'	28.00'	C21	30.99'	S69°16'20"E	18°11'47"	31.12'	98.00'	C3
29 740		BLDG PAD	1667637.54	7405338.23	13	1.50'	N59°46'37"W	0°12'54"	1.50'	400.00'	C22	5.39'	N72°51'05"W	11°02'17"	5.39'	28.00'	C4
30 740 31 740		BLDG PAD BLDG PAD	1667644.68 1667607.23	7405331.71 7405290.74	14 15	32.03'	N57°22'30"W	4°35'21"	32.04'	400.00'	C23	9.81'	N57°14'50"W	20°10'12"	9.86'	28.00'	C5
32 740		BLDG PAD BLDG PAD	1667704.18	7405290.74	15	33.94'	N52°38'56"W	4°51'45"	33.95'	400.00'	C24	15.04'	N31°34'45"W	31°09'58"	15.23'	28.00'	C6
33 740		BLDG PAD	1667741.62	7405243.10	17	39.09'	N47°25'01"W	5°36'05"	39.11'	400.00'	C25	21.18'	S22°36'28"E	13°13'22"	21.23'	92.00'	C7
34 740	╷┥┠	BLDG PAD	1667754.54	7405231.30	18	12.73'	N58°53'57"W	1°58'16"	12.73'	370.00'	C26	29.35'	S38°23'46"E	18°21'15"	29.47'	92.00'	C8
35 740	╷┥┠	BLDG PAD	1667717.09	7405190.33	19	32.10'	N55°25'39"W	4°58'19"	32.11'	370.00'	C27	41.36'	S12°55'13"W	95°12'40"	46.53'	28.00'	C9
36 740		BLDG PAD	1667790.42	7405123.31	20	34.14'	N50°17'49"W	5°17'21"	34.16'	370.00'	C28	32.94'	S88°02'45"E	19°21'04"	33.10'	98.00'	C10
37 74		BLDG PAD	1667827.86	7405164.28	21	10.95'	N46°48'16"W	1°41'46"	10.95'	370.00'	C29	36.98'	N71°24'08"E	21°45'10"	37.21'	98.00'	C11
38 740		BLDG PAD	1667797.55	7405116.79	22	19.00'	N44°29'07"W	3°06'39"	19.00'	350.00'	C30	98.99'	N30°11'30"E	60°40'06"	103.77'	98.00'	C12
						18.93'	N41°32'52"W	2°55'55"	18.93'	370.00'	C31	41.90'	S31°47'05"E	31°34'38"	42.44'	77.00'	C13
			LINE TAE			33.96'	N37°27'04"W	5°15'41"	33.98'	370.00'	C32	11.11'	S11°51'32"E	8°16'30"	11.12'	77.00'	C14
 PROJ						32.03'	N32°20'23"W	4°57'41"	32.04'	370.00'	C33	23.15'	N21°08'21"W	52°52'06"	23.99'	26.00'	C15
MANA		LENGTH	BEARING	LINE		32.03'	N27°22'42"W	4°57'41"	32.04'	370.00'	C34	22.43'	N34°58'17"E	49°58'35"	23.16'	26.55'	C16
DRAV			S45°30'53"W	L1		33.96'	N22°16'00"W	5°15'41"	33.98'	370.00	C35	44.52'	N21°08'21"W	52°52'06"	46.14'	50.00'	C17
CHEC		/ 20.01'	S45°30'53"W	L2		125.28'	N9°53'22"W	19°29'37"	125.88'	370.00	C36	39.34'	N28°27'43"E	46°20'01"	40.14	50.00	C18
DATE						125.20	119 55 22 10	19 29 37	125.00	370.00	0.30	39.34	1120 27 43 E	40 2001	40.43	50.00	010
) FORM	L AS T	APPROVAL		[IMENT	ERING DEPA	ENGINE			PLANNING COMMISSION						

R	PLANNING COMMISSION	ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT	APPROVAL AS TO FORM	• •	
	APPROVED THIS DAY OF A.D., 20 BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION.		APPROVED AS TO FORM THIS DAY OF A.D., 20	THE TOWN OF THE CONDITIC DEDICATION C PUBLIC USE.	
	CHAIR, PLANNING COMMISSION	DIRECTOR, ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT	HIDEOUT TOWN ATTORNEY	MAYOR	



1. Follow up presentation and discussion of the concept plan for a planned community development project on the Salzman property



Staff Report for the Boulders – Concept Plan Review

То:	Chairman Tony Matyszczyk Town of Hideout Planning Commission
From:	Thomas Eddington Jr., AICP, ASLA Town Planner
Re:	The Boulders Concept Plan Review by Skyhawk Development
Date:	19 January 2022 (15 December 2021 Staff Report Updated in Italics)
Submittals:	(Incomplete) Concept Plan Application and Master Plan (9 December 2021) Concept Plan dated 10 January 2022

Site Location (proposed site in red outline)



Town of Hideout Planning Map

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

1



Site Characteristics

Total Acres of Site:	114 Acres
Current Zoning:	Mountain (M)
Allowed Density:	One (1) unit per acre or approximately 85 units after road infrastructure is built.
Concept Density:	+/-610 Units (or +/-574 ERUs; only draft calculations currently available) 5.35 units per acre
General Uses:	The developers are proposing a development concept that includes a variety of residential building typologies, a bed-and-breakfast, a retail pad, and a hotel.

Concept Plan (10 January 2022)





Planning Issues & Concerns for Discussion – Carried Over from December 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

Density:

A 500%+ increase beyond existing allowances requires a thorough discussion of the 'gives and gets' associated with a conceptual up-zoning of such scale.

Planning Commission input required:

- This proposed Concept Plan will create +/-610 units which equates to 5.35 units/acre.
- By way of comparison, the density of recent subdivision approvals:

0	Deer Springs:	97 acres, 248 Units (2.57 units/acre)
0	Lakeview:	22.4 acres, 69 units (3.08 units/acre)

- At the December 2021 Planning Commission meeting, the Commissioners expressed concern about the density. The Planning Commission should provide input and direction for the Applicant to move forward. Is there support for this amount of density? If not, what density does the Planning Commission believe is appropriate? Conversely, if so, what amount of local/unique/specialty destination commercial development to create a mixed-use Town 'center' component would be required as a 'get' for the Town to 'give' on the density? See below for additional detail.
- Uses Missing: A town center or village square would provide the local commercial opportunities that are missing in the community and requested daily. This is the last large piece of developable property in the Town and the only location where a town center or village square could be built. It could be incorporated around or near the hotel and provide an amenity to visitors and residents alike. +/-10 20 acres dedicated to these uses would not only provide space for commercial amenities such as restaurants, local retail, etc. but also ensure the future viability of the Town with sales tax a desperately needed fiscal component to balance the Town's existing heavy reliance on residential property tax dollars.

Planning Commission input requested:

At the December 2021 Planning Commission meeting, the Commissioners requested additional commercial development. The developers have added a retail pad site in the open space that is NE of the hotel. How much commercial space does the Planning Commission want to see as part of this proposed development?



- A general rule of thumb suggests that approximately 10% 15% of a development should be reserved for future commercial space. Would the Planning Commission support +/-10 acres for a small village or town center?
- An approach could be for the Town to reserve +/-10 acres for future local/unique/specialty destination commercial development. This area could provide an opportunity for the Town/developer to partner and consider options to sell/lease/long-term/give/lease land to entrepreneurs that commit to building the type of commercial development appropriate in this unique mountain setting. This would also help to achieve the goal to create a Town Center that is noted in the 2019 General Plan.
- The residential density displaced by this commercial development could be located on a different portion of the overall site plan.
- The following is a conceptual location for a 10-acre site that could be set aside for future commercial development:





Connection to Town: The Town is disconnected from east to west as a result of SR 248 – it creates a very real and dangerous barrier for pedestrian and bike connectivity in particular. An underground pedestrian and biking tunnel could be part of this concept plan and truly provide easy access from east to west, particularly if located near North Hideout Trail Road.

Planning Commission input required:

- How important is it to connect this proposed development to the western part of the community?
- The existing Concept Plan has trails throughout the proposed development as required by Town Code, but there are no connections proposed across SR 248.
- Open Space/Buffers: The development should have clustered areas with significant open space buffers providing park/trail opportunities. This is especially true where the proposed concept plan proposes six-plex buildings up against the singlefamily fabric proposed and entitled on the south side of Golden Eagle. Trails should connect to the adjacent neighborhoods and across (under or over) SR 248.

Planning Commission input requested:

- Does the Planning Commission support the six-plexes proposed to be built adjacent to the single-family units on the south side of the Golden Eagle neighborhood?
- If so, the developer should commit to Design Standards with required offset dimensions, etc.
- Infrastructure: Issues regarding water rights and availability must be addressed. How will the road infrastructure be built and financed? A Public Improvement District (PID) has been discussed in prior meetings with the developers; intent and details should be clarified.

Planning Commission input required:

• The Applicant proposes to use a PID to finance the infrastructure for this project. Scott Davis from the Economic Development Committee will be at the meeting to discuss the components of a PID project.

Next Steps



The Planning Commission should review the proposed concept plan and provide input to the developers.

No action is necessary or permitted at this time (not all concept plan requirements have been submitted per HTC 11.06.18), however staff thought it was important to begin the review and input process with the Planning Commission.

Although incomplete, their concept plan application is an opportunity for the Planning Commission to coordinate the 'gives and gets' of possible future development opportunities with the developers. Can a partnership be made that ensures the Town gets what it needs on the last large piece of undeveloped (and unentitled) with up-zoning that must be consistent with principles of the General Plan and can the developer make the financials work. Such a partnership needs to be a win-win endeavor for both parties. The proposed pre-concept plan is the first iteration to open this partnership discussion. The Planning Commission should relay all concerns, missing components, and ideas so that the next iteration of a concept plan includes the pieces in a comprehensive manner.

Planning Commission input required:

- The Applicants would appreciate any specific direction relative to the proposed Concept Plan.
- They will be on the agenda next month, 17 February 2022, to discuss the possible rezoning for this property from Mountain (M) to Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) w/ associated residential zones