Minutes
Town of Hideout
Town Council Regular Meeting and Public Hearings
October 9, 2025

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in Regular Meeting and Public Hearing on October 9, 2025, at 6:00 PM in the City Council Chambers located at 10860 North Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah.

Regular Meeting

I. Call To Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Ralph Severini called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Roll Call

Present: Mayor Ralph Severini
Council Member Jonathan Gunn
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Bob Nadelberg (attending via Zoom)
Council Member Chris Baier
Council Member JD Cronin (attending via Zoom)

Staff Present: Thomas Eddington, Town Planner
Alicia Fairbourne, Town Recorder
Polly McLean, Town Attorney
Dennis Pay, Town Engineer
Jan McCosh, Town Administrator

III. Public Input – Floor Open for any Attendee to Speak on Items not Listed on the Agenda.

Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 6:02 p.m.

Brian Cooper recognized that the Economic Development Committee has done a lot of work recently, but he has not seen a summary of the results. He asked if that could be shared at the next Town Council Meeting.

Council Member Haselton wanted to be respectful to Staff, but also wants to state on the record that the final Meeting Materials Packet was received late. It was sent out at 6:42 p.m. last night. The Meeting Materials Packet was 268 pages and an additional seven pages were received this morning at 8:28 a.m. At 5:00 p.m. this evening, there was a revised Meeting Materials Packet received.

Approved

Council Member Haselton tries to be a conscientious Council Member and read everything included in the Meeting Materials Packet, but when it is received late, it is almost impossible to do so. She does not understand how the Town Council can make informed decisions when the information is received so late.

Council Member Haselton reported that the Planning Commission has adopted new rules. Their rules stated that Commissioners will not discuss anything unless the information is received three days in advance. She believes the Town Council should be treated as respectfully as the Planning Commission. The information must be received in a timely manner so it is possible to review everything, understand the materials, and make informed decisions. Mayor Severini expressed support for the comments shared. He thought it made sense to continue to monitor the situation, because it is not possible to review that amount of material in such a short amount of time. It is possible to adopt a similar rule to the Planning Commission. If there is not information provided three days beforehand, then it will not be discussed.

Mayor Severini asked Town Attorney, Polly McLean, whether a formal vote is needed. Ms. McLean stated that since the Rules and Regulations for the Planning Commission were looked at recently, it makes sense to revisit the Rules and Regulations for the Town Council as well. This could be done over the next few months. Mayor Severini believed this effort should be prioritized. Council Member Chris Baier pointed out that it is ultimately the responsibility of the Mayor to set the agenda and run the meeting.

The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 6:10 p.m.

IV. Agenda Items

1. Update on the Hideout Community Reinvestment Agency - *Presented by Rob Sant, Economic Development & Redevelopment Agency Deputy Director, and Spencer Foster, Mountainland Association of Governments*.

Economic Development Consultant, Rob Sant, introduced himself and Spencer Foster with the Mountainland Association of Governments ("MAG"). Messrs. Sant and Foster both have a background in Community Reinvestment Agencies ("CRA"). Summary information was shared. Mr. Sant explained that a few months ago, Hideout adopted an Ordinance to create the Hideout CRA. There are a few steps that need to be taken before a Certificate of Creation is received from the Lieutenant Governor. Work is being done on a Final Entity Plat, which will be used to create the CRA. Once that is ready, it is possible to submit the Final Entity Plat and other documentation to the Lieutenant Governor. After that, there will be a CRA in Hideout and the Town Council will have the authority to create Community Reinvestment Areas. There are a few being considered, including Richardson Flat. Mr. Sant shared a high-level budget to illustrate what could be developed and what kind of revenues could be generated. It was reiterated that this is a high-level budget and there were some general assumptions made. The next step would be to work directly with the landowner. There would then be a detailed budget created, which would look at some of the actuals.

Approved

Mr. Sant noted that the town has a lot of experience with the Military Installation Development Authority ("MIDA"). He explained that CRAs are a little bit different, but both use incremental tax revenues. In a MIDA area, it is called Property Tax Allocation, and in a CRA, it is called Tax Increment Financing ("TIF"). It is the same tool, but one is controlled by MIDA and the other is controlled at the town level through the CRA. Mr. Sant shared an analysis spreadsheet that shows the high-level budget. He reiterated that there are certain assumptions. For instance, it is assumed that 120 acres will be developed of the 350 acres of land. The other acreage will be open space, which was previously identified as being important to the town. It is also assumed that there could be approximately $3 million of building values per acre. What that would mean for the town is that after some of the residential and other exemptions, there would be around $300 million of new taxable value. This would produce approximately $250,000 of property tax revenue for the town. Taxing entity-wide, there would be approximately $2.4 million of property tax.

Mr. Sant reminded the Council that with a CRA, there are negotiations with the other taxing entities. In this case, it would be Summit County, Park City School District, and the Special Service Districts. The process includes negotiations and a request to share a portion of the incremental growth for a certain amount of time. That could be 15 to 20 years, and the amount could range from 50% to 80% of the tax increment. In the high-level budget document, the assumption is 70% for 20 years. He explained that this would result in $26 million of property tax increment that could be reinvested back into the project area. The money could be used for infrastructure or incentivizing development if there are gaps in financing.

Mr. Sant further discussed the difference between MIDA and a CRA. With MIDA, there is a specific timeframe. It is 75% of the property tax for a 25-year period, and then it can be extended for an additional 15-year period. With a CRA, the timing and the percentages are all negotiated with each individual taxing entity. Mr. Sant shared the Tax Rate and Increment Analysis section of the high-level budget document. The entities listed include: Summit County, Park City School District, Hideout, Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, Park City Fire Service District, Summit County Mosquito Abatement District, and Synderville Basin Recreation District. There would be a meeting with property owners in the project area and a discussion about existing needs. This would be followed with negotiations with the taxing entities.

The high-level budget document was further reviewed. Mr. Sant offered to answer Council Member questions about CRAs. Council Member Jonathan Gunn wanted to understand why a taxing entity would want to participate. Mr. Sant explained that this is future revenue. It is not current revenue, but revenue that will be generated. He shared some example scenarios with the Council and noted that there is some give and take that makes participation desirable. Mr. Foster echoed those comments and explained that if there is participation from the taxing entities, there will be certain infrastructure and development built.

Council Member Baier believed that in order for there to be participation from the different taxing entities, there would need to be something desirable for them in the project area. Mr. Foster confirmed that there would need to be something mutually beneficial. Council Member Baier stated that Hideout wants to be a good neighbor. The kind of development that would be

Approved

targeted in the Richardson Flat annexation area would need to be thoughtful. The vision of all the different taxing entities would need to be considered.

Council Member Baier asked if it is necessary to have an agreement with every taxing entity. It was mentioned earlier that the terms will be variable, but she wanted to know there is variability by entity. She asked if the CRA only works if every taxing entity reaches an agreement with Hideout. Mr. Sant used Richardson Flat as an example and explained that the growth in assessed value could be the rationale for taxing entity participation. With CRAs, there needs to be an Interlocal Agreement negotiated with each of the taxing entities. Each agreement is a separate legal document, so each could have a different participation rate established. The list of the different taxing entities was further reviewed.

Mr. Sant explained that the taxing entities might view a CRA as a benefit because it is possible to have a voice and a seat at the table. Mr. Foster added that CRAs are a long-range tool. At the beginning of a CRA, the value of the land is not worth a lot, but after the CRA is created and the development is finalized, the land value will be much higher. If it is possible to show that both the agency and taxing entities will benefit from development in an area, then that is generally what incentivizes a CRA to move forward.

Mayor Severini mentioned Column D of the document. Mr. Sant reported that there will be a more specific budget created in the future. It will be possible to look at the actuals between a CRA and a MIDA scenario. This budget document assumes all taxing entities would participate at 70% for 20 years. Some taxing entities might have a policy where there is 15 years at 50%, so that could impact the overall numbers. The CRA could have a lengthier process than MIDA because there are negotiations that have to occur.

2. Presentation of the Government Data Privacy Act (GDPA) - *Presented by Spencer Foster, Mountainland Association of Governments.*

It was determined that Item 3 on the Town Council Meeting agenda will be heard before Item 2. Following the presentation from Wasatch Fire District Chief, Eric Hales, there was a presentation on the Government Data Privacy Act ("GDPA"). Mr. Foster reported that the GDPA was passed in 2024, and it is Utah Code 63A-19. This law was passed to standardize how the government handles personal data. This applies to all governmental entities and requires privacy program implementation by December 31, 2025. It is fairly simple to come into compliance in the current year, but in the future, there will be more requirements.

As for what compliance means for 2025, each governmental entity needs to complete a Privacy Program Report. Mr. Foster will send all of the information and templates to Staff. The report has to be completed by the end of this year. The report is not accessible via a GRAMA request. The only agency that can request the report from the governmental entity is the Office of Data Privacy. The list of GDPA requirements was shared. Mr. Foster explained that in the future, the town will need to appoint a Chief Administrative Officer and a Records Officer for the Privacy Program Report. He recommends moving forward with these appointments through a Resolution. Next year, there will be a privacy policy established and a data inventory. Additionally, there will need to be annual Staff training conducted.

Approved

Mr. Foster explained that a Chief Administrative Officer is someone who will oversee the privacy program and complete the Privacy Program Report. It is typically a role filled by the Mayor or a key member of Staff. The Records Officer will manage the public records and GRAMA requests. There must be annual training completed. Mr. Foster shared information about how to build a program foundation. He noted that this involves defining the scope, creating a privacy policy, and completing a maturity self-assessment. This is an ongoing effort, so the State does not expect cities to have a mature privacy program for the next few years. As long as the governmental entity is working to improve the program, there will be time allotted to do so. It is necessary to start taking action now, which means implementing basic practices:

- Only collect necessary data;
- Notify residents when collecting personal data;
- Don't share or sell data;
- Train Staff annually;
- Respond to correction or data access requests.

Throughout 2026, there will be a list or inventory created. This will look at what personal data the town processes, what systems store that data, and with whom it is shared. Mr. Foster shared the next steps:

- Watch State-wide Privacy Awareness Training Video;
- Assign a Chief Administrative Officer and Records Officer and adopt a Resolution;
- Review Privacy Program Report;
- Review and adopt a Privacy Program Policy;
- Start a data inventory; and
- Identify where personal data is being collected.

Council Member Baier asked for additional information about the law that was passed. Mr. Foster reported that it passed in the Legislative Session in 2024. It is Utah Code 63A-19-101 and there is additional information included in the presentation slides. Council Member Baier wanted to know why the town would do the bare minimum to start. It would make sense to implement this as quickly as possible. Mr. Foster explained that he has been advising smaller towns to handle the most important tasks first, because there is limited bandwidth as far as Staff resources. Mayor Severini stated that he will be in touch with Mr. Foster about this in the near future, because it is critical that there be a focus on privacy.

3. Update on Hideout Fire Station 56.

Chief Hales introduced himself to the Town Council. He explained that Council Member Gunn sits on the Fire Advisory Commission and asked that there be information shared about the proposed fire station. A few years back, there was a conceptual drawing shared. It looked at what could be done on the triangular parcel that the town owns off of SR-248. There has since been entry into an 50-year lease with the town and there have been discussions with the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") about how to optimize the space. He stated that there can be a fire station located there as well as Public Works.

Approved

There has been work done with UDOT on an Access Agreement. Chief Hales reported that the documents that need to be presented to UDOT have been finalized, but the Signalization Plan is still needed. Since this will be a fire station, there needs to be signals that provide a warning when a vehicle comes out. He clarified that these lights will only be used in the event of an emergency. Chief Hales shared the Site Plan with the Council and pointed out the access locations. There is work being done with UDOT to move it down so the width can accommodate the fire station and still provide access to the future Public Works.

This station will be able to house two apparatus, which will most likely be a fire engine and an ambulance. The station can hold six people. Chief Hales explained that it might be a few years before there is a full staff in place, but there will be enough room for the station to grow. He reviewed the floor plan and pointed out the apparatus bay, dayroom, and workout room. Council Member Baier asked what metric is being used to determine the staff needed at the station. Chief Hales explained that it comes down to the call volume. Right now, the average is 30 calls a month in Hideout, which is approximately one per day. Some of the calls are related to fire alarms, and some are related to medical calls. The staff needed depends on the call volume in the corridor. It was noted that there is also mutual aid provided, as there are Mutual Aid Agreements with all of the neighboring jurisdictions. Chief Hales pointed out that the Deer Valley East Village development will impact the area. He shared additional information about staffing levels.

Chief Hales provided a rendering of the fire station. He clarified that there has not been a presentation made to the Planning Commission, so nothing has been finalized at this time. The intention is to maintain the mountain modern feel, so this will suit the community. UDOT does not want more than one access onto SR-248, but there is comfort in sharing the access with Public Works. There has been work done with an architect to make sure this is firewise as far as landscaping and the building construction. Chief Hales explained that the goal is for the fire station to be ready around this time next year. He acknowledged that this is an aggressive timeline, but there is a desire to move forward as quickly as possible.

Mayor Severini reported that there is a desire to get the Insurance Services Office ("ISO") rates down. He asked Chief Hales if he has submitted information to the ISO. Chair Hales stated that as soon as the temporary station was put in, there was outreach conducted, but it has not been recognized at this time. He thanked the Town Council for allowing him to share information about the proposed fire station.

4. Review of Town Code Section 1.10.060 – Council Member Briefings.

Ms. McLean shared information about Town Code Section 1.10.060. She explained that there was a suggestion made by Council Member Gunn to review this section of code. When briefings have taken place, the rest of the Council has been made aware. The briefings are done with two, so there is not a quorum of the Council present at one time. It is required that Staff provides the briefings within seven calendar days of the request, but there is no language related to a resolution. Mayor Severini asked if there have been issues delivering information in a timely manner. Ms. McLean reported that the first request received was fairly time-intensive,

Approved

and it occurred before a planned vacation. In that instance, she was unable to complete the briefings within the seven days, but this was explained to the Council. Staff is willing to provide whatever information is requested and attempts are made to do so in a timely manner.

Council Member Haselton asked how many Council Members have requested briefings and how much time it has taken Staff to respond. Ms. McLean reported that she received requests in April and May and that was more intensive. It has been fairly quiet since then. Council Member Baier noted that there was some pushback on the language previously, which is documented in the Meeting Minutes from April 10. The Meeting Minutes indicate that there were concerns about straining limited resources and creating operational inefficiencies if the request has to be fulfilled within seven days. There were no limits to Staff hours listed and there was no clear definition of what constitutes a briefing. The way it is written, there is the potential for abuse. To date, there have not been examples of abuse, but it is still necessary to consider that possibility. She believes there should be future refinements made to this section of code.

Mayor Severini stated that he has not seen much of a burden placed on Staff. Council Member Gunn reported that the prior administration was withholding critical and time-sensitive information. The amendment was created to allow members of the Council to receive confidential briefings in a manner consistent with the law. Ms. McLean explained that the reason this item was added to the current Town Council Meeting agenda was due to some confusion from the public about whether a resolution was required within seven days. She noted that the section of code is available to read on the website. Mayor Severini noted that he cannot find any evidence of undue strain on the Staff or consultants at this time.

5. Public Hearing: Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding an Amendment of the Official Town of Hideout Zoning Map to Rezone Parcel 00-0020-8164 (Wildhorse Development) from the Mountain (M) Zone to Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU). This Proposed Development is Located on the Northern Side of SR-248, between the Woolf Property and the Klaim Subdivision.

Mayor Severini reported that this agenda item is related to a rezone request. The applicant, Tim Schoen, introduced himself to the Council and explained that the land was purchased 20 years ago. There is an opportunity to create a brand. He clarified that there is an intention to live there and manage the development. Mr. Schoen shared a number of presentation slides with the Town Council. Jerry Crylen shared additional information about the plan. This has been a labor of love, and something has been envisioned for the last 20 years. He highlighted some of the objectives for the development:

- Transform and enrich the fabric of Hideout;
- Respond to resident desire for service amenities;
- Meaningfully increase town revenue generation; and
- Align with the Hideout General Plan.

Approved

Information about the General Plan vision was shared. Mr. Crylen reported that the General Plan has three primary goals, including preserving outstanding views, cultivating an inviting neighborhood atmosphere, and building a connected community. He believes the proposal meets all of those goals and noted that there will be compliance with the dark sky provisions. A presentation slide related to the development phasing was shared. On the site, there are three phases shown: Phase I (2026), Phase II (2027), and Phase III (2028.) In the Master Development Agreement ("MDA"), there is a request for a Public Infrastructure District ("PID") for financing a portion of the infrastructure. Mr. Crylen explained that Phase II is envisioned as a commercial retail space, and it will take advantage of the views.

Images were provided that represent the style of the homes. Mr. Crylen clarified that the designs are not finalized at this time, and there will be variations in the single-family homes. The villas will have a continuity in design. He added that there will be compliance with the height and open space requirements throughout the project. There was a concern shared by the Planning Commission about the positioning of the villas. He reported that the villas will be less than 3,000 square feet. The plan currently shows a 15-foot setback, but it was requested that this be pushed back further to 20 feet, for which there was agreement to do. He pointed out the table on the presentation slide and discussed the blue lines shown. What is proposed addresses the safety concerns. The red circles depict a 26-foot radius, which would allow residents to make a three-point turn in order to exit the site. This also addresses questions related to safety.

The Wildhorse Village information was shared. There will be two levels, ADA compliance, and an elevator inside. There are 48 parking spaces proposed to address the traffic needs. Mr. Schoen stated that Wildhorse Village is about creating a place where neighbors connect, families gather, and Hideout shines as a community. There is proposed to be an artisan café and bakery, a signature restaurant, and a gourmet market and deli. He noted that there will be negotiations needed for the actual tenants, but the tenants selected need to match the strategic direction. It is important to be mindful when it comes to branding.

Mr. Crylen shared information about capital investment. The infrastructure is $5,330,900 and commercial is $9,720,000, which results in a total of $15,050,900. The economic/revenue information was reviewed next. The numbers shown are supported by Mr. Sant. There was work done for over a year to refine the numbers. On average, over a 20-year period of time, the annual revenue is projected to be $188,414. Mr. Sant stated that the sales tax number shown is a conservative estimate. There was discussion about the assumptions used for the retail sales tax number and what kind of restaurant is envisioned.

Mr. Crylen reported that there is a strong team in place, which includes Otto Walker Architects, Stantec, Columbia Capital Municipal Advisors, Mulholland Development Solutions, and AGEC. Council Member Gunn stated that in the MDA, there should be a condition that ensures the emergency easement is locked down. In addition, he would like the MDA to state that there will not be any combustible materials within five feet of any structure. He would also like to see the precise amounts of water that will be brought in for culinary and irrigation included in the MDA. Council Member Gunn asked who would maintain the trails. He noted that 3.13.4.1 has language that conflicts with 1.15.3. He understands there is an issue in Section 4.1 and asked about the resolutions that will be proposed. Mr. Crylen shared comments about the

APPROVED

commercial timeline. He explained that the intention is to move forward with the timeline that is in the MDA currently. Some language was added that gave them pause, because it tied the completion of the commercial building to the issuance of the Certificates of Occupancy for the residential. In his view, these are separate, so there needs to be some additional clarity provided in the document.

Town Planner, Thomas Eddington, presented the Staff Report and explained that at the September 18, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting, there was a positive recommendation for the MDA by a vote of 3-to-2. There was a positive recommendation for the rezone by a vote of 4-to-1. He noted that there were some Planning Commission concerns about the MDA, which was the reason for the 3-to-2 vote that occurred. Mr. Eddington reported that the site is 15.12 acres and is situated between the Woolf property and the Klaim Subdivision. It is a steep terrain with steep slopes. The proposal is for seven single-family dwelling units, five villas, and a commercial building. It is currently zoned Mountain, which is a residential designation that allows one unit per one acre. The steep slopes over 30% will be deducted from that total in terms of density. There are a number of acres that are over 30%. The applicant is proposing to cluster the development pursuant to the Cluster Ordinance, which will be wrapped into the MDA.

The only area proposed for a rezone is the commercial area, which is 1.3 acres. Mr. Eddington explained that just that area would be proposed to move from Mountain, which is a residential designation, to Neighborhood Mixed Use to allow for the commercial development. He reported that rezoning is discretionary and must align with the General Plan. The applicant mentioned earlier that the General Plan is met, and the Planning Commission agreed with that statement. There was a recommendation at the Planning Commission Meeting on September 18, 2025, to include a trail connection. It was noted that there are discussion items in the Staff Report, but many of these items have already been considered.

The Planning Commission discussed the emergency egress through the Klaim development. There is an easement needed and it is a requirement for the commercial development. It was noted that the easement has not been signed at this time, but it has been given to the Klaim developer for review. The applicant explained that there will be a meeting with the developer next week, so that process is underway.

Mr. Eddington mentioned the code exceptions that were incorporated into the MDA. Many of the lots will be built on slopes that exceed 30%, ranging from 30% to 36%. This was one of the tradeoffs and is noted as an exception. The reduced lot sizes are also incorporated, as well as reduced minimum setbacks for the single-family estate lots. Those are 15 feet for the front yard, 20 feet for the rear, and 15 feet for each side yard. While the setbacks were significantly reduced, the lot sizes were also reduced. For the villa properties, the front yard was reduced to 20 feet, the rear yards to 20 feet, and the side yards to 10 feet. There was discussion about driveways and the information included in the Meeting Materials Packet.

Mr. Eddington shared additional information about the exceptions. He reported that there are ones related to retaining walls due to the steep slope terrain. Retaining walls are a maximum of 10 feet pursuant to the Town Code, but the exceptions requested were for up to 12 feet in

Approved

height for the residential areas and up to 23 feet in height for the area of the access road. The Council discussed retaining walls in other areas of the town and it was confirmed that there is some precedent for a higher retaining wall height. It was noted that there was a request made for short-term rentals in the villas, not the single-family dwellings.

The Planning Commission favorably recommended the project with several conditions:

- No more than two access points for the villas;
- The utility pole on Lot 12 shall be removed and placed underground;
- Snow removal will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association ("HOA") created for the Wildhorse development;
- A trail will be constructed through the open space to connect to the Klaim trail network (exact location to be determined); and
- Conditions of Approval listed in the Planning and Engineering Staff Reports.

A question was asked about the rationale for the condition related to access points. Mr. Eddington explained that the Planning Commission had some safety concerns and there was more comfort with no more than two access points. The initial Concept Plan showed a turnaround for emergency vehicles.

Town Engineer, Dennis Pay, reviewed the Engineering recommendations in the Meeting Materials Packet:

- A Slope Map is part of the package, but is not included. The applicant's engineer-of-record shall seal (stamp, date, sign) the Slope Map, because it is a final document on which decisions will be made;
- All streets meet current town standards;
- The building setback on the west side of Woolf Road shall be 20 feet;
- As noted on the Concept Plan, public access and snow storage easements shall be included with the pertinent public utility easements;
- A jersey barrier, or an equivalent pedestrian safety barrier, shall be used on the west side of the street going up the hill. It can be removed temporarily for public utility maintenance and can serve as a pedestrian refuge. Barrier height shall be designed to comply with the Building Code;
- Resolve the boundary discrepancy with KLAIM in the vicinity of the retaining wall at the entrance to Klaim;
- Remove the power line through Lot 12 and install a power pole on the Woolf property at the end of Woolf Road;
- Obtain a permit from UDOT to discharge stormwater into their right-of-way:
    - Connect storm drain system to the orange line in the photo above. The connection from the UDOT culvert to the orange pipe must be designed pursuant to town standards;
    - Evaluate the orange pipe, for the Town Engineer's review, to ensure that connections, sizes, materials, and slopes meet engineering standards;
    - Make necessary improvements based on the Town Engineer's feedback.
- Add these to the Conceptual Plans:

Approved

- The feasibility of lots is unknown where storm drainage detention and retention are employed. Lot feasibility will be determined at final design;
- Fire hydrant spacing shall be determined by Wasatch Fire District at final design;
- Where public storm water drains onto private property, an easement shall be granted to the town, establishing that the private property owner accepts the drainage as theirs and releases and indemnifies the town from any potential liability associated with it; and
- Town Code 10.08.18D – "The Town Engineer shall determine the most appropriate engineering system and materials for retaining walls located within public-right-of-way and those located outside public-right-of-way that support a public road."

Those items were incorporated into the Planning Commission recommendation. Mr. Pay offered to answer Council Member questions about the information shared. A question raised about how possible it is to work through these items. Mr. Pay explained that these are all items that can be worked through. Mr. Eddington shared comments about the jersey barrier. Council Members wanted to better understand why this is needed and what it might look like. Discussions were had about the design. Mr. Pay mentioned Item 9D from the report, which has language from the Town Code. The language does not directly address tiers, but as far as materials and construction, the Town Engineer has discretion.

Nate Mitchell introduced himself as Legal Counsel for the applicant and read the following language: "Final approval for the layout shall be submitted for Preliminary and Final Subdivision review pursuant to the process governed by the HMC." There is also language that states: "Applications for approval for the Project shall be subject to the requirements of the HMC, except as otherwise expressly provided in this Agreement." Section 3.11 specifically addresses the road requirement and states: "Compliance with the Town's Engineering Standards and Specifications is required and no exceptions are permitted, except as otherwise specifically identified in this Agreement, without an amendment to this document." It is the intention of the applicant to comply with the engineering standards. There has been a discussion about vesting with Ms. McLean and she insisted that some of the vesting language in the code not be included. She wanted the engineering standards to be repeatedly referenced throughout the MDA document.

Mr. Schoen reported that from a brand standpoint, the intention is to ensure that all of the materials are at the higher end aesthetically. There will continue to be collaboration throughout this process. Mayor Severini pointed out that there is a second portion to this discussion, which is related to the MDA. Ms. McLean shared additional comments about the rezone. What is interesting about this application is that all that is being rezoned is the commercial area. The remainder will stay under the Mountain Zone designation. There is an entitlement to cluster under the code, but it is unlikely that the roads and some of the other elements would be possible without the MDA. Mr. Mitchell asked to share comments about the rezone. Mayor Severini noted that there is still a public hearing that needs to take place. Council Members asked to hear comments from Mr. Mitchell before public input is received on the rezone or the MDA.

Approved

Mr. Mitchell referenced the document on Page 114 of the Meeting Materials Packet. He expressed concerns about the language in Section 3(b). It states: "The Phasing Plan in the Development Agreement must be adhered to and if the commercial is not completed by December 31, 2027, the zoning designation shall revert to MR." There is a desire to follow the Phasing Plan that has been outlined, but the inclusion of this specific date is concerning. The MDA itself has some default language and dispute resolution provisions. The concern here is that there could be work done, and then the zoning designation could revert back due to the date listed. He would like there to be a longer cure period in case there are issues. In addition, it would be beneficial for there to be language that further defines what constitutes completion.

Mr. Crylen pointed out that if there is a provision that the zoning could revert, this will make it difficult to procure a tenant. Ms. McLean explained that the reason all of these exceptions have been allowed is because of the commercial use that is being added to the community. The idea is to make sure that the commercial use is added. The town does not want to be left with more residential and not the commercial component that was promised. There is a desire to work with the applicant, but it is important to make sure the commercial is completed. There was discussion about the language. Mayor Severini wondered how all parties involved could reach an agreement about the completion date, as there are assurances needed.

Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 8:38 p.m.

Ted Pearlstein reported that he recently purchased a home in Hideout. He commended the Town Council for their thoughtfulness and commitment. Mr. Pearlstein shared information about his recent purchase. The proposal being discussed was one of the reasons he selected the location he did. He likes the idea of being able to walk with his family members to the commercial development. Having that commercial use in the community could incentivize others who are looking to purchase property as well.

Ingram Cook understood the desire to add more commercial uses to the community. He believed commercial was being looked into at Richardson Flat as well. Mayor Severini confirmed that there is a proposal and an existing MDA. Mr. Cook wanted to know if the current applicant took the other commercial uses into consideration when the numbers were determined. He also asked if the focus will be on full-time residents or part-time residents. It was reported that the homes will have full-time residents.

Mr. Cook wanted to know how the town will support having commercial in multiple locations. He wants whatever commercial use is added to be successful. Council Member Gunn mentioned the Lakehouse restaurant near the Deer Creek Reservoir, which is always packed. There is not a lot of residential in that area, but the restaurant is successful. He believes the demand exists and the commercial will be a benefit.

Mayor Severini explained that decisions are made based on the best information available. He noted that there are homes coming into the area, so the density will increase over time. Mr. Cook pointed out that it is important to consider how many people will be in the area year-round. Mayor Severini reported that approximately 45% of residents are full-time and 55% are part-time. He shared information about the homes that are being built in the community and in

Approved

the surrounding area. Mr. Cook reiterated that the whole area needs to be taken into consideration when it comes to the assumed numbers.

Mayor Severini asked the applicant to share information about how this will be marketed. Mr. Crylen explained that the intention is to work closely with the town. Approximately one year ago, there was an interview with three different groups who are experts in retail in the valley. There was data brought in that looked at what would work best in this location. These groups have been doing this work for a long time, know the area, and are interested in ensuring there is the right mix of commercial uses. Mayor Severini acknowledged that there could be competition from other entities, so it is important that the commercial uses are able to co-exist and thrive. Mr. Schoen stressed the importance of diverse uses. There is a desire to have the right mix so these commercial uses make sense and are complementary.

William Woolf explained that this is a project that he has had mixed emotions about. It is difficult when development happens near your property, but he understands that Mr. Schoen has a goal to develop. He is not one to stand in the way of development and is not opposed to what is proposed. He wants to be a good neighbor. Mr. Woolf stated that, based on development in the surrounding areas, the restaurant will attract more high-end clientele. This is a special location, and he believes it will be attractive to a lot of people. Mr. Woolf expressed concerns about potentially renaming the road and the removal of a power pole. His All West Communications is on the pole, and he does not want to lose internet access. Mr. Schoen explained that there is a requirement to remove the pole. He offered to work with Mr. Woolf to address some of his concerns. Mr. Woolf reiterated his desire to maintain the All-West connection.

Brian Cooper stated that he is in favor of the project. He echoed the importance of collaboration and cooperation with all of the near-term commercial uses. There will be a five-star hotel built nearby at some point. Since it is in close proximity, it would make sense for the developers to work together. It would be nice if there were a committee that looked at coordination so all of the uses are complementary to one another. Mayor Severini noted that the Economic Development Committee could discuss this.

Council Member Gunn commented that there are still a lot of items that need to be finalized. He asked about the timeline. Ms. McLean reported that there was information added to the bottom of the Staff Report. It explains that the Town Council can approve the MDA and Rezone, approve them with conditions, deny them, or continue the matter to a date no later than October 16, 2025, unless the developer stipulates to a later date. The code states that if an application is denied, it is not possible to reapply for one year. Council Member Gunn asked for applicant feedback about the preferred Town Council action.

Mr. Mitchell stated that a lot of work has been done on the MDA to find a middle ground. Mr. Schoen would like to see this move forward, but if another two weeks is needed, he understands that. He advocated for a vote at the current meeting with conditions that must be met. It was noted that the motion language could state: "…subject to all of the conditions discussed during the Town Council Meeting." Ms. McLean wants to honor the applicant timeline, but from a legal standpoint, the town is protected more if there is a final document. Council Member Gunn

Approved

suggested an additional two weeks so all of the details can be finalized. It was noted that the next Town Council Meeting is scheduled for November 13, 2025.

Council Member Haselton requested information about what would happen in the event of a denial. Ms. McLean explained that if someone submits a land use application that is denied, unless there is a material factual mistake, the application cannot be resubmitted for one year. Council Member Baier stated that in order to ensure there is a thoughtful and careful review, additional time is needed. She is unable to vote on the MDA or Rezone at this meeting because she has not had enough time to review the materials.

Council Member Gunn asked if it is possible to waive the current deadline and continue this to the next regularly scheduled Town Council Meeting. Before the next meeting, there will be work done to address the remaining issues. There was applicant support for this approach. Council Member Baier stated that the materials need to be provided to the Town Council no later than three days before the next meeting.

Mr. Mitchell reported that over the next two weeks, there will be work done on a final MDA. If there is anything that is not agreed to in the language, that can be addressed in the next two weeks. That will give Staff time to prepare the Meeting Materials Packet and distribute the information to the Town Council.

Ms. McLean mentioned the recommendations from the Planning Commission. She noted that if there is agreement with those recommendations, it will require some re-engineering. Mr. Eddington confirmed this and explained that it would primarily impact the villa lots. Mr. Mitchell stated it is 99% engineered at this point. There has been a lot of compromise made in order to work with the town. Redesigning the engineering to have two access points instead of five access points makes this project not financially feasible. If there were an MDA that required only two access points, it would be difficult to agree to execute that. Mr. Mitchell explained that there is a desire to be responsive to the input of the Planning Commission, but he does not believe they are in a position to redo the engineering at this stage. He respectfully requested that the Town Council not impose this condition on the Planning Commission. Mr. Crylen explained that limiting it to two ingress/egress points and requiring an additional road to serve the villas would result in an additional cost of $3.5 million, which is why it is not feasible to pursue.

Mr. Mitchell asked for guidance on some outstanding issues. He reported that there is an easement issue and work is being done to resolve that. It is proposed that the MDA mention the issuance of a Building Permit. There is also a recommended condition related to Klaim and a retaining wall issue. He believes that is a private issue between neighbors, because there is a portion of their retaining wall that enters the property. There does not necessarily need to be a Condition of Approval that this be addressed. A lot of the other conditions in the engineering report have already been addressed, and some may be unnecessary, because they are addressed elsewhere in the MDA. He is confident that all items can be worked through. Mr. Mitchell next asked for guidance and clarity about the language related to completion.

The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 9:16 p.m.

Approved

Mayor Severini noted that the item can be continued to the next Town Council Meeting, with a provision that there will be work done with Staff. Ahead of the next meeting, there can be additional clarification about what "completion" means in this instance. The information must be shared with Council Members at least three days before the next scheduled meeting in order to allow time to review all materials.

6. Public Hearing: Discuss and Possibly Make a Recommendation to Town Council Regarding a Master Development Agreement (MDA) for the Wildhorse Development.

Ms. McLean pointed out that the Town Council has discussed both the MDA and Rezone applications. She suggested that there be a separate public input session conducted for the MDA application.

Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 9:16 p.m. There were no comments. The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 9:17 p.m.

Mayor Severini noted that the Town Council can make a motion to continue both applications to a date certain, which is the November 13, 2025, Town Council Meeting. This has been agreed to by all parties.

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to CONTINUE the MDA and Rezone to the next regularly scheduled Town Council Meeting, which is November 13, 2025, to afford time for the parties to work out the details discussed during the Town Council Meeting. By agreement of all parties, it will be continued to the next meeting. Council Member Haselton seconded the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Nadelberg, Council Member Cronin, Council Member Baier, Council Member Haselton, Council Member Gunn. There were none opposed. The motion carried 5-0.

The Town Council took a short break from 9:19 p.m. to 9:26 p.m.

7. Public Hearing: Discussion and Possible Approval of an Amendment of the Official Town of Hideout Zoning Map to Rezone Parcels 00-0020-8181, 00-0020-8182, 00-0020-8184, and 00-0020-8185 (the "Elkhorn Springs" Development) from Mountain (M) Zone to Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU), Residential 3 (R3), Residential 6 (R6), Residential 20 (R20), and Natural Preservation (NP) – *Presented by Thomas Eddington, Town Planner*.

Mr. Eddington presented the Staff Report and explained that the Town Council initially heard about this project on August 14, 2025, and there was a subsequent meeting on September 11, 2025. During the last discussion, there was a request for additional information from the applicant. He reported that this is a complete rezone of the existing Mountain Zone to a series of residential zones, as well as some Neighborhood Mixed Use commercial. Mr. Eddington shared a section of the Meeting Materials Packet titled, "Specific Issues Requiring Town Council Input or Direction." The first item has to do with the parking lot proposed for the pickleball building. It is an off-street

Approved

parking lot, which is in conformance with the Town Code. However, there was some discussion about whether angled parking might better serve the site. Based on a discussion with the Town Engineer, there would need to be an exception made to the town standards.

The second item on the list has to do with a recommendation to remove the stairs connecting the neighborhood. After the site visit, it was determined that this can work, so the applicant is able to reincorporate the previously proposed stairways to provide better connectivity throughout the site. The third item has to do with nightly and short-term rentals. Mr. Eddington stated that the Town Council did not support nightly rentals in the project without additional mitigation measures. He asked for additional direction. At this time, language related to nightly rentals has been removed from the MDA document.

The next item has to do with side yard setback reductions for applicable lots. Mr. Eddington asked if the Town Council is comfortable with reduced side yard setbacks of 10 feet. For most of the units in the development, there would be 10 feet that could be landscaped. He explained that there is a need to maintain the Wildland Urban Interface ("WUI") standards. Item E in the document notes that a couple of lots were moved back from the pond to better protect the area. These changes have been made to the documents.

Council Member Haselton asked whether there are three lots shown on the plan. It was clarified that now there are two shown. One house was removed in the location shown, and one was removed elsewhere. The Variance Map was shared with the Town Council. It states that the total townhomes are 66, the total stacked flats are 24, the total single-family homes are 145, and the commercial is one. Changes have been made, and those numbers are not accurate, as there are 230 lots in total. There was another house next to the pond, but that was removed, because it was too close. Additional discussions were had about the pond area.

Mr. Eddington shared the last item on the "Specific Issues Requiring Town Council Input or Direction" list. Early on, there was a discussion about money and services for the Spine Trail, which is the trail along SR-248. During the Planning Commission process, there was some conversation about who would handle the work. There was a quote received for approximately $950,000 for the survey work as well as the design and engineering work. Throughout this process, there have been different interpretations about what the money would be used for. Staff believed it was for the full set of drawings, including survey, design, and engineering. The Planning Commission thought it was important to have that money to execute the priority listed in the General Plan under the element related to parks, trails, and open space. Neighborhood connectivity is important to residents. In 2023, a Trails Division was implemented as part of UDOT. Last year, the idea was that UDOT would start promoting trail systems within the UDOT right-of-way. There was $95 million designated for 60 miles of trails. There were 13 projects chosen for 2025. It was clarified that money is only given out to construction-ready projects. He offered to answer Council Member questions.

Council Member Gunn expressed support for angled parking, adding the stairs back in, removing nightly rentals, and moving the house near the pond. As for the trail, there is no positive indication from UDOT or others that there would be a willingness to assist with the additional funds. 1.11.4.1 talks about the cash payments, and Section D refers to a cash payment for the purposes of the trail.

Approved

He would like to add language to the end of that section to state: "…or any other use the Town Council may lawfully choose." He does not think the two projects necessarily need to be tied together. Mr. Eddington clarified that the UDOT comments were only related to the Spine Trail. Other Council Members were asked to share comments.

Council Member Haselton read the Planning Commission notes, and there were many Commissioners who felt the money should be used for a community center. She would like some of that money to be used for a community center as well. She agreed with the language proposed by Council Member Gunn. Council Member Baier wanted some of the money earmarked for the Spine Trail. She pointed out that this is a regional asset and will increase connectivity. There should be a focus on the Hideout portion.

Mayor Severini looked at the distance between Richardson Flat and Golden Eagle Road, which is 3.7 miles. He asked if the town is looking at 3.7 miles or more than that. He wanted to understand what the $58,000 will cover. The applicant, Nate Brockbank, stated that this was the price received for the topography and basic design. Additional discussions were had about the trail. Mr. Brockbank explained that the $58,000 and the cost of the sign will come out of his own pocket. The attorney for the applicant, Eric Davenport, stated that he added the words: "…or such other lawful purpose the Town Council may decide." Council Member Gunn agreed to that language. He noted that the money needs to be able to move to another project if the trail cannot move forward in some manner. While he loves the idea, if one of the partners says no, then the town needs to be able to pivot. Ms. McLean reported that the Meeting Minutes from the July 17, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting were sent to Council Members. There was a positive recommendation with certain conditions outlined. She read the condition language from that meeting for those present:

- The survey and design for the Spine Trail and the town entrance sign would be included as contributions from the applicant;
- The funds derived from the Community Impact Mitigation fees be utilized for a community center, relocation of the Public Works Building and/or creation of commercial development elsewhere in the town;
- Nightly Rentals be limited to the Neighborhood Mixed Use and Residential 20 Zones of the development;
- The developer will have five years to develop the commercial area, otherwise that property will revert ownership to the town, and the developer will have a Conditional Use Permit for the approved types of neighborhood mixed used retail businesses to be detailed in the MDA;
- The payment schedule in the MDA will be corrected to list $1.5 million for each of the two payments;
- The Town Council will consider the potential risks of private roads; and
- Other red-lined items from the draft MDA will be finalized with the applicant.

Ms. McLean reported that the motion carried at the Planning Commission level. Mr. Brockbank explained that those issues have been addressed in the MDA. Ms. McLean noted that there is a discrepancy between $950,000 and $58,000. The $950,000 was the estimate received, but

Approved

ultimately, the Town Council determines what needs to be done. Council Members thought the Planning Commission recommendations were well thought out and comprehensive. The Town Engineer was asked to share comments on the engineering. Mr. Pay reported that the 12% grade on the secondary access road should be approved by the Wasatch Fire District. The grade for the maintenance access road should be 15% maximum. The developer shall provide a typical section for the layout of the Public Utility Easement ("PUE"), trail, and utility locations. He noted that a four-foot walkway does not meet town standards, because sidewalks are typically 5 feet. On the drawings, some of the roads are called private roads, but those are actually private driveways, so that term needs to be incorporated. He reviewed some of the items that need to be addressed within the exhibits.

The engineer for the applicant, Paul Watson, reported that there is agreement with the comments made by Mr. Pay. Mr. Eddington shared some clarifying information with those present. He reported that what was referred to by the Town Engineer was a proposal for decomposed granite, because it fits into the landscape. 5 feet would meet the width requirement, but it would still be an exception because there is no concrete sidewalk proposed. At the last meeting, there was support for that material because it fit the character. If there was a desire to have a five-foot-wide decomposed granite walkway adjacent to the roads, that could be done, but the PUE would have to be reduced from six feet to five feet. There was Council Member support for the slight reduction of the PUE. Council Member Baier wanted to better understand the PUE and the trails. Mr. Eddington clarified that the PUE is on the inside of the trail, so the five-foot PUE would not negatively impact the trail. There could be a gas line in the buffer area between the curb of the road and the start of the trail. It was noted that, as far as utilities, the decomposed granite is easier than a concrete sidewalk.

Council Member Haselton asked how to get off of SR-248 into the development without a turn lane. Mayor Severini reported that he spoke to UDOT this week about the issue. Both of the engineers stated that they didn't feel the sight lines were adequate, especially with the speed and the hills. He asked them for a brief report that summarized their comments, but it was not received ahead of the Town Council Meeting. Mayor Severini provided a summary of the conversation. The speeds would be too high, and the line of sight would not be enough. In addition, the view would further deteriorate at night. There was a solution proposed, and Mayor Severini offered an alternative. A safer alternative would be to implement a "jug handle" design. While there was agreement that this could work, it was noted that the applicant would need to pay for this.

Mr. Brockbank agreed to look into the jug handle design that has been proposed by Mayor Severini. There were additional discussions about the speed limit in the area. Mayor Severini noted that UDOT has not considered lowering the speeds at this time. Mr. Brockbank explained that access is one of the concerns. There have been several meetings with UDOT so far. He thanked the Mayor for speaking to UDOT about this as well. Council Member Gunn asked about a left-turn arrow so the oncoming traffic would be stopped. Mr. Pay stated that the meeting the Mayor had with UDOT was successful. He asked Mr. Brockbank to let him know when he reaches out to UDOT next, because it would be beneficial to meet with them together.

Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 10:19 p.m.

Approved

Ingram Cook asked if a request had been made to slow down the speed to 55 miles per hour. That corridor is known for the high volume of animals that are killed. It makes sense to slow the speed limit there. Mayor Severini reported that there was a discussion about how to slow down the traffic coming into Ross Creek. During the discussion, there were suggestions about reducing speeds, speed signs, digital signs, road widening, and a traffic light at the intersection of Shoreline and Deer Mountain Boulevard. Those would need to be adjusted in order to adjoin. He explained that UDOT prioritizes four-way intersections. The area was walked and multiple options were considered. The engineers will now look at two different options, one of which is to potentially have the right exit lane widened. This information does not directly address the current application, but there can be additional details shared in the future. Mr. Cook stated that he is still unclear why UDOT would not change the speed limit from 65 miles per hour to 55 miles per hour, as this has already been done on both ends of the road. It is a simple change that could be made.

The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 9:26 p.m.

Ms. McLean suggested that the Town Council discuss both the Rezone and MDA before making a motion.

8. Public Hearing: Discussion and Possible Approval of a Master Development Agreement (MDA) for the Elkhorn Springs Development, which would include Nightly Rentals in Zoning Districts that do not Currently Allow for Nightly Rentals, and Variations to Requirements for Slopes, Cut and Fill, Retaining Wall Height, and Road Grade – *Presented by Thomas Eddington, Town Planner*.

Ms. McLean reported that changes to the MDA were received on Monday afternoon. Some comments were then returned. She acknowledged the frustrations that have been expressed by the Council about the lateness of the materials. Additionally, she noted that there are still terms that have not been finalized. She is concerned about how the terms in the MDA will be worked out. Mr. Davenport explained that after the last meeting, there was a revised MDA sent out. This is not a situation where something was sent to the town at the last minute. There were requests received from Staff to make revisions, and those were done as quickly as possible. He has felt that the target has continued to move, because there have been changes made to the language that was already supported. Yesterday, he received a lot of red lines from Ms. McLean, and he did his best to review them. In his mind, there are really only a few issues, one of which has to do with shortened deadlines. As an example, in the prior MDA, there was 15 years to build out the development. In the most recent revisions that were sent to them, this was shifted to 10 years.

Ms. McLean stated that she received a version from Mr. Davenport on September 10, 2025, which was really from August 22, 2025. This is what was seen at the Town Council Meeting in September. It did not include a lot of items. The final version was received on October 1, 2025. That was eight days ago, and there was work done as quickly as possible. She noted that there is a termination clause that is not typical, so she needed time to review that language. There was a previous discussion about the desire for firm deadlines so the project moves

Approved

forward, but that seemed to be lacking. Discussions were had about the dates and deadlines. Mr. Brockbank shared comments about the termination clause. He clarified that there has not been a situation where a development agreement has been cancelled, but there is an agreement with Bob Martino to build the rock road. The clause is there in case there is an issue with the cost of that work. He reiterated that there is no plan to back out of what has been proposed.

Mr. Brockbank stated that Staff has been wonderful to work with, and he praised Ms. McLean and Mr. Eddington. He shared comments about the deadlines for the phases. It is not possible to build in the winter, so if there is a house is sold in October, it is not possible to start that house until March. It then takes a year to build. He does not want more specific timeframes to be included in the language for that reason. The intention is to have the MDA reference 15 years for the eight total phases of the development. He is not certain that a 10-year deadline could be met, and he does not want to sign something if he is unsure that the deadline is possible. Council Members believed more time was needed on the MDA. Council Member Haselton asked if it would be possible to hold a Special Meeting of the Town Council next week.

Ms. McLean reported that in August and September, there were a lot of questions from the Council. That version of the MDA was not workable. She understands that a lot has been done, but it is her responsibility to work with Staff and listen to Council Member concerns. This is a large project with 230 units on 115 acres, so the Town Council wants to make sure everything is done correctly. There was discussion about the timeline. Mr. Brockbank asked for the rationale behind the shift from 15 years to 10 years and reiterated that there is uncertainty about being able to meet that timeline. If the market remains strong, then it might be done in 10 years, but if there are changes in circumstances, then it might not happen.

Council Member Gunn asked if this is the point where the seller will not give them more time, which was confirmed. He asked about a contingency clause that states certain issues must be resolved within a specific amount of time, or the approval will be withdrawn. He asked if that would satisfy the seller, which was confirmed. Ms. McLean explained that she looks at what could be built as a matter of right. It is 115 acres with some steep areas. This would result in a total of 80 units. Council Member Gunn reiterated his suggestion to approve the applications with a contingency clause in place so the seller does not pull out. Mr. Eddington stated that this could work. Ms. McLean explained that the Town Council is the Legislative Body and ultimately makes the decision, but there are still some items that need to be finalized.

Council Member Gunn pointed out that the termination clause could be limited to a situation where the road costs more than a certain amount. There could be some specificity included. Council Member Gunn stated that there is a timing issue because more time is needed to finalize some of the details. Mr. Brockbank does not believe there are a lot of outstanding issues and feels confident that those can be worked through. He suggested the deadline language reference 10 years with a five-year extension.

Ms. McLean mentioned some of the variance requests and noted that there could be more discussion about those. The Council considered some of the outstanding issues and whether or not those can be resolved in a timely manner. Council Member Gunn asked if it would be possible to have sessions with two Council Members at a time. Ms. McLean was not supportive

Approved

of this approach. Mr. Brockbank shared comments about the Variance List shown. He noted that the list is included on the map and on a spreadsheet.

It was noted that the contract ends on the first of next month, and no more extensions will be granted. Council Member Baier suggested that the Town Council hold a Special Meeting next week. There were discussions about a potential date for a meeting. Ms. McLean reported that she is out of town next week and she has other obligations that cannot be changed. Council Members tried to determine a feasible date.

Mayor Severini believed a vote on this item requires all Council Members present, as it is critical to the town. He is concerned it will not be possible to select a date for a Special Meeting, because Ms. McLean is not available and the applicant is traveling. Council Member Gunn asked if there could be a condition that states if the issues are not worked out to the satisfaction of all parties by a certain date, the approval would be withdrawn. Ms. McLean stated that she is nervous about that kind of agreement. She asked if the Council is comfortable moving forward now based on what has been presented and the condition proposed by Council Member Gunn. Mayor Severini expressed concerns about this approach.

Council Member Haselton wanted to see some sort of resolution. She stated that Mr. Brockbank has always been easy to work with, but she also respects the concerns expressed by Ms. McLean. It was suggested that there be a Zoom meeting on October 20, 21, or 22, 2025. Details could be worked out as much as possible prior to that meeting, and then there could be a Zoom meeting held. Mr. Brockbank stated that as long as it took place before November 1, 2025, then it would work with the timeline. Council Member Baier explained that there is a process to determine whether a date and time can be determined to meet. She suggested that a poll be sent out to Council Members. A date can be selected based on availability. It is possible to state right now that there is an intention to meet before November 1, 2025, and the date will be set based on the results of the poll that is distributed. Ms. McLean shared her availability with the Council. Mayor Severini asked if the applicant can reach out to the seller about an extension. It was reiterated that there cannot be another extension granted. Mr. Brockbank stated that it is possible to work out the remaining issues, as the plan has not changed much throughout the process.

Council Member Nadelberg agreed with the comments shared by Council Member Gunn. This is the third time there has been an attempt at a real estate deal on the Salzman property. All three times, the seller has put time constraints on the deal. He does not understand why the seller feels the need to back everyone into a corner. Mr. Brockbank reported that it took almost a year to move past the Planning Commission phase, so he understands the seller's concerns. Several Council Members expressed support for holding another meeting before November 1, 2025. Ms. McLean reported that there needs to be public input. It was noted that Council Member JD Cronin is no longer responsive on the call.

Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 11:11 p.m.

Ingram Cook wanted to understand why the applicant was being asked to interrupt his vacation to accommodate the Town Council, but there is not the same level of flexibility being shown in

Approved

return. It makes sense to release a poll and find a date that works for as many members of the Council as possible. It is important to him that this community is represented and that there be work done with Mr. Brockbank.

The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 11:15 p.m.

Council Member Baier made a motion to continue the MDA and Rezone to a date before November 1, 2025. It was noted that the meeting date will be determined by a poll. The motion was seconded by Council Member Gunn. There was discussion about the motion and the correct process. Council Member Nadelberg asked about the previous suggestion from Council Member Gunn to move forward with approval during the current Town Council Meeting, with a clear condition. Council Member Gunn believed both options would result in the same outcome. A formal vote was taken on the motion.

Motion: Council Member Baier moved to CONTINUE the MDA and Rezone to a date uncertain, but after October 21, 2025, and before November 1, 2025. The meeting date will be determined by poll and will be set within the next week. Council Member Gunn seconded the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Nadelberg, Council Member Baier, Council Member Haselton, Council Member Gunn. Voting Abstention: Council Member Cronin. The motion passed.

9. Discussion and Update Regarding Installation of Signage to Reinforce Dog Leash Requirements.

Given the time, it was determined that most of the remaining items would be heard at a future meeting.

10. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Date and Time of the 2025 General Election Board of Canvassers Meeting.

It was noted that there has to be work done with the County Clerk's Office on the schedule so there is coordination with other cities in Wasatch County. The County Clerk's Office has mentioned November 18, 2025. There will be a poll sent out to Council Members to finalize the meeting time on that date.

11. Discussion of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations.

The above item was not discussed.

12. Consideration and Possible Adoption of Ordinance 2025-O-XX, Amending Hideout Municipal Code 5.04.075 to Align Construction Hours with Section 10.04.32.

The above item was not discussed.

Approved

13. Discussion of Code Enforcement and Collections for Construction Violations.

This item was not discussed.

14. Discussion and Possible Appointment of a Representative of Hideout to Engage in Discussions Regarding the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP).

The above item was not discussed.

V. Committee Updates.

1. **Planning Commission - *Thomas Eddington, Town Planner.***
2. **Design Review Committee - *Thomas Eddington, Town Planner.***
3. **Wildfire Committee - *Council Member Gunn*.**
4. **Economic Development Committee - *Council Member Cronin.***
5. **Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) Committee - *Council Member Baier.***
6. **Transportation Committee - *Council Member Haselton.***

No committee updates were shared.

VI. Approval of Council Minutes

1. **July 1, 2025, Town Council Meeting Minutes DRAFT.**

The Meeting Minutes from July 1, 2025, were not voted on.

VII. Follow-Up of Items from Approved Minutes.

This item was not discussed.

VIII. Closed Executive Session – Discussion of Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation, Personnel Matters, and/or the Sale or Acquisition of Real Property, as needed.

There was no Closed Executive Session.

A request was made to start Town Council Meetings earlier so the meetings are not running so late into the night. Ms. McLean reported that she assists another jurisdiction and their Council Meetings start at 3:00 p.m. Mayor Severini asked if an earlier start would be convenient to the public, since many people are not done with work until 5:00 p.m. It was noted that the schedule could be rearranged so updates are shared first. By the time the substantive issues are discussed, it will be closer to 6:00 p.m. A suggestion was made to start Town Council Meetings earlier when the new meeting schedule is adopted in January.

Approved

IX. Meeting Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to ADJOURN. Council Member Haselton seconded the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Nadelberg, Council Member Baier, Council Member Haselton, Council Member Gunn. Voting Abstention: Council Member Cronin. The motion passed.

The Town Council Meeting adjourned at 11:24 p.m.

Maria Devereux, Town Recorder
Minutes Approved May 6, 2026

Approved