HIDEOUT, UTAH TOWN COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING
May 06, 2026
Agenda

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Town Council of Hideout, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting at 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Wednesday, May 06, 2026

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

Meeting URL: https://zoom.us/j/4356594739 To join by telephone dial: US: +1 408 638 0986
Meeting ID: 435 659 4739

Regular Meeting
4:00 PM

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Public Input - Floor open for any attendee to speak on items not listed on the agenda

1. The Public Comment period is an opportunity for individuals to make general public comment for items not listed on the agenda. Comments regarding items set for a Public Hearing will be taken during the designated hearing. (Three (3) minutes per person).

IV. Agenda Items

1. Approval of the Minutes - July 10, 2026
2. Approval of the Minutes – August 14, 2025
3. Approval of Minutes - September 11, 2025
4. Approval of the Minutes - October 9, 2025
5. Approval of the Minutes - October 29, 2025
6. Approval of the Minutes - November 13, 2025
7. Approval of the Minutes - November 21, 2025
8. Approval of the Minutes - December 3, 2025
9. Approval of the Minutes - December 17, 2025
10. Approval of the Minutes - January 8, 2026
11. Approval of the Minutes - February 10, 2026
12. Approval of the Minutes - February 12, 2026

V. Meeting Adjournment

File Attachments for Item:

1. Approval of the Minutes - July 10, 2026

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Town Council Regular Meeting and Public Hearings
July 10, 2025

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah held a Regular Meeting and Public Hearings on Thursday, July 10, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. electronically via Zoom and in person at Hideout Town Hall, 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah in Council Chambers.

The following are meeting minutes from the meeting.

Regular Meeting

I. Call to Order

Mayor Severini called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Roll Call

Present: Mayor Ralph Severini
Mayor Pro-Tempore Chris Baier
Council Member J.D. Cronin
Council Member Jonathan Gunn
Council Member Carol Haselton
Excused: Council Member Bob Nadelberg
Staff Present: Town Administrator Jan McCosh
Recorder for the Town of Hideout Alicia Fairbourne
Town Planner Thomas Eddington
Town Engineer Gordon Miner
Public Present: Brian Cooper, John Jansen

III. Public Input

Mayor Severini opened public input period at 6:02 p.m.

Brian Cooper commented on low water pressure in Shoreline 1 and asked that a new pressure regulating valve and related fire hydrant testing be prioritized in future planning and budgeting.

The Council discussed creating a committee to collect infrastructure concerns and route them through the Mayor and staff for prioritization.

Public Input was closed at 6:23 p.m.

IV. Agenda Items

1. Discussion of Roadway Policies.

Jason Burningham was not present, and the item was deferred to a future meeting.

DRAFT

Council requested that staff confirm his availability and provide historical road expenditure data in advance of the next discussion.

2. Presentation of the 2024 Annual Audit - *Spencer Hintzie, Gilbert & Stewart*

   The audit team was not present. The item was not heard and will be continued to the August meeting.

3. Discussion and presentation of the annual Fraud Risk report - *Spencer Hintzie, Gilbert & Stewart*

   The audit team were not present. The item was not heard and was moved to the August meeting.

4. Discussion of General Plan Update and MAG's participation - *John Janson, City Design*

   John Jansen presented an overview of the General Plan update process and introduced the consulting team. He explained that the plan would focus on long-range vision, policy direction, capital planning, and required state elements, including land use, housing, water, and transportation.

   Council discussed desired outcomes for the plan, including clearer guidance on commercial areas and a more deliberate approach to future growth.

5. Discussion and update of the Wildfire Symposium hosted by the Wasatch Fire Department and the Town of Hideout to be held on July 15, 2025.

   Mayor Severini announced that the town will host a Wildfire Symposium on Tuesday, July 15, at Black Rock Mountain Resort. Built around the idea that "wildfires have no boundaries," the event aims to get the region ready before fire season starts.

6. Notice of Cancellation of Primary Election.
   Alicia Fairbourne, Town Recorder, announced the primary election is canceled due to candidate withdrawal; the general election will proceed in November.

7. **Public Hearing for the purposes to receive public input.** Discussion and possible approval of Ordinance 2025-O-XX, an Ordinance adopting amendments to the Hideout Town Standard Specifications and Drawings Manual.

   Mayor Severini opened and closed public comment – after hearing none.

   Motion: Council Member Haselton moved to approve Ordinance 2025-O-XX, an Ordinance adopting amendments to the Hideout Town Standard Specifications and Drawings)Manual with the following amendments to the proposed language: removing the work ‘proposed’ from section 2b.

DRAFT

Second by Council Member Baier.

The vote on the motion is as follows:
Mayor Pro Tempore Baier, yes
Council Member Cronin, yes
Council Member Gunn, yes
Council Member Haselton, yes
Council Member Nadelberg, excused
The motion passes unanimously.

8. Discussion and possible adoption of Ordinance 2025-O-XX, an Ordinance Amending Sections 3.02.020, 3.02.030, and 3.02.040 of the Hideout Town Code Regarding Planning Commissioners Qualifications and Training, Compensation, and Removal.

   Mayor Severini shared updates to Planning Commission rules, including a requirement that all commissioners be full-time Hideout residents. Polly Mclean explained the necessity to align them with Town Council standards. Mayor Severini also noted that new commissioners must complete two hours of expert training within their first 60 days, and the Town will track certificates to ensure members stay current on land-use laws.
   To keep procedures consistent, the removal process now mirrors the Town Council's: members who miss more than two unexcused meetings may be removed for cause. The Town also introduced a modest stipend—$50 per meeting for members and $100 for the Chair—to recognize their time and support consistent participation.
   Council Member Baier noted that rules of conduct should be in place, and hasn't found it in code.

   Motion: Council Member Haselton made a motion to adopt an ordinance amending sections 3.02.02.3.02030 and 3.02.040 of the Hideout town code regarding Planning Commission qualifications, training, removal, and compensation. Second by Council Member Gunn.

   The vote on the motion is as follows:
   Mayor Pro Tempore Baier, yes
   Council Member Cronin, yes
   Council Member Gunn, yes
   Council Member Haselton, yes
   Council Member Nadelberg, excused
   The motion passes unanimously.

9. **Public Hearing:** Discussion and possible approval of Ordinance 2025-O-XX regarding setting the compensation of statutory officers, elected officials, and contracted employees.

DRAFT

The Council discussed the need for clearer committee and commission procedures and expectations. Polly Mclean, Town Attorney, advised of the changes to Utah code, a public hearing is required with any changes or increases in salary, etc. The Council discussed the proposed amounts of $50 per month (not per meeting) for members and $100 per month for the Chair.

Motion: Council Member Gunn made a motion to approve the Ordinance 2025-O-XX setting the compensation of statutory officers, elected officials, and contracted employees, amending the language in municipal code 01.12.020 from 'per meeting' to 'per month' as it relates to the compensation schedule and the Town Council. Second by Council Member Hazelton.

The vote on the motion is as follows:
Mayor Pro Tempore Baier, yes
Council Member Cronin, yes
Council Member Gunn, yes
Council Member Haselton, yes
Council Member Nadelberg, excused
The motion passes unanimously.

10. **Public Hearing:** Consideration of adoption of Resolution 2025-R-XX amending the FY26 Budget

Mayor Severini explained that the FY26 budget needed to be formally updated to remain compliant with state law, even though the related costs were already included in prior financial planning. Town Attorney Polly McLean clarified that recent legal requirements now mandate an official public hearing and Council approval for any changes affecting compensation for elected officials or staff.

Council Member Haselton moved to ratify the adoption of the Resolution amending the FY26 Budget. Second by Council Member Gunn.

The vote on the motion is as follows:
Mayor Pro Tempore Baier, yes
Council Member Cronin, yes
Council Member Gunn, yes
Council Member Haselton, yes
Council Member Nadelberg, excused
The motion passes unanimously.

11. Discussion and possible approval of Resolution 2025-R-XX, a resolution of the Hideout Town Council establishing per diem compensation for members of the Planning Commission

DRAFT

Mayor Severini introduced the resolution to formally set Planning Commission compensation, as required by the recently adopted compensation ordinance. Town Recorder Alicia Fairbourne explained that the ordinance requires the Council to approve the actual rates by resolution. The Council confirmed proposed amounts of $50 per meeting for members and $100 per meeting for the Chair.
Mayor Pro-Tempore Baier, briefly discussed whether to use a monthly stipend, but the mayor and Recorder agreed that a per-meeting (per diem) model is more appropriate due to the Commission's variable schedule. Recorder Fairbourne noted that attendance-based payments can be easily administered. the

Council Member Gunn moved to approve Resolution 2025-R-XX to finalize the new compensation structure for members of the Planning Commission. Second by Council Member Haselton.

The vote on the motion is as follows:
Mayor Pro Tempore Baier, yes
Council Member Cronin, yes
Council Member Gunn, yes
Council Member Haselton, yes
Council Member Nadelberg, excused
The motion passes unanimously.

Committee Updates

The Town Council received updates on the Planning Commission, Design Review Committee, Wildfire Committee, Economic Development Committee, POST Committee, and Transportation Committee. Discussion included wildfire mitigation efforts, trails, transportation planning, and the need to reestablish or clarify certain committees and reporting structures and to continue discussions.

Approval of Council Minutes.
Motion: Council Member Haselton made a motion to approve the May 8, 2025 Town Council meeting minutes with approved corrections on pg. 5. Second by Council Member Cronin.

The vote on the motion is as follows:

Mayor Pro Tempore Baier, yes
Council Member Cronin, yes
Council Member Gunn, yes
Council Member Haselton, yes
Council Member Nadelberg, excused

DRAFT

The motion passes unanimously.

Motion: Council Member Gunn made a motion to adjourn the meeting, second by Council Member Cronin. The meeting was adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

Maria Devereux, Town Recorder

Signature:

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

2. Approval of the Minutes – August 14, 2025

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Town Council Regular Meeting and Public Hearing
August 14, 2025

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in Regular Meeting on August 14, 2025, at 5:00 p.m., in person and electronically via Zoom, in the Town Council Chambers located at 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah.

Regular Meeting – 6:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Mayor Ralph Severini called the meeting to order.

II. Roll Call

Present: Mayor Ralph Severini, Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier, Council Member J.D. Cronin, Council Member Jonathan Gunn, Council Member Carol Haselton, and Council Member Bob Nadelberg.

Staff present: Town Attorney Polly McLean, Town Administrator Jan McCosh, Town Recorder Alicia Fairbourne, and Planning Commission Member Glynnis Tihansky.

Staff attending remotely: Town Planner Thomas Eddington, Town Engineer Gordon Miner, Public Works Director Daniel Allen, and Financial Advisor Katie Shepley.

Public present: Brian Cooper.

Public attending remotely: Sally Grant, Daniel Warner, and Julie Quick.

III. Public Input

Mayor Severini opened the floor for public comment at 6:13 p.m. Sally Grant suggested creating more community gathering spaces and expressed concern that the proposed dog park may be too small. She also mentioned signage and fire mitigation, noting that the latter would be addressed in a future meeting. Daniel Warner raised concerns about limited communication with the HOA, citing an outdated website and reduced accessibility due to the HOA attorney's absence, and requested greater transparency and stronger connections between the HOA board and residents. Julie Quick reported traffic safety issues at Sailwater Lane and Deepwater Drive, describing the area as disorganized with no signage, and urged the Town to expedite sign installation to prevent accidents.

IV. Agenda Items

1. **Discussion of updating advisory committees to the mayor, including working groups – Presented by Mayor Severini**

Mayor Severini presented proposed updates to mayoral advisory committees and the creation of specialized working groups. He recommended keeping the Planning Commission focused on the General Plan and possibly converting the Public Utilities Advisory Committee, while also proposing a new Communications and Public Safety Committee to manage wildfire initiatives, resident outreach, events, evacuation planning, and the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. He noted that committees should submit annual budgets and clarified that their role is advisory, not functional. Town Attorney Polly McLean confirmed that the Planning Commission remains distinct from these advisory committees.

2. Discussion and consideration of a possible appointment regarding the Planning Commission Chair vacancy and consideration of moving Alternate Planning Commissioner Chase Winder to a Regular position

Council Member Jonathan Gunn moved to approve Alternate Planning Commissioner Chase Winder to a regular position to fill the vacancy, second by Council Member Bob Nadelberg. The vote was as follows: Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier – yes, Council Member J.D. Cronin – yes, Council Member Jonathan Gunn – yes, Council Member Carol Haselton – yes, Council Member Bob Nadelberg – yes. The motion passed unanimously.

The Council discussed the Planning Commission Chair vacancy. Mayor Severini requested additional time to interview two more candidates and suggested appointing Council Member Gunn as an interim chair. Several members expressed strong support for Glynnis Tihansky, citing her long service and preparedness. Attorney Polly McLean clarified that the chair must be a current commissioner or alternate and that appointing a council member would create legal and conflict of interest concerns; she also noted that the Town Code does not clearly define who appoints the chair or the term length.

Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier moved to appoint Glynnis Tihansky as Chair of the Planning Commission, seconded by Council Member Carol Haselton. The vote was as follows: Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier – yes, Council Member J.D. Cronin – no, Council Member Jonathan Gunn – no, Council Member Carol Haselton – yes, Council Member Bob Nadelberg – no. The motion failed 3–2.

3. Presentation of the FY24 Annual Audit – Presented by Ben Probst, Spencer Hintzie, Gilbert & Stewart

Ben Probst of Gilbert & Stewart presented the FY24 audit, which received an unmodified opinion, the highest level of assurance. One finding noted that general governmental expenditures exceeded the amended budget by $51,000, primarily due to the handling of Midas Funds; adjustments are being reviewed to avoid a repeat finding. The Town's total net position increased by $657,624 for the fiscal year.

4. Discussion and presentation of the annual Fraud Risk Report– Spencer Hintzie, Gilbert & Stewart

Spencer Hintzie and Ben Probst of Gilbert & Stewart CPAs presented the Town's annual Fraud Risk Assessment, required by the Utah Office of the State Auditor. Hideout scored 335 of 395, placing the Town in the low risk category. The assessment identified opportunities to strengthen internal controls, including formalizing an internal audit function and audit committee.

V. Public Hearing

5. Discussion and possible approval of an amendment of the Official Town of Hideout Zoning Map – Elkhorn Springs Development to rezone parcels 00-0020-8181, 00-0020-8182, and 00-0020-8184 (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)

Town Planner Thomas Eddington presented the proposed rezoning of the Elkhorn Springs Development from Mountain (M) to Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU), Residential 3 (R3), Residential 6 (R6), Residential 20 (R20), and Natural Preservation (NP). The proposal includes a mix of housing types, a commercial pad at the entrance, and requested Sensitive Lands Ordinance waivers. The developer also outlined mitigation measures, including funding for the community park, public safety infrastructure, the spine trail, and a south entrance sign. Mayor Severini opened the public hearing at 9:05 p.m. Patricia Bidwell commented that she remained uncertain about the project's financial impact on the Town despite the analysis presented and requested a clearer breakdown of benefits and risks. Discussion only. The public hearing closed at 9:13 p.m.

6. 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 - 00 0020 8185.

Thomas Eddington presented the proposed MDA for Elkhorn Springs, which would allow nightly rentals in certain zones and request waivers for slopes, cut and fill, retaining wall height, and road grade. In return, the developer offered mitigation funding for public facilities, a transfer fee, an indoor pickleball facility, a commercial pad, and spine trail and entrance sign improvements. Discussion only.

7. Discussion and possible approval of specific base material allowed for public utility easement walkways to be included in the Hideout Engineering Design Specifications Manual - ***Presented by Thomas Eddington, Town Planner and Gordon Miner, Town Engineer***

Town Planner Thomas Eddington and Town Engineer Gordon Miner recommended adopting decomposed granite as the standard surfacing material for public utility easement walkways in the Hideout Engineering Design Specifications. They explained that decomposed granite is durable, smoother than standard gravel, and significantly less expensive than asphalt or concrete. The standard will also establish a consistent 5 foot wide trail within easements to replace mixed materials and improve uniformity throughout the Town.

Council Member Jonathan Gunn moved to adopt the standards as written, seconded by Council Member J.D. Cronin. The vote was as follows: Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier – yes, Council Member J.D. Cronin – yes, Council Member Jonathan Gunn – yes, Council Member Carol Haselton – yes, Council Member Bob Nadelberg – yes. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Discussion and possible adoption of Resolution 2025-R-XX, a Resolution Adopting Stage 2 Fire Restrictions Within Hideout – *Presented by Polly McLean, Town Attorney*

Town Attorney Polly McLean presented Resolution 2025 R XX to adopt Stage 2 Fire Restrictions in Hideout, aligning the Town with Wasatch County and other Utah municipalities following state and fire district guidance. The resolution was prompted by recent hot work related fires and aims to strengthen fire safety communication, including additional warnings about vehicle related fire risks.

Council Member J.D. Cronin moved adoption as written, seconded by Council Member Jonathan Gunn. The vote was as follows: Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier – yes, Council Member J.D. Cronin – yes, Council Member Jonathan Gunn – yes, Council Member Carol Haselton – yes, Council Member Bob Nadelberg – yes. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Code enforcement and construction violation collections

Town Attorney Polly McLean discussed ongoing challenges with code enforcement and collecting fines for construction violations, noting that Public Works has been issuing tickets despite this not being its core function. The Council agreed that the primary issue is staffing and process, not legal authority. Moving forward, the Town will pursue hiring a part time compliance officer, update summons forms with payment information, and work with developers to ensure subcontractors are aware of local rules. Mrs. McLean confirmed that Hideout already has the legal authority to enforce these codes; the real hurdle is manpower and process.

10. Discussion regarding installation of signage to reinforce dog leash requirements – Mayor Severini

Mayor Severini noted growing concerns about off leash dogs at the roundabout, where dogs frequently run into the street and create safety risks. The Council discussed amending the leash law to require a physical leash, coordinating with Wasatch County Animal Control on enforcement, and installing additional signage at key locations in consultation with HOAs. Members agreed the situation underscores the need for a dedicated, fenced dog park already planned for the Deer Springs development.

11. Discussion regarding creation of a new informative webpage on the Town of Hideout website for fire planning - *Presented by Mayor Severini*

Mayor Severini announced a new fire planning webpage led by the Hideout Wildfire Committee. The page will consolidate wildfire and earthquake preparedness information, including the Town's first formal evacuation plan, and will be linked to the developing Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. The Town plans to promote the page widely once it is live.

VI. Committee Updates

The Planning Commission continues guiding the General Plan and major developments, with the Design Review Committee now integrated for streamlined land use and design review. **The Wildfire Committee** is reorganized under Public Safety and Communications, leading a wildfire and evacuation webpage and adopting annual budgets and reporting. The Economic **Development Committee** remains separate, focused on non residential growth and key projects such as Ross Creek and Silver Meadows, with stronger budget transparency. **The Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) Committee** stays independent, fundraising for public amenities and trails and submitting monthly updates and two annual budgets. T**he Transportation Committee** maintains its current structure, coordinating regional transit and moving toward formal annual budgets, with possible future alignment with POST.

VII. Approval of Council Minutes

May 12, 2025 – Town Council Closed Meeting Minutes (Draft)

There were no corrections. Council Member J.D. Cronin moved to approve the May 12, 2025, Town Council Closed Meeting Minutes as presented, seconded by Council Member Jonathan Gunn. The vote was as follows: Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier – yes, Council Member J.D. Cronin – yes, Council Member Jonathan Gunn – yes, Council Member Carol Haselton – yes, Council Member Bob Nadelberg – yes. The motion passed unanimously.

May 12, 2025 – Town Council Special Meeting Minutes (Draft)

There were no corrections. Council Member J.D. Cronin moved to approve the May 12, 2025, Town Council Special Meeting Minutes as presented, seconded by Council Member Jonathan Gunn. The vote was as follows: Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier – yes, Council Member J.D. Cronin – yes, Council Member Jonathan Gunn – yes, Council Member Carol Haselton – yes, Council Member Bob Nadelberg – yes. The motion passed unanimously.

June 12, 2025 – Hideout Town Council Meeting Minutes

A discrepancy was noted in the recorded vote—listed as 3–2 in the draft while a member recalled 4–1—requiring final verification of the official voting record. The Council also directed that the public input section be formally added to the draft minutes and discussed the appropriate level of detail for technical matters, affirming that privileged information from closed sessions must remain protected. Council Member J.D. Cronin moved to approve the June 12, 2025, Town Council Meeting Minutes as presented, seconded by Council Member Jonathan Gunn. The vote was as follows: Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier – yes, Council Member J.D. Cronin – yes, Council Member Jonathan Gunn – yes, Council Member Carol Haselton – yes, Council Member Bob Nadelberg – yes. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Closed Executive Session

Discussion of pending or reasonably imminent litigation, personnel matters, deployment of security personnel, devices or systems, and/or sale or acquisition of real property as needed. At the conclusion of the agenda items, Mayor Severini noted that one additional item could require discussion in a Closed Session.

Council Member Jonathan Gunn moved to proceed into a Closed Session, seconded by Council Member Carol Haselton. At 10:18 p.m., Mayor Severini called the Closed Session to order.

Present: Mayor Ralph Severini, Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier, Council Member J.D. Cronin, Council Member Jonathan Gunn, Council Member Carol Haselton, and Council Member Bob Nadelberg. Staff present: Town Attorney Polly McLean.

Council Member Jonathan Gunn moved to adjourn the Closed Meeting and enter the Open Meeting, seconded by Council Member J.D. Cronin. The vote was as follows: Mayor Pro Tempore Chris Baier – yes, Council Member J.D. Cronin – yes, Council Member Jonathan Gunn – yes, Council Member Carol Haselton – yes, Council Member Bob Nadelberg – yes. The motion passed unanimously.

IX. Meeting Adjournment

Mayor Severini adjourned the meeting at 10:29 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:

Maria Devereux, Town Recorder

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

3. Approval of Minutes - September 11, 2025

Town of Hideout

Town Council Regular Meeting Sept. 11, 2025

The Town Council of the Town of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in a Regular Meeting and Public Hearing on Sept. 11, 2025 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers located at 10860 North Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah.

Special Meeting

I. Call to Order – 5:00 p.m.

Mayor Severini the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. led the Pledge of Allegiance.

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
September 11, 2025 – 5:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Ralph Severini opened the Work Session at 5:00 p.m. and the Regular Meeting at 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Severini.

II. Roll Call

Present:
Mayor Ralph Severini
Council Member Chris Baier
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Bob Nadelberg
Council Member J.D. Cronin

Staff Present:
Alicia Fairbourne, Town Recorder

Staff Attending Remotely:
Jan McCosh, Town Administrator
Thomas Eddington, Town Planner
Gordon Miner, Town Engineer
Daniel Allen, Public Works Director
Dalin Hackett, Town Treasurer
Tony Matyszczyk, Planning Commission Chair

Public Attending Remotely:
Monica Schaffer

DRAFT

Jeremy Hales
Jason Burningham
Katie Shepley
Justin Hatch
Jared Rigby

Additional Public in Attendance:
Kevin Lothridge, William Woolf, Tabitha Gibbs, Hendrik van Zutphen, Cat Woltering, Tanya Brady, Suzanne Severini, Sharon Shaw, John Travis, Eric Davenport, Sean Philipoom, Nate Brockbank, Kelly Guppo, Bret Rutter, Briana Warner, Larry E., Rachel Cooper, Laura L., LuAnn Peterson, Joe Culter, Valerie Lindley, Terese Walton, Paul Watson, Ted Kim, Sally Grant, and others.

III. Work Session (Discussion Only – No Action Taken)

5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

1. Roadway Policies – Jason Burningham

Mr. Burningham reviewed roadway governance options for the Town, including full municipal ownership, hybrid models, and shared responsibility with special service districts. He noted that current roadway funding levels appear insufficient if the Town intends to assume full responsibility for all roads. He stated that LRB will complete a financial analysis once engineering data from HAL is available and that sustainable roadway management will require increased revenue or reallocation of existing funds.

2. Roadway Review and Analysis – Katie Shepley

Ms. Shepley summarized roadway spending using LTAP data, reporting that roadway-related expenses account for roughly one-quarter of the Town's total spending. She noted that the current maintenance budget is inadequate to maintain long-term road conditions and that LTAP modeling shows a need for increased annual investment. She stated that final recommendations will be refined once HAL's engineering analysis is complete.

IV. Public Comment – 6:13 p.m.

Public comments addressed speeding on West Ascent Drive, construction equipment blocking lanes, contractor parking issues, increased cut-through traffic in Deer Springs, adherence to Town code for appointments, non-resident use of pickleball courts, and enforcement capabilities. Staff reported that digital speed signs have been ordered, and the Mayor and Sheriff agreed to coordinate enforcement planning.

DRAFT

Public comment closed at 6:56 p.m.

V. Agenda Items

1. Appointment of Glynnis Tihansky as Planning Commission Chair

Motion: Council Member Cronin moved to approve the appointment of Glynnis Tihansky as Chair of the Planning Commission.
Second: Council Member Gunn.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Baier: Aye
Council Member Gunn: Aye
Council Member Haselton: Aye
Council Member Nadelberg: Aye
Council Member Cronin: Aye

The motion passed 5–0.

---

2. Appointment of Catherine Woltering as Alternate Planning Commissioner

Motion: Council Member Cronin moved to appoint Catherine Woltering as an Alternate Planning Commissioner.
Second: Council Member Haselton.

Vote:
Council Member Baier: Aye
Council Member Gunn: Aye
Council Member Haselton: Aye
Council Member Nadelberg: Aye
Council Member Cronin: Aye

Motion passed 5–0.

---

3. Code Enforcement and Construction Violations – Sheriff Rigby

Sheriff Rigby discussed options for enhanced code enforcement, including a proposal for six days per week of enforcement coverage focused on construction-related violations and parking issues. He and the Mayor agreed to continue discussions regarding scheduling, funding, and implementation.

DRAFT

4. Dog Leash Signage – Suzanne Severini and Justin Hatch

Mrs. Severini and Mr. Hatch discussed installing signage requiring dogs to be leashed. Mr. Hatch recommended requiring physical leashes rather than e-collars. Mayor Severini stated he would return with draft ordinance language aligned with County standards.

---

5. Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) Participation – Jeremy Hales

Mr. Hales provided an overview of the County's CEMP and described ongoing workshops to help municipalities develop compliant local plans. The Mayor and Council Members discussed appointing representatives to continue participation and acknowledged the need to update the Town's existing emergency plan. Mr. Hales will provide follow-up materials.

---

6. Meet the Candidates Night – September 30, 2025

The League of Women Voters announced a candidate forum scheduled for September 30th from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., outlining the event format and outreach efforts.

---

7. Town-Sponsored Concert – September 12, 2025

A town-sponsored concert was announced for September 12 at the Public Works Building, with tickets including dinner and dessert. Event logistics and vendor details were briefly described.

---

8. Public Open House – September 25, 2025

A public open house for General Plan updates was announced for September 25 at Black Rock Mountain Resort. The event will gather community input on updates to the 2019 General Plan.

---

9. Hideout Mountain Village Annexation Petition – Recorder Fairbourne

Recorder Fairbourne presented an annexation petition for two parcels at Jordanelle Parkway and Lori Lane. She reviewed the statutory process and next steps, including a Planning Commission public hearing and fiscal impact analysis. A site visit will be scheduled within two weeks.

---

10. Public Hearing: Zoning Map Amendment – Elkhorn Springs

Town Planner Nate Brockbank presented the proposed zoning map amendment for the Elkhorn Springs parcels, requesting rezoning from Mountain (M) to NMU, R3, R6, R20, and NP. He

DRAFT

reviewed infrastructure considerations, including relocation of a public utility easement, and summarized proposed amenities and financial contributions included in the MDA.

---

11. Public Hearing: Master Development Agreement – Elkhorn Springs

Mr. Brockbank discussed wildlife corridor considerations and proposed nightly rentals for 89 units. The Council requested additional information before taking action, and no final decision was made.

---

12. Ordinance 2025-O-XX – WUI Code Update

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to adopt Ordinance 2025-O-XX, WUI Code - replacing "flammable" with "combustible" per Fire District recommendation.
Second: Council Member Nadelberg.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Baier: Aye
Council Member Gunn: Aye
Council Member Haselton: Aye
Council Member Nadelberg: Aye
Council Member Cronin: Aye

The motion passed 5–0.

XI. Meeting Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Severini requested a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Council Member Cronin moved to adjourn the meeting.
Second: Council Member Haselton.

Vote:
Council Member Baier: Aye
Council Member Gunn: Aye
Council Member Haselton: Aye
Council Member Nadelberg: Aye
Council Member Cronin: Aye

The meeting was adjourned.

DRAFT

Maria Devereux Town Recorder

Signature

Date: _____

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

4. Approval of the Minutes - October 9, 2025

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.

DRAFT

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.

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

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.

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 80-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.

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,

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.

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

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

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:

- 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.

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

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

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.

DRAFT

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

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.

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

DRAFT

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.

DRAFT

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

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

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

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.

DRAFT

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.

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

5. Approval of the Minutes - October 29, 2025

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Town Council Special Meeting
October 29, 2025

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in Regular Meeting and Public Hearing on October 29, 2025, at 4:00 PM in the City Council Chambers located at 10860 North Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah.

Special Meeting

I. Call To Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Ralph Severini called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Roll Call

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

Staff Present: Thomas Eddington, Town Planner
Maria Devereux, Recorder for Hideout
Polly McLean, Town Attorney
Dennis Pay, Town Engineer
Jan McCosh, Town Administrator

III. Public Hearing Agenda (*Continued from October 9, 2025*)

1. 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 the Mountain (M) Zone to Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU), Residential 3 (R3), Residential 6 (R6), Residential 20 (R20), and Natural Preservation (NP).

Mayor Severini reported that the Elkhorn Springs development discussion is a continuation from the October 9, 2025, Town Council Meeting. The Council will discuss the proposed Rezone and Master Development Agreement ("MDA"). Mayor Severini reported that the Recorder for Hideout, Alicia Fairbourne, has been an excellent resource, but this is her last Town Council Meeting. He thanked Ms. Fairbourne for all of her hard work. Town Administrator, Jan McCosh, she has been a significant part of the town for the last five years and has done a lot of wonderful work for the community.

It was noted that the applicant, Nate Brockbank, was attending the meeting virtually. Other members of the applicant team, Eric Davenport, Patrick Holmes, and Spencer Holmes, were also attending the meeting. Mayor Severini stated that this item has been discussed by the Council a few times already. He asked about the appropriate process for the presentations. It was determined that there will be an update shared and then additional information will be provided by the applicant and the Town Engineer.

Town Planner, Thomas Eddington, reported that the Town Council has heard about the Elkhorn Springs development a few times already. Additional information was requested as well as some MDA updates. That is what the Town Council will review tonight. Mr. Eddington first provided background information.

The eastern half of the property was discussed on July 18, 2024, at the Planning Commission level. At that time, the applicant requested 164 units and approximately 15,000 to 20,000 square feet of commercial. On January 16, 2025, a new application was presented, which included both the east and west portions of the property. At that time, the request was for 211 units and three units of neighborhood commercial. On February 18, 2025, the Concept Plan was approved by the Planning Commission, which essentially allowed the applicant to move forward with the Rezone request and the associated MDA. In July 2025, the Planning Commission reviewed some amendments and the zone request. He explained that the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation, with conditions, to the Town Council.

The proposed development was heard by the Town Council in August. Mr. Eddington explained that this proposal includes a number of exceptions, which have been outlined in the MDA. Those exceptions are also included in Exhibit S of the MDA. The proposal is for 230 residential lots and one commercial lot. If this was a by-right proposal, it would accommodate between 70 and 90 units of housing at one unit per acre. It was noted that there are also steep slopes that need to be considered in the calculations.

Mr. Eddington reported that there is an increase in density being requested in this case. It was reiterated that the exceptions can be seen in Exhibit S of the MDA. There are proposed setback exceptions and there is also cut and fill proposed that is greater than what the code allows. It was noted that there are some fairly significant exceptions being requested and those are contained within the MDA. There are issues that require Council Member direction, but the Town Engineer was asked to speak to the Council first.

Town Engineer, Dennis Pay, submitted an Engineering Report for the meeting held on October 9, 2025. It outlined several items that needed to be addressed. Most of those have since been addressed to his satisfaction. However, the grade for the secondary access road at 12% needs to be approved by the Wasatch Fire District. He has not received verification, but the applicant has continued to work with the Fire District. Another item relates to the estimate for the trails. He emphasized that the $58,000 is for the preliminary design and layout. There are still issues related to access off of SR-248. The applicant is working with the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") on that. Mr. Pay is representing the town in discussions with UDOT about entrances into the development as well as the corridor in general.

There was a request that there be a stamped Slope Map submitted, but that has not been provided. The applicant needs their engineer to stamp and submit that. Mr. Pay reported that the applicant also needs to provide a Wetland Delineation Map. There has been an agreement to do that, but it was not included in the submitted materials. That could impact some of the lots, which has been acknowledged by the applicant. Mr. Pay stated that most of the other items in the Engineering Report have been addressed.

Mr. Brockbank thanked the Town Council for holding the Special Meeting. He knows that several people are out of town and he appreciated the efforts that have been made. Staff has also dedicated a lot of their time to this matter, which he is grateful for. There has been a lot accomplished over the last few weeks.

Mr. Brockbank referenced a letter from some tenants in Golden Eagle related to nightly rentals. He clarified that nightly rentals are not being requested for the development. One issue that has come up is the development phasing. He suggested that there not be timeframes listed. Before moving onto the next phase, there is a commitment that the amenities will be finished. As an example, if there is a park included in Phase II, the work in Phase III will not be started until the park in Phase II has been completed.

Mr. Brockbank discussed the wetland issue. He does not believe there are any wetlands, but there is support to move or lose lots in the development if that is necessary. There are a few lots are in question that might be too close to what could be considered wetlands. He clarified that he does not believe those are wetlands, but are man-made. It was noted that Paul Watson is prepared to share additional information about this. Mr. Brockbank reported that there is a drain that goes underneath the road where there are some wetland grasses, but again, it is a man-made wetland. He will have someone perform a delineation. In the agreement, it is proposed that those lots be moved or lost in the event there is a wetland in the area.

As for the timing of the agreement, it started out as 15 years, but it was then reduced to 10 years. Mr. Brockbank asked that it be 15 years with a five year extension. Right now, the agreement mentions a two year extension. He offered to answer Council Member questions and noted that the applicant team can also address Council Member comments and concerns. Mayor Severini asked to first discuss the wetlands issue. He wanted to know who will decide whether something is considered a wetland. Mr. Pay reported that the code states the determination must be made by a qualified professional approved by the Town Engineer. He is willing to work with the applicant to determine a qualified professional for this work. The applicant has already agreed that if it is considered a wetland, those lots will either be moved or lost. Mr. Brockbank reported that Dennis Winger is normally used for this work. He will likely be the one to come out and look at the site. If there is someone else that Staff would suggest, he is open to that as well.

Council Member Gunn noted that there could be an agreement that if there is a wetland issue, the lots will either be dropped or moved to a mutually agreeable location. Mr. Brockbank expressed support for this. He believed that kind of language is already included in the MDA. Council Member Haselton asked if it is possible to view a map of the area. There was a Concept

Plan shared with those present. The wetlands in question were pointed out, as were the lots that could be impacted. Mr. Eddington asked the Town Council to consider whether there would be a recommendation to move those two lots to another location, even if the wetlands are man-made as opposed to natural. Council Member Haselton asked about the two lots to the left of the pond, closest to the house. She knows that one lot was removed, but she still believes those lots are too close to the pond. The pond was intended to be an open space area for residents. She expressed concerns about the size of those lots and the proximity to the pond.

Mr. Eddington acknowledged that the lots near the pond were discussed during the site visit. Mr. Brockbank removed one of the lots and the setbacks were pushed back further. The question is whether there is enough space to be able to walk around the pond without being on private property. If there are Council Member concerns and there is a desire to preserve the area, there could be a discussion about removing four lots and creating a four-plex or a different housing typology. Council Member Haselton attended the site visit and thought the location was too close. Mr. Brockbank believed there is more than enough room. The pond is man-made and was created by a previous owner, so the pond itself can be moved. He would rather not lose those lots, because there are only a few places where it is possible to locate them. It might make more sense to move the pond 20 or 30 feet. In the MDA, there is agreement that if the pond is considered a wetland by the professional, that the lots will be moved. He feels certain that the pond is not a wetland, as it is fed by water rights. In the MDA, the four lots are discussed.

Mr. Eddington's recommendation was to not remove the pond and the riparian vegetation that is around it, but potentially to look at a relocation of the lots. He noted that this is a Town Council decision, but there is a fair amount of riparian vegetation that has grown around the pond area. Mr. Brockbank explained that it is possible to shift the pond over to create more room if that is desired by the Council. He does not want to lose $2 million worth of lots due to the location of a man-made pond.

It was noted that the MDA states certain lots will be moved to another location if there is a determination that there are wetlands. If there are not wetlands, then the Concept Plan would move forward, as presented. Mr. Eddington asked if there is Council Member comfort with that approach. There was some Council Member agreement with the earlier comments made by Council Member Haselton, as the lots look close to the pond. Given that this proposal is requesting a lot of variances, it might make sense to lose those two lots in order to enhance the community open space. Council Member Haselton thought there could be a reduction in the size of the building or the size of the lot. It was noted that the pond is a feature of the property and it is a selling point, whether it is natural or man-made. Mr. Brockbank stated that there can be work done with Mr. Eddington to either move the lots or finalize the location of the pond.

Mayor Severini asked if there is an adequate area to move the lots. Mr. Eddington believed so. It is possible to look at other areas and still maintain the character of the development. Council Member Chris Baier pointed out that the pond is a man-made feature. If it can be reconfigured to be a landscape feature, she is fine with that. She would like to discuss some of the more complicated matters associated with the application. Mayor Severini stated that he would like to hear all Council comments related to the information that has been presented so far. Council

Member Baier noted that there was information presented about the requested exceptions. Cut and fill covers a large expanse, and she would like to discuss the amount. In addition, there are setback exceptions throughout, which should also be considered.

It was reported that every lot in the Residential 6 Zone will have an exception because there is a conditional side yard setback. The requested amount is 10 feet on each lot. It is the conditional side yard setback that has resulted in the exceptions throughout. Additional information about side yard setbacks was shared. The Council was informed that the front and rear yard setback requirements are met.

Town Attorney, Polly McLean, reported that the Council received an overview of the requested exceptions. She sent out a document with high-level information. For the stacked flats, 20 feet is requested, and 30 feet is required under the code for some of the setbacks. Mayor Severini explained that the reason the wider side yard setbacks were determined back in 2020 was to protect viewsheds. Previous developments complied with the former standard, but there was a desire to establish a better standard. Council Member Baier noted that there are standards in place for a reason. When the code was changed, it was done intentionally. She asked why the Council is considering so many exceptions in this case.

Council Member Haselton mentioned the meeting for the General Plan that was held approximately one month ago. One of the main priorities was to preserve views for the residents in Hideout. The views are one of the reasons people have chosen to move to the area. If the view corridors are reduced, then what people want is not really being considered. Mayor Severini agreed with the comments shared. He asked the applicant to speak about the protection of viewsheds, given the variances that have been proposed. Mr. Brockbank explained that there are several ways to still maintain view corridors. The slopes are one way to maintain view corridors, as it is not only related to the amount of side yard provided.

Mayor Severini does not see a Contour Map in the Meeting Materials Packet. Since there are so many variances on the side yard setbacks, it would have been nice to have a map that better illustrates the impacts. Mr. Brockbank explained that having narrower side yard setbacks will result in reduced costs. There was no desire to have stacked flats initially, but there has been an agreement to include those, because the town wanted a different housing type. It will be the lowest housing price in the development.

There are four or five different price ranges throughout the development, which is unique for a subdivision. Mr. Watson explained that across this project, there is 200 feet of elevation gain from the property line to the south to the property line to the north. There is also another 100 feet down to the UDOT right-of-way in a lot of cases. These houses are intended to stack, so every house has either a walk-out basement or a walk-out upper story. The house on the high side will look over the house on the low side to achieve the views. A lot of corridors have remained open to protect views, but what is proposed will not block views for those on the site. As for the grading, there are exhibits that can be reviewed that show the contours.

Council Member Gunn stated that he feels it is important to protect existing views. If someone owns a house in Hideout and has an existing view, then he supports the protection of that view.

DRAFT

In this case, there seem to be some competing interests. Diversity in the housing stock means that certain compromises need to be made. One of the tradeoffs for having a diverse housing stock is the available view. For every single property owner to have a perfect view, there would be a lot fewer houses within the development, and each house would be more expensive as a result. Mr. Brockbank agreed with that statement. Council Member Baier stated that she previously advocated for a diverse housing stock. She asked whether the right balance had been struck. Mr. Brockbank explained that there is a desire for each house to have a nice view, but to accomplish the variation in prices, there needs to be some compromise.

Council Member Baier asked about the driveway lengths. One common complaint has to do with driveways that are so short that it is not possible to park a full-size truck. Mr. Brockbank reported that the shortest driveway is 25 feet. A lot of the driveways with a sidewalk on the side are 35 feet. Mr. Watson explained that if someone is on the side that does not have the sidewalk, the setbacks from the curb and gutter are either 26 feet or 31 feet, while the code is 25 feet. On the sides with the sidewalks, the distance is either 18 feet or 23 feet behind the sidewalk. As for the 2:1 versus 3:1 slope, the reason there is a desire to do the 2:1 is that there is less ground disturbance and fewer cubic yards of dirt are moved. There is a lot of rock in this area. 3:1 works well with flatter projects, but 2:1 works better for projects in the mountains, because there is less disturbance. Mr. Brockbank reported that there is a letter in the Meeting Materials Packet from Mr. Watson further outlining the 2:1 rationale. Mr. Watson clarified that 2:1 is standard in the mountains. It is a geotechnical standard that is followed unless there is some criterion to make it flatter. Mr. Davenport emphasized that a letter has been included in the Meeting Materials Packet.

Mr. Eddington reported that the request is to have a 2:1 slope, which would be 50%. There are conditions in the submitted reports to state that if there is a 2:1 approval, there must be a commitment made to ensure the slope is stabilized. It must be planted with rooted plants so there will not be an erosion issue on the sides. There was a commitment to do that. Mr. Eddington asked if Mr. Pay is comfortable with the 2:1 that has been proposed. Mr. Pay confirmed this and explained that it can be done safely.

Mr. Eddington asked to further discuss driveway lengths. The driveways on the side of the road with the trails would be 18 feet to 23 feet. He clarified that those are 18 feet to 23 feet from the trail to the front of the house, so there is no overhang or blocking of the trail. Mr. Watson reported that the 18 feet is from the back of the sidewalk to the front setback of the house. Mr. Eddington stated that the trails could be used without being impeded by vehicles. The Council expressed appreciation for the clarification.

Council Member Bob Nadelberg mentioned the setbacks shown on one of the exhibits. He asked about housing space between units. He believed that at any point, there will be at least 20 feet, which was confirmed. Mr. Watson stated that the minimum is a 10-foot side yard, so a house next to another house will result in a 20-foot separation. Discussions were had about the rear yard setbacks. Ms. McLean stated that there is no request for a rear yard setback that is less than 20 feet, but the 20-foot rear yard setback is an exception to the code in the R20 Zone and the NMU Zone.

DRAFT

Council Member Nadelberg mentioned Exhibit I2 and noted that a certain section of houses backs up to one another fairly closely. There might only be 40 feet between structures. Mr. Watson confirmed this. Council Member Nadelberg asked if there will be a retaining wall or some fencing to maintain privacy. Mr. Watson reported that the elevation difference on Lot 503 versus 602 is 20 feet. The upper story of 602 will look over the top of 503. Council Member Nadelberg wanted to know if there will be a fence or natural landscape barrier in the development for privacy. Mr. Brockbank clarified that there are no walls in between the lots planned at this time. There can be landscaping with trees, but there is no desire to block the views. He pointed out that fences are not allowed in Hideout, so there are no fences planned.

Council Member Gunn noted that in an ideal world, there would not be a need for a variance. That being said, when a variance will benefit the town, it makes sense to consider one. If a variance will not benefit the town, then it should not be considered. In this case, when considering the entire project, it seems the requested variances benefit the town because it moves the town toward certain housing stock goals.

Mayor Severini had a question about the traffic. This was discussed by the Council previously, and it was also considered at the Planning Commission level. He asked about the turnaround on SR-248. Mr. Brockbank reported that at the last meeting, the Town Council was informed that there would be a future meeting with UDOT. Right now, there is a light plan at Golden Eagle. Based on the last conversation with UDOT, there would be a U-turn signal there rather than a right-in, right-out. A traffic study has been conducted and presented to UDOT. Mayor Severini noted that at the last Town Council Meeting, there was a discussion about a potential "jug handle" design, but he understands that it is more expensive. Mr. Brockbank has not explored traffic options since the last meeting, as the focus has been on the MDA. If there is approval at the current Town Council Meeting, then different traffic options will be explored.

Ms. McLean reported that the code requires a 50-foot setback from the UDOT right-of-way, and the applicant has requested reductions. Council Member Nadelberg mentioned Exhibit I2 and the cluster of townhomes that would block a lot of the view corridors for those living in Lots 508 to 513. He suggested losing a unit on each of the four-plexes so there would be better view corridors. That dense clustering could become an eyesore. Mr. Watson further discussed the elevation differences on the site. Lot 511 has an upper-story walkout, while Lots 520, 521, 522, and 523 are all basement walkouts. Additionally, he clarified that the UDOT setback issue is a town issue to be addressed and not a UDOT issue. Council Member Nadelberg reiterated that he feels the four-plexes could be turned into three-plexes for aesthetics. Mr. Brockbank offered to work with Mr. Eddington on the four-plex buildings that are proposed.

Council Member Nadelberg next asked about the slopes on the roads. Mr. Eddington reported that there are some roads that exceed the maximum 10% slope. There is a variance requested in some locations. There is a maintenance access road at 15%, but that is only for maintenance access. There is also a secondary access road that is 12%, which would require approval from the Wasatch Fire District. Discussions were had about other road exceptions in town. Maps that show the contours were shared. Council Member Nadelberg believed some of the roads in Golden Eagle and Soaring Hawk might be over 10% as well. There was not certainty about this, but it was confirmed that some slopes might be higher.

Mr. Brockbank clarified that the entire road will not be 12%. There are two sections of the road that hit 12%, but after that, it flattens out to 10%. Council Member Nadelberg wanted to understand whether there is precedent for this in the town. Mr. Brockbank reported that the Town Code mentions 10%, but the Fire Code mentions 12%. There will be a letter submitted from the Fire Department. He added that the 15% road will be in Phase I of the development. Mr. Watson pointed out the access road to the pond on a map of the development. It was reiterated that this road will only be for maintenance access.

Mayor Severini asked if issues had been identified by Staff related to the proposed slopes. A question was asked about whether there are any driveways that exceed Town Code standards. Mr. Watson reported that all driveways are intended to meet standards. Council Member Gunn asked about the pickleball court. It is his understanding that it will have some sort of facility. He wanted to know if it will include restrooms with water. Mr. Brockbank confirmed this. Council Member Gunn believed that regardless of the number of units, there will be water brought in according to certain standards, which was also confirmed.

Mr. Eddington reported that there are a number of discussion points included in the Staff Report. The applicant is proposing to plant sod/grass in the front yard. He asked if the Council is comfortable with having sod placed in the front yard or if there would be a preference to have that in the backyard area. There are not a lot of places in the community where sod has been allowed in the front yard. The ordinance does not prohibit this location, but it recommends native vegetation or water-wise exotics. Staff recommends considering sod in the rear yard instead. Mayor Severini asked whether all of the wildfire standards have been incorporated, which was confirmed. Fire Officials in the State have noted that sod is beneficial, because it is low. Mr. Davenport confirmed that the standards have been incorporated. It was noted that the MDA states there will be no combustible materials within 5 feet and no trees within 10 feet. Mr. Eddington explained that this is in compliance with the Wildland Urban Interface ("WUI") ordinance.

Mr. Brockbank informed those present that the reason there was a proposal for the sod has to do with aesthetics. When people purchase homes, there can be complaints about the lack of grass. Enough water was purchased to have sod in the front yards. There is not enough water to do the front and backyards, but there is enough to do the front yard in sod. The rationale is mostly for aesthetics, because one of the biggest complaints in Hideout is related to landscaping. He reiterated a desire for the sod in the front.

Ms. McLean reported that she received a message about plowing roads that are greater than 10%. That 12% is meant to be for the secondary access, but those will be public roads, so the town will be responsible for maintenance and plowing. This will be difficult, so it might be beneficial for the Homeowners Association ("HOA") to be responsible for plowing the portion that is 12%. It was noted that there is not a consistent 12% grade on that road, as it is only in certain sections. Mayor Severini asked if the applicant team has any suggestions. Mr. Watson thought it would be challenging to have the HOA maintain only a small portion of the road. Ms. McLean stated that there are some roads that do not meet town standards that are maintained privately. The applicant team clarified that the Fire Department has expressed support for 12%,

so that is a strong indicator of what is safe for a road. Mayor Severini believed the town and the applicant could work together to make sure there is proper snowplowing done in the area.

Additional discussions were had about the message that Ms. McLean received. It stated that if the slope is greater than 10%, it is almost impossible to plow. Exhibit H in the Meeting Materials Packet was reviewed. The only two roads that are shown to be greater than 10% are the maintenance road for the stormwater basin at 15% and the existing road to the Salzman house. The road to the Salzman house is at 15% slope now and will be used for emergency access. After construction, the section will be 12%. Mr. Watson added that the existing road that comes off of UDOT is actually at 18%, and it will be dropped down to 15%. He reviewed the road slopes that are proposed throughout the development area. It was noted that the exhibit can be updated to more clearly show the areas where the slope will exceed 10%.

Ms. McLean stated that the intention is to have all of the roads be public, with the exception of the roads indicated. It was confirmed that there are private driveways. Discussions were had about the road in front of the townhomes. It was reiterated that the exhibit can be updated so there is additional clarification.

Council Member Nadelberg asked about the road that ends in a cul-de-sac. As someone enters that road heading in the northwest direction, he wanted to know if that would increase continuously, or if it would increase, crest at the townhomes, and then start to decrease. Mr. Watson reported that it is essentially one continuous 12%. He shared additional information about the road and the slope that is proposed. Council Member Nadelberg pointed out if it is downhill in the northwestern direction, that it is a blind sharp corner, which could create issues. Mr. Watson confirmed that there is a continuous downhill slope there. After the cul-de-sac point, it is only for emergency egress. However, there is work being done with UDOT, because there is a desire to turn that into a right-in, right-out. Anything with asphalt would be 12% or less. Council Member Nadelberg wondered whether additional grading could be done to address the blind spots. Mr. Watson reported that the curves follow the contours, which is the reason those are shown.

Mr. Brockbank asked if there is a blind spot that there are concerns about. Mr. Watson does not believe so. He pointed out that it is possible to push the setbacks further back. The lot where the curve is located is 164 feet deep. The setbacks could be 40 feet instead of 31 feet, but the design criteria for the curves has already been met. He believes the design is appropriate, as proposed. It was clarified that the area being discussed is Phase V. Mr. Brockbank explained that this portion of the development would be approximately seven years out. Mr. Watson noted that if the curves are pushed out, it will either be pushed into the hill or hanging over the side. The curves right now are a function of the existing ground. There is a desire to disturb as little as possible. Mr. Watson believed the concerns expressed could be addressed through setbacks and some plat notes. Council Member Gunn believed that opening the sightline slightly would allow people to see further around the curve. Mr. Watson confirmed that this is something that can be done. There are no crests in the hillside. He shared additional clarifying information with the Council.

It was stated that the 4% grade will be at the cul-de-sac in the northeast. There will be no crest from that point all the way to the T-intersection. Mr. Watson reported that there are grades being changed, but the vertical curves account for those changes in grade. Mr. Eddington summarized the conversation and noted that there could be increased front yard setbacks for Lot 509 through to Lot 512. There has to be approval by the Wasatch Fire District in order for the 12% that has been discussed. Mr. Eddington asked for Council Member clarification about the sod that was discussed earlier. Council Member Haselton liked it being in the front, because it will make the houses look better. Mr. Eddington mentioned the area next to the proposed pickleball courts. Right now, there is a proposal for a freestanding parking lot. There was some previous discussion about angled parking, but this would require an exception from the Town Code.

The plan does not currently show angled parking, but there is a desire to receive Council Member feedback about this possibility. Mr. Eddington explained that Staff could work with the applicant team on this. Council Member Haselton asked for feedback from the Town Engineer. Mr. Pay believed there would need to be a closer look taken at the proposal. He personally does not like backing out into traffic, and he pointed out that angled parking would be an exception. There are instances where angled parking makes sense, but it depends on traffic volumes, speeds, and other factors. He needs to look at this proposal more closely before sharing a formal opinion with the Town Council. Mr. Eddington reported that the angled parking would result in additional parking spaces and would elongate the park area. It was noted that this could be considered as an option, but would be subject to final approval by the Town Engineer.

Mr. Davenport asked for clarification about the parking. There is a willingness to work with the town on angled parking, but he does not want that to delay the approval of the MDA. The engineering for the parking area has already been completed. Mr. Eddington clarified that the MDA could be approved, but the angled parking could be explored further with Staff. He next discussed the timing of the development. There was initially a 15-year project timeline proposed, and it was reduced to 10 years. At the last Town Council Meeting, a request was made to return it to 15 years. The applicant is currently asking for a 15-year timeline with a five-year extension for the project. Mr. Patrick Holmes explained that he is one of the owners of Holmes Homes. He expressed appreciation to the Mayor and Council for making time to discuss this application. It is clear that the Town Council wants what is right for the community. Mr. Holmes stated that the time requirement for the development is unreasonable. He has never had a time constraint put on a development like this before. There is still a lot of work that needs to be done as this moves forward, even if the MDA is approved during the current Town Council Meeting.

Mr. Holmes reiterated that it is unreasonable to place a strict timeline on the project. This makes it difficult to find investors, because market changes could result in the loss of previous approvals. He believes an aggressive approach has been shared by Mr. Brockbank, which is that the next phase will not move forward until the amenities are finished in the previous phase. He pointed out that the pickleball court needs to be built and enclosed in an early phase. Mr. Holmes understands the concerns from a Town Council perspective, because there have been situations with other developers where amenities have not been completed. He suggested that

DRAFT

there be a more reasonable approach taken. He also asked that the weather conditions be considered, as it is not possible to develop in Hideout throughout the year.

Something that would be reasonable, but would still protect the town, would be to not allow an occupancy permit in the next phase until all of the amenities are completed in the prior phase. Mr. Holmes believed that would provide the town with adequate protection, but would also make more sense for the applicant team. The timeline that has been proposed is not reasonable and is not in the spirit of cooperation. Mayor Severini asked if the suggestion is that there not be a time commitment, but a Certificate of Occupancy could not be issued for the next phase until all of the amenities from the previous phase have been completed. This was confirmed. Mr. Holmes does not recall a timeline like this on other projects.

Ms. McLean asked if there is opposition to the 10-year timeline or any timeline at all. Mr. Holmes clarified that he is opposed to the establishment of a timeline. Ms. McLean clarified that every MDA the town has entered into has an expiration. Mr. Holmes wanted to understand the rationale for the short timeline that has been proposed. He hopes that it will be possible to do 30 houses per year, but there are variables to consider. Ms. McLean shared additional information about MDA terminations. Deer Springs was 10 years, and it was entered into in July 2018 with an expiration in 2028 and no extension listed. It was pointed out that there was an amendment made to that timeline. That development shows that a 10-year limit is not necessarily realistic. The applicant team reiterated concerns about the timeline proposed.

Additional discussions were had about the timeline. It was clarified that the 10-year timeline was proposed by the town, but it was never agreed to by the applicant team. Mr. Holmes asked that a reasonable decision be made. He does not feel the proposed timeline is reasonable in this case. Ms. McLean explained that from a legal perspective, there needs to be a term established. There cannot be a contract that does not end. There are no MDAs without established limits. She pointed out that it can be troublesome when there are entitlements that sit indefinitely. An example is the parking lot at Park City Mountain Resort. Ms. McLean does not recommend that the Town Council remove a term from the Elkhorn Springs MDA.

Council Member Gunn believed the proposal from Mr. Holmes is that if a current phase is left unfinished, there will be no Certificate of Occupancy issued for the next phase until the prior phase is completed. Mr. Holmes clarified that if the definition of "completed" included all of the homes, that would be difficult, because construction on the homes will start at different times. It would be possible to reference the horizontal improvements and amenities in the phase. The reason it is not possible to reference completion of the homes in the phase is that there might be lots that do not sell immediately. Council Member Gunn stated that the proposal is for the infrastructure and amenities in the current phase to be completed before a Certificate of Occupancy is possible in the next phase. This was confirmed. Council Member Gunn asked how the applicant team would feel about adding that provision with a timeline of 20 years. There was support expressed for that kind of timeline, as it would add more flexibility. Mr. Brockbank asked if it would be possible to have a 20-year timeline with a five-year extension, which was supported. It was noted that there is a desire to move forward as quickly as possible, but flexibility is appreciated.

Mr. Eddington stated that the Council has already answered the next question in the Staff Report, which was related to amenities and phasing. The Council has determined that there must be horizontal infrastructure and amenities before a Certificate of Occupancy can be issued in a subsequent phase. All of the outlined discussion points have been addressed. Mr. Davenport noted that there were some items in the Staff Report that were inconsistent with the MDA. He is not certain whether the conditions in the Staff Report will be adopted when a motion is made. As an example, in the MDA, it mentions 12-foot stairs, but there is some older information in the Staff Report that no longer applies. Information was shared about the stairs and the sidewalk widths. Mr. Eddington reported that the public utility easement ("PUE") was reduced on the inside. Ms. McLean asked that there be additional discussion about the MDA and Rezone after the public hearing is opened, as there are a few items that she would like to review.

The Town Council took a five-minute break before continuing the discussion.

Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 6:37 p.m.

Scott Dubois stated that he represents Mustang Development. A letter was submitted to the Town Council earlier in the day with a number of concerns and observations about the MDA. One of the concerns related to nightly rentals, but it sounds like that has been resolved. Mr. Dubois reported that there are still concerns about all of the different exceptions, but he acknowledged that those have been largely addressed by the Council. He noted that precedent is being established for deviations from requirements and people will rely on that moving forward. Some of the contents of the letter were highlighted. Mr. Dubois felt it was important that the MDA include requirements for Elkhorn Springs to reimburse Mustang Development for the cost of construction of infrastructure, which is the primary road proposed to be used and the obligations under the Master MDA and Reimbursement Agreement regarding impact fees. He believes it makes sense to include a requirement in Elkhorn Springs MDA that they participate in payment for system improvements, as that term is used in the Reimbursement Agreement and Impact Fee Study.

Mayor Severini noted that there was mention of the easement in the letter. Mr. Dubois stated that it was originally understood that Elkhorn was proposing to use Golden Eagle roads for secondary access, so that was an issue he assumed would be discussed, but it seems that has since been abandoned. He asked that it be made clear that Elkhorn residents would not be allowed to use the Golden Eagle ingress/egress without some sort of compensation for those roads. There is also an issue that exists between Mustang Development and the Elkhorn Springs team where the proposed road going from the UDOT right-of-way into their development is on land that is owned by Mustang Development. He is not sure that is an issue the Town Council needs to weigh in on, as it can be addressed by the two parties. However, it is something that would need to be resolved before any actual development occurred.

Mr. Davenport does not see a need for additional language to be added into the MDA related to Mustang Development. Mr. Dubois did not agree with that statement, as there could be issues related to non-payment. That could expose the town to a breach of contract claim, which is something he would like to avoid. Council Member Haselton reported that she did not have an

opportunity to review the letter. It was sent out at 3:05 p.m. and she was preparing for the Town Council Meeting at that time. There have been recent discussions about late submissions and she would have liked to receive the letter earlier. Mr. Dubois apologized and explained that it was sent to everyone listed as a Council Member on the website. He did not become aware of the comments made at the last Town Council Meeting until a few days ago.

Council Member Nadelberg asked if this was initiated by his law firm or his client. Mr. Dubois stated that he found out about the previous meeting discussions recently, but he is unable to discuss what he spoke to his client about. Council Member Nadelberg reported that on Page 3 of the letter, there is a concern expressed that the town will be establishing a precedent. The letter later states that it will allow for some increase in the existing zoning under the original MDA. Council Member Nadelberg reported that at the time he purchased his own property, it was represented to him by the realtors who were in direct employment of Mustang that the whole area was zoned as 2.4 ERUs per acre. His property was purchased with the expectation that there would be other single-family properties of similar density. In December 2016, the developer, who was also the Mayor at the time, along with various other members of the Council, passed a Resolution to effectively double the density. The letter from Mr. Dubois talks about this development, setting a precedent, but it seems like a bait-and-switch situation has already occurred.

Mr. Dubois stated that he cannot speak to what a real estate agent may or may not have told him in the past. When purchasing a property, it is necessary to look at what is vested and recorded. He does not have knowledge of the situation mentioned by Council Member Nadelberg and asked that the discussion remain focused on the Elkhorn Springs project that has been proposed. This is 114 acres and there are 230 units proposed, which is 2.2 units per acre. The code was adopted for a reason and the zoning was adopted for a reason. He expressed concerns about the number of exceptions proposed in this case.

Council Member Nadelberg explained that he shared that example because the developer arbitrarily changed the density by a significant amount. There is already a precedent for many of the concerns that Mr. Dubois has expressed. Council Member Baier asked about system improvements. Mr. Dubois explained that in the Impact Fee Study that was done by the town, it was determined that every development in the town benefits from the system improvements of the roads. There would need to be an analysis conducted to determine what systems are being tied into through the Elkhorn Springs project.

Mr. Eddington asked to address an issue in the letter that was submitted. In the letter, there was language about a conflict of interest with Mr. Eddington. It stated that the town should ask questions about undue influence and conflicts, as the planner might be working as a proponent of the Elkhorn Springs development. Mr. Eddington clarified for the record that there is no conflict of interest and the statement in the letter is false. As the Town Planner, his focus is on protecting the town. He is not employed by Mr. Brockbank or Elkhorn Springs. Mr. Dubois apologized for including that in the letter if this statement is accurate. He was informed that Mr. Eddington was providing advice and assistance to the applicant team at the beginning of the project. He apologized if there was incorrect information received.

DRAFT

Ingram Quick asked the Council to consider approving this opportunity for the town. He noted that there was a discussion about SR-428, but he did not hear any additional comments about the speed limit. Mr. Quick believed reducing speeds would make a difference. Mayor Severini reported that there have been discussions about this with UDOT. There are many different options on the table at the moment, but a lot depends on the priorities that UDOT has. Mr. Quick mentioned the Fire Station that will be added. It would make sense to mention the fact that there will be fire trucks in the area as a way to encourage change. Commissioner Gunn pointed out that the speed limit on SR-428 is beyond the matter at hand. The speed limits should be discussed at a future Town Council Meeting rather than the current one.

The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 7:01 p.m.

Ms. McLean noted that the Rezone is tied to the MDA, so it is unlikely that the Town Council will grant the Rezone without the MDA. As a result, it is possible for the Council to discuss both items at the same time. After the discussion, there will be two separate votes, one for the Rezone and one for the MDA.

Mayor Severini reported that a Hydrologist from the State identified two spots on this property with certain possibilities. He has spoken to Mr. Brockbank about this. If those are not covered by a building or a street, then those will revert to the town, so it will be possible to potentially use them for additional culinary water. He would like to have that written into the MDA. Mr. Brockbank agreed with the language that was shared by Mayor Severini. As long as it is not covered by a road or building and does not impact their water system, there is no reason that the town could not use them. Mayor Severini noted that if the current configuration is covering something up, but it was possible that something could be moved, there could be work done with the applicant team to find a solution. Mr. Brockbank expressed support for that.

Ms. McLean shared comments about the MDA. There is agreement that the wetland setbacks have to be adhered to, and there will be a wetland delineation. It is possible to direct Staff to include these items and work with the developer prior to execution of the MDA. Mr. Davenport stated that after the delineation has occurred, if there is an indication that the 100-foot setback would impact the lots, then it is possible to move those lots somewhere else and not lose density. Ms. McLean believed it was a little more nuanced than that, but there is no proposal to lose density. It appeared the Council wanted the 100-foot setback from the pond. There was discussion about relocating the potentially impacted lots. Council Member Gunn noted that there was language proposed to state that the lots could be relocated by mutual agreement.

Ms. McLean asked if the Council is supportive of the 12% grade that was mentioned earlier. Alternatively, there could be discussions about a private road. It was clarified that only portions of the road are 12%. There are questions related to snow plowing and who will handle that work. Ms. McLean stated that the Town Council can provide direction to work with the developer on this. Mayor Severini would ideally like to see one snowplow operation handle the work. Ms. McLean pointed out that the private roads will be maintained separately. Council Member Gunn asked if the developer would be willing to handle the snowplowing for the road that has been discussed. Mr. Davenport does not believe there will be an issue with the town handling plowing on that road, as only a portion of it is at 12%, and the rest is 10%.

Mr. Pay reported that during the Town Council Meeting, he had text exchanges with the Public Works Director and the Elkhorn Springs Engineer. The Public Works Director stated that with the current equipment, it is not possible to plow more than 10%. It might be best to investigate this issue more. Alternatively, there could be design alterations done to improve the situation. There can be direction provided that Staff continue to look into this issue to find a safe solution that satisfies all involved parties.

Council Member Gunn shared suggested language with those present. If different snowplowing equipment is necessary to plow the 12% sections, the town and the developer would split the cost. Mr. Brockbank noted that this will likely not be necessary for another eight years, as it is part of Phase V. There were some concerns about an open-ended item. Ms. McLean shared additional comments with the Council. She could not locate the plaza mentioned in the MDA and asked for clarification. Mayor Severini reported that the park and plaza are the same thing, so there needs to be a correction in the MDA.

Ms. McLean believed the direction she received was to add something about the ability to develop the wells and to work together to make those wells accessible. Council Member Haselton asked about the $58,000 for the preliminary design of the construction drawings for the Spine Trail. She wanted to know if there is support for that amount. Ms. McLean explained that this is up to the Town Council to determine. There was a discussion previously, and it seemed like the Council found $58,000 to be acceptable.

Ms. McLean discussed the Resolution. Her understanding is that the developer will not own the development when the agreement is recorded. As a result, the actual owner of the property will need to be a signatory. Mr. Davenport reported that he sent some language to the Town Attorney to address this. There will be written authorization from the seller provided to state that it is possible to sign on his behalf.

Mr. Davenport reiterated that there are some old notes in the Staff Report. For instance, there are items that have been agreed to, but those are not included in the condition language. He does not want those conditions included, because what has been discussed is written in the MDA. If the conditions in the Staff Report are adopted as part of the MDA and Resolution, then there will be a disagreement about what has been determined. He wants to make sure everyone is on the same page. Some of the language states that the town will determine at its discretion what the amenities are, but those have already been determined. Ms. McLean confirmed that there has been a conceptual agreement about what the amenities are.

There were additional discussions about the language included in the Meeting Materials Packet. When it comes to phasing, there is language in the MDA that states it has to be sequential, but what was agreed to during the meeting was to allow for some flexibility. Ms. McLean noted that there will not be Certificates of Occupancy issued on the next phase unless the infrastructure and amenities are completed in the prior phase. It was pointed out that the amenities are tied to different phases. There was additional Council Member discussion about the proposed phases and other developments in the community.

Council Member Baier stated that there is a desire to allow flexibility, but there is also no desire to wait many years for the amenities to be implemented. If the phases are done out of order, there should be communication with the Town Council. Example scenarios were shared. Mayor Severini stated that it is possible to separate the amenities out from the phases and instead have a list of amenities with timeframes. Mayor Severini thought separating them out would make sense for all involved. A comment was made to clarify that the phases are already planned out. The intention is to handle each phase in order, but there is a desire to have a little bit of flexibility to address market conditions. Ms. McLean stated that if there is a change of the sequence to the phasing, the applicant must return to the Town Council. There will need to be Council action taken at that time, but she noted that the Town Council wants this to succeed.

Mr. Davenport reported that there is language in the Staff Report to indicate that the design of the stairs can change at the discretion of the town, but that has already been discussed. He asked that the MDA govern, or this be removed from the conditions. Mr. Eddington clarified that there is no condition that this would be changed, but that there would be collaboration. Mr. Davenport next noted that there is reference to all of the limits of disturbance being fenced, which would be expensive. Mr. Eddington explained that the orange construction fencing is being referenced, which is included in the code.

Mr. Davenport asked for clarification about the trails. It was stated that once the trails are established, those would be turned over to the town for maintenance. Council Member Gunn understood that the developer would design and build the trails, and after three years, those would be turned over to the town. This was confirmed. Ms. McLean noted that there are two separate paragraphs about trails, so work will be done to ensure that those match. Mr. Davenport asked about the default remedy. Ms. McLean believed some language was going to be proposed, but she has not seen the proposed language at this point.

Discussions were had about the applications before the Town Council. Ms. McLean explained that there will be two separate votes. The first vote will be related to the Rezone and the second to the MDA. Mayor Severini asked if there are any other Council Member comments. Clarification was requested about the MDA vote. Ms. McLean reported that there is a Resolution in the Meeting Materials Packet for the MDA. The MDA will not be signed tonight, because the discussed changes must be implemented. There will be an Ordinance for the Rezone and there is a Zoning Map that highlights the zoning. Mr. Eddington clarified that it is being zoned from Mountain, which is a residential zone, but not Mountain Residential.

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to APPROVE the 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, consistent with the agreements made during the Town Council Meeting. This authorizes the Town Attorney to rewrite the MDA, consistent with the discussion. Council Member Cronin seconded the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Baier, Council Member Cronin, Council Member Gunn, Council Member Haselton, Council Member Nadelberg. The motion passed 5-to-0.

DRAFT

2. Discussion and Possible Approval of a Master Development Agreement (MDA) for the Elkhorn Springs Development, which would Include Variations to Requirements for Slopes, Cut and Fill, Retaining Wall Height, and Road Grade.

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to APPROVE the Master Development Agreement for the Elkhorn Springs Development, subject to the discussions and agreements had during the Town Council Meeting. This authorizes the Town Attorney to re-write the MDA, consistent with the discussion and agreements. Council Member Nadelberg seconded the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Baier, Council Member Cronin, Council Member Gunn, Council Member Haselton, Council Member Nadelberg. The motion passed 5-to-0.

IV. Meeting Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Haselton moved to ADJOURN. Council Member Cronin seconded the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Baier, Council Member Cronin, Council Member Gunn, Council Member Haselton, Council Member Nadelberg. The motion passed 5-to-0.

The Town Council Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

_____

Maria Devereux, Town Clerk

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

6. Approval of the Minutes - November 13, 2025

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Town Council Special Meeting
November 18, 2025

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in a Board of Canvassers Meeting on November 18, 2025 at 5:30 pm in the City Council Chambers located at 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah and electronically via Zoom.

I. Call to Order
Mayor Severini called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m., noting that it was being conducted in a hybrid format with participants attending both in person at Hideout Town Hall and remotely.

II. Roll Call

Attending Remotely: Mayor Ralph Severini
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Chris Baier
Council Member Johnathan Gunn
Council Member Bob Nadelberg

Excused: Council Member J. D. Cronin

Staff Present: Town Recorder for the Town of Hideout, Maria Devereux

Public Present: None

Public Attending Remotely: None

III. Agenda Items

Certification of the November 4, 2025 Municipal Election Results

The Hideout Town Council convened to discuss and certify the results of November 04, 2025, Hideout Municipal Election.

Mayor Severini explained that the official canvass documents were received from the county earlier that day.

Maria Devereux, Town Recorder, reviewed the Canvass documents as provided by the County. She noted, with a total of 550 registered voters in the Town of Hideout, 382 votes cast, and 69.45% voter turnout, the following are the results of the 2025 Municipal Election for one (1) Mayoral seat, and two (2) Town Council seats.

In the race for Mayor (4 year term), Chris Baier received 108 votes. (28.35%), Ralph Severini received 273 votes. (71.65%).

Resulting in Ralph Severini being elected to fill the Mayoral seat.

In the race for two (2) Council seats (4 year term), the candidates are as follows:

Tanya E. Brady 249 votes (35.52%), Brian George Cooper 223 votes (31.81%), J.D. Cronin votes (19.12%), and Doug Silver 95 (13.55%)

This resulted in Tanya E. Brady and Brian George Cooper being elected to fill the two (2) open seats. She explained, these are the results of the official canvass.

Mayor Severini asked for a motion to approve/certify the November 4, 2025 Municipal Election results as presented.

Motion: Council Member Nadelberg moved to approve the 2025 Municipal Election Results as presented. Second by Council Member Gunn.

The vote on the motion is as follows:

Council Member Baier, Yes
Council Member Hazelton, Yes
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes
Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Cronin, Excused

The motion passes unanimously.

IV. Meeting Adjournment

Mayor Severini asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Council Member Hazelton moved to adjourn the Board of Canvassers Meeting. Second by Council Member Gunn.

The vote on the motion is as follows:

Council Member Baier, Yes
Council Member Hazelton, Yes
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes
Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Cronin, Excused

The motion passes unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:43 PM.

_____
Maria Devereux, Recorder for Hideout

File Attachments for Item:

7. Approval of the Minutes - November 21, 2025

Town of Hideout

Town Council Special Meeting Minutes of November 21, 2025

November 21, 2025
4:00 PM

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in a Special Meeting on November 21, 2025 at 4:00 PM, held electronically via Zoom and in person in the Town Council Chambers located at 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah.

Special Meeting

I. Call to Order

Mayor Severini called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 PM and after a brief closed session meeting at 3:30 PM the Council returned from closed Session and noted that this Special Meeting contained one agenda item. The Mayor also stated that no public comment would be taken during this meeting.

II. Roll Call

Present:
Mayor Severini
Council Member Chris Baier
Council Member Carol Hazelton
Council Member JD Cronin
Council Member Jonathan Gunn

Excused: Council Member Nadelburg

Staff Present:
Rob Crockett, Chief Litigation Counsel
Polly McLean, Town Attorney

Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Recorder
Jan McCosh, City Administrator

III. Agenda Item

1. Discussion and possible approval of settlement and payment for the impact fee case with Mustang Development

DRAFT

Mayor Severini reported that, following the Council's Closed Session discussion, the Town Council proposed a settlement amount of $600,000 to resolve the impact fee case involving Mustang Development. He noted that this is one of four related cases and represents the first step toward resolving the broader group of matters.

Chief Litigation Counsel Rob Crockett stated he had nothing further to add and affirmed that the settlement is in the best interest of the Town.

There were no additional comments from the Council.

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to approve the settlement agreement in the amount of $600,000 and to authorize the Town's attorneys to work with the Mayor to finalize and execute the settlement agreement reflecting the terms discussed.
Second: Council Member Cronin.

The votes on the motion were as follows:

Council Member Baier, Yes
Council Member Hazelton, Yes
Council Member Cronin, Yes
Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Nadelburg, Excused

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Carol Hazelton moved to adjourn the meeting.
Second: Council Member Jonathan Gunn

The votes on the motion were as follows:
Council Member Baier, Yes
Council Member Hazelton, Yes
Council Member Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Nadelburg, Excused

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 PM.

Maria Devereux Town Recorder

Signature: _____ | Date: _____

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

8. Approval of the Minutes - December 3, 2025

Town of Hideout, UT
Town Council Special Meeting Minutes
December 3, 2025
5:00 PM

Mayor **Severini** called the Special Town Council Meeting to order at approximately 5:00 PM. He noted that the meeting included open dialogue and that no public comment would be taken during this Special Meeting.

A list of attendees is on file with the Town of Hideout.

I. Call to Order

1. Mayor Severini welcomed all in attendance.

II. Purpose of Meeting

2. The purpose of the meeting was for the Town Council and Planning Commission to review work to date on the General Plan update.

III. Presentations

3. Presentations were provided by Jake Young, consultant with Citi Design, and John Jansen, consultant with Planning Solutions. The consultants reviewed current land use scenario planning work, including preliminary concepts, analysis, and potential development patterns. They requested input from members of the Planning Commission and Town Council to guide the next phase of the General Plan update.

IV. Discussion

- Discussion focused on land use alternatives, growth assumptions, community priorities, and next steps in the planning process. The session emphasized development of Hideout's future land use map, incorporating community input and legal constraints.

- Key points included:
- The need to preserve open space, trails, and views.
- A preference for moving toward one primary land use scenario to support community unity.
- An estimated buildout capacity of approximately 7,000 units, compared to roughly 700 existing units today.
- Potential for commercial development near the Black Rock Hotel area and the Ross Creek area.
- Consideration of mixed use or neighborhood commercial development near Golden Eagle Road, including the possibility of a future transit stop to support mobility and reduce vehicle trips.
- The importance of public access to trails and open space.
- Interest in exploring the potential of a community center.

No action was taken at this meeting.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:12 PM.

Maria Devereux, Town Recorder
Signature: _____
Date: _____

File Attachments for Item:

9. Approval of the Minutes - December 17, 2025

TOWN OF HIDEOUT, UTAH

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in a Regular Meeting on December 17, 2025 at 4:00 p.m., via Zoom and in-person in the City Council Chambers located at 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Ralph Severini called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present:
Council Member Jonathan Gunn
Council Member Chris Baier
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Bob Nadelberg
Mayor Ralph Severini

Staff:

Town Planner Thomas Eddington, Town Engineer Dennis Pay, Recorder Maria Devereux
Excused: Council Member Nadelberg.

Public present:

Donna Turner, Glynnis Tihansky, Joseph Kjar, Julie Quick, Ingram Quick, Jaxson Stewart, Catherine Woltering, Peggy Pora, Cameron Platt, Justin Ker.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. Public Input
Mayor Severini opened the Public Input period at 4:00 p.m.

Glynnis Tihansky, Planning Commission Chair, stated that the Mayor and Town Council have full authority to move forward on proposed rules and regulations. She acknowledged Council Member Gunn's right to express concerns but note his private emails and public comments as disrespectful. The Planning Commission asked the Town Council to consider proposed rules; their memo noted the rules adopted on September 18, 2025, and suggested code changes without demanding action. A comparative table showed most peer cities allow the commission to select its chair/vice chair and many include a "with or without" dismissal clause; the proposed language aligns with Park City and Salt Lake City. The mayor and Council may modify the rules, and differences should be resolved through discussion rather than public grievances. The chair

welcomes Council input and reiterates the Planning Commission's role as a recommending body serving the town's interests.

Public Input closed at 4:08 p.m.

IV. Agenda Items

1. Consideration to Authorize the Mayor to enter into a Possible Extension and/or Amendment for the ILA with the Wasatch County Sheriff's Office.

   Mayor Severini reported that Sheriff Rigby was unable to attend. He explained that the proposed extension includes approximately a 5% cost increase and noted the importance of maintaining a collaborative relationship with the Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff has offered to allow the Town to share a satellite office space on a part-time basis, which would improve presence and response.

   Motion: Council Member Baier moved to adopt the Interlocal Agreement extension with the Wasatch County Sheriff's Office.
   Second by Council Member Cronin.

   The vote on the motion was as follows:
   Council Member Haselton, yes;
   Council Member Brady, yes;
   Council Member Nadelberg, excused;
   Council Member Cooper, yes;
   Council Member Gunn, yes.
   The motion passed unanimously.

2. Discussion and possible Adoption of Resolution 2025-R-XX Appointing a Chief Administrative Officer and Records Officer(s)

   Mayor Severini explained that the Town must adopt the resolution before year end, although implementation will occur next year. Jan McCosh noted that Hideout participates in the EDGE Cities group, which provides support to small, high-growth municipalities. The Mayor recommended appointing Jan McCosh as Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and Maria Devereux as Records Officer.

   Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to adopt Resolution 2025-R-XX appointing Jan McCosh as Chief Administrative Officer and Maria Devereux as Records Officer.
   Second by Council Member Haselton.

   The vote on the motion was as follows:
   Council Member Haselton, yes;
   Council Member Brady, yes;
   Council Member Nadelberg, excused;
   Council Member Cooper, yes;
   Council Member Gunn, yes.
   The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

3. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution 2025-R-XX: Commendation for Outstanding Public Service by Chris Baier.

Mayor Severini introduced the resolution commending Council Member Baier for his service.

Motion: Council Member Haselton moved to adopt Resolution 2025-R-XX commending Council Member Chris Baier.
Second by Council Member Cronin.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, yes;
Council Member Brady, yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, excused
Council Member Cooper, yes;
Council Member Gunn, yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

4. Discussion and possible Appointment of a Representative of Hideout to engage in discussions regarding the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP).

Mayor Severini recommended appointing Town Engineer Dennis Pay as the Town's representative. Mr. Pay described his experience with emergency management planning and noted that community outreach and a resident committee would likely be needed.

Motion: Council Member Haselton moved to appoint Dennis Pay as the Town's representative for the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.
Second by Council Member Gunn.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, yes;
Council Member Brady, yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, excused ;
Council Member Cooper, yes;
Council Member Gunn, yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

V. Committee Updates

Planning Commission – Thomas Eddington reported on the upcoming public hearings for a rezone related to the fire station and Public Works building, and the Phase 1 subdivision plan for Elkhorn Springs.
Design Review Committee – No additional report.
Wildfire Committee – Council Member Gunn reported ongoing HOA interviews and information sharing.
Economic Development Committee – No additional report.
Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) Committee – No additional report.
Transportation Committee – No additional report.

DRAFT

Recess Prior to Public Hearing
At 5:50 p.m., Council Member Gunn made a motion to suspend the meeting until 6:00 p.m.
Second by Council Member Haselton.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, yes;
Council Member Brady, yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, yes;
Council Member Cooper, yes;
Council Member Gunn, yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Public Hearing – 6:00 PM

1. Discussion and possible action on the Final Subdivision Plat for Shoreline Phase 4

Public Hearing opened at 8:05 p.m.

Public comments were received from:
• Donna Turner – environmental and drainage concerns
• A. Pederson – undocumented fill and soil suitability concerns
• Katherine Wooltrain – water quality and BOR issues
• Doug Silver – comments read by the Mayor
• Brad Airmet, Mary Freeman, Ingram – concerns regarding fill odor, geotechnical issues, drainage, and environmental impacts.
• Dennis Pay, Town Engineer – reviewed engineering concerns and BOR requirements
• Council Member Baier – clarifying comments

Public Hearing closed at 8:57 p.m.

Council deliberated extensively regarding:
• undocumented fill up to 14 feet deep
• geotechnical recommendations requiring removal of fill under foundations and pavements
• potential contamination concerns
• unresolved Bureau of Reclamation trespass complaint
• lack of BOR drainage criteria
• inability to review drainage design
• environmental impacts to Jordanelle Reservoir
• need for a discharge permit
• missing plat notes and HOA dedication language
• street lighting, intersection slopes, roadway section, and evacuation concerns

Motion: At 10:36 p.m., Council Member Gunn moved to grant contingent approval of the Shoreline Phase 4 Final Subdivision Plat, subject to twenty-five (25) negotiated contingencies (in report).
Second by Council Member Cronin.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Baier, yes;

DRAFT

Council Member Gunn, yes;
Council Member Cronin, yes;
Council Member Brady, yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, excused.
The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Approval of Council Minutes
November 18, 2025 Town Council/Board of Canvassers Meeting Minutes
Meeting minute approved at previous council meeting.

IX. Follow up of Items from Approved Minutes
No additional items were discussed.

X. Meeting Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to adjourn the meeting.
Second by Council Member Cronin.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, yes;
Council Member Brady, yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, excused;
Council Member Cooper, yes;
Council Member Gunn, yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:51 p.m.

Maria Devereux, Recorder
Town of Hideout

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

10. Approval of the Minutes - January 8, 2026

TOWN OF HIDEOUT, UTAH

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in a Regular Meeting on January 8, 2026 at 5:00 p.m., via Zoom and in-person in the City Council Chambers located at 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Mayor Ralph Severini
Council Member Jonathan Gunn
Council Member Brian Cooper
Council Member Tanya Brady
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Bob Nadelberg

STAFF PRESENT

Town Recorder Maria Devereux
Town Administrator Jan McCosh
Town Attorney Polly McLean
Town Planner Thomas Eddington

PUBLIC PRESENT

J. Mason Kjar
Brad Airmet
Mason Kjar
Grace Doerfler

DRAFT

I. Call to Order

Mayor Severini called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. Roll Call

Roll call was conducted. All Council Members were present.

IV. Oath of Office

The Oath of Office was administered by Town Recorder Maria Devereux to Mayor Ralph Severini, Council Member Tanya Brady, and Council Member Brian Cooper. All were congratulated and welcomed.

V. Closed Executive Session

The Town Council entered into Closed Executive Session at 5:11 PM for purposes permitted under Utah Code 52-4-205.

Motion: Council Member Haselton moved to enter into Closed Executive Session.
Second by Council Member Nadelberg.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Haselton, Yes;
Council Member Brady, Yes;
Council Member Gunn, Yes;
Council Member Cooper, Yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

The Council reconvened to the open meeting at 6:14 PM.

VI. 6:00 PM Regular Business Meeting

The regular business meeting began at 6:14 PM, as posted.

VII. Public Input

Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input. No comments were offered in person or online. Public input was closed.

VIII. Agenda Items

1. Discussion and Review of Services Provided to the Town of Hideout by the Wasatch County Sheriff's Office. (0:02:36)

Sheriff Jared Rigby reviewed the annual Additional Law Enforcement Services Contract. The contract increases from $80,000 to $84,000 due to county wage adjustments. Services include 50 hours per month of additional enforcement, including traffic enforcement, truck enforcement, and directed patrol.

DRAFT

Council discussed increased visibility, including rotating placement of a marked patrol vehicle, use of speed trailers, and message boards. Council expressed interest in establishing a deputy workspace or substation in Hideout.

---

2. Discussion of Parking and Code Enforcement with Interstate Parking. (0:24:06)

Town Administrator McCosh summarized discussions with Interstate Parking regarding parking enforcement and expanded code enforcement services. Interstate provides back-end processing, collections, and reporting, while Town staff would issue citations.

Council requested written materials, references, and a future presentation.

---

3. Discussion and Possible Authorization for the Mayor to Enter into a Franchise Agreement with UTOPIA. (0:29:20)

UTOPIA representative Nicole Cottle provided an overview of the proposed franchise agreement and answered questions from the Council. Following discussion, the Council determined that additional review and revisions were needed before taking action.

Nicole Cottle will send a revised franchise draft committing to underground-only installation except where underground is infeasible. Polly Mclean agreed to circulate the Comcast franchise agreement; Documents to be distributed to the council.

The UTOPIA franchise agreement item will be placed on the February Town Council meeting agenda.

---

4. Utah LTAP Presentation and Discussion (0:51:24)

LTAP presented pavement condition assessments and long-term maintenance recommendations. Preventative maintenance is emphasized to extend pavement life. Reconstruction of Claim Road is recommended after construction of traffic subsides.

---

5. Ethics Training (1:10:13)

Town Attorney McLean reviewed and presented annual disclosure requirements and Municipal Officers' Ethics Act provisions. Open Meetings Act training is required for Council and Planning Commission.

---

6. Discussion of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations

Council reviewed Planning Commission Rules and Regulations, including Chair/Vice Chair elections, training timelines, ex parte communication, and public comment procedures. Polly Mclean, Attorney, recorded updates as provided by the council. No formal action was taken.

---

7. Consideration of an Ordinance to Implement the Process and Term for the Chair and Chair Pro Tem of the Planning Commission (Ordinance 2026-O-XX) (1:29:04)

Council considered an ordinance establishing the annual election process, term requirements, and responsibilities for the Planning Commission Chair and Chair Pro Tem. The ordinance clarifies leadership structure and ensures alignment with training and meeting requirements.

Motion: Council Member Cooper moved to adopt the ordinance as amended.
Second by Council Member Haselton.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes;
Council Member Brady, Yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes;
Council Member Cooper, Yes;
Council Member Gunn, Yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

---

8. Consideration of an Ordinance to Establish a Seven-Person Planning Commission and Remove Alternates (Ordinance 2026-O-XX) (02:24:5)

The Council reviewed an ordinance expanding the Planning Commission from five to seven members, eliminating alternate positions, and updating term staggering to ensure continuity. Staff explained that the current development workload, upcoming General Plan work, and increased volume of land-use applications have placed greater demands on the Commission. Expanding to seven members will improve quorum reliability, broaden representation, and distribute responsibilities more evenly. Eliminating alternates aligns Hideout with common practice in Utah municipalities, where full members are preferred for consistency in training, participation, and decision-making.

The Council discussed the benefits of having a larger body for complex land-use matters and agreed that the updated term staggering will prevent multiple seats from expiring simultaneously, ensuring institutional knowledge is retained.

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to adopt the ordinance as amended.
Second by Council Member Cooper.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes;
Council Member Brady, Yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes;
Council Member Cooper, Yes;
Council Member Gunn, Yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

9. Consideration of an Ordinance to Amend Hideout Code Section 1.10.050 to Change Regular Council Meeting Time to 5 PM (Ordinance 2026-O-XX) (02:40:39)

Council reviewed and approved an ordinance amending the municipal code to change the regular Town Council meeting start time from 6:00 PM to 5:00 PM, reflecting current practice and improving meeting efficiency.

Motion: Council Member Cooper moved to adopt the ordinance.
Second by Council Member Gunn.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes;
Council Member Brady, Yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes;
Council Member Cooper, Yes;
Council Member Gunn, Yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

---

10. Approval of an Ordinance Adopting the 2026 Regular Meeting Schedule (Ordinance 2026-O-XX) (02:40:39)

Council reviewed and adopted the 2026 meeting schedule, ensuring compliance with the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act and aligning meeting dates with holidays and known scheduling considerations.

The Council reviewed and approved the 2026 meeting schedule.

Motion: Council Member Cooper moved to adopt the ordinance.
Second by Council Member Gunn.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes;
Council Member Brady, Yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes;
Council Member Cooper, Yes;
Council Member Gunn, Yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

---

11. 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 (03:24:49)

The Council reviewed an ordinance consolidating and aligning construction hours and noise regulations across the municipal code. The amendment improves clarity, enforcement consistency, and public understanding of permitted construction times.

Council Member Gunn suggested that the ordinance be reviewed again in the future to allow additional opportunity for public input on the proposed changes.

DRAFT

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to adopt the ordinance as amended by the Town Attorney. Second by Council Member Cooper.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes;
Council Member Brady, Yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes;
Council Member Cooper, Yes;
Council Member Gunn, Yes.
The motion passed unanimously.

---

12. Appointment of Council Member(s) to Participate in the Hiring Process for a New City Attorney (2:58:00)

The Council discussed participation in the hiring process for a new City Attorney and reviewed the need for at least one council member to participate in the city attorney recruitment/interview process and confirmed coordination of the RFP/interview logistics with Jan McCosh.

Volunteers: Councilmembers Jonathan Gunn and Tanya Brady volunteered to serve on the interview committee.

Jan McCosh will coordinate the RFP and interview schedule with the volunteer council members and staff.

Mayor Severini approved Council Members Gunn and Brady to be a part of the hiring process.

---

13. Discussion and Possible Approval of Committee Appointments of Mayor and Councilmembers

Mayor Severini reviewed proposed committee assignments for 2026. Council discussed roles and responsibilities. Discussion was deferred to after the February 10th retreat. No action was taken.

---

14. Town Council Retreat – Tuesday, February 10, 2025

The Council confirmed the retreat date and discussed anticipated agenda topics. No action required.

IX. Committee Updates

Current committees in review.

X. Approval of Council Minutes

DRAFT

Motion: Council Member Cooper moved to approve the November 18, 2025 Board of Canvassers Minutes.
Second by Council Member Haselton.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes;
Council Member Cooper, Yes;
Council Member Gunn, Abstain;
Council Member Brady, Abstain;
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes.
The motion passed.

XII. Meeting Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to adjourn.
Second by Council Member Cooper.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes;
Council Member Brady, Yes;
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes;
Council Member Cooper, Yes;
Council Member Gunn, Yes.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:39 PM.

Maria Devereux
Town Recorder, Town of Hideout

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

11. Approval of the Minutes - February 10, 2026

Town of Hideout

Town Council and Planning Commission Offsite Retreat Minutes

February 10, 2026

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met for an offsite meeting held at Black Rock Resort located at 909 W Peace Tree Trail., Heber City, UT 84032 on February 10, 2026 held via Zoom and in person from 12:00 PM to 6:00 PM.

Minutes

Town of Hideout Town Council and Planning Commission
Offsite Retreat
February 10, 2026
12:00 PM – 7:00 PM

The Town Council and Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met for an Offsite Retreat on Tuesday, February 10, 2026, beginning at approximately 12:00 PM at the Black Rock Mountain Resort, 909 West Peace Tree Trail, Heber City, Utah.

A list of attendees is on file with the Town of Hideout.

I. Call to Order

Mayor Severini called the Retreat to order and welcomed attendees. The Mayor served as Master of Ceremonies for the event. Town Administrator Jan McCosh assisted in facilitating the program and coordinating the agenda. Maria Devereux, Town Recorder, was present to document the proceedings.

Members of the Town Council and Planning Commission were in attendance, along with Sherita Schaefer and invited regional partners.

II. Welcome and Introductions (12:00–1:00 PM)

The Retreat opened with a networking lunch and introductions with regional leaders. Participants engaged in discussion regarding regional coordination, growth, and shared priorities.

III. Transportation Panel (1:00–1:45 PM)

A panel of regional transportation representatives provided updates on current and future transportation planning affecting Hideout and the surrounding area. Topics included roadway capacity, regional connectivity, and anticipated impacts of future development.

DRAFT

IV. Wildfire and Emergency Preparedness Panel (2:00–2:45 PM)

Emergency management professionals presented information on wildfire risk, evacuation planning, interagency coordination, and community preparedness strategies. Discussion included mitigation efforts and public education initiatives.

V. State of the Town Address – Mayor Severini (3:00–4:00 PM)

Mayor Severini delivered the 2026 State of the Town Address, highlighting accomplishments, ongoing initiatives, and future priorities for the Town. The address was well received and described by attendees as exceptional. A community reception followed the presentation.

VI. General Plan Update and Community Outreach (4:00–7:00 PM)

The Council and Commission participated in a working session focused on the Town's General Plan update. Discussion included community outreach strategies, long-range land use planning, infrastructure needs, public engagement methods, and coordination with regional partners. Staff and elected officials reviewed current draft materials and identified next steps.

VII. Final Remarks and Concluding Discussion (6:00 PM)

The Retreat concluded with final remarks from Mayor Severini and closing discussion among Council and Commission members. The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:00 PM.

VIII. Actions Taken

No action was taken at this meeting.

Maria Devereux Town Recorder, Signature _____ Date:_____

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

12. Approval of the Minutes - February 12, 2026

TOWN OF HIDEOUT

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
February 12, 2026 – 5:00 P.M.
10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Ralph Severini called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present:
Council Member Jonathan Gunn
Council Member Tanya Brady
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Bob Nadelberg
Mayor Ralph Severini

Staff:
Town Manager Jan McCosh
Town Attorney Polly McLean
Town Recorder, Maria Devereux
A quorum was present.

III. CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Council entered Closed Executive Session pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-205 to discuss litigation, personnel, real property, and security matters.

PUBLIC MEETING – 6:00 P.M.

IV. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Severini reconvened the public meeting at 6:00 p.m.

V. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (0:14 - 0:58)

VI. PUBLIC INPUT (0:58 - 17:46)

DRAFT

Residents raised concerns regarding unlicensed short-term rentals, lost business license and TRT revenue, and STRs operating in non-permitted zones. Council discussed enforcement options including third-party monitoring and internal staffing.

A resident noted late delivery of meeting materials; Council reaffirmed that late submissions will be moved to the next month's agenda.

Council discussed the need for a document-management system. Town Attorney clarified that drafts are not GRAMA-retained records.

Mayor Severini closed Public input closed.

VII. AGENDA ITEMS

---

1. Appointment of Planning Commissioners – JD Cronin & Dr. Steve Powell (37:50 - 41:07)

Both candidates presented their qualifications.

Motion: Council Member Haselton moved to appoint JD Cronin and Dr. Steve Powell as Planning Commissioners. Seconded by Council Member Brady.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes
Council Member Brady, Yes
Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

Both appointees were sworn in by Maria Devereux, Town Recorder.

---

2. Appointment of Mayor Pro Tempore (41:09 - 42:58)

Motion: Council Member Nadelberg moved to appoint Council Member Jonathan Gunn as Mayor Pro Tempore.Seconded by Council Member Haselton.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes
Council Member Brady, Yes
Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

3. Land Use Training – Jordan Cullimore, Office of the Property Rights Ombudsman (43:02 - 1:26:55)

Training covered LUDMA, legislative vs. administrative decisions, the General Plan, and roles of the Council, Planning Commission, and Land Use Authority.

---

4. Utility Rates Study – LRB (Lewis, Robertson, Burningham) (1:26:57 - 2:09:44)

LRB (Lewis, Robertson, Burmingham) presented findings on water, sewer, and stormwater rates, including JSSD pass-through increases, the need for tiered water rates, multifamily underbilling, and the need for impervious-area-based stormwater fees.
Council directed staff and LRB to prepare revised rate models for March.

No motion taken.

---

5. Resolution 2026-R-XX – Fee & Rate Schedule

Postponed to March pending completion of rate modeling.

---

6. OPMA Training – Town Attorney Polly McLean (2:09:45 - 2:28:40)

Annual training was provided on public notice, closed meetings, recordings, public comment, and penalties for violations.

---

7. Appointment of New City Attorney – Corbin Gordon (2:33:49 - 2:45:39

A selection committee recommended Corbin Gordon.

Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to appoint Corbin Gordon as City Attorney.
Seconded by Council Member Brady.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes
Council Member Brady, Yes
Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

Council thanked outgoing Town Attorney Polly McLean for her service.

---

8. Ordinance 2025-O-XX – Construction Hours Alignment (2:45:40 - 2:52:56)

Updates included weekday hours 7 a.m.–7 p.m., weekend/holiday hours 10 a.m.–6 p.m., removal of the 60 dB limit, contractor notification requirements, and limited exceptions for special operations.

Motion: Council Member Haselton moved to adopt Ordinance 2025-O-XX.
Seconded by Council Member Nadelberg.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes
Council Member Brady, Yes
Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

---

9. Committee Appointments (2:53:01 - 3:06:46)

Council discussed committee assignments.
No action taken.

---

10. Town Council Retreat Overview – February 10, 2025 (3:06:54 - 3:13:57)

Mayor Severini reported that the retreat included strong presentations and was well executed.

---

11. UTOPIA Franchise Agreement

Postponed to March due to late materials. Polly Mclean, updated document that will be sent a week or more before the next council meeting.

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of 01/29/2026 Special Meeting Minutes (Draft)

Approval of minutes postponed to next meeting.

DRAFT

IX. FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

Staff will continue work on STR enforcement, document management, utility rate modeling, stormwater analysis, and capital improvement planning.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Council Member Brian Cooper moved to adjourn.
Seconded by Council Member Carol Haselton.

The vote on the motion was as follows:
Council Member Haselton, Yes
Council Member Brady, Yes
Council Member Gunn, Yes
Council Member Nadelberg, Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Maria Devereux

Hideout Town Recorder

_____

DRAFT