HIDEOUT, UTAH
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
September 17, 2026
Agenda

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Hideout Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting at 6:00 PM, or soon thereafter, on Thursday, September 17, 2026, in the Town of Hideout Council Room located at 10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah for the purposes and at the times described below.

The public may join remotely, attend in-person, or view the open portions of this meeting by connecting to:
https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCKdWnJad-WwvcAK75QjRb1w/.

Interested parties may join via Zoom:
Meeting URL: https://zoom.us/j/4356594739 | Meeting ID: 435 659 4739

Regular Meeting
6:00 PM

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Public Comment

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 Item(s)

1. Discussion and Consideration for Approval of Business License Application | Home Occupation. Applicant: Michael Zarkos | Business Name: Uintah Trading Co. LLC
Pursuant to Hideout Municipal Code § 4.06.060(B)

V. Work Session

1. Review of the Town of Hideout **General Plan (Draft)** – Thomas Eddington, Town Planner. *Discussion Only.*

VI. Consent Agenda

1. Approval of the November 20, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
2. Approval of the February 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
3. Approval of the March 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
4. Approval of the April 16, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
5. Approval of the May 21, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
6. Approval of the July 22, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

VII. Meeting Adjournment

I, Maria Devereux, the Recorder for the Town of Hideout, UT, do hereby certify that the above Thursday, September 17, 2026, Hideout Planning Commission Regular Meeting was posted at the following locations: 1) Hideout Town Hall, 2) Town website www.hideoututah.gov and 3) the Utah Public Notice Website at www.utah.gov/pmn. Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Mayor or City Recorder at 435-659-4739 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. -- Posted September 16, 2026

File Attachments for Item:

1. Discussion and Consideration for Approval of Business License Application | Home Occupation. Applicant: Michael Zarkos | Business Name: Uintah Trading Co. LLC Pursuant to Hideout Municipal Code § 4.06.060(B)

4.06.060 PROCEDURE

1. In-Home Offices:
    1. Town staff may, upon application, issue a home occupation business license, which shall state the in-home office use permitted and any limitations imposed thereon.
    2. The license shall not be issued until the applicant represents that the applied for use will not violate covenants, conditions and restrictions or other deed restrictions affecting the use of the property involved.
    3. The license shall not be issued unless the Town staff is satisfied that the applicant will meet all of the conditions listed below, and that the applicant has agreed in writing to comply with all said conditions.
2. Home Occupations Other Than In-Home Offices:
    1. The Town Planning Commission may, upon application, issue a home occupation business license, which shall state the home occupation business permitted, the conditions attached thereto, and any time limitations imposed thereon.
    2. The license shall not be issued until the applicant represents that the applied for use will not violate covenants, conditions and restrictions or other deed restrictions affecting the use of the property involved.
    3. The license shall not be issued unless the planning commission is satisfied that the applicant will meet all of the conditions listed in this section, and that the applicant has agreed in writing to comply with all said conditions.
    4. If the proposed home occupation business involves children in any way, then prior to an application being put on the planning commission agenda for approval, a criminal background check shall be obtained on the applicant and all other persons who would be involved with the home occupation business or who would be at the home occupation business location when children are present during business hours.

HIDEOUT, UT

Business Licensing Department
10860 N. Hideout Trail
Hideout, Utah 84036

BUSINESS LICENSE APPLICATION - 2026

	STATE SALES TAX NUMBER	STATE LICENSE NUMBER
	16688965-002-[redacted]	14706383-[redacted]
UTAH DBA FILE NUMBER	**FEDERAL I.D. NUMBER**	**SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER**
NA	42-315[redacted]	[redacted]

BUSINESS NAME, "DOING BUSINESS AS" & PHYSICAL ADDRESS:
Uintah Trading Co. LLC
[redacted] Hideout, Utah
84036
(No DBA)

BUSINESS TYPE:
Corporation ____
Limited Liability X
Limited Partnership ____
Other ____

MAILING ADDRESS:
Uintah Trading Co. LLC
7533 S Center View Ct Ste R, West Jordan, UT 84084

TELEPHONE (BUSINESS)	MAX. OCCUPANCY
435-709-5680	2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY:	HOME OCCUPATION	E-Mail Address	# OF EMPLOYEES
Classic firearms reconditioning and appraisal	YES ☑ NO ☐	mikezarkos700@gmail.com	1

MANAGER'S NAME	**ADDRESS (HOME)**	**TELEPHONE (HOME)**	**DATE OF BIRTH**
Michael Zarkos	[redacted], Hideout, Ut 84036	[redacted]	[redacted]
AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS			
Michael Zarkos	[redacted], Hideout, Ut 84036		
OWNER NAME			
Michael Zarkos	[redacted], Hideout, Ut 84036		

I certify under penalty of perjury and license revocation that I am the authorized representative of the property owner; that I have read, know and fully understand the information and provisions of this license and the accompanying ordinance section governing business licenses; I certify that the information provided and representation made are complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge and my application is in accordance with Hideout ordinances. This license shall be VOID if information or representations provided by licensee is incorrect or later changes and I fail to update such information within ten business days of the change of information. I acknowledge and understand the following: 1) That THIS IS NOT A LICENSE, but merely an application for a license to do business within Hideout 2) That if my application is approved, I shall be notified and issued a license certificate which must be displayed at my place of business at all times. 3) That all Business Licenses expire on December 31st of the year issued. 4) That the granting of this license to do business within Hideout does not discharge or replace any other licensing or registration requirements I may have under City, County, State or Federal laws. 5) A $15.00 inspection fee must be paid at the time of application, for all new businesses or businesses who have changed location.

POSITION Manager SIGNATURE [signature] DATE 07/26/26

GENERAL BUSINESS LICENSE

ADMINISTRATION FEE $83.00

CODE NUMBER	FEE RATE	X	# OF UNITS	=	AMOUNT DUE
		X		=	
		X		=	
		X		=	
		X		=	

TOTAL BUSINESS LICENSE FEE $ ____

CITY CLEARANCE:

BUILDING DEPT.	APPROVED _____	REJECTED _____	DATE
PLANNING DEPT.	APPROVED _____	REJECTED _____	DATE

STAFF NOTES:

File Attachments for Item:

1. Approval of the November 20, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

TOWN OF HIDEOUT, UTAH
November 20, 2025 - 6:00 P.M.
10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in a Regular Meeting on Thursday, November 20, 2025, at 6:00 p.m., in person at Hideout Town Hall and electronically via Zoom.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Glynnis Tihansky presided. The supplied dialogue begins during an audio check and roll call shortly after the scheduled 6:00 p.m. start and does not contain a formal call-to-order statement or time.

II. ROLL CALL

Chair:	Glynnis Tihansky
Commissioners:	Rachel Cooper and Donna Turner
Alternate Commissioners:	Brad Airmet and Catherine Woltering (attending electronically)
Absent:	Commissioners Joel Pieper and Chase Winder
Town Staff and Advisors:	Thomas Eddington, Town Planner (attending electronically), and Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Recorder
Applicants and Public:	John Travis; another applicant representative attending electronically; Brian Cooper, Shoreline One resident and Councilmember-elect; and other participants not clearly identified in the supplied dialogue

A quorum was present. The discussion following the minutes vote indicated that Alternate Commissioner Airmet served as a voting member in place of an absent regular commissioner; Alternate Commissioner Woltering was present but did not need to vote.

III. PUBLIC INPUT

Chair Tihansky opened the floor for public input on matters not listed on the agenda. Brian Cooper identified himself as a Shoreline One resident and Councilmember-elect. He began comments concerning hotel demand and the value of the proposed annexation parcels. Chair Tihansky clarified that comments concerning an agenda item should be reserved for that item, and Mr. Cooper concluded his remarks. No other public comments were offered.

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

1. October 16, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes

No corrections or other comments were requested.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Rachel Cooper to approve the October 16, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes.

The vote was as follows:

Chair Tihansky, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Alternate Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Alternate Commissioner Woltering, Did Not Vote

The motion carried by a vote of 4-0.

V. AGENDA ITEMS

The agenda stated that the following items were for discussion only and that no votes would be taken.

1. Discussion of a Proposed Concept Plan for the Hideout Mountain Village Annexation

Town Planner Thomas Eddington reviewed an annexation petition previously presented to the Town Council and explained that the work-session discussion was intended to obtain early Planning Commission input while the applicants refined their concepts. The proposed annexation involved two parcels near the intersection of SR-248 and Jordanelle Parkway: a 1.02-acre parcel at 1141 Lori Lane with one associated water share, and a 1.90-acre parcel at 1160 Lori Lane with seven associated water shares.

Mr. Eddington stated that both parcels were within the Town's annexation declaration area and could be contiguous to the Town through the Silver Meadows/Richardson Flat annexation corridor along SR-248 and Jordanelle Parkway. He emphasized that the images in the packet were precedent and conceptual images only and were not final building designs.

For the smaller parcel, the applicants discussed a drive-through coffee shop and the possibility of a second tenant, such as a bakery, breakfast restaurant, fast-casual restaurant, grab-and-go market, or take-and-bake food business. The discussion included possible interest from a national coffee operator as well as outreach to local businesses. Commissioners and the applicants discussed access from Lori Lane, the existing site elevation and retaining condition, pedestrian and bicycle connections to nearby sidewalks and the Richardson Flat pathway, a possible marked crossing, and the need to coordinate any improvements with Wasatch County. Commissioners also requested restrained signage, such as monument signage, that would remain compatible with the surrounding area and avoid obstructing views.

For the larger parcel, the applicants presented several alternatives, including ground-floor commercial space with residential units above, a boutique hotel, and an all-commercial development. Mr. Travis clarified that one concept image showed an entirely commercial project with underground parking, a bridge-like connection between building areas, and a restaurant or gathering space with an upper-level deck. The applicants stated that additional water would be required for a hotel or multifamily project and expressed concern that available water could limit those uses.

The discussion increasingly focused on community-serving commercial uses. Mr. Travis described a possible 6,000- to 8,000-square-foot high-end neighborhood market offering deli, meat, pastry, and prepared or takeout foods, together with possible restaurant space. Participants discussed construction costs, achievable commercial lease rates, hotel occupancy and market demand, and the importance of a financially viable project. Commissioners responded favorably to orienting the building so it would be visible from SR-248 while parking remained behind or below the building.

The Planning Commission expressed general interest in commercial uses that would provide services to residents and visitors while protecting views, providing safe nonmotorized connections, minimizing the visual impact of parking and signage, and addressing water availability. No formal action was taken. The applicants were expected to use the comments to continue refining the concept.

2. Discussion of Hideout Fire Station Rezone

The agenda packet included a staff report concerning a proposed rezone of the approximately 3.35-acre Town-owned parcel on SR-248 from Mountain (M) to Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU). The proposed zoning would allow Fire Station 56, and potentially a future Town Public Works facility, to be considered as conditional public-service uses. The staff report anticipated a public hearing before the Planning Commission in December, followed by a formal recommendation to the Town Council.

The supplied dialogue ends during Agenda Item 1 and does not include this item. Accordingly, the record provided does not establish whether the fire-station rezone was discussed or what direction, if any, was given. No formal action is documented.

3. Discussion of Hideout General Plan Update and Community Survey Results

The agenda packet reported that 269 people participated in the General Plan survey, which was open from September 25 through November 5, 2025, and had an 83.3 percent completion rate. The presentation identified views and location, community, outdoor recreation, and proximity to activities among the features respondents valued most. Common concerns included residential expansion and density, narrow roads and unsafe connections, construction, environmental maintenance, and distance from amenities and services. Respondents also expressed interest in grocery, restaurant, retail, recreational, and community uses; improved walking and biking connections; safer highway crossings; and protection of Hideout's natural character.

The staff report stated that the consultants would present General Plan scenarios to the Planning Commission and Town Council at a follow-up meeting on December 3, 2025. The supplied dialogue does not include this agenda item, so the record provided does not establish whether the survey results were presented or what comments were made. No formal action is documented.

VI. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The supplied dialogue ends at approximately 31 minutes and 52 seconds during Agenda Item 1 and does not contain the remainder of the meeting. No adjournment motion, vote, or time can be determined from the materials provided.

These minutes were prepared from the meeting agenda, agenda packet, and supplied dialogue and were approved by the Hideout Planning Commission on September 16, 2026.

Maria Devereux, Town Recorder
Minutes: EG

File Attachments for Item:

2. Approval of the February 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS MINUTES
TOWN OF HIDEOUT, UTAH
February 19, 2026 - 5:00 P.M.
10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in a Regular Meeting and Public Hearings on Thursday, February 19, 2026, at approximately 5:00 p.m., in person at Hideout Town Hall and electronically via Zoom.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Donna Turner called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m. and presided until the Commission elected a Chair later in the meeting.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance is listed on the agenda, but the supplied dialogue does not contain an audible recitation or other confirmation that it occurred.

III. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present:	Donna Turner, Rachel Cooper, Brad Airmet, JD Cronin, and Dr. Steve Powell
Attending Electronically:	Catherine Woltering
Arriving After Call to Order:	Chase Winder, who joined before the officer elections
Town Staff and Advisors:	Thomas Eddington, Town Planner; Polly McLean, Town Attorney; Corbin Gordon, incoming Town Attorney; and Maria Devereux, Town Recorder
Presenters and Applicants:	Rob Terry, Land Use Training Director, Office of the Property Rights Ombudsman; representatives of the Wildhorse and Deer Springs applicants; and other consultants
Public:	Brian Cooper, Monica Johnson, Kevin and Laura Eldridge, Ross Johnson, and other members of the public whose names were not clearly captured in the supplied dialogue

A quorum was present. All seven commissioners were present for the officer elections and the two subdivision matters.

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

1. December 18, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes

Several commissioners noted that they had not attended the December meeting. Town Attorney Polly McLean advised that the Commission could approve the minutes based on the recollections of members who had attended and reviewed the draft. Two commissioners who attended the December meeting stated that the draft was accurate to the best of their recollection.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Brad Airmet and seconded to approve the December 18, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes. The supplied dialogue does not clearly identify the maker of the motion or the seconder.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Cronin, Abstain
Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Abstain
Commissioner Powell, Abstain
Commissioner Woltering, Yes
The motion passed by a vote of 3-0, with 3 Abstentions.

V. AGENDA ITEMS

1. Introduction and Welcome of Newly Appointed Planning Commissioners

The Commission welcomed newly appointed Commissioners JD Cronin and Dr. Steve Powell, who had been sworn in before the meeting. Dr. Powell stated that he had lived in Hideout for approximately eight years after a career as a physician in Connecticut and described his family and interest in skiing, cycling, hiking, snowshoeing, and cross-country skiing. Commissioner Cronin described his professional background in finance, trading, banking, and work with the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. He stated that he hoped to contribute a financial perspective and assist the Town in preserving and improving the community. No formal action was taken.

2. Land Use Training

Rob Terry, Statewide Land Use Training Director with the Office of the Property Rights Ombudsman, presented land-use training for the Commission. He described the Ombudsman Office as a neutral resource that provides information, education, mediation, and advisory opinions in disputes involving private-property rights and governmental interests. He also identified the Land Use Academy of Utah as a resource containing training materials, guidebooks, presentations, and model documents.

Mr. Terry reviewed Utah land-use law and the purposes of the Land Use Development and Management Act, including protection of health, safety, welfare, prosperity, good order, convenience, and community aesthetics. He described the General Plan as a required, long-range, advisory document intended to guide the community while remaining capable of amendment as circumstances change. He explained that zoning and other land-use ordinances implement the General Plan and should be clear, internally consistent, and applied fairly.

The training distinguished legislative decisions, such as adoption of a General Plan, land-use ordinances, zoning changes, and annexations, from administrative decisions that apply existing standards to a specific application. Mr. Terry explained that the Town Council acts legislatively, while the Planning Commission generally makes recommendations but may also serve as the designated land-use authority for administrative applications. He and Town staff confirmed that preliminary subdivisions involving single-family, two-family, and townhome development are administrative under current Utah law and that Hideout had designated the Planning Commission as the approval authority for those preliminary subdivisions.

Mr. Terry emphasized that administrative decisions must follow the adopted standards, be supported by substantial evidence in the record, and interpret unresolved ambiguity in favor of the land-use applicant. Public opinion and preference may be considered in legislative matters, but an administrative land-use decision must be based on applicable standards and fact-based evidence rather than popularity or opposition. The Commission also discussed communications received outside a meeting, parking requirements, guest parking, and the Commission's ability to recommend future ordinance amendments to the Town Council. No formal action was taken.

3. Annual Appointment of the Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair

Commissioner Woltering nominated Commissioner Chase Winder for Chair, and Commissioner Turner nominated Commissioner Rachel Cooper. The nominees summarized their backgrounds, Planning Commission service, and interest in serving as Chair.

Motion: Commissioner Turner moved to appoint Commissioner Chase Winder as Planning Commission Chair. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Catherine Walterine.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Airmet, No
Commissioner Cooper, No
Commissioner Turner, No
Commissioner Powell, No
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion failed by a vote of 3-4.

Motion: Commissioner Turner moved to appoint Commissioner Rachel Cooper as Planning Commission Chair. The supplied dialogue confirms that the motion was seconded by Commissioner Chase Winder.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Cronin, No
Commissioner Winder, No
Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, No

The motion carried by a vote of 4-3. Commissioner Rachel Cooper was appointed Planning Commission Chair.

The Commission then considered Vice Chair. Commissioners Catherine Woltering and Chase Winder were nominated.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Brad Airmet and seconded by Commissioner Chase Winder to appoint Commissioner Chase Winder as Planning Commission Vice Chair.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Cronin, No
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, No
Commissioner Turner, No
Commissioner Powell, No
Commissioner Woltering, No

The motion failed by a vote of 2-5.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Donna Turner and seconded by Commissioner JD Cronin to appoint Commissioner Catherine Woltering as Planning Commission Vice Chair.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Winder, No
Commissioner Airmet, No
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried by a vote of 5-2. Commissioner Catherine Woltering was appointed Planning Commission Vice Chair. Chair Cooper then assumed responsibility for conducting the meeting.

4. Review and Approval of the Planning Commission Rules and Regulations

Town Attorney Polly McLean explained that the draft rules had been distributed previously, had been reviewed by the Town Council, and had been revised to address comments received. Because the document had only been redistributed to the Commission on the morning of the meeting, she suggested that the Commission identify desired changes and continue final consideration until the next meeting so incoming Town Attorney Corbin Gordon could also review the document.

Chair Cooper proposed adding an expectation that commissioners visit the site of a pending land-use application, either individually or through a properly noticed group visit, before acting on the application. She also proposed a regular report from the Chair and commissioners concerning meetings with the Mayor or other Town officials when the information related to Planning Commission responsibilities. Discussion addressed the need to define the scope and form of those reports and to avoid improper ex parte communications with applicants. Counsel noted that the draft already discouraged ex parte communications and required disclosure when such communications occurred.

The Commission also discussed updating references to the seven-member Commission, attaching the current Town Code after the municipal code update was completed, and ensuring that new commissioners had access to Town email and the agenda materials.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Walterine and seconded by Commissioner JD Cronin to continue review and approval of the Planning Commission Rules and Regulations until the next regular meeting to allow the proposed revisions and additional legal review.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC INPUT

At counsel's suggestion, the Commission received public input on matters not otherwise scheduled for public hearing. Monica Johnson, a West Ascent resident, asked whether the Planning Commission was subject to a conflict-of-interest policy and whether commissioners completed an annual conflict certification. Counsel explained that state conflict and ethics requirements applied to appointed commissioners and were referenced in the proposed rules. Participants also discussed annual Open and Public Meetings Act training, which was separate from a conflict disclosure. Chair Cooper supported considering an annual conflict-of-interest disclosure as a transparency measure. No formal action was taken.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Wildhorse Preliminary Subdivision - Parcel 00-0020-8164

Town Planner Thomas Eddington reviewed the preliminary subdivision for the approximately 15.12-acre Wildhorse development located east of SR-248 and north of the KLAIM development. The proposal included seven single-family lots, five detached villa lots, and one neighborhood-commercial lot. He stated that the proposed plat, lot arrangement, and road network conformed to the Concept Plan, rezoning, and Master Development Agreement approved by the Town Council in November 2025.

Mr. Eddington explained that the conditions previously negotiated for the development were incorporated into the Master Development Agreement. Those conditions included emergency access through the adjoining KLAIM property, stormwater and roadway requirements, retaining-wall and pedestrian-safety requirements, undergrounding of utilities if permitted by the utility provider, trails and sidewalks, snow storage, and restrictions preserving the commercial use of the commercial lot. Staff would also confirm whether Gray Woolf Road required additional plat work and would correct plat notes and signature blocks before final subdivision approval. The Town Engineer's written review identified technical corrections but concluded that none was significant and recommended approval conditioned on continued work with staff.

Commissioners discussed the five individual villa driveways, noting that the Planning Commission had previously recommended fewer access points but that the Town Council ultimately approved the individual accesses in the Master Development Agreement. Counsel explained that the preliminary subdivision was an administrative application and that the Commission was required to apply the standards and approved agreement. The Commission also discussed the recorded height restriction, steep grades, driveway safety, relocation of a utility pole, the emergency-access easement, ensuring that emergency access and snow-storage areas remained unobstructed, residential and commercial signage, the distinction between HOA open space and the publicly accessible trail, and year-round pedestrian access.

The applicant agreed to coordinate with staff and the HOA so that the sidewalk and decomposed-granite trail would remain a safe pedestrian passage, including during winter conditions. The Commission also discussed drainage and runoff affecting Lot 1, retaining-wall details, the speed limit on the private road, and the technical items in the Town Engineer's report.

Chair Cooper opened the public hearing. One in-person resident thanked the Planning Commission and applicant for their work. Brian Cooper, attending electronically, also expressed appreciation for the applicant's cooperation with staff and commented on the proposed speed limit. No opposition to the application was expressed, and the public hearing was closed.

Motion: Chair Cooper moved to approve the Wildhorse Preliminary Subdivision subject to the conditions contained in the Planning and Engineering Staff Reports and the approved Master Development Agreement. The motion was seconded by Commissioner JD Cronin.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

2. Deer Springs Phase 3 Preliminary Subdivision - Parcel 00-0021-3162

Mr. Eddington reviewed the Deer Springs Phase 3 preliminary subdivision. Phase 3 proposed 27 townhome lots, extension of Belaview Way through a new road identified as Two-Point Circle, a community park, playground, dog park, and trails connecting to prior phases. He explained that the location and general program were contemplated by the Deer Springs Master Development Agreement.

Staff identified retaining walls near SR-248 that would exceed current Town limits but were authorized by the existing Master Development Agreement. Staff proposed natural-looking wall materials, landscaped breaks, and vegetation to reduce the visual scale and assist with sound attenuation. The Commission reviewed the required park amenities, including pickleball courts, a pavilion, playground, open space, dog park, and trails. Staff recommended retaining native vegetation in passive areas to conserve water and discussed replacing the contemplated amphitheater with an outdoor exercise course, subject to any Town Council approval required by the agreement.

The applicant submitted information indicating that the community park contained approximately 2.54 acres and the dog park approximately 1.13 acres, exceeding the 3.5-acre combined requirement. The Master Development Agreement required the park improvements to be completed before any certificate of occupancy was issued in Phase 3. The applicant stated that it intended to construct the park and residential improvements during the same construction season and believed it could comply, although any proposed amendment to that timing would require further Town approval.

The Commission and applicant discussed the size of the pavilion, possible swings in the playground, bicycle racks, electrical service and hours for the pavilion, dark-sky lighting, drainage, the timing and winter maintenance of trail connections, possible parking near the dog park, public access to privately maintained HOA amenities, and whether the dog-park access route could be kept usable during winter. Discussion also addressed Town entry signs, the proposed replacement or relocation of the monument sign near Belaview Way and Shoreline Drive, permanent or temporary speed-radar signs, traffic calming, trail easements, road width, and corrections required by the Town Engineer.

Chair Cooper opened the public hearing. Residents expressed concerns that earlier Deer Springs phases and landscaping were not complete; pedestrians lacked safe routes; vehicles traveled at excessive speeds; permanent speed controls and traffic-calming measures were needed; and the Town should ensure that previously approved commitments were completed. Residents also raised concerns regarding construction debris, landscaping failures, wildfire risk, compliance with Firewise and Wildland-Urban Interface standards, dog-park hours and rules, snow removal, maintenance costs, HOA responsibility, and the effect of a community-wide public amenity on existing HOA members. A commenter recommended drought-tolerant grass and encouraged participation in Town public-safety and water-conservation committees. The applicant stated that it would work with residents and staff to address the concerns, including park rules, maintenance, access, trash collection, and construction practices.

Staff confirmed that the proposed landscaping would be required to comply with the Town's Wildland-Urban Interface standards. Counsel and staff explained that this was the required public hearing for the preliminary subdivision and that, if the matter were continued, the later meeting would remain public but would not constitute another public hearing. Written comments could still be submitted to the Town for the record.

Motion: Commissioner Woltering moved to continue review and possible action on the Deer Springs Phase 3 Preliminary Subdivision to the March 19, 2026 Planning Commission meeting so the applicant and staff could address the outstanding questions. The motion was seconded by Commissioner JD Cronin.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously. The matter was continued to March 19, 2026.

VIII. GENERAL PLAN WORK SESSION

Mr. Eddington invited the Commission to provide observations from the February 10 community open house and explained that the consultants would prepare the draft General Plan and return to the Commission over the next several months for review and direction. Commissioners requested a clearer framework and timeline describing the Commission's responsibilities and anticipated work products.

The Commission requested that the survey results be separated by full-time residents, part-time residents, and nonresidents so the Commission could evaluate whether priorities differed among respondent groups. Commissioners also discussed reopening or extending the survey to obtain additional participation. Staff agreed to coordinate an email reminder and direct survey link, and commissioners agreed to distribute the survey through neighborhood email lists. The discussion proposed keeping the survey open through approximately March 15, 2026, before the next Planning Commission meeting.

Staff stated that demographic, census, and geographic-information-system data had largely been collected, while public input and preparation of the required General Plan elements would continue. The Commission noted that a future opportunity for public comment would be provided as the draft progressed. No formal action was taken.

IX. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Near the conclusion of the meeting, commissioners thanked outgoing Town Attorney Polly McLean for her service.

Motion: Commissioner Steve Powell moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Brad Airmet seconded the Motion.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at approximately 8:21pm.

These minutes were prepared from the meeting agenda, agenda packet, and supplied dialogue and were approved by the Hideout Planning Commission on September 17, 2026.

_____
Maria Devereux, Town Recorder

Minutes: EG

File Attachments for Item:

3. Approval of the March 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS MINUTES
TOWN OF HIDEOUT, UTAH
March 19, 2026 - 6:00 P.M.
10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in a Regular Meeting and Public Hearings on Thursday, March 19, 2026, at 6:02 p.m., in person at Hideout Town Hall and electronically via Zoom.

I. WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

Chair Rachel Cooper called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Chair:	Rachel Cooper
Vice Chair:	Catherine Woltering (attending electronically)
Commission Members:	Brad Airmet, JD Cronin, Dr. Steve Powell, and Donna Turner
Absent:	Chase Winder
Town Staff and Advisors:	Town Planner Thomas Eddington, Town Attorney Corbin Gordon, and Town Recorder Maria Devereux.

The opening roll call is partially unclear in the supplied dialogue. The subsequent discussion and votes confirm the attendance shown above. A quorum was present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Cooper opened the floor for public comment on matters not listed on the agenda. No comments were offered in person or electronically.

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

1. February 19, 2026 Regular Meeting and Public Hearing Minutes

Chair Cooper directed that consideration of the February 19, 2026 draft minutes be continued to the April meeting. No formal motion, second, or vote is audible in the supplied dialogue, and no other action was taken on the minutes.

Before beginning the land-use matters, the Commission informally discussed whether regular meetings should begin at 5:00 p.m. rather than 6:00 p.m. Members generally preferred retaining the 6:00 p.m. start time because of work schedules and public convenience. Staff noted that an earlier start could be considered and properly noticed for a meeting with an unusually full agenda. No formal motion or vote was taken.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Deer Springs Phase 3 Preliminary Subdivision - Parcel 00-0021-3162

Town Planner Thomas Eddington reviewed the Deer Springs Phase 3 preliminary subdivision, which had been continued from the February 19, 2026 meeting. The proposal included 27 townhome lots, extension of Belaview Way and construction of Two-Point Circle, a community park, pickleball courts, a pavilion, playground, dog park, and trails connecting to the prior phases.

Mr. Eddington summarized revisions and responses to the concerns raised at the prior meeting. The applicant added eight parking spaces around the cul-de-sac near the dog park. Staff confirmed that retaining walls adjacent to SR-248 could reach approximately 20 feet under the existing Master Development Agreement, although the walls would be required to use natural-looking or stained materials and landscaping to reduce their visual impact. The pavilion would be enlarged to meet the agreement, the

lighting would be dark-sky compliant, and the final landscape and plat details would be coordinated with Town staff.

The Commission discussed potential amendments to the Master Development Agreement, including replacing fixed barbecues with propane cooking facilities, replacing the contemplated amphitheater with an outdoor exercise course, and allowing alternate playground equipment. Those changes would be presented to the Town Council as required. Commissioners also discussed bicycle racks, Town entry and monument signs, permanent speed-radar signs, a possible stop sign at the new intersection, construction cleanup, landscaping, public access to the trails and park amenities, and winter maintenance of the trail leading to the dog park.

The applicant agreed to work with staff regarding the proposed hybrid or drought-tolerant sod, supplemental landscaping, construction debris, traffic-safety measures, and trail maintenance. At the Commission's request, the applicant also agreed to investigate whether a hydroseed mixture could be used that did not contain the grass referred to during the meeting as “tiger tail,” because of concerns regarding dogs.

Counsel clarified that the required public hearing on this preliminary subdivision had been held at the February meeting and could not be reopened as a second public hearing under the applicable subdivision process. The matter remained before the Commission at a public meeting for final action, and no additional public testimony was taken.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Donna Turner and seconded by Commissioner Steve Powell to approve the Deer Springs Phase 3 Preliminary Subdivision, subject to the conditions in the Planning Staff Report and continued review by the Town Planner and Town Engineer. A second was made. The supplied dialogue does not clearly identify the maker of the motion or the seconder.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Absent
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

2. Hideout Fire Station Conditional Use Application - Parcel 00-0021-2486

Mr. Eddington reviewed the conditional use application for a permanent fire station on the approximately 3.39-acre Town-owned parcel along SR-248. The Town Council had rezoned the property to Neighborhood Mixed Use, in which a fire station or other public-services facility is a conditional use. Staff concluded that the proposed station satisfied the general conditional-use criteria because it was consistent with the General Plan, provided a necessary public service, enhanced public health and safety, and could be approved subject to reasonable conditions.

The Commission reviewed the proposed mountain-modern building design, placement of the structure into the hillside, retaining walls, landscaping and revegetation, screening of the generator, transformer, mechanical equipment, and trash enclosure, building setbacks, emergency access, and the future access connection to a possible Town Public Works facility. Staff recommended that the project remain subject to the conditions in the planning report and any engineering conditions developed during final review.

Lincoln Li explained that the SR-248 access would include a flashing red emergency beacon and advance-warning devices approximately 500 feet on each side of the entrance. He and the Fire District representatives discussed the ongoing UDOT process for a conditional access permit and limited-access

break. The Fire District anticipated committing to future acceleration and deceleration lanes within approximately three to five years, subject to final UDOT requirements and funding.

The Wasatch County Fire Chief stated that the station would initially house a Type 1/3 pumper capable of structural and wildland fire response and an ambulance. The station would have a minimum of three cross-trained personnel who could respond in the fire apparatus or ambulance depending on the call. He stated that the location provided the best available coverage for Hideout and improved response time by providing direct access to SR-248.

Chair Cooper opened the public hearing. A neighboring resident who identified himself as Bill expressed concern regarding the speed and safety of SR-248 and described a prior fatal collision involving a vehicle that swerved to avoid a deer near the proposed station site. He requested that the existing game fence be continued or relocated around the developed area to discourage wildlife from entering the highway. The Fire District agreed to coordinate with the Town and applicant regarding appropriate fencing. The dialogue does not contain a formal statement closing the public hearing before the Commission acted.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Donna Turner to approve the Hideout Fire Station Conditional Use Application, subject to the conditions in the Planning Staff Report, conditions imposed through Town Engineer review, and the additional conditions discussed during the meeting, including coordination regarding wildlife fencing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Donna Turner.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Absent
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

3. Hideout Fire Station Preliminary Subdivision - Parcel 00-0021-2486

Mr. Eddington reviewed the preliminary subdivision that would divide the Town-owned property into two lots: one for the fire station and one for a future public-services building, potentially a relocated Public Works facility. The subdivision also preserved access and utility arrangements needed to serve the future Town facility.

The primary unresolved issue concerned the Neighborhood Mixed Use side-yard setback. The concept and UDOT access documents appeared to assume a 20-foot setback, while the current zoning standard required 30 feet. Staff discussed moving the property line or shifting the building and access approximately ten feet, but the project team cautioned that changing the alignment could require substantial revisions to the pending UDOT access documents. The Commission and staff also discussed whether a variance, easement, acquisition of additional land, or another legally permissible solution could address the setback.

Additional conditions included clarification of the retaining-wall heights and materials, the location of the trash enclosure, calculation and management of cut and fill, maintenance of natural topography, and completion of the acceleration and deceleration lane drawings before final subdivision approval.

Chair Cooper opened the public hearing. John Travis commented on the long-term treatment of SR-248 as a potential Main Street corridor and asked whether the proposed location provided the best response coverage. The Fire Chief responded that the Fire District had evaluated the available locations and that the proposed site, with direct highway access, provided the best coverage for the existing Town and anticipated growth. No additional electronic comments were offered. The dialogue does not contain a formal statement closing the public hearing before the Commission acted.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Brad Airmet to approve the Hideout Fire Station Preliminary Subdivision, subject to the conditions in the Planning Staff Report, the Town Engineer's conditions, all additional conditions discussed during the meeting, and legal review to determine whether the setback issue could be resolved lawfully without obtaining a variance. A second was made by Commissioner JD Powell.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0.

VI. WORK SESSION

1. Hideout Mountain Village

Mr. Eddington and the applicants presented updated concepts and a draft Annexation Master Development Agreement for two parcels near the intersection of SR-248 and Jordanelle Parkway. The approximately 1.02-acre parcel at 1141 Lori Lane was proposed for a drive-through coffee shop and potentially one or more additional small commercial tenants. The approximately 1.90-acre parcel at 1160 Lori Lane could contain retail or restaurant uses with office or residential space above, or a boutique hotel.

The Commission reviewed the site-specific plans and precedent images and discussed creating a coordinated village appearance rather than a conventional suburban commercial development. Commissioners generally favored mountain-modern architecture, warm and natural materials, stone elements, shade, outdoor seating, pedestrian connections, bicycle parking, and sufficient vehicle parking and drive-through stacking. Discussion also addressed the size and height of the larger building, underground parking, transit or shuttle service, and preserving flexibility for locally owned businesses and temporary food vendors.

Staff explained that drive-through uses were not otherwise allowed under the Town's current commercial regulations, but that the Annexation Master Development Agreement could expressly authorize the anticipated coffee-shop drive-through. The Commission discussed limiting that authorization to the coffee-shop site and avoiding formula fast-food uses while preserving reasonable flexibility for other national or regional tenants. The applicants stated that the coffee-shop design would be adapted to the proposed village character rather than using a standard suburban prototype.

Staff stated that the draft agreement would next be presented to the Town Council and might return to the Planning Commission for additional input as the agreement, annexation, permitted uses, and business concepts were refined. During the discussion, participants expressed general support for the concept. This was an informal indication of support during a non-voting work session; no formal motion, second, or recorded vote occurred.

3. Silver Meadows Annexation - Taken Out of Agenda Order

At Chair Cooper's request, Mr. Eddington provided an overview of the Silver Meadows Annexation Master Development Agreement executed on October 16, 2020. The approximately 348- to 350-acre project contemplated 240 single-family lots, 95 cottage lots, 40 twin-home units, 100 apartments, 125 town-center condominium units, approximately 95,000 square feet of net retail and commercial space, approximately 72,800 square feet for assisted living, and approximately 206 acres of open space.

Staff explained that at least 20 percent of the residential units were required to qualify as affordable housing, with an average affordability level at or below 80 percent of area median income. The housing program included both ownership and rental products, with deed restrictions contemplated for the affordable units. The denser apartments, condominiums, and mixed-use buildings were concentrated in the proposed town center, while the hillside areas contained cottage lots, twin homes, and single-family lots.

The Commission discussed the town center, retail and commercial uses, trails and open-space preservation, institutional sites for possible fire or police facilities, the rail-trail corridor, and the possibility of a Richardson Peak gondola. Members also discussed the assisted-living site. Staff explained that assisted living was an authorized option and that the designated property could not be used for another purpose without returning to the Town for an amendment or renegotiation. Environmental cleanup and the relationship between the project, Richardson Flat, Park City, and the surrounding annexation areas were also discussed.

The presentation was informational. No formal action was taken.

2. General Plan Work Session

The Commission reviewed the draft future land-use map, active transportation and open-space map, and possible questions for the second General Plan community survey. Staff proposed a survey of approximately ten multiple-choice questions that could be completed in five to ten minutes and asked the Commission to identify the subjects on which public input would be most useful.

Discussion included potential transit and shuttle use, desired bus-stop locations and parking, use of Richardson Flat as a park-and-ride or transfer location, future use of the existing Public Works site if the facility were relocated, and the appropriate number, location, and character of commercial nodes. Commissioners emphasized differentiating the future town center from smaller neighborhood-serving commercial areas and avoiding an oversupply or scattered pattern of commercial zoning.

The Commission also discussed safe pedestrian and bicycle highway crossings, trail connections, wildlife crossings, annexation objectives and boundaries, the effect of annexation on the tax base and municipal services, and whether the survey should ask residents directly about future annexations. Members recommended removing the water-taxi concept as impractical and adding questions regarding assisted living, senior housing, transitional or step-down housing, and whether residents would use or bring family members to such facilities in Hideout.

Commissioners requested improved map readability, clearer labels, and questions that would generate useful planning direction rather than general preferences. Staff agreed to work with the planning consultants to refine the maps and survey questions and to return the materials to the Commission. No formal action was taken.

VII. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Steve Powell and seconded by Commissioner Catherine Wolterine to adjourn the meeting. No roll-call or voice vote on the motion is audible.

The meeting concluded at approximately 9:25 p.m., after which the recording was stopped.

These minutes were prepared from the meeting agenda, agenda packet, and supplied dialogue and were approved by the Hideout Planning Commission on September 16, 2026.

_____

Maria Devereux, Town Recorder

Minutes: CG

File Attachments for Item:

4. Approval of the April 16, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF HIDEOUT, UTAH
April 16, 2026 - 6:00 P.M.
10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in a Regular Meeting on Thursday, April 16, 2026, at 6:02 p.m., in person at Hideout Town Hall and electronically via Zoom.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Rachel Cooper called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Chair:	Rachel Cooper
Vice Chair:	Catherine Woltering
Commission Members:	Chase Winder (attending electronically), Brad Airmet, JD Cronin, and Dr. Steve Powell
Excused:	Donna Turner
Town Staff and Advisors:	Town Planner Thomas Eddington and Town Attorney Corbin Gordon (attending electronically). The supplied dialogue does not clearly identify all other staff present.
Public:	Brian Cooper and an unidentified remote participant.

The opening roll call is partially unclear in the supplied dialogue. The subsequent discussion and votes confirm the attendance shown above. A quorum was present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Cooper opened the floor for public comment on matters not listed on the agenda. Brian Cooper requested that the Town create searchable versions of its Master Development Agreements and related development records and make them available through a centralized development repository on the Town website. He noted that scanned recorded copies are difficult to search and that the records would be useful to residents, homeowners associations, commissioners, council members, and staff.

Town Planner Thomas Eddington agreed to work with the Recorder regarding searchable PDF versions that retain signature pages and exhibits and to consider a more complete online repository organized by development. No other public comments were offered, and no formal action was taken.

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

At the beginning of the meeting, Chair Cooper directed that consideration of the draft minutes be deferred. The Commission returned to the April 8 draft near the end of the meeting. The March 19 draft was discussed but was not approved.

1. April 8, 2026 Planning Commission Special Meeting and Public Hearing

The Commission requested that the draft state that the setback provisions considered at the special meeting authorize a discretionary adjustment and do not create an entitlement to a reduced setback. Staff agreed to make that clarification.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Catherine Woltering to approve the April 8, 2026 Planning Commission Special Meeting and Public Hearing minutes, subject to the correction discussed during the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner JD Cronin.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Absent
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The minutes were approved unanimously among the council members present.

2. March 19, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting and Public Hearings

The Commission discussed whether the draft accurately reflected the separate actions taken on the fire-station matters and whether the project-specific setback issue required clarification or additional Commission action. Staff stated that the recording would be reviewed, the separate votes would be clarified in the draft, and the fire-station item would be brought back only if further action proved necessary.

No motion was made to approve the March 19, 2026 minutes. Consideration was continued to a future meeting.

V. AGENDA ITEMS

1. Discussion and Consideration to Approve the Revised Planning Commission Rules and Regulations

Mr. Eddington reviewed the history of the Planning Commission Rules and Regulations. The Town Council had recommended revisions associated with increasing the Commission from five regular members and two alternates to seven voting members and eliminating alternate positions. The related Town Code amendments had been completed, and the revised rules were returned to the Commission for final review and adoption.

Commissioners discussed the four-member quorum, outdated references in the attached code materials, annual election of the Chair and Vice Chair, required training, and the requirement that members notify the Chair and Recorder when they will be absent. Chair Cooper identified additional editorial corrections, including updating the membership language to reflect seven voting members. Town Attorney Corbin Gordon explained that the rules belong to the Planning Commission under the Town Code; the Commission could adopt its preferred version and then inform the Town Council without obtaining another Council approval, inasmuch as compliance is maintained with Utah Code §10-20-301.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Catherine Wolterine and seconded by Commissioner JD Cronin to approve the Planning Commission Rules and Regulations with the edits discussed by Chair Cooper and during the meeting.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Absent
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously among the council members present.

2. Discussion and Review of the Silver Meadows Annexation Master Development Agreement

The Commission continued its work-session review of the Silver Meadows Annexation and Master Development Agreement (AMDA), which governs approximately 348 acres and authorizes up to 600 residential units, approximately 95,000 square feet of commercial development, parks and open space, a town or community center, an optional assisted-living facility, and other public and recreational improvements. Mr. Eddington explained that the AMDA runs with the land and remains binding on the current developer, although the developer may request amendments.

Commissioners expressed concern that several commitments were insufficiently defined, including the size and programming of the town hall or community center, the timing and configuration of parks and public amenities, the school site, and the assisted-living facility. Members favored obtaining more specific commitments if the AMDA is amended or its deadlines are extended and requested that proposed building and site designs be presented early enough for meaningful review.

The Commission examined the affordable-housing provisions in detail. Members noted that the AMDA defines affordable housing at 80 percent or less of Summit County area median income, while the development table appears to count some units at 100 to 120 percent of area median income toward the overall 20-percent commitment. Commissioners questioned whether the table was internally consistent, whether the phasing could allow affordable units to be delayed, and whether projects above 80 percent of area median income would qualify for tax-credit or other financing. Members requested training for the Planning Commission and Town Council on affordable, workforce, and middle-income housing, available subsidies, and implementation strategies. Mr. Gordon stated that this subject could be incorporated into the planned “Hideout U” training program.

Discussion of the commercial and community components included the proposed 10,000-to-30,000-square-foot grocery store, the approximately 72,800-square-foot assisted-living facility, the relationship between residential and commercial phasing, building-height standards, and the possibility of prioritizing assisted living earlier in the project. The Commission also discussed broadening the permitted use of the eight-and-one-half-acre school site to allow a charter or specialty school, library, recreation fields, or another educational or public use if a traditional public school is not warranted.

The AMDA concept plan also depicts a possible recreational chairlift. Staff reported that the contemplated financial-feasibility study had not been completed. Commissioners discussed whether the concept could support hiking and mountain biking, activate the town-center plaza, or become part of a broader regional transportation or recreation connection involving Deer Valley, Park City, Richardson Flat, and preparations for the 2034 Winter Olympics. Members suggested that the Town consider a regional task force or Olympic committee, but no committee was created and no formal action was taken.

The Commission reviewed access and vesting provisions. Mr. Eddington reported that the developer was coordinating with UDOT regarding one or more SR-248 connections and that a connection north of the proposed town center was being considered. Mr. Gordon stated that the failure to attach or record the referenced vested-law exhibit did not eliminate vesting because the applicable laws could be identified as those in effect when the AMDA was executed; however, recording a clarifying exhibit would reduce future uncertainty.

Staff reported that several AMDA deadlines, including matters involving the SR-248 connection, Richardson Flat parking, the school site, design standards, and land for a potential town hall, had been extended through July 1, 2026. Mr. Gordon explained that amendments or extensions should ideally be documented in a written agreement executed by both parties. Commissioners asked staff and the Mayor to use the upcoming deadline and any requested extension as an opportunity to clarify conflicting or vague provisions, including affordable housing, public facilities, access, and the school-site use.

Commissioners also raised health and safety concerns regarding the nearby Richardson Flat mine-tailings and remediation areas. Members requested reliable environmental information regarding contaminated soils, dust, stormwater, groundwater, fencing, and any required cap or remediation before the Commission considers residential plats or other development applications in the affected area. Staff

agreed that the developer would be required to address those matters through engineering and environmental review before approvals are issued.

Mr. Eddington agreed to confer with the Mayor and the developer, consider an early working-group discussion, and ensure that the Commission receives necessary environmental and design information before future applications are presented. This was a discussion item, and no formal action was taken.

3. Discussion and Final Review of the General Plan Community Survey Questions - Town Survey No. 2

Mr. Eddington presented ten proposed multiple-choice questions developed from the Commission's March discussion. The survey was intended to take approximately five minutes and obtain focused public input for the General Plan update.

The Commission requested an optional open-ended comment field for additional concerns or recommendations. Members also recommended clarifying the Jordanelle question to identify motorized boat access and a possible water taxi at Ross Creek; adding preservation of open space as a possible reason for annexation; listing tennis and pickleball courts separately; and considering a question addressing viewsheds or reduced building heights in future annexations and areas not already vested.

During the survey discussion, commissioners also raised questions about whether parks, courts, trails, and other amenities maintained by homeowners associations are open to the public under the applicable development agreements. Staff agreed to review the Deer Waters agreement and related documents. The Commission further discussed how building height is measured from natural grade and confirmed that applicants must demonstrate compliance through plan review, engineering review, inspections, and final approval before certificates of occupancy are issued.

Staff proposed distributing the survey through the Town website and email or text notifications. Commissioners recommended sending the initial notice outside normal work hours and sending a reminder several days later. Staff anticipated opening the survey promptly, closing it in early May, returning the results at the next regular meeting, and discussing whether another public open house should be held as the consultants prepare the draft General Plan. No formal motion or vote was taken.

VI. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Motion: After the Commission completed its review of the meeting minutes, a motion was made by Commissioner Brad Airmet and seconded by Commissioner Catherine Woltering to adjourn the meeting.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Absent
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously among the council members present, and the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:44 p.m.

These minutes were prepared from the meeting agenda, agenda packet, and supplied dialogue and were approved by the Hideout Planning Commission on _____.

_____
Maria Devereux, Town Recorder

Minutes: EG

File Attachments for Item:

5. Approval of the May 21, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF HIDEOUT, UTAH
May 21, 2026 - 6:00 P.M.
10860 N. Hideout Trail, Hideout, Utah

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah, met in a Regular Meeting on Thursday, May 21, 2026, at approximately 6:00 p.m., in person at Hideout Town Hall and electronically via Zoom.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Rachel Cooper called the meeting to order at 6:01pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Chair:	Rachel Cooper
Vice Chair:	Catherine Woltering
Commission Members:	Brad Airmet, JD Cronin, Dr. Steve Powell, Donna Turner, and Chase Winder
Town Staff and Advisors:	Town Planner Thomas Eddington. General Plan consultants Jake Young and John Janson attended remotely. The dialogue references Town Recorder Maria Devereux but does not clearly establish all other staff present.
Public:	No public comment was offered. Other remote participants, if any, were not identified.

The verbal roll call is partially unclear. Commissioners JD Cronin, Chase Winder, Dr. Steve Powell, Catherine Woltering, and Brad Airmet are identifiable by name, and Chair Cooper concluded that all members were present. The record supports that all seven Commissioners attended, although the individual participation method is not fully discernible. Commissioner Airmet was participating remotely. A quorum was present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Cooper opened the floor for public comment on matters not listed on the agenda. No public comments were offered, and no formal action was taken.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

1. Fire Station - Consideration of Reduced Setbacks Based on Site Conditions

Town Planner Thomas Eddington explained that the Neighborhood Mixed Use zoning provisions had been amended to authorize the Planning Commission to reduce otherwise applicable setbacks for a public-safety facility when the reduction is necessary for the facility or site, is the minimum reasonably necessary, does not create unreasonable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated, and serves the public health, safety, and welfare. Although the Town had previously approved the fire-station zoning, conditional use, and subdivision, the amended ordinance required a separate Planning Commission determination regarding the setback reduction.

The revised site plan showed a 20-foot setback along the north side of the property where 30 feet would otherwise be required. The trash enclosure was also located close to the side property line, and the proposed soil-nail-wall easement extended into the setback area. Staff stated that the triangular shape and physical constraints of the site made the reductions necessary to accommodate construction and operation of the fire station. The staff report also recommended continued review of the landscape plan for appropriate screening, ground cover, and plant materials. No Commissioner or member of the public raised an objection before the Commission acted.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner JD Cronin and seconded by Commissioner Chase Winder to approve the reduced setbacks for the fire station as described in the staff report.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes
Commissioner Cooper, Yes
Commissioner Cronin, Yes
Commissioner Powell, Yes
Commissioner Turner, Yes
Commissioner Winder, Yes
Commissioner Woltering, Yes

The motion carried unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

2. General Plan Update and Community Survey Results for Survey No. 2

Mr. Eddington reviewed the second General Plan survey, which was open from April 20 through May 15, 2026 and received 85 responses. Staff identified support for practical transportation and connectivity improvements; preservation of open space, viewsheds, wildlife, and community character; investment in trails, parks, recreation, and gathering places; and thoughtful long-term investment that remains sensitive to cost. Commissioners asked whether the results could be separated by residency status and how broadly the survey had been distributed. Staff agreed to review the survey data. The complete results and written comments were included in the public packet.

General Plan consultants Jake Young and John Janson presented a draft vision statement organized around "connecting neighborhoods." It described Hideout as a connected mountain-and-lake community that preserves natural beauty, scenic views, open space, and wildlife while providing high-quality neighborhoods, trails, gathering places, safe transportation, water-wise stewardship, and long-term sustainability. Commissioners generally supported the concept but recommended editing it for brevity. The consultants also reviewed guiding principles for land use, transportation, trails and parks, housing, water, the environment, the economy, and public services. Members requested stronger references to the SR-248 spine trail, safe highway crossings, regional transit and trail connections, neighborhood-scale commercial centers, development that respects terrain, and gathering spaces linking neighborhoods with the Town center and the Jordanelle Reservoir.

The Commission discussed affordable housing at length and distinguished it from workforce or generally lower-cost housing, noting the different deed restrictions, financing tools, tax-credit eligibility, and developer incentives. Several Commissioners stated that the General Plan should address affordable housing now because approved development could increase the Town's population beyond the threshold at which state housing requirements apply. The Commission requested an educational work session with the Town Council regarding affordable, workforce, and middle-income housing and realistic implementation strategies before the General Plan is finalized. The consultants agreed to add the topic to the draft and assist with background materials.

Water and environmental discussion included water-wise landscaping, growth tied to available water and infrastructure capacity, watershed and Jordanelle water-quality protection, sensitive-land and grading standards, dark-sky lighting, wildlife corridors, and wildfire risk. Staff noted that the Town had already adopted wildfire-interface requirements for landscaping and building materials. Commissioners also requested that the General Plan carry forward the prior Ross Creek planning work, including nonmotorized reservoir access and recreation, while managing traffic, parking, visitor use, and neighborhood impacts.

The consultants presented draft annexation, future-land-use, transportation, and active-transportation maps. The annexation map removed areas now within Park City and retained a broader planning area around the Jordanelle Reservoir without proposing immediate annexation. The future-land-use map identified the Silver Meadows Town Center, neighborhood centers, master-planned communities, open space, the golf course, and mountain-conservation areas; at the Commission's direction, Ross Creek was identified as a neighborhood center.

The transportation and trail maps showed existing and proposed UDOT intersections, possible vertically separated crossings of SR-248, proposed High Valley Transit stops, conceptual gondola and water-taxi elements, the SR-248 spine trail, neighborhood trails, regional connections, and bicycle facilities. The maps remain drafts and will be circulated for detailed review.

The consultants anticipated delivering a draft General Plan in early July and completing the process by the end of 2026. The Commission will continue reviewing major policies and maps at upcoming meetings. A formal public hearing and additional written and open-house comment opportunities will occur before the Commission recommends a plan to the Town Council. This was a work-session discussion, and no formal motion or vote was taken.

3. Discussion and Consideration to Move the June Regular Planning Commission Meeting

The Commission discussed moving the regular June 18 meeting to accommodate schedules and allow additional time for General Plan work. Several possible dates were discussed, including June 15 and dates later in the month. The discussion ultimately focused on Tuesday, June 30, 2026, at 5:00 p.m., potentially in conjunction with a joint educational work session with the Town Council regarding affordable housing.

Staff stated that it would confirm availability through a group poll and coordinate the meeting and required public notice. No formal motion, second, or recorded vote occurred, and the supplied dialogue does not establish that the June date was finally changed during this meeting.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

1. February 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

The Commission reviewed the February 19 draft minutes. During the discussion, staff requested clarification of the surname of a participant identified in the draft only as "Bill." A surname was provided orally.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Chase Winder and seconded by Commissioner Steve Powell to approve the February 19, 2026 Planning Commission meeting minutes after the correction discussed during the meeting.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Airmet, Yes.
Commissioner Cooper, Yes.
Commissioner Cronin, Yes.
Commissioner Powell, Yes.
Commissioner Turner, Not Voting
Commissioner Winder, Yes.
Commissioner Woltering, Not Voting

The motion carried unanimously among those voting.

2. March 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

The Commission directed that consideration of the March 19, 2026 draft minutes be continued to the next meeting. A participant asked whether a motion was required to table or continue the draft, and the response indicated that no motion was necessary. No motion, second, or recorded vote occurred.

VI. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The supplied dialogue ends after the Commission's discussion of the meeting minutes. It does not contain an adjournment motion, second, vote, or stated adjournment time.

Motion: A motion was made by Commissioner Chase Winder and seconded by Commissioner JD Cronin to adjourn the meeting.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Commissioner Cronin, Yes.
Commissioner Winder, Yes.
The responses of the other Commissioners are not sufficiently discernible from the supplied recording to be accurately recorded.

The meeting concluded at approximately 7:35pm.

These minutes were prepared from the meeting agenda, agenda packet, and supplied dialogue and were approved by the Hideout Planning Commission on September 16, 2026.

_____
Maria Devereux, Town Recorder

Minutes: EG