



HIDEOUT, UTAH TOWN COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING

April 16, 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 Thursday, April 16, 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> **Meeting ID:** 435 659 4739

Regular Meeting 5:00 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. Approval of Council Minutes

1. [Approval of the Minutes - July 10, 2025 Town Council Meeting Minutes](#)
2. [Approval of the Minutes – August 14, 2025 Town Council Regular Meeting and Public Hearing.](#)
3. Approval of Minutes - September 11, 2025 Town Council Regular Meeting and Public Hearings
4. [Approval of the Minutes - October 9, 2025 Town Council Meeting](#)
5. Approval of the Minutes - October 29, 2025 Town Council Meeting
6. Approval of the Minutes - November 13, 2025 Town Council Special Meeting.
7. Approval of the Minutes - November 21, 2025 Town Council Special Meeting
8. [Approval of the Minutes - December 3, 2025 Town Council and Planning Commission Special Meeting](#)
9. Approval of the Minutes - February 10, 2026 Town Council and Planning Commission Retreat

V. Meeting Adjournment

File Attachments for Item:

1. Approval of the Minutes - July 10, 2026 Town Council Meeting Minutes

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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 Town Council Regular Meeting and Public Hearing.

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. **The 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

File Attachments for Item:

4. Approval of the Minutes - October 9, 2025 Town Council Meeting

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.

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

5
6 Council Member Haselton reported that the Planning Commission has adopted new rules. Their
7 rules stated that Commissioners will not discuss anything unless the information is received three
8 days in advance. She believes the Town Council should be treated as respectfully as the Planning
9 Commission. The information must be received in a timely manner so it is possible to review
10 everything, understand the materials, and make informed decisions. Mayor Severini expressed
11 support for the comments shared. He thought it made sense to continue to monitor the situation,
12 because it is not possible to review that amount of material in such a short amount of time. It is
13 possible to adopt a similar rule to the Planning Commission. If there is not information provided
14 three days beforehand, then it will not be discussed.

15
16 Mayor Severini asked Town Attorney, Polly McLean, whether a formal vote is needed. Ms.
17 McLean stated that since the Rules and Regulations for the Planning Commission were looked
18 at recently, it makes sense to revisit the Rules and Regulations for the Town Council as well.
19 This could be done over the next few months. Mayor Severini believed this effort should be
20 prioritized. Council Member Chris Baier pointed out that it is ultimately the responsibility of
21 the Mayor to set the agenda and run the meeting.

22
23 The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 6:10 p.m.

24 25 **IV. Agenda Items**

26 27 **1. Update on the Hideout Community Reinvestment Agency - Presented by** 28 ***Rob Sant, Economic Development & Redevelopment Agency Deputy Director,*** 29 ***and Spencer Foster, Mountainland Association of Governments.***

30
31 Economic Development Consultant, Rob Sant, introduced himself and Spencer Foster with the
32 Mountainland Association of Governments (“MAG”). Messrs. Sant and Foster both have a
33 background in Community Reinvestment Agencies (“CRA”). Summary information was
34 shared. Mr. Sant explained that a few months ago, Hideout adopted an Ordinance to create the
35 Hideout CRA. There are a few steps that need to be taken before a Certificate of Creation is
36 received from the Lieutenant Governor. Work is being done on a Final Entity Plat, which will
37 be used to create the CRA. Once that is ready, it is possible to submit the Final Entity Plat and
38 other documentation to the Lieutenant Governor. After that, there will be a CRA in Hideout
39 and the Town Council will have the authority to create Community Reinvestment Areas. There
40 are a few being considered, including Richardson Flat. Mr. Sant shared a high-level budget to
41 illustrate what could be developed and what kind of revenues could be generated. It was
42 reiterated that this is a high-level budget and there were some general assumptions made. The
43 next step would be to work directly with the landowner. There would then be a detailed budget
44 created, which would look at some of the actuals.

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

14
15 Mr. Sant reminded the Council that with a CRA, there are negotiations with the other taxing
16 entities. In this case, it would be Summit County, Park City School District, and the Special
17 Service Districts. The process includes negotiations and a request to share a portion of the
18 incremental growth for a certain amount of time. That could be 15 to 20 years, and the amount
19 could range from 50% to 80% of the tax increment. In the high-level budget document, the
20 assumption is 70% for 20 years. He explained that this would result in \$26 million of property
21 tax increment that could be reinvested back into the project area. The money could be used for
22 infrastructure or incentivizing development if there are gaps in financing.

23
24 Mr. Sant further discussed the difference between MIDA and a CRA. With MIDA, there is a
25 specific timeframe. It is 75% of the property tax for a 25-year period, and then it can be
26 extended for an additional 15-year period. With a CRA, the timing and the percentages are all
27 negotiated with each individual taxing entity. Mr. Sant shared the Tax Rate and Increment
28 Analysis section of the high-level budget document. The entities listed include: Summit
29 County, Park City School District, Hideout, Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, Park
30 City Fire Service District, Summit County Mosquito Abatement District, and Synderville Basin
31 Recreation District. There would be a meeting with property owners in the project area and a
32 discussion about existing needs. This would be followed with negotiations with the taxing
33 entities.

34
35 The high-level budget document was further reviewed. Mr. Sant offered to answer Council
36 Member questions about CRAs. Council Member Jonathan Gunn wanted to understand why a
37 taxing entity would want to participate. Mr. Sant explained that this is future revenue. It is not
38 current revenue, but revenue that will be generated. He shared some example scenarios with
39 the Council and noted that there is some give and take that makes participation desirable. Mr.
40 Foster echoed those comments and explained that if there is participation from the taxing
41 entities, there will be certain infrastructure and development built.

42
43 Council Member Baier believed that in order for there to be participation from the different
44 taxing entities, there would need to be something desirable for them in the project area. Mr.
45 Foster confirmed that there would need to be something mutually beneficial. Council Member
46 Baier stated that Hideout wants to be a good neighbor. The kind of development that would be

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

3
4 Council Member Baier asked if it is necessary to have an agreement with every taxing entity.
5 It was mentioned earlier that the terms will be variable, but she wanted to know there is
6 variability by entity. She asked if the CRA only works if every taxing entity reaches an
7 agreement with Hideout. Mr. Sant used Richardson Flat as an example and explained that the
8 growth in assessed value could be the rationale for taxing entity participation. With CRAs,
9 there needs to be an Interlocal Agreement negotiated with each of the taxing entities. Each
10 agreement is a separate legal document, so each could have a different participation rate
11 established. The list of the different taxing entities was further reviewed.

12
13 Mr. Sant explained that the taxing entities might view a CRA as a benefit because it is possible
14 to have a voice and a seat at the table. Mr. Foster added that CRAs are a long-range tool. At
15 the beginning of a CRA, the value of the land is not worth a lot, but after the CRA is created
16 and the development is finalized, the land value will be much higher. If it is possible to show
17 that both the agency and taxing entities will benefit from development in an area, then that is
18 generally what incentivizes a CRA to move forward.

19
20 Mayor Severini mentioned Column D of the document. Mr. Sant reported that there will be a
21 more specific budget created in the future. It will be possible to look at the actuals between a
22 CRA and a MIDA scenario. This budget document assumes all taxing entities would participate
23 at 70% for 20 years. Some taxing entities might have a policy where there is 15 years at 50%,
24 so that could impact the overall numbers. The CRA could have a lengthier process than MIDA
25 because there are negotiations that have to occur.

26
27 **2. Presentation of the Government Data Privacy Act (GDPA) - Presented by**
28 ***Spencer Foster, Mountainland Association of Governments.***
29

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

37
38 As for what compliance means for 2025, each governmental entity needs to complete a Privacy
39 Program Report. Mr. Foster will send all of the information and templates to Staff. The report
40 has to be completed by the end of this year. The report is not accessible via a GRAMA request.
41 The only agency that can request the report from the governmental entity is the Office of Data
42 Privacy. The list of GDPA requirements was shared. Mr. Foster explained that in the future,
43 the town will need to appoint a Chief Administrative Officer and a Records Officer for the
44 Privacy Program Report. He recommends moving forward with these appointments through a
45 Resolution. Next year, there will be a privacy policy established and a data inventory.
46 Additionally, there will need to be annual Staff training conducted.

1
2 Mr. Foster explained that a Chief Administrative Officer is someone who will oversee the
3 privacy program and complete the Privacy Program Report. It is typically a role filled by the
4 Mayor or a key member of Staff. The Records Officer will manage the public records and
5 GRAMA requests. There must be annual training completed. Mr. Foster shared information
6 about how to build a program foundation. He noted that this involves defining the scope,
7 creating a privacy policy, and completing a maturity self-assessment. This is an ongoing effort,
8 so the State does not expect cities to have a mature privacy program for the next few years. As
9 long as the governmental entity is working to improve the program, there will be time allotted
10 to do so. It is necessary to start taking action now, which means implementing basic practices:

- 11
- 12 • Only collect necessary data;
- 13 • Notify residents when collecting personal data;
- 14 • Don't share or sell data;
- 15 • Train Staff annually;
- 16 • Respond to correction or data access requests.
- 17

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

- 21
- 22 • Watch State-wide Privacy Awareness Training Video;
- 23 • Assign a Chief Administrative Officer and Records Officer and adopt a Resolution;
- 24 • Review Privacy Program Report;
- 25 • Review and adopt a Privacy Program Policy;
- 26 • Start a data inventory; and
- 27 • Identify where personal data is being collected.
- 28

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

37 38 **3. Update on Hideout Fire Station 56.**

39
40 Chief Hales introduced himself to the Town Council. He explained that Council Member Gunn
41 sits on the Fire Advisory Commission and asked that there be information shared about the
42 proposed fire station. A few years back, there was a conceptual drawing shared. It looked at
43 what could be done on the triangular parcel that the town owns off of SR-248. There has since
44 been entry into an 80-year lease with the town and there have been discussions with the Utah
45 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) about how to optimize the space. He stated that there
46 can be a fire station located there as well as Public Works.

1
2 There has been work done with UDOT on an Access Agreement. Chief Hales reported that the
3 documents that need to be presented to UDOT have been finalized, but the Signalization Plan
4 is still needed. Since this will be a fire station, there needs to be signals that provide a warning
5 when a vehicle comes out. He clarified that these lights will only be used in the event of an
6 emergency. Chief Hales shared the Site Plan with the Council and pointed out the access
7 locations. There is work being done with UDOT to move it down so the width can
8 accommodate the fire station and still provide access to the future Public Works.

9
10 This station will be able to house two apparatus, which will most likely be a fire engine and an
11 ambulance. The station can hold six people. Chief Hales explained that it might be a few years
12 before there is a full staff in place, but there will be enough room for the station to grow. He
13 reviewed the floor plan and pointed out the apparatus bay, dayroom, and workout room.
14 Council Member Baier asked what metric is being used to determine the staff needed at the
15 station. Chief Hales explained that it comes down to the call volume. Right now, the average
16 is 30 calls a month in Hideout, which is approximately one per day. Some of the calls are
17 related to fire alarms, and some are related to medical calls. The staff needed depends on the
18 call volume in the corridor. It was noted that there is also mutual aid provided, as there are
19 Mutual Aid Agreements with all of the neighboring jurisdictions. Chief Hales pointed out that
20 the Deer Valley East Village development will impact the area. He shared additional
21 information about staffing levels.

22
23 Chief Hales provided a rendering of the fire station. He clarified that there has not been a
24 presentation made to the Planning Commission, so nothing has been finalized at this time. The
25 intention is to maintain the mountain modern feel, so this will suit the community. UDOT does
26 not want more than one access onto SR-248, but there is comfort in sharing the access with
27 Public Works. There has been work done with an architect to make sure this is firewise as far
28 as landscaping and the building construction. Chief Hales explained that the goal is for the fire
29 station to be ready around this time next year. He acknowledged that this is an aggressive
30 timeline, but there is a desire to move forward as quickly as possible.

31
32 Mayor Severini reported that there is a desire to get the Insurance Services Office (“ISO”) rates
33 down. He asked Chief Hales if he has submitted information to the ISO. Chair Hales stated
34 that as soon as the temporary station was put in, there was outreach conducted, but it has not
35 been recognized at this time. He thanked the Town Council for allowing him to share
36 information about the proposed fire station.

37 38 **4. Review of Town Code Section 1.10.060 – Council Member Briefings.**

39
40 Ms. McLean shared information about Town Code Section 1.10.060. She explained that there
41 was a suggestion made by Council Member Gunn to review this section of code. When
42 briefings have taken place, the rest of the Council has been made aware. The briefings are done
43 with two, so there is not a quorum of the Council present at one time. It is required that Staff
44 provides the briefings within seven calendar days of the request, but there is no language related
45 to a resolution. Mayor Severini asked if there have been issues delivering information in a
46 timely manner. Ms. McLean reported that the first request received was fairly time-intensive,

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

4
 5 Council Member Haselton asked how many Council Members have requested briefings and
 6 how much time it has taken Staff to respond. Ms. McLean reported that she received requests
 7 in April and May and that was more intensive. It has been fairly quiet since then. Council
 8 Member Baier noted that there was some pushback on the language previously, which is
 9 documented in the Meeting Minutes from April 10. The Meeting Minutes indicate that there
 10 were concerns about straining limited resources and creating operational inefficiencies if the
 11 request has to be fulfilled within seven days. There were no limits to Staff hours listed and
 12 there was no clear definition of what constitutes a briefing. The way it is written, there is the
 13 potential for abuse. To date, there have not been examples of abuse, but it is still necessary to
 14 consider that possibility. She believes there should be future refinements made to this section
 15 of code.

16
 17 Mayor Severini stated that he has not seen much of a burden placed on Staff. Council Member
 18 Gunn reported that the prior administration was withholding critical and time-sensitive
 19 information. The amendment was created to allow members of the Council to receive
 20 confidential briefings in a manner consistent with the law. Ms. McLean explained that the
 21 reason this item was added to the current Town Council Meeting agenda was due to some
 22 confusion from the public about whether a resolution was required within seven days. She
 23 noted that the section of code is available to read on the website. Mayor Severini noted that he
 24 cannot find any evidence of undue strain on the Staff or consultants at this time.

25
 26 **5. Public Hearing: Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding an**
 27 **Amendment of the Official Town of Hideout Zoning Map to Rezone Parcel**
 28 **00-0020-8164 (Wildhorse Development) from the Mountain (M) Zone to**
 29 **Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU). This Proposed Development**
 30 **is Located on the Northern Side of SR-248, between the Woolf Property and**
 31 **the Klaim Subdivision.**

32
 33 Mayor Severini reported that this agenda item is related to a rezone request. The applicant, Tim
 34 Schoen, introduced himself to the Council and explained that the land was purchased 20 years
 35 ago. There is an opportunity to create a brand. He clarified that there is an intention to live
 36 there and manage the development. Mr. Schoen shared a number of presentation slides with
 37 the Town Council. Jerry Crylen shared additional information about the plan. This has been a
 38 labor of love, and something has been envisioned for the last 20 years. He highlighted some of
 39 the objectives for the development:

- 40
 41
 - 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.
- 42
 43
 44
 45

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

10
11 Images were provided that represent the style of the homes. Mr. Crylen clarified that the designs
12 are not finalized at this time, and there will be variations in the single-family homes. The villas
13 will have a continuity in design. He added that there will be compliance with the height and
14 open space requirements throughout the project. There was a concern shared by the Planning
15 Commission about the positioning of the villas. He reported that the villas will be less than
16 3,000 square feet. The plan currently shows a 15-foot setback, but it was requested that this be
17 pushed back further to 20 feet, for which there was agreement to do. He pointed out the table
18 on the presentation slide and discussed the blue lines shown. What is proposed addresses the
19 safety concerns. The red circles depict a 26-foot radius, which would allow residents to make
20 a three-point turn in order to exit the site. This also addresses questions related to safety.

21
22 The Wildhorse Village information was shared. There will be two levels, ADA compliance,
23 and an elevator inside. There are 48 parking spaces proposed to address the traffic needs. Mr.
24 Schoen stated that Wildhorse Village is about creating a place where neighbors connect,
25 families gather, and Hideout shines as a community. There is proposed to be an artisan café
26 and bakery, a signature restaurant, and a gourmet market and deli. He noted that there will be
27 negotiations needed for the actual tenants, but the tenants selected need to match the strategic
28 direction. It is important to be mindful when it comes to branding.

29
30 Mr. Crylen shared information about capital investment. The infrastructure is \$5,330,900 and
31 commercial is \$9,720,000, which results in a total of \$15,050,900. The economic/revenue
32 information was reviewed next. The numbers shown are supported by Mr. Sant. There was
33 work done for over a year to refine the numbers. On average, over a 20-year period of time, the
34 annual revenue is projected to be \$188,414. Mr. Sant stated that the sales tax number shown is
35 a conservative estimate. There was discussion about the assumptions used for the retail sales
36 tax number and what kind of restaurant is envisioned.

37
38 Mr. Crylen reported that there is a strong team in place, which includes Otto Walker Architects,
39 Stantec, Columbia Capital Municipal Advisors, Mulholland Development Solutions, and
40 AGECE. Council Member Gunn stated that in the MDA, there should be a condition that ensures
41 the emergency easement is locked down. In addition, he would like the MDA to state that there
42 will not be any combustible materials within five feet of any structure. He would also like to
43 see the precise amounts of water that will be brought in for culinary and irrigation included in
44 the MDA. Council Member Gunn asked who would maintain the trails. He noted that 3.13.4.1
45 has language that conflicts with 1.15.3. He understands there is an issue in Section 4.1 and
46 asked about the resolutions that will be proposed. Mr. Crylen shared comments about the

1 commercial timeline. He explained that the intention is to move forward with the timeline that
2 is in the MDA currently. Some language was added that gave them pause, because it tied the
3 completion of the commercial building to the issuance of the Certificates of Occupancy for the
4 residential. In his view, these are separate, so there needs to be some additional clarity provided
5 in the document.
6

7 Town Planner, Thomas Eddington, presented the Staff Report and explained that at the
8 September 18, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting, there was a positive recommendation for
9 the MDA by a vote of 3-to-2. There was a positive recommendation for the rezone by a vote
10 of 4-to-1. He noted that there were some Planning Commission concerns about the MDA,
11 which was the reason for the 3-to-2 vote that occurred. Mr. Eddington reported that the site is
12 15.12 acres and is situated between the Woolf property and the Klaim Subdivision. It is a steep
13 terrain with steep slopes. The proposal is for seven single-family dwelling units, five villas,
14 and a commercial building. It is currently zoned Mountain, which is a residential designation
15 that allows one unit per one acre. The steep slopes over 30% will be deducted from that total
16 in terms of density. There are a number of acres that are over 30%. The applicant is proposing
17 to cluster the development pursuant to the Cluster Ordinance, which will be wrapped into the
18 MDA.
19

20 The only area proposed for a rezone is the commercial area, which is 1.3 acres. Mr. Eddington
21 explained that just that area would be proposed to move from Mountain, which is a residential
22 designation, to Neighborhood Mixed Use to allow for the commercial development. He
23 reported that rezoning is discretionary and must align with the General Plan. The applicant
24 mentioned earlier that the General Plan is met, and the Planning Commission agreed with that
25 statement. There was a recommendation at the Planning Commission Meeting on September
26 18, 2025, to include a trail connection. It was noted that there are discussion items in the Staff
27 Report, but many of these items have already been considered.
28

29 The Planning Commission discussed the emergency egress through the Klaim development.
30 There is an easement needed and it is a requirement for the commercial development. It was
31 noted that the easement has not been signed at this time, but it has been given to the Klaim
32 developer for review. The applicant explained that there will be a meeting with the developer
33 next week, so that process is underway.
34

35 Mr. Eddington mentioned the code exceptions that were incorporated into the MDA. Many of
36 the lots will be built on slopes that exceed 30%, ranging from 30% to 36%. This was one of the
37 tradeoffs and is noted as an exception. The reduced lot sizes are also incorporated, as well as
38 reduced minimum setbacks for the single-family estate lots. Those are 15 feet for the front yard,
39 20 feet for the rear, and 15 feet for each side yard. While the setbacks were significantly
40 reduced, the lot sizes were also reduced. For the villa properties, the front yard was reduced to
41 20 feet, the rear yards to 20 feet, and the side yards to 10 feet. There was discussion about
42 driveways and the information included in the Meeting Materials Packet.
43

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

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

5
 6 The Planning Commission favorably recommended the project with several conditions:

- 7
- 8 • No more than two access points for the villas;
- 9 • The utility pole on Lot 12 shall be removed and placed underground;
- 10 • Snow removal will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association (“HOA”)
 11 created for the Wildhorse development;
- 12 • A trail will be constructed through the open space to connect to the Klaim trail network
 13 (exact location to be determined); and
- 14 • Conditions of Approval listed in the Planning and Engineering Staff Reports.

15
 16 A question was asked about the rationale for the condition related to access points. Mr.
 17 Eddington explained that the Planning Commission had some safety concerns and there was
 18 more comfort with no more than two access points. The initial Concept Plan showed a
 19 turnaround for emergency vehicles.

20
 21 Town Engineer, Dennis Pay, reviewed the Engineering recommendations in the Meeting
 22 Materials Packet:

- 23
- 24 • A Slope Map is part of the package, but is not included. The applicant’s engineer-of-
 25 record shall seal (stamp, date, sign) the Slope Map, because it is a final document on
 26 which decisions will be made;
- 27 • All streets meet current town standards;
- 28 • The building setback on the west side of Woolf Road shall be 20 feet;
- 29 • As noted on the Concept Plan, public access and snow storage easements shall be
 30 included with the pertinent public utility easements;
- 31 • A jersey barrier, or an equivalent pedestrian safety barrier, shall be used on the west side
 32 of the street going up the hill. It can be removed temporarily for public utility
 33 maintenance and can serve as a pedestrian refuge. Barrier height shall be designed to
 34 comply with the Building Code;
- 35 • Resolve the boundary discrepancy with KLAIM in the vicinity of the retaining wall at
 36 the entrance to Klaim;
- 37 • Remove the power line through Lot 12 and install a power pole on the Woolf property
 38 at the end of Woolf Road;
- 39 • Obtain a permit from UDOT to discharge stormwater into their right-of-way:
 - 40 ○ Connect storm drain system to the orange line in the photo above. The
 41 connection from the UDOT culvert to the orange pipe must be designed pursuant
 42 to town standards;
 - 43 ○ Evaluate the orange pipe, for the Town Engineer’s review, to ensure that
 44 connections, sizes, materials, and slopes meet engineering standards;
 - 45 ○ Make necessary improvements based on the Town Engineer’s feedback.
- 46 • Add these to the Conceptual Plans:

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

12
13 Those items were incorporated into the Planning Commission recommendation. Mr. Pay
14 offered to answer Council Member questions about the information shared. A question raised
15 about how possible it is to work through these items. Mr. Pay explained that these are all items
16 that can be worked through. Mr. Eddington shared comments about the jersey barrier. Council
17 Members wanted to better understand why this is needed and what it might look like.
18 Discussions were had about the design. Mr. Pay mentioned Item 9D from the report, which has
19 language from the Town Code. The language does not directly address tiers, but as far as
20 materials and construction, the Town Engineer has discretion.

21
22 Nate Mitchell introduced himself as Legal Counsel for the applicant and read the following
23 language: “Final approval for the layout shall be submitted for Preliminary and Final
24 Subdivision review pursuant to the process governed by the HMC.” There is also language that
25 states: “Applications for approval for the Project shall be subject to the requirements of the
26 HMC, except as otherwise expressly provided in this Agreement.” Section 3.11 specifically
27 addresses the road requirement and states: “Compliance with the Town’s Engineering Standards
28 and Specifications is required and no exceptions are permitted, except as otherwise specifically
29 identified in this Agreement, without an amendment to this document.” It is the intention of the
30 applicant to comply with the engineering standards. There has been a discussion about vesting
31 with Ms. McLean and she insisted that some of the vesting language in the code not be included.
32 She wanted the engineering standards to be repeatedly referenced throughout the MDA
33 document.

34
35 Mr. Schoen reported that from a brand standpoint, the intention is to ensure that all of the
36 materials are at the higher end aesthetically. There will continue to be collaboration throughout
37 this process. Mayor Severini pointed out that there is a second portion to this discussion, which
38 is related to the MDA. Ms. McLean shared additional comments about the rezone. What is
39 interesting about this application is that all that is being rezoned is the commercial area. The
40 remainder will stay under the Mountain Zone designation. There is an entitlement to cluster
41 under the code, but it is unlikely that the roads and some of the other elements would be possible
42 without the MDA. Mr. Mitchell asked to share comments about the rezone. Mayor Severini
43 noted that there is still a public hearing that needs to take place. Council Members asked to
44 hear comments from Mr. Mitchell before public input is received on the rezone or the MDA.
45

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

10
11 Mr. Crylen pointed out that if there is a provision that the zoning could revert, this will make it
12 difficult to procure a tenant. Ms. McLean explained that the reason all of these exceptions have
13 been allowed is because of the commercial use that is being added to the community. The idea
14 is to make sure that the commercial use is added. The town does not want to be left with more
15 residential and not the commercial component that was promised. There is a desire to work
16 with the applicant, but it is important to make sure the commercial is completed. There was
17 discussion about the language. Mayor Severini wondered how all parties involved could reach
18 an agreement about the completion date, as there are assurances needed.

19
20 Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 8:38 p.m.

21
22 *Ted Pearlstein* reported that he recently purchased a home in Hideout. He commended the
23 Town Council for their thoughtfulness and commitment. Mr. Pearlstein shared information
24 about his recent purchase. The proposal being discussed was one of the reasons he selected the
25 location he did. He likes the idea of being able to walk with his family members to the
26 commercial development. Having that commercial use in the community could incentivize
27 others who are looking to purchase property as well.

28
29 *Ingram Cook* understood the desire to add more commercial uses to the community. He
30 believed commercial was being looked into at Richardson Flat as well. Mayor Severini
31 confirmed that there is a proposal and an existing MDA. Mr. Cook wanted to know if the
32 current applicant took the other commercial uses into consideration when the numbers were
33 determined. He also asked if the focus will be on full-time residents or part-time residents. It
34 was reported that the homes will have full-time residents.

35
36 Mr. Cook wanted to know how the town will support having commercial in multiple locations.
37 He wants whatever commercial use is added to be successful. Council Member Gunn
38 mentioned the Lakehouse restaurant near the Deer Creek Reservoir, which is always packed.
39 There is not a lot of residential in that area, but the restaurant is successful. He believes the
40 demand exists and the commercial will be a benefit.

41
42 Mayor Severini explained that decisions are made based on the best information available. He
43 noted that there are homes coming into the area, so the density will increase over time. Mr.
44 Cook pointed out that it is important to consider how many people will be in the area year-
45 round. Mayor Severini reported that approximately 45% of residents are full-time and 55% are
46 part-time. He shared information about the homes that are being built in the community and in

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

3
4 Mayor Severini asked the applicant to share information about how this will be marketed. Mr.
5 Crylen explained that the intention is to work closely with the town. Approximately one year
6 ago, there was an interview with three different groups who are experts in retail in the valley.
7 There was data brought in that looked at what would work best in this location. These groups
8 have been doing this work for a long time, know the area, and are interested in ensuring there
9 is the right mix of commercial uses. Mayor Severini acknowledged that there could be
10 competition from other entities, so it is important that the commercial uses are able to co-exist
11 and thrive. Mr. Schoen stressed the importance of diverse uses. There is a desire to have the
12 right mix so these commercial uses make sense and are complementary.

13
14 *William Woolf* explained that this is a project that he has had mixed emotions about. It is
15 difficult when development happens near your property, but he understands that Mr. Schoen
16 has a goal to develop. He is not one to stand in the way of development and is not opposed to
17 what is proposed. He wants to be a good neighbor. Mr. Woolf stated that, based on
18 development in the surrounding areas, the restaurant will attract more high-end clientele. This
19 is a special location, and he believes it will be attractive to a lot of people. Mr. Woolf expressed
20 concerns about potentially renaming the road and the removal of a power pole. His All West
21 Communications is on the pole, and he does not want to lose internet access. Mr. Schoen
22 explained that there is a requirement to remove the pole. He offered to work with Mr. Woolf
23 to address some of his concerns. Mr. Woolf reiterated his desire to maintain the All-West
24 connection.

25
26 *Brian Cooper* stated that he is in favor of the project. He echoed the importance of collaboration
27 and cooperation with all of the near-term commercial uses. There will be a five-star hotel built
28 nearby at some point. Since it is in close proximity, it would make sense for the developers to
29 work together. It would be nice if there were a committee that looked at coordination so all of
30 the uses are complementary to one another. Mayor Severini noted that the Economic
31 Development Committee could discuss this.

32
33 Council Member Gunn commented that there are still a lot of items that need to be finalized.
34 He asked about the timeline. Ms. McLean reported that there was information added to the
35 bottom of the Staff Report. It explains that the Town Council can approve the MDA and
36 Rezone, approve them with conditions, deny them, or continue the matter to a date no later than
37 October 16, 2025, unless the developer stipulates to a later date. The code states that if an
38 application is denied, it is not possible to reapply for one year. Council Member Gunn asked
39 for applicant feedback about the preferred Town Council action.

40
41 Mr. Mitchell stated that a lot of work has been done on the MDA to find a middle ground. Mr.
42 Schoen would like to see this move forward, but if another two weeks is needed, he understands
43 that. He advocated for a vote at the current meeting with conditions that must be met. It was
44 noted that the motion language could state: "...subject to all of the conditions discussed during
45 the Town Council Meeting." Ms. McLean wants to honor the applicant timeline, but from a
46 legal standpoint, the town is protected more if there is a final document. Council Member Gunn

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

3
4 Council Member Haselton requested information about what would happen in the event of a
5 denial. Ms. McLean explained that if someone submits a land use application that is denied,
6 unless there is a material factual mistake, the application cannot be resubmitted for one year.
7 Council Member Baier stated that in order to ensure there is a thoughtful and careful review,
8 additional time is needed. She is unable to vote on the MDA or Rezone at this meeting because
9 she has not had enough time to review the materials.

10
11 Council Member Gunn asked if it is possible to waive the current deadline and continue this to
12 the next regularly scheduled Town Council Meeting. Before the next meeting, there will be
13 work done to address the remaining issues. There was applicant support for this approach.
14 Council Member Baier stated that the materials need to be provided to the Town Council no
15 later than three days before the next meeting.

16
17 Mr. Mitchell reported that over the next two weeks, there will be work done on a final MDA.
18 If there is anything that is not agreed to in the language, that can be addressed in the next two
19 weeks. That will give Staff time to prepare the Meeting Materials Packet and distribute the
20 information to the Town Council.

21
22 Ms. McLean mentioned the recommendations from the Planning Commission. She noted that
23 if there is agreement with those recommendations, it will require some re-engineering. Mr.
24 Eddington confirmed this and explained that it would primarily impact the villa lots. Mr.
25 Mitchell stated it is 99% engineered at this point. There has been a lot of compromise made in
26 order to work with the town. Redesigning the engineering to have two access points instead of
27 five access points makes this project not financially feasible. If there were an MDA that
28 required only two access points, it would be difficult to agree to execute that. Mr. Mitchell
29 explained that there is a desire to be responsive to the input of the Planning Commission, but
30 he does not believe they are in a position to redo the engineering at this stage. He respectfully
31 requested that the Town Council not impose this condition on the Planning Commission.
32 Mr. Crylen explained that limiting it to two ingress/egress points and requiring an additional
33 road to serve the villas would result in an additional cost of \$3.5 million, which is why it is not
34 feasible to pursue.

35
36 Mr. Mitchell asked for guidance on some outstanding issues. He reported that there is an
37 easement issue and work is being done to resolve that. It is proposed that the MDA mention
38 the issuance of a Building Permit. There is also a recommended condition related to Klaim and
39 a retaining wall issue. He believes that is a private issue between neighbors, because there is a
40 portion of their retaining wall that enters the property. There does not necessarily need to be a
41 Condition of Approval that this be addressed. A lot of the other conditions in the engineering
42 report have already been addressed, and some may be unnecessary, because they are addressed
43 elsewhere in the MDA. He is confident that all items can be worked through. Mr. Mitchell
44 next asked for guidance and clarity about the language related to completion.

45
46 The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 9:16 p.m.

1
2 Mayor Severini noted that the item can be continued to the next Town Council Meeting, with a
3 provision that there will be work done with Staff. Ahead of the next meeting, there can be
4 additional clarification about what “completion” means in this instance. The information must
5 be shared with Council Members at least three days before the next scheduled meeting in order
6 to allow time to review all materials.

7
8 **6. Public Hearing: Discuss and Possibly Make a Recommendation to Town**
9 **Council Regarding a Master Development Agreement (MDA) for the**
10 **Wildhorse Development.**

11
12 Ms. McLean pointed out that the Town Council has discussed both the MDA and Rezone
13 applications. She suggested that there be a separate public input session conducted for the MDA
14 application.

15
16 Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 9:16 p.m. There were no comments. The
17 public input portion of the meeting was closed at 9:17 p.m.

18
19 Mayor Severini noted that the Town Council can make a motion to continue both applications
20 to a date certain, which is the November 13, 2025, Town Council Meeting. This has been
21 agreed to by all parties.

22
23 *Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to CONTINUE the MDA and Rezone to the next*
24 *regularly scheduled Town Council Meeting, which is November 13, 2025, to afford time for*
25 *the parties to work out the details discussed during the Town Council Meeting. By agreement*
26 *of all parties, it will be continued to the next meeting. Council Member Haselton seconded*
27 *the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Nadelberg, Council Member Cronin, Council*
28 *Member Baier, Council Member Haselton, Council Member Gunn. There were none*
29 *opposed. The motion carried 5-0.*

30
31 The Town Council took a short break from 9:19 p.m. to 9:26 p.m.

32
33 **7. Public Hearing: Discussion and Possible Approval of an Amendment of the**
34 **Official Town of Hideout Zoning Map to Rezone Parcels 00-0020-8181, 00-**
35 **0020-8182, 00-0020-8184, and 00-0020-8185 (the “Elkhorn Springs”**
36 **Development) from Mountain (M) Zone to Neighborhood Mixed Use**
37 **(NMU), Residential 3 (R3), Residential 6 (R6), Residential 20 (R20), and**
38 **Natural Preservation (NP) – Presented by Thomas Eddington, Town Planner.**

39
40 Mr. Eddington presented the Staff Report and explained that the Town Council initially heard
41 about this project on August 14, 2025, and there was a subsequent meeting on September 11, 2025.
42 During the last discussion, there was a request for additional information from the applicant. He
43 reported that this is a complete rezone of the existing Mountain Zone to a series of residential
44 zones, as well as some Neighborhood Mixed Use commercial. Mr. Eddington shared a section of
45 the Meeting Materials Packet titled, “Specific Issues Requiring Town Council Input or Direction.”
46 The first item has to do with the parking lot proposed for the pickleball building. It is an off-street

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

4
5 The second item on the list has to do with a recommendation to remove the stairs connecting the
6 neighborhood. After the site visit, it was determined that this can work, so the applicant is able to
7 reincorporate the previously proposed stairways to provide better connectivity throughout the site.
8 The third item has to do with nightly and short-term rentals. Mr. Eddington stated that the Town
9 Council did not support nightly rentals in the project without additional mitigation measures. He
10 asked for additional direction. At this time, language related to nightly rentals has been removed
11 from the MDA document.

12
13 The next item has to do with side yard setback reductions for applicable lots. Mr. Eddington asked
14 if the Town Council is comfortable with reduced side yard setbacks of 10 feet. For most of the
15 units in the development, there would be 10 feet that could be landscaped. He explained that there
16 is a need to maintain the Wildland Urban Interface (“WUI”) standards. Item E in the document
17 notes that a couple of lots were moved back from the pond to better protect the area. These changes
18 have been made to the documents.

19
20 Council Member Haselton asked whether there are three lots shown on the plan. It was clarified
21 that now there are two shown. One house was removed in the location shown, and one was
22 removed elsewhere. The Variance Map was shared with the Town Council. It states that the total
23 townhomes are 66, the total stacked flats are 24, the total single-family homes are 145, and the
24 commercial is one. Changes have been made, and those numbers are not accurate, as there are 230
25 lots in total. There was another house next to the pond, but that was removed, because it was too
26 close. Additional discussions were had about the pond area.

27
28 Mr. Eddington shared the last item on the “Specific Issues Requiring Town Council Input or
29 Direction” list. Early on, there was a discussion about money and services for the Spine Trail,
30 which is the trail along SR-248. During the Planning Commission process, there was some
31 conversation about who would handle the work. There was a quote received for approximately
32 \$950,000 for the survey work as well as the design and engineering work. Throughout this process,
33 there have been different interpretations about what the money would be used for. Staff believed
34 it was for the full set of drawings, including survey, design, and engineering. The Planning
35 Commission thought it was important to have that money to execute the priority listed in the
36 General Plan under the element related to parks, trails, and open space. Neighborhood connectivity
37 is important to residents. In 2023, a Trails Division was implemented as part of UDOT. Last year,
38 the idea was that UDOT would start promoting trail systems within the UDOT right-of-way. There
39 was \$95 million designated for 60 miles of trails. There were 13 projects chosen for 2025. It was
40 clarified that money is only given out to construction-ready projects. He offered to answer Council
41 Member questions.

42
43 Council Member Gunn expressed support for angled parking, adding the stairs back in, removing
44 nightly rentals, and moving the house near the pond. As for the trail, there is no positive indication
45 from UDOT or others that there would be a willingness to assist with the additional funds. 1.11.4.1
46 talks about the cash payments, and Section D refers to a cash payment for the purposes of the trail.

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

5
 6 Council Member Haselton read the Planning Commission notes, and there were many
 7 Commissioners who felt the money should be used for a community center. She would like some
 8 of that money to be used for a community center as well. She agreed with the language proposed
 9 by Council Member Gunn. Council Member Baier wanted some of the money earmarked for the
 10 Spine Trail. She pointed out that this is a regional asset and will increase connectivity. There
 11 should be a focus on the Hideout portion.

12
 13 Mayor Severini looked at the distance between Richardson Flat and Golden Eagle Road, which is
 14 3.7 miles. He asked if the town is looking at 3.7 miles or more than that. He wanted to understand
 15 what the \$58,000 will cover. The applicant, Nate Brockbank, stated that this was the price received
 16 for the topography and basic design. Additional discussions were had about the trail. Mr.
 17 Brockbank explained that the \$58,000 and the cost of the sign will come out of his own pocket.
 18 The attorney for the applicant, Eric Davenport, stated that he added the words: "...or such other
 19 lawful purpose the Town Council may decide." Council Member Gunn agreed to that language.
 20 He noted that the money needs to be able to move to another project if the trail cannot move
 21 forward in some manner. While he loves the idea, if one of the partners says no, then the town
 22 needs to be able to pivot. Ms. McLean reported that the Meeting Minutes from the July 17, 2025,
 23 Planning Commission Meeting were sent to Council Members. There was a positive
 24 recommendation with certain conditions outlined. She read the condition language from that
 25 meeting for those present:

- 26
- 27 • The survey and design for the Spine Trail and the town entrance sign would be included as
- 28 contributions from the applicant;
- 29 • The funds derived from the Community Impact Mitigation fees be utilized for a community
- 30 center, relocation of the Public Works Building and/or creation of commercial
- 31 development elsewhere in the town;
- 32 • Nightly Rentals be limited to the Neighborhood Mixed Use and Residential 20 Zones of
- 33 the development;
- 34 • The developer will have five years to develop the commercial area, otherwise that property
- 35 will revert ownership to the town, and the developer will have a Conditional Use Permit
- 36 for the approved types of neighborhood mixed used retail businesses to be detailed in the
- 37 MDA;
- 38 • The payment schedule in the MDA will be corrected to list \$1.5 million for each of the two
- 39 payments;
- 40 • The Town Council will consider the potential risks of private roads; and
- 41 • Other red-lined items from the draft MDA will be finalized with the applicant.
- 42

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

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

11
12 The engineer for the applicant, Paul Watson, reported that there is agreement with the comments
13 made by Mr. Pay. Mr. Eddington shared some clarifying information with those present. He
14 reported that what was referred to by the Town Engineer was a proposal for decomposed granite,
15 because it fits into the landscape. 5 feet would meet the width requirement, but it would still be
16 an exception because there is no concrete sidewalk proposed. At the last meeting, there was
17 support for that material because it fit the character. If there was a desire to have a five-foot-wide
18 decomposed granite walkway adjacent to the roads, that could be done, but the PUE would have
19 to be reduced from six feet to five feet. There was Council Member support for the slight reduction
20 of the PUE. Council Member Baier wanted to better understand the PUE and the trails. Mr.
21 Eddington clarified that the PUE is on the inside of the trail, so the five-foot PUE would not
22 negatively impact the trail. There could be a gas line in the buffer area between the curb of the
23 road and the start of the trail. It was noted that, as far as utilities, the decomposed granite is easier
24 than a concrete sidewalk.

25
26 Council Member Haselton asked how to get off of SR-248 into the development without a turn
27 lane. Mayor Severini reported that he spoke to UDOT this week about the issue. Both of the
28 engineers stated that they didn’t feel the sight lines were adequate, especially with the speed and
29 the hills. He asked them for a brief report that summarized their comments, but it was not received
30 ahead of the Town Council Meeting. Mayor Severini provided a summary of the conversation.
31 The speeds would be too high, and the line of sight would not be enough. In addition, the view
32 would further deteriorate at night. There was a solution proposed, and Mayor Severini offered an
33 alternative. A safer alternative would be to implement a “jug handle” design. While there was
34 agreement that this could work, it was noted that the applicant would need to pay for this.

35
36 Mr. Brockbank agreed to look into the jug handle design that has been proposed by Mayor
37 Severini. There were additional discussions about the speed limit in the area. Mayor Severini
38 noted that UDOT has not considered lowering the speeds at this time. Mr. Brockbank explained
39 that access is one of the concerns. There have been several meetings with UDOT so far. He
40 thanked the Mayor for speaking to UDOT about this as well. Council Member Gunn asked about
41 a left-turn arrow so the oncoming traffic would be stopped. Mr. Pay stated that the meeting the
42 Mayor had with UDOT was successful. He asked Mr. Brockbank to let him know when he reaches
43 out to UDOT next, because it would be beneficial to meet with them together.

44
45 Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 10:19 p.m.
46

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

14
 15 The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 9:26 p.m.

16
 17 Ms. McLean suggested that the Town Council discuss both the Rezone and MDA before making
 18 a motion.

19
 20 **8. Public Hearing: Discussion and Possible Approval of a Master Development**
 21 **Agreement (MDA) for the Elkhorn Springs Development, which would**
 22 **include Nightly Rentals in Zoning Districts that do not Currently Allow for**
 23 **Nightly Rentals, and Variations to Requirements for Slopes, Cut and Fill,**
 24 **Retaining Wall Height, and Road Grade – Presented by Thomas Eddington,**
 25 **Town Planner.**

26
 27 Ms. McLean reported that changes to the MDA were received on Monday afternoon. Some
 28 comments were then returned. She acknowledged the frustrations that have been expressed by
 29 the Council about the lateness of the materials. Additionally, she noted that there are still terms
 30 that have not been finalized. She is concerned about how the terms in the MDA will be worked
 31 out. Mr. Davenport explained that after the last meeting, there was a revised MDA sent out.
 32 This is not a situation where something was sent to the town at the last minute. There were
 33 requests received from Staff to make revisions, and those were done as quickly as possible. He
 34 has felt that the target has continued to move, because there have been changes made to the
 35 language that was already supported. Yesterday, he received a lot of red lines from Ms.
 36 McLean, and he did his best to review them. In his mind, there are really only a few issues, one
 37 of which has to do with shortened deadlines. As an example, in the prior MDA, there was 15
 38 years to build out the development. In the most recent revisions that were sent to them, this was
 39 shifted to 10 years.

40
 41 Ms. McLean stated that she received a version from Mr. Davenport on September 10, 2025,
 42 which was really from August 22, 2025. This is what was seen at the Town Council Meeting
 43 in September. It did not include a lot of items. The final version was received on October 1,
 44 2025. That was eight days ago, and there was work done as quickly as possible. She noted that
 45 there is a termination clause that is not typical, so she needed time to review that language.
 46 There was a previous discussion about the desire for firm deadlines so the project moves

1 forward, but that seemed to be lacking. Discussions were had about the dates and deadlines.
2 Mr. Brockbank shared comments about the termination clause. He clarified that there has not
3 been a situation where a development agreement has been cancelled, but there is an agreement
4 with Bob Martino to build the rock road. The clause is there in case there is an issue with the
5 cost of that work. He reiterated that there is no plan to back out of what has been proposed.
6

7 Mr. Brockbank stated that Staff has been wonderful to work with, and he praised Ms. McLean
8 and Mr. Eddington. He shared comments about the deadlines for the phases. It is not possible
9 to build in the winter, so if there is a house is sold in October, it is not possible to start that
10 house until March. It then takes a year to build. He does not want more specific timeframes to
11 be included in the language for that reason. The intention is to have the MDA reference 15
12 years for the eight total phases of the development. He is not certain that a 10-year deadline
13 could be met, and he does not want to sign something if he is unsure that the deadline is possible.
14 Council Members believed more time was needed on the MDA. Council Member Haselton
15 asked if it would be possible to hold a Special Meeting of the Town Council next week.
16

17 Ms. McLean reported that in August and September, there were a lot of questions from the
18 Council. That version of the MDA was not workable. She understands that a lot has been done,
19 but it is her responsibility to work with Staff and listen to Council Member concerns. This is a
20 large project with 230 units on 115 acres, so the Town Council wants to make sure everything
21 is done correctly. There was discussion about the timeline. Mr. Brockbank asked for the
22 rationale behind the shift from 15 years to 10 years and reiterated that there is uncertainty about
23 being able to meet that timeline. If the market remains strong, then it might be done in 10 years,
24 but if there are changes in circumstances, then it might not happen.
25

26 Council Member Gunn asked if this is the point where the seller will not give them more time,
27 which was confirmed. He asked about a contingency clause that states certain issues must be
28 resolved within a specific amount of time, or the approval will be withdrawn. He asked if that
29 would satisfy the seller, which was confirmed. Ms. McLean explained that she looks at what
30 could be built as a matter of right. It is 115 acres with some steep areas. This would result in a
31 total of 80 units. Council Member Gunn reiterated his suggestion to approve the applications
32 with a contingency clause in place so the seller does not pull out. Mr. Eddington stated that this
33 could work. Ms. McLean explained that the Town Council is the Legislative Body and
34 ultimately makes the decision, but there are still some items that need to be finalized.
35

36 Council Member Gunn pointed out that the termination clause could be limited to a situation
37 where the road costs more than a certain amount. There could be some specificity included.
38 Council Member Gunn stated that there is a timing issue because more time is needed to finalize
39 some of the details. Mr. Brockbank does not believe there are a lot of outstanding issues and
40 feels confident that those can be worked through. He suggested the deadline language reference
41 10 years with a five-year extension.
42

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

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

3
4 It was noted that the contract ends on the first of next month, and no more extensions will be
5 granted. Council Member Baier suggested that the Town Council hold a Special Meeting next
6 week. There were discussions about a potential date for a meeting. Ms. McLean reported that
7 she is out of town next week and she has other obligations that cannot be changed. Council
8 Members tried to determine a feasible date.

9
10 Mayor Severini believed a vote on this item requires all Council Members present, as it is
11 critical to the town. He is concerned it will not be possible to select a date for a Special Meeting,
12 because Ms. McLean is not available and the applicant is traveling. Council Member Gunn
13 asked if there could be a condition that states if the issues are not worked out to the satisfaction
14 of all parties by a certain date, the approval would be withdrawn. Ms. McLean stated that she
15 is nervous about that kind of agreement. She asked if the Council is comfortable moving
16 forward now based on what has been presented and the condition proposed by Council Member
17 Gunn. Mayor Severini expressed concerns about this approach.

18
19 Council Member Haselton wanted to see some sort of resolution. She stated that Mr. Brockbank
20 has always been easy to work with, but she also respects the concerns expressed by Ms.
21 McLean. It was suggested that there be a Zoom meeting on October 20, 21, or 22, 2025. Details
22 could be worked out as much as possible prior to that meeting, and then there could be a Zoom
23 meeting held. Mr. Brockbank stated that as long as it took place before November 1, 2025, then
24 it would work with the timeline. Council Member Baier explained that there is a process to
25 determine whether a date and time can be determined to meet. She suggested that a poll be sent
26 out to Council Members. A date can be selected based on availability. It is possible to state
27 right now that there is an intention to meet before November 1, 2025, and the date will be set
28 based on the results of the poll that is distributed. Ms. McLean shared her availability with the
29 Council. Mayor Severini asked if the applicant can reach out to the seller about an extension.
30 It was reiterated that there cannot be another extension granted. Mr. Brockbank stated that it is
31 possible to work out the remaining issues, as the plan has not changed much throughout the
32 process.

33
34 Council Member Nadelberg agreed with the comments shared by Council Member Gunn. This
35 is the third time there has been an attempt at a real estate deal on the Salzman property. All
36 three times, the seller has put time constraints on the deal. He does not understand why the
37 seller feels the need to back everyone into a corner. Mr. Brockbank reported that it took almost
38 a year to move past the Planning Commission phase, so he understands the seller's concerns.
39 Several Council Members expressed support for holding another meeting before November 1,
40 2025. Ms. McLean reported that there needs to be public input. It was noted that Council
41 Member JD Cronin is no longer responsive on the call.

42
43 Mayor Severini opened the floor for public input at 11:11 p.m.

44
45 *Ingram Cook* wanted to understand why the applicant was being asked to interrupt his vacation
46 to accommodate the Town Council, but there is not the same level of flexibility being shown in

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

4
5 The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 11:15 p.m.

6
7 Council Member Baier made a motion to continue the MDA and Rezone to a date before
8 November 1, 2025. It was noted that the meeting date will be determined by a poll. The motion
9 was seconded by Council Member Gunn. There was discussion about the motion and the
10 correct process. Council Member Nadelberg asked about the previous suggestion from Council
11 Member Gunn to move forward with approval during the current Town Council Meeting, with
12 a clear condition. Council Member Gunn believed both options would result in the same
13 outcome. A formal vote was taken on the motion.

14
15 ***Motion: Council Member Baier moved to CONTINUE the MDA and Rezone to a date***
16 ***uncertain, but after October 21, 2025, and before November 1, 2025. The meeting date will***
17 ***be determined by poll and will be set within the next week. Council Member Gunn seconded***
18 ***the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Nadelberg, Council Member Baier, Council***
19 ***Member Haselton, Council Member Gunn. Voting Abstention: Council Member Cronin.***
20 ***The motion passed.***

21
22 **9. Discussion and Update Regarding Installation of Signage to Reinforce Dog**
23 **Leash Requirements.**

24
25 Given the time, it was determined that most of the remaining items would be heard at a future
26 meeting.

27
28 **10. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Date and Time of the 2025**
29 **General Election Board of Canvassers Meeting.**

30
31 It was noted that there has to be work done with the County Clerk's Office on the schedule so
32 there is coordination with other cities in Wasatch County. The County Clerk's Office has
33 mentioned November 18, 2025. There will be a poll sent out to Council Members to finalize
34 the meeting time on that date.

35
36 **11. Discussion of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations.**

37
38 The above item was not discussed.

39
40 **12. Consideration and Possible Adoption of Ordinance 2025-O-XX, Amending**
41 **Hideout Municipal Code 5.04.075 to Align Construction Hours with Section**
42 **10.04.32.**

43
44 The above item was not discussed.

1 **13. Discussion of Code Enforcement and Collections for Construction**
 2 **Violations.**

3
 4 This item was not discussed.

5
 6 **14. Discussion and Possible Appointment of a Representative of Hideout to**
 7 **Engage in Discussions Regarding the Comprehensive Emergency**
 8 **Management Plan (CEMP).**

9
 10 The above item was not discussed.

11
 12 **V. Committee Updates.**

- 13
 14 **1. Planning Commission - *Thomas Eddington, Town Planner.***
 15 **2. Design Review Committee - *Thomas Eddington, Town Planner.***
 16 **3. Wildfire Committee - *Council Member Gunn.***
 17 **4. Economic Development Committee - *Council Member Cronin.***
 18 **5. Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) Committee - *Council Member Baier.***
 19 **6. Transportation Committee - *Council Member Haselton.***

20
 21 No committee updates were shared.

22
 23 **VI. Approval of Council Minutes**

- 24
 25 **1. July 1, 2025, Town Council Meeting Minutes DRAFT.**

26
 27 The Meeting Minutes from July 1, 2025, were not voted on.

28
 29 **VII. Follow-Up of Items from Approved Minutes.**

30
 31 This item was not discussed.

32
 33 **VIII. Closed Executive Session – Discussion of Pending or Reasonably Imminent**
 34 **Litigation, Personnel Matters, and/or the Sale or Acquisition of Real Property, as**
 35 **needed.**

36
 37 There was no Closed Executive Session.

38
 39 A request was made to start Town Council Meetings earlier so the meetings are not running so
 40 late into the night. Ms. McLean reported that she assists another jurisdiction and their Council
 41 Meetings start at 3:00 p.m. Mayor Severini asked if an earlier start would be convenient to the
 42 public, since many people are not done with work until 5:00 p.m. It was noted that the schedule
 43 could be rearranged so updates are shared first. By the time the substantive issues are discussed,
 44 it will be closer to 6:00 p.m. A suggestion was made to start Town Council Meetings earlier
 45 when the new meeting schedule is adopted in January.

1 **IX. Meeting Adjournment**

2
3 ***Motion: Council Member Gunn moved to ADJOURN. Council Member Haselton seconded***
4 ***the motion. Voting Yes: Council Member Nadelberg, Council Member Baier, Council***
5 ***Member Haselton, Council Member Gunn. Voting Abstention: Council Member Cronin.***
6 ***The motion passed.***

7
8 The Town Council Meeting adjourned at 11:24 p.m.

9
10
11 _____
12 Maria Devereux, Town Recorder

DRAFT

File Attachments for Item:

8. Approval of the Minutes - December 3, 2025 Town Council and Planning Commission
Special Meeting

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Town Council Special Meeting
December 3, 2025

Town of Hideout, Town Council and Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes
December 3, 2025 — 5:00 PM Hideout Town Hall, 10860 N Hideout Trail, Hideout, UT 84036
The Town Council and Planning Commission convened in a Special Meeting.

Meeting Purpose

Presentation and review of current land use scenario planning work as part of the General Plan update; obtain direction from the Council and Commission for next steps.

Present

Jake Young, Consultant — Citi Design John Jansen, Consultant — Planning Solutions

Mayor Severini

(Attendance of Town Council and Planning Commission members not listed here; to be verified and appended if needed.)

Staff / Recorder Maria Devereux, Recorder

Presentations

Jake Young and John Jansen presented preliminary land use concepts, analyses, and potential development patterns. The consultants summarized the scenario planning work completed to date and requested input and direction to inform the next phase of the General Plan update.

Discussion Summary

Discussion between the consultants, Planning Commission, and Town Council focused on land use alternatives, growth assumptions, community priorities, and next steps. Key points included:

- Preservation priorities: Strong emphasis on preserving open space, trail connectivity, and important viewsheds.
- Preferred scenario: Support expressed for moving toward a single primary land use scenario to promote community cohesion.
- Buildout estimate: Estimated future buildout capacity of approximately 7,000 residential units versus roughly 700 existing units.
- Commercial opportunities: Potential commercial development discussed for areas near Black Rock Hotel and Ross Creek.
- Mixed-use / neighborhood commercial: Consideration of limited mixed-use or neighborhood commercial development near Golden Eagle Road to serve local needs. Discussion included potential incorporation of a future transit stop to support mobility and reduce vehicle trips.
- Public access: Importance of maintaining and improving public access to trails and open spaces.
- Community facilities: Interest expressed in further exploring a potential community center.

Direction / Next Steps

The consultants will incorporate feedback from this work session into the next phase of the General Plan update, including refinement of the preferred land use scenario and maps, and further analysis of the topics discussed (e.g., commercial locations, transit integration, open space conservation, and community facilities).

Adjournment

The special meeting adjourned at 7:12 PM.

Note

The minutes summarize the presentations and discussion from the joint work session. A verified attendance roster for Town Council and Planning Commission members may be appended after verification.

Maria Devereux, Recorder for the Town of Hideout

Disclaimer: These minutes summarize the discussion and presentations provided during the work session. Attendance by individual members of the Planning Commission and Town Council is not listed here and may be updated upon verification.

DRAFT