

**MINUTES OF THE
WASATCH COUNTY
JSPA PLANNING COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 17, 2024**

PRESENT: Committee Chair Bill Redkey, Committee Member Craig Hahn, Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar, Committee Member Ray Whitchurch
EXCUSED: Committee Member Robert Holmes, Committee Member Mark Hendricks
STAFF: Doug Smith, Wasatch County Planner; Jon Woodard, Assistant Wasatch County Attorney; Anders Bake, Assistant Wasatch County Planner; Rick Tatton, Court Reporter *(via Zoom)*.
PRAYER: Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Committee Chair Bill Redkey and repeated by everyone.

Committee Chair Bill Redkey then called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 17, 2024. The record should also reflect that all the Committee Members are present except for Mark Hendricks and Robert Holmes, who are excused. The record should also show that the JSPA Planning Committee is meeting in the Wasatch County Council Chambers in the Wasatch County Administration Building located at 25 North Main, Heber City, Utah 84032. Committee Chair Bill Redkey then called the first agenda item.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 27, 2024 MEETING.

Motion

Planning Committee Chair Bill Redkey made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 27, 2024 meeting as written.

Planning Committee Member Mark Hendricks seconded the motion.

The motion carries with the following vote:

AYE: Planning Committee Chair Bill Redkey, Committee Member Ray Whitchurch, Committee Member Mark Hendricks, Committee Member Craig Hahn, Committee Member Ray Whitchurch, Committee Member Robert Holmes, Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar.

NAY: None.

-
- ITEM 1** ALLISON AAFEDT, REPRESENTING JORDANELLE GOLF LODGE, LLC, REQUESTS CONSIDERATION BY THE COUNTY LEGISLATIVE BODY FOR APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 24-11 ENACTING, APPROVING, ADOPTING OR AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IN ORDER TO ADDRESS ASPECTS OF THE SKYRIDGE LODGE PROJECT. **IF FORWARDED, THE RECOMMENDATION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE JSPA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THIS ITEM WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL AS THE LEGISLATIVE BODY, AT A PUBLIC HEARING ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2024. (JON WOODARD AND DOUG SMITH)*
- ITEM 2** ALLISON AAFEDT, REPRESENTING JORDANELLE GOLF LODGE, LLC, REQUESTS FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR SKYRIDGE GOLF LODGE, A PROPOSED CONDO-HOTEL INCLUDING 65 UNITS (35 ERUS), RECEPTION AREA, FITNESS CENTER, AND OTHER AMENITY SPACES LOCATED AT 1393 W SKYRIDGE DRIVE IN THE JORDANELLE SPECIALLY PLANNED AREA (JSPA) ZONE. **IF FORWARDED, THE RECOMMENDATION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE JSPA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THIS ITEM WILL BE*

CONSIDERED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL AS THE LEGISLATIVE BODY, AT A PUBLIC HEARING ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2024. (DEV-9177; ANDERS BAKE)

ITEM 3 ALLISON AAFEDT, REPRESENTING JORDANELLE GOLF LODGE, LLC, REQUESTS FINAL SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE JORDANELLE GOLF LODGE OVERFLOW PARKING, A PROPOSED SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN TO CONSTRUCT AN OFF-SITE PARKING LOT LOCATED OFF THE JORDANELLE PARKWAY ON PARCEL 21-2807 IN THE JORDANELLE SPECIALLY PLANNED AREA (JSPA) ZONE. **IF FORWARDED, THE RECOMMENDATION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE JSPA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THIS ITEM WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL AS THE LEGISLATIVE BODY, AT A PUBLIC HEARING ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2024. (DEV-9178; ANDERS BAKE)*

Staff

Doug Smith, the Wasatch County Planner, presented a Power Point presentation and then addressed the JSPA Planning Committee and indicated the determination is whether or not the County Council, after receiving recommendations from the Planning Commission and the JSPA Planning Committee should approve the Legislative Development Agreement (LDA), the off-site parking plan, the small scale subdivision and the Lodge site plan. Also, that there are three applications that are part of this proposal. Staff will address all three items separately divided by sections although all three application items are interrelated and have overlap.

Doug Smith indicated that the vision and purpose of the JSPA as stated in 16.41.01 is to:

- Create a globally recognized “Year-Round” resort
- To provide amenities supporting year-round activities
- The quality standards of 4 and 5 star hotels
- Encourage golf
- Fitness and wellness centers
- Retail dining and entertainment
- Adequate and accessible parking
- A wide range of well segmented real estate products.

The staff report covers three separate interrelated application items organized in the following order:

1. Ordinance 24-11, approving the Legislative Development Agreement
2. Offsite parking lot and parking plan with small scale subdivision creating two parcels with the offsite parking parcel being 3.39 acres and site plan approval for the offsite parking
3. Site plan approval for the 61,344 square foot lodge on 5.37 acres

The above applications were sent through an internal Development Review Committee (DRC) process that includes review by about 17 internal and external reviewers. Most of the 17 review entities are looking at technical issues with the proposal. Until the issues brought up by the various departments are resolved the item is not placed on a Planning Commission or Planning Committee agenda. This proposal went through a number of review cycles each time with additional detail or clarification requested by various departments.

Doug Smith indicated that if Ordinance 24-11 and the development agreement are not approved by the legislative body, a different approval process may be required i.e., a code amendment to allow the proposal, or the project may be denied. If approved as proposed, the ordinance and the development agreement would need to be acted on concurrently with the other items on the agenda.

Doug Smith indicated that the major items addressed in the LDA (Legislative Development Agreement) include the following:

1. The height of the building is allowed to be a maximum of 75 feet as shown in the exhibit in the development agreement. The single-family portions of the JSPA code allows for a maximum height of 35 feet or two and one half stories whichever is greater.

2. County Code 16.33.07 and 16.41.5.8 requires all the parking to be on-site or within 200 feet of the use. The project includes onsite parking and offsite parking. The offsite parking is approximately 1 mile from the site. The offsite parking will only be valet parking or employee parking and is intended only for overflow for employees and special events.
3. Parking stalls proposed are 9 feet by 18 feet not 9 feet by 20 feet as required by WCC.
4. The code does not allow double stacked parking which is the case with the stalls on the lodge site. Stalls on the lodge site will be valet only, as is not unusual for a four- or five- star hotel.
5. The proposal also uses shared parking with the clubhouse to accomplish the parking members for the proposal which is intended in the JSPA code but is ratified in the LDA.
6. The code requires parking to be at the rear of sides of the use. The proposal has parking in front of the lodge, but due to the change in grade on the site, will not be visible from the street. Part of the concern in the code for the location of parking lots is that parking should not dominate the street scape. Buildings, especially in a village would front the street, not parking lots.
7. The original approved master plan showed 20 ERU's on the lodge site (10 buildings, 20 townhomes) which was then changed in addendum 3 to a lodge with 27 ERU's. Addendum 4 states that there are 35 ERUs for the lodge plus 3 MIDA units with 4 keys. The SkyRidge Development is limited to 503 total ERU's. The development will need to limit future lots so that at the final approval of the final plat there is no more than 503 ERU's. The 3 MIDA units are not counted in the ERUs, as is clarified in the LDA.
8. The hotel use and parking do not comply with the permitted uses for the residential land use category of the JSPA code. This has been addressed in the amended master plan and development agreement and will be further approved through this LDA.
9. Removal of the requirements for the welcome center and the amenities stipulated in addendum 3.

Doug Smith indicated that the Lodge proposed in this area is a unique situation not covered by existing County codes. Due to the unique situation and limited circumstances of the proposal the applicant proposed that a Legislative Development Agreement (LDA) would be used, as allowed by Utah State (Section 17-27a-528(2)(a)(iii)), for this use, which would not otherwise be allowed under existing applicable land use regulations.

Anders Bake, Assistant Wasatch County Planner, addressed the JSPA Planning Committee and indicated that one of the necessary items requiring approval is a small scale 2 lot subdivision that creates the 3.39 acre offsite parking parcel and a 1.96-acre parcel that may be used for future amenities. The code for parking is the following:

16.33.07: LOCATION OF PARKING FACILITIES

The off-street parking facilities required by this chapter shall be located on the same lot as the use except, in cases of practical difficulty the designated land use authority may approve a substitute location which meets the following conditions:

1. All or part of the substitute location must be on an adjacent lot, or within two hundred feet from the use, and easily accessible for pedestrian traffic so pedestrians are not required to cross a public street to access the use for which the parking is provided.
2. The substitute lot must be in the same possession as the use it is intended to service and must be maintained as long as the use or structure exists. Such possession may be by recorded deed or long-term lease and should run concurrently with the life of the building or use. The length of such lease shall be at least twenty-five years but may be terminated or modified earlier with the consent of the county planning department, if the use for which the parking is required is terminated or modified.
3. Off-street parking spaces required in connection with a use shall be in the same zone as the use the parking is intended to serve and shall not be located within a different zone, unless off-street parking lots are listed as a stand-alone permitted use within the adjacent different zone.
4. Parking shall not be located in required front or side yards.

In short staff is recommending approval of the offsite parking proposal with the following conditions:

1. The Council approve the shared parking proposal which allows for a discount of 82 summer stalls and 56 winter stalls from the generally applicable code requirements.
2. The site plan for the offsite parking lot is in compliance with the code except for the requirement to be within 200 feet of the lodge and the stall sizes of 9 feet by 18 feet. These issues are addressed in the LDA.
3. The offsite parking lot is not open to the public but will be used for overflow (valet only) and employee parking which the lodge will be required to provide a shuttle service for all times that the lodge is open.

Anders Bake indicated that in the 3rd amended development agreement it allows the lodge as a permitted use. A permitted use is still required to go through the site plan review to ensure that the proposed use and all the necessary ancillary issues i.e, parking, landscaping, lighting, architecture, etc. have been considered and either comply with code or will be part of the development agreement.

Also, the development is not allowed to go above the 503 ERU maximum approved density. Future phases will need to be adjusted accordingly so when the last plat is recorded the density will be at or below 503 ERU's. The only designation in the JSPA that would have allowed for the lodge is a resort village which would have required additional stipulations that would have been impossible to meet in this area.

Anders Bake indicated that the application proposes to increase the density for this parcel for the lodge, but the ERUs will come from other parcels in the project that have not been platted yet. This is memorialized and agreed to in the LDA.

The access to the lodge is off of SkyRidge Drive which has two access points onto the Jordanelle Parkway.

Some of the concern of the proposal is the size of the structure and the proximity to residential uses and SkyRidge Drive. The setbacks provided on the site plan are: Approximately 141 feet from SkyRidge Drive. The setback to the north single family lot line at the closest point is approximately 210 feet. The setback to the south is approximately 14 feet. The setback to the east property line is 53 feet. All the setbacks are greater than the setbacks for the JSPA zone which are: front is a minimum of 20 feet from the right-of-way, side setbacks are a minimum of 10 feet and the rear setback requirement is a minimum of 20 feet. These additional setbacks help mitigate the size of the Lodge.

The site plan states that the lodge site has 47.9 percent open space which will be dedicated to landscaping.

The county agrees that a departure from the more typical height requirement in the Overlay Zone is appropriate. The parties agree that the lodge furthers the intent of the JSPA for a year-round resort and is consistent with the JSPA principals in the JSPA code sections 1.1.1, 1.1.4 and 5.1.1 that the JSPA should provide the guests and residents in the surrounding properties lodging, retail, dining, entertainment, transit and recreational activities on a year round basis.

The lighting for the proposal is regulated under the recently adopted lighting code. A primary intent of the lighting code is to ensure that all lighting is at the minimum levels required by code for the IBC (International Building Code) required lighting for egress from the building to a public way.

With regard to the signage, the sign that is shown on the site plan will be required to get a separate permit and is not being approved at this time.

The applicant has committed to comply with the JSPA code and design handbook for materials, material percentages and colors. The JSPA Planning Committee has reviewed the architecture in previous meetings and made comments on February 27, 2024.

This proposal has been reviewed by the various members of the Development Review Committee (DRC) for compliance with the respective guidelines, policies, standards, and codes. The committee has accepted the item for the Planning Commission, JSPA Planning Committee and County Council to render a decision. Deputy County Attorney Jon Woodard has reviewed the development agreement and the ordinance and has no legal objections to them as drafted.

Anders Bake then went through the DRC Report.

JORDANELLE SSD comments:

- Continue plan review with District engineer and JSSD staff.

ENGINEERING comments:

- Rock retaining walls higher than 4 feet will have to be stamped by a professional geotechnical engineer.
- On Sheet IR200, it appears the water for irrigation will be tapped into the main line in SkyRidge Drive. Not going to allow that.
- As a condition of approval, fall protection must meet IBC. Handrails will be required on all retaining walls if required.

Anders Bake then went through the proposed findings and indicated that these findings go for all the different agenda items.

1. On February 15, 2017, the County Council approved the master plan for SkyRidge, formerly Mayflower Lakeside North, with a total density of 503 ERUs.
2. On February 25, 2021, the JSPA Planning Committee recommended approval of the amended preliminary and master plan that included the lodge and offsite parking parcel.
3. On March 3, 2021, the SkyRidge Master Plan and Preliminary Plan were amended by the Wasatch County Council. The amendments included the lodge and offsite parking parcel.
4. The master plan changes also included allowing a Golf Academy Lodging Facility ("Lodge") as a permitted use, and such amendments were required to be memorialized in a Third Amendment to DA.
5. The master plan amendments granted on March 3, 2021 also approved certain amenities including parking on the off-site Parking Parcel.
6. The Parties entered in the Third Amendment to the Lakeside North Master Plan Development Agreement (the "3rd Amended DA") on August 12, 2021, which is recorded as Entry #505907 in the recorder's office of Wasatch County.
7. The approval of an amended master plan and overall preliminary that included the off-site parking and the lodge still required a number of approvals including site plan, plat and LDA.
8. The proposal is for approval of a Legislative Development Agreement, a small-scale subdivision plat approval and site plan approvals for the lodge and parking lot, including the parking plan.
9. Due to the uniqueness of the proposal, among other reasons stated in the development agreement, the County Legislative Body has decided to enter into a legislative development agreement as allowed by Utah Code 17-27a-528(2)(a)(iii).
10. The vision and purpose of the JSPA as stated in 16.41.01 is to: Create a globally recognized "Year-Round" resort, to provide amenities supporting year-round activities, the quality standards of 4 and 5 star hotels, encourage golf, fitness and wellness centers, retail dining and entertainment, adequate and accessible parking and a wide range of well segmented real estate products.
11. The legislative development agreement process was discussed with the Council on May 1, 2024, in a public meeting and no reason for not following this process was given by the Council.
12. The proposal is located in the JSPA (Jordanelle Specially Planned Area) overlay zone.
13. The original master plan for the project showed single family residential uses in a townhouse configuration that included 20 units.
14. Utah Code states that a land use authority shall approve a conditional use if reasonable conditions are proposed to mitigate anticipated detrimental effects. See Utah Code 17-27a-506(2)(a)(ii). The applicant has proposed a legislative development agreement through which the application can be approved outside of the conditional use process.
15. For reasons explained in the development agreement and this staff report, the legislative development agreement makes both the lodge and its height a permitted use, whereas without the development agreement, the lodge and the height would have to be approved through a different process.
16. Normally under Utah Code, if an application meets the requirements of the code, the land use authority must approve the application. Due to the legislative development agreement, which allows a use or development of land that applicable land use regulations governing the area subject to the development agreement would otherwise prohibit, the Council has greater discretion than would normally be allowed.
17. Single family homes in this area of the JSPA are allowed to have a maximum height of 35 feet from natural grade.
18. The Lodge is proposed to be 75 feet tall at its highest point.
19. The setbacks for the Lodge are significantly greater than setbacks required by code.
20. The legislative development agreement gives the county legislative body the discretion to allow or require the height they believe is a benefit to the health, safety, and welfare of the community.
21. The Development Review Committee has reviewed the project and forwarded the item for Planning Commission and JSPA Planning Committee consideration and Council decision.
22. The development agreement explains the rationale for many of the matters addressed therein. The Council hereby adopts the recitals of the development agreement, and the body of the development agreement, as findings for those matters addressed therein.
23. Ordinance 24-11 authorizes the adoption of the development agreement. The Council adopts Ordinance 24-11.
24. This staff report and the presentations made by staff during the public meetings are hereby incorporated into these findings.
25. The Council finds that, based on the findings, the Lodge as proposed, the small-scale subdivision, the site plans, and the parking plans, advance the general welfare of Wasatch County.

Anders Bake then went through the proposed conditions.

1. The off-site parking parcel, as per code, must have a 10 foot PUE around the periphery of both parcels.

2. The existing oak brush between the lodge and the residential lots must be maintained as an alternative to the buffer noted in the code.

Anders Bake, Assistant Wasatch County Planner, indicated that based on the analysis in this staff report, it appears that the proposal can be compliant with applicable laws subject to the conditions found in the report as well as stipulations outlined in the LDA. Therefore, it is recommended that the Wasatch County Planning Commission and JSPA Planning Committee forward a positive recommendation of the proposal based on the findings and subject to the conditions included in the staff report and Legislative Development Agreement (LDA).

Applicant

Allison Aafedt, representing Jordanelle Golf Lodge and property manager, presented a power point presentation and then addressed the Planning Committee and indicated that Doug Smith, Anders Bake and Jon Woodard have done a great job in presenting this, but I will just mention a few things. In March of 2021 we amended our development agreement and master plan to include the golf lodge and this started this concept of the golf lodge back in 2019. Everything that is being done is open to the public. The height has been mentioned from SkyRidge Drive the lodge would not exceed 35 feet from street elevation and wanted to keep within our JSPA guidelines there because it really fits in with the community and didn't want it having seven stories above SkyRidge Drive and wanted it to be nestled down with the slope. It doesn't seem to be as tall as it really is. The parking will be valet parking. We had a study done with regard to parking and it indicated that we did have adequate parking and the shared parking concept was the key factor here.

Heather Kruse, representing MIDA, addressed the Planning Committee and indicated that we support what is being talked about today in having these year-round offerings. The partnership with SkyRidge has really been excellent to work with.

Public Comment

Bill Redkey then opened the meeting up for public comment.

JAMI HEWLETT indicated how much space is allowed for the golf course. Concerned about the ERU's for MIDA. Concerned about the military discount. Jon Woodard, Assistant Wasatch County Attorney, indicated that you should be cautioned first of all over the audio we can't hear anything that is said out in the audience so have them come forward and speak at the pulpit microphone. Another concern is it can be really difficult to ask highly detailed questions and expect an answer on the fly because there is a risk here if you do that because of inaccurate information could be shared. We just need to hear public comment regarding this matter. Jami Hewlett indicated that she is concerned about the ERU's. Also concerned about the vehicle trips that there will be and we need to mitigate the traffic. Concerned about single family home lots and if they are maxed out because the community is allowed 503 ERU's. Also why are we allowing them to go outside of the current zoning. Zones are put in to protect things that happen. Also concerned about the LDA and how it is going to help and improve residents who live in that area. Also concerned about the 75 foot height on the building and how that will affect the residents. Bill Redkey indicated that what the staff has presented in this matter establishes how it is going to benefit the community and simply refer you to that. Jami Hewlett also indicated that we need to get UDOT involved. Parking at the golf club house is a concern.

LORI GAGON indicated that she is one of the owners that have one of the lots. This is way more than what was originally proposed. She indicated that she got a water report back from the Jordanelle Water Service and there are contaminants in the water such as the chemical Round Up and other pesticides and these chemicals are in the drinking water in Midway, Heber, Charleston and other drinking water places in Wasatch County. So there is a big health concern regarding this development. Also there is uranium in the Jordanelle water. I am concerned about the air quality control. In order to pass this LDA, there should be further information on how these matters are going to be controlled in Wasatch County.

NICK LOPEZ, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that he is a fireman, and he is concerned about how this development will control fires in the area because of the small roads, etc. How are fire apparatus going to get through to fight fires if necessary? There is a fire, health safety concern here. There are only two entrances to the property on SkyRidge and only one driveway into the property and Lodge. The width of the SkyRidge roads are questionable. There is little or no access for fire ladder trucks. Also manpower is an issue in responding to this development. Wildland fires are a concern.

VAUGHN HOKANSON, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that there is a political climate that we are dealing with right now and feel like this development fits into that climate. There are major problems with this development. If you choose to pass this

onto the County Council in its current state and the current political climate. There needs to be more public comment. I am willing to litigate on it and know there are many others who would as well.

JONATHAN JACKSON, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that I want to have development here that improves the quality of life. The interest here should be for the full time residents. We need to preserve the quality of life here. This is a beautiful development and would like to take advantage of it to benefit others as well as myself. I have a concern with the height restriction the 35 feet and 75 feet. Landscape should be better in looking at this from Highway 40. Needs to be an economic impact study to the residents of Heber Valley. How will this impact taxes? This will increase traffic.

DAVID LEWIS, resident of Wasatch County and a general contractor, indicated that we have purchased some or all seven lots built for ourselves and others in the SkyRidge Mountain Community. We really like the vision that the developer has and have invested in other lots in the future. I would voice my support to SkyRidge in what they are doing in that area.

JOSEPH RUBINSZTAIN, resident of Wasatch County, indicated we own lot 115 which is one of the lots that is most impacted right to the east of the lodge. Concerned about the negative traffic impact, decreases market value of the immediate adjacent properties. We are trying to sell our property and have had no offers due to the impact of the lodge and views, privacy or traffic. There is going to be a damage cost incurred to our property of two million dollars. We also look forward to the amenities of the welcome center. Concerned about the 75-foot height hotel. Proposing a reduced number of rooms.

TRACY KIENITZ, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that they own lot 114 and the lodge will affect us. We are going to be selling our house if this lodge is approved. Concerned about people walking because there is no sidewalk because of the increased traffic on SkyRidge Drive. Doug Smith, the Wasatch County Planner, indicated that people walking along SkyRidge Drive would have to be walking in the road with the traffic or walk on the trails that are in the development. Something should be done with regard to this.

DAVID RYAN, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that the size of the lodge is a concern, there is a concern about the fire protection concerning the lodge, parking is another concern, there is not enough parking spaces as required by code and are smaller. Not all the parking is not within 200 feet of the lodge. There are other codes that need to be changed and this lodge is just too big for this location. The five building codes need to be changed. The traffic study doesn't take everything into account. The chemicals are a big issue as was brought up. I would encourage you to not make any decisions until you get more answers because there are just too many unknown questions.

KATHRYN TERRELL, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that you have received a letter from a number of us in the neighborhood and would ask you to review that letter that was sent to you very carefully. Concerned about the lodge and its size.

MICHAEL GLADSON, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that he supports the lodge and would appreciate the amenities of the lodge and that they are open to the public and plan to use the lodge for an overflow of our family and just take advantage of all the opportunities.

MICHAEL JONES, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that the housing prices are very high in so much that people that were raised in Wasatch County cannot afford to live here. I am totally against this proposal.

MICHAEL HEWLETT, resident of Wasatch County, indicated that he is concerned with the legality. etc. of a LDA, Legislative Development Agreement. Concerned that this would fit the requirements of a LDA. Also this would not benefit our local community and would not benefit the residents that are nearby. We are known as Wasatch County, a target for big money developers because the leaders will approve everything that is asked. It is above our ability to say no. We have no choice but give in to these big money developers. I want you to understand that you absolutely have the right to say no. They are asking for things far above and beyond what is allowed. The only benefit to them getting this LDA is for them to make more money. There is no benefit to our community they just are wanting more money. Why do we need this is my big question?

Motion

Committee Member Ray Whitchurch made a motion that we close the public comment.

Committee Chair Bill Redkey seconded the motion.

The motion carries with the following vote:

AYE: Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar, Committee Member Ray Whitchurch, Committee Member Craig Hahn, Committee Chair Bill Redkey.

NAY: None.

Committee Chair Bill Redkey then closed public comment.

Applicant

Matt Hutchinson, attorney for SkyRidge and Jordanelle Golf Lodge, addressed the Planning Committee and indicated the scope is much narrower than the public comments might have led someone to believe. LDA agreements are contemplated by the Utah Code and especially important tools to address zoning issues like you have here where you have a JSPA that sets out all of these aspirational principals for making an internationally known resort. We have blanket code provisions. There is nothing wrong with pushing a process that allows the public to comment. What SkyRidge is asking for here the reallocation of 8 ERU's from single family lots to the lodge so that is the change in the size of the lodge that is before you. Previously it was 27 ERU's and that has been approved now for three years in this location.

(Matt Hutchinson) Secondly, the default parking provisions of the code don't take into account seasonal variation between neighboring uses. JSPA sort of refers to this. The blanket code provisions which are like x-number of stalls per thousand feet don't take into account a dynamic year round resort amenity like the lodge next to the golf course with having skiers in the wintertime at the lodge and golfing in the summertime at the club house. That is why the applicant engaged with the parking consultant which the county then hired a separate consultant to evaluate. So to the extent that any public comments about the parking have swayed you at all you should consider how many hours by professionals went into evaluating the plan that is before you and all of them signed off on it including staff.

(Matt Hutchinson) Now on height the applications seek approval that takes advantage of the topography and keeping in mind there is already going to be a twenty-seven ERU lodging facility in this location. If you take that as a given at some configuration is going to occur and has already been approved in that location. This is after literally many changes and hundreds and thousands of hours of architect time and work for a compact solution in this location that works. As staff pointed out you have massive setbacks from the road and from the neighboring lot owners. Now we have been talking about this the one aspect of the building that is seventy-five feet in elevation and none of the owners you heard from and no other member of the public who spoke is oriented in that location. That is the side that faces the driving range and the downhill parts of the golf course that are below the site. So all of the sites that are sort of exposed to the rest of the platted subdivisions in the neighborhood are subjected or you know in their viewshed are much lower exposure than that rear elevation you saw.

(Matt Hutchinson) Some of the owners in SkyRidge may have tried to lead you to believe that this was completely undisclosed and in fact all of the buyers in SkyRidge received a subdivision report from the developer before they bought their lots and in that subdivision report it says potential additional future development. Developers are currently exploring the development of a lodging facility in the vicinity of the planned SkyRidge club house and golf academy while no county approvals have yet to be obtained for such a facility but the developer does have sufficient unallocated density entitlements to construct a lodging facility with sixty to seventy rooms. I wrote that in 2019 or 2020 before any lots were sold. So it is not fair for the owners to come and make comments at a hearing like this and say that they were blind-sided by the project. It has been disclosed to them and while specific details weren't made public until recently. This has not been a secret operation.

(Matt Hutchinson) Finally, comments above privacy and I mean I understand it, but this is clustered and is a subdivision with clustered neighborhood and ten foot setbacks and this is not a neighborhood where it is reasonable to expect complete privacy from all neighboring projects in your back yard. What SkyRidge is asking for here is a positive recommendation to the County Council where we are appearing tomorrow.

Michael Hokanson indicated that I respect Matt's professional job to be here. I appreciate being last because I was to just mention a reminder that Matt is paid to be here. I am not paid to be here. I am here because I am worried about our community, and I don't want you to only think about the developers but want you to think about the citizens who took their time to be here and we are united and are strong and we are opposed to this. The authority that grants you the authority to grant this LDA only exists when it is in the best welfare of the citizens of Wasatch County. After all the public comment that has been made that there is any question that there are serious issues that do not take into consideration the well-being of the Wasatch County citizens.

Jack Johnson, principal in the development of SkyRidge, indicated that we have been through besides what Matt Hutchinson said on how long this has been proposed and the steps that we have gone through this last six or seven months in going through the planning department and all the departments to get this to this point has been a lot of work. Well over one hundred comments that we have responded to. We have had many meetings with the planning department and went over them one by one and we are at this point right now we have solved those issues that were there and there were some significant issues, but they have all been solved. We have spent a lot of time on this and don't think that we skipped any steps that has gone on. There is a lot of confusion on the ERU's and how they were determined and we are not going over ERU's and this was set up a long time ago with the RSPA and the JSPA like Matt said and the bullet points that were on the JSPA this fits exactly in those bullet points for this development thank you.

Committee Comments

Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar indicated that there is a lot to respond to. Some of the individuals that made comments and Doug Smith could go through the exact steps like for the fire fighter that brought up the concerns that that would assure everyone that this goes through all these different agencies. The fire district reviews it and I personally know the fire marshal and he is not a push over and it was indicated that maybe they were pushed in for doing this. Personally, I am an architect, and we have had many projects where we have been asked to redesign because it didn't meet fire standards. So I know that the Wasatch Fire District takes this very seriously and if it goes across their desk a number of times and there is back and forth.

(Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar) As far as pollutants in the water and chemicals in the air, I really think that is out of our scope of what we are asked to do and out of our control. We absolutely care about it, but I think those are matters that probably want to be taken up with JSSD and with other places here that are really affecting those things.

(Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar) As far as has been asked how will this benefit me? I think it is really hard for us as a committee to think about how every single project will benefit someone because everyone has different reasons for liking or disliking a certain facility. Someone who loves golf is going to love this and someone who doesn't like golf might not be for it but so a lot of things are kind of hard for us. We are made up of different professions, we have a landscape architect, attorney, a land developer together as a committee we tried to evaluate these things and make the best decisions we can but individually we have our limited expertise and just want to remind everyone of that too. I generally look at the building and try to make sure that it is meeting the design guidelines and I usually won't speak to something that is outside of my experience and leave it to the other experts that do have that.

(Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar) I will say that in the February meeting when we looked at this and that was a work meeting and renderings were not in our packet and we saw them on the screen and had a chance to discuss them. I went back and read the meeting notes, and I know that both Ray and I had a concern that the building appeared top heavy. I don't see how that has been addressed. I see all the roofs that are the shed roofs that are sticking out appear to be the same as me. It says in the JSPA one of the first things in the JSPA design guidelines is building massing should step with the natural variations in the topography to integrate the building into the natural landscape. I think the building is grounded well but it almost grows at the top and that was an initial concern and I don't think it has been addressed. Maybe we could put the two side by side and we would have a different opinion but because we don't have that in our pocket it is hard to know if that was addressed. There were also comments made about the heavy columns and think those are still the same. There is a lot more than that but those are my initial comments.

(Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar) Also we see in other jurisdictions like in Park City we have projects where we have designated valet parking and there are double stalls and even have stacked car lifts and it has to be designated alley but it is fairly normal for that to be accepted as a part of a development. Obviously, as long that is not open to the public for them try and navigate.

Committee Member Ray Whitchurch added that if you go with the mechanized system that you think about the noise that it would create for that. I guess to really reemphasize because that club house feels really nice from the street side, and I fully understand that is a larger building. I am still concerned about those shed reverse roofs that come out and if there is a way to step the building more to the side. I know we really appreciate the effort from the north side to bring it down and see if that can be maybe taken to another level because if you look at the rendering it is a big wall and if that could be broken down it wouldn't feel so obtrusive. It is a beautiful building, and I have stated that before and also for the project, but I just think that needs to be more adjustment. Carefully review this design guidelines especially with massing.

Committee Member Ray Whitchurch indicated that I have got a little bit concern about these LDA's. I think this is the first one we have had come through us and essentially, they are setting us up to rewrite the zoning code. That is what it feels like because there are so many variations, and I look at all the exclusions that are coming out on this list. It starts to feel like the code is becoming

irrelevant based on these LDA's. That is concerning to me because you are changing the rule. I like the idea of a golf academy. I support it happening there. I am just, sometimes you just try to put too much in a small site I recognize that some of that exorbitant set back is probably in order to accommodate the parking that is also a variation in the code. So I understand you are trying to basically squeeze a lot into a small space. So I have had to come to a final conclusion there is a lot frankly here for me to digest. I am pretty concerned about like how this LDA is approached, and I know the legislature has good intentions and I know that staff has good intentions, and I just wonder if the code is not flying, why the LDA bypasses the code. I may regret saying that some day. I think that we need to continue this to discuss the various subjects. And take a little bit more time to digest what we have seen and heard and to continue this to another session to see if there are things that the developer team can come up to help mitigate some of these impacts. I am not against the project. Little concerned about the process, but I am also open to having it a legitimate thing. I have run into a hundred cases in my career where I have had to say that in making a worst project rather than a better project. What we have heard said from the public is to give us a little bit more time to digest this.

Committee Member Craig Hahn indicated that he has heard a lot of great comments tonight from all sides of the residents and the community. Everybody online. The committee members that brought up some great points tonight and the applicant has as well. There are a few things in here that I think we need to spend quite a bit of time discussing. The building massing is one of those. I am kind of wondering if there are ways to modify the massing a little bit to accommodate some of these concerns about building heights and sizes. I am not as concerned about the number of ERU's as I would be the square footage of a building. To me this is where I would be concerned, and we have heard some comment earlier about the number of ERU's going up. I would be more concerned about the square footage of the building versus the number of ERU's because the math can be manipulated quite a bit so what I was asking for earlier was to make sure what we saw in February is the same building and again Peter mentioned earlier we didn't really have a whole lot of time to digest what we saw back in February and we certainly didn't have the public comment on the building itself. There is a lot to digest here and I don't how long we have to go tonight, and we can spend three/four hours in discussing this and I don't know that we are set up for that.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) Here is what I am concerned about. I wonder there are some things in the massing like I said that can be modified to alleviate some of the concerns of the neighbors. I am looking on Exhibit No. K which is page twenty-three of our packet. That is the site rendering of the building that shows kind of the L-shaped. The units that are on the left-hand side. It looks like four stories on the site maybe five way down below. Those units right there appear to look right onto one of the neighbors that have commented tonight or two of the neighbors specifically. I am wondering if there is a way to turn those units and face the hill instead of looking right at that. Is there a way to knock a unit off the top of that to help that building a little bit more and move that square footage to a place that doesn't impact those particular neighbors.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) In looking at the site plan the largest portion of the building, the seventy-five foot height, the corner of the seventy-five height is on the golf course and when you look at the overall master plan of SkyRidge there is not a single home that is below that seventy-five foot corner. All that said, as far as I can tell, you would see it from down below I guess but again it is a long way away.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) Some of the other things that I heard tonight, and we saw that there were some concerns on the roof top deck. Is there a way to block that from a lighting, sound and visual standpoint from the neighbors? That was a concern of mine and does it even need to be there. I get the music, fantastic, and I understand that, but can we talk about that a little bit more.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) The parking it is rare that you hear somebody arguing for more parking especially a community. Again, if I were living here I would want less parking on this site and ship that parking elsewhere. I would whether deal with a shuttle that has ten people in it than ten cars that are rolling into my neighborhood. There were some great comments about what happens if there is a large event here, say a wedding. A wedding that gets out of control the next thing you know you have got three hundred people showing up for this wedding which in modern standards that is a fairly small wedding. What happens and what is the plan for dealing with the overflow? Once all of these options are filled, I would like to know, and the committee would like to know is where does everybody else go and how does that get handled.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) The fire department again I would echo what Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar had talked about with the reviews that are handled in projects and I have had a couple of projects go through Wasatch County myself. The fire marshal is not pushed over by the developer. Every time I ever dealt with it, it has been the other way around. The fire marshals here in Wasatch County/Summit County have learned a lot of lessons from what is happening out-of-state in other areas. In California especially they take this very, very seriously the requirements for development within projects like SkyRidge or environments like SkyRidge they have changed a lot over the last five or six years. They take this very, very seriously and I would have to lean on what they have already comments on or not commented on to be our specific guide. I am not an expert on as a fire fighter, so I have to lean on their experience in what they want. That was my understanding that this building will still go through

building department review. I have had a lot of projects that go through the planning stage which is where this project is at come back and general comments are made and then you go through the building department comments they are a thousand times worse. None of this is a push over. I can assure to that that none of this is a push over. There is no rubber stamp here. I think we all take that as professionals. That is why we are on this panel. We are all professionals here.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) We started the JSPA as a blank slate. It was important to all of us to try and avoid some of the issues we have seen in other communities. Development brings issues there is no way around that. Development brings traffic. It brings issues, it brings fire issues, quality of life issues, air quality and it brings all of that. What we are trying very hard to do here is to learn lessons from other places and incorporate that into here. It has been a long process, and we have been at this for many years.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) A lot of this have been taken out of our hands with the staff on the west side of the highway. We don't control that anymore. That is all under MIDA and maybe that is part of the discussion or educational process for people who are new to this project and new to this process. MIDA is its own deal. We have no control over it, and they honestly are outside of this they are using three units or four units over here. They really don't really have a lot of control on this side that I am aware of. Maybe that changes, I don't know.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) The quality of life concerns I have heard and how does this help the average person here and I think that is subject as Peter talked about. If you like golf you might like it and if you don't then you are probably not like this. If you like skiing and it is up to everybody else. There are a lot of trails here that are open to the public. I rode a bike out here all the time and love it aside from the chip and seal issue that we talked about a while ago. It is fantastic riding out here and to me it is a benefit. To other people it might not be. So it is subjective. The welcome center I would like to get a little more information on that like is that still planned, if so, what is it. Where is it would that be a benefit, would that be a true amenity versus sale center kind of thing. There is still an option that I understand on one of the parcels for the parking lot to accommodate future amenities which could be a welcome center or whatever that might be. I would like to get a discussion more on that.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) The overflow parking and if I look at the site plan on it, personally I don't think there is enough landscaping involved with it especially considering the size of it. A ten foot buffer up against and it has got to be more than ten feet probably twenty to twenty-five feet from the back of curb to the roadway. I am sure there is a ditch in there somewhere. To me I would like to discuss that a little bit more as a committee. The other thing that I was looking at in there was the ADA stalls but more of a technical issue. The ADA stalls I don't think they meet code because it seems like they are pushing the users of one of those stalls out into the drive aisle to get to where they are supposed to be going. At least I have never been able to use that. In my projects I have never been able to use that as a means of egress or access to the ADA stalls, so I think that needs to be looked at a little bit more. I don't have a problem with the shuttle system using this as an employee parking bringing people from here up to the lodge or the golf academy, again, I would rather see and the distance to me is irrelevant and I don't know where the 200 feet came from to me that is an irrelevant number.

(Committee Member Craig Hahn) Those are kind of the pieces that I would want to discuss more and maybe I am not prepared to discuss entirely yet. I feel like I need to spend a little bit more time, this is a big project. There is a lot of concern now and I want to be able to address those using a rational amount of time to discuss this personally. I would like to give some direction instead of just tabling this until the next meeting. I would like to see some more information on the site plan of this. I would like to see more information on heights like a grading plan would be fine for me. The landscaping to me is concerning the neighbors and I realize that there are elevation differences between these lots. Just from a staff point more information on these site plans maybe the full package I don't know. Knowing that there is some concern about building heights. I do respect that we have 210 foot setbacks which aren't insignificant those are big setbacks. They have a great point that those units are now looking directly into their living room. Is there a way to improve that a little bit? We could get a view study that shows those are oriented towards the proposed building sites and what we are really talking about as related to peeping into other people's own living rooms. Overall, I am not opposed to this project overall and a lot of this is fairly standard especially in the valley system of the double parking stalls that is pretty typical and doesn't concern me the size of the parking stalls. Doesn't concern me nine by eighteen is industry standard pretty everything where in this country nine by twenty is not a standard. In some locations it is smaller than that. The parking sizes, that doesn't really bother me as much. Location of the offsite doesn't really bother me. I would like to see more emphasis on screening that because it is one of the main entries to the project and would like to see more emphasis of that screening of that parking lot. Is there a way to break it up a little bit more? That is the kind of stuff that we have a hard time seeing with the information that is in our packet. This is more of the details on how the parking lot works and do a better job screening it, breaking it up a little bit, things like that. Just a row of trees along the parameter really doesn't do much for me.

Committee Chair Bill Redkey indicated that the sense that I have heard from the committees is we need to learn more. Parking is one of the issues tonight or do you need further discussion on the parking. My question would be to the applicant you have gotten sufficient direction to meet the concerns of the committee?

Matt Hutchinson indicated that there were three agenda items and not sure whether any of those might be ripe for decision, but you have got a single presentation but three agenda items. One is the site plan, one is the small subdivision and just trying to narrow the issues if we are going to have another meeting. Would you consider voting on some if not all. Doug Smith indicated that without the LDA going to the Council, because the LDA includes all those things, I don't know you would move forward with any item without the LDA going to the Council.

Jack Johnson indicated that since this body doesn't have a regular meeting, we are obviously a little nervous on the timing of this. Like to see if we can get a meeting as soon as we can.

Doug Smith indicated that from his perspective it will take them some time for them to address this and it will also take some time for us to review it and get packets back out to you so we will need to send out a poll to see when you guys are available and advertising deadlines and that type of thing but we still need time to do our part as well.

Jon Woodard, if we could set it to a date certain that would be great for noticing purposes and moving things along, but I understand Doug's concern especially where we have only got four people here tonight and we want to make sure that we can have enough people there for a quorum.

Motion

Committee Member Ray Whitchurch made a motion that we continue the items until a most convenient available date.

Committee Chair Bill Redkey seconded the motion.

The motion carries with the following vote:

**AYE: Committee Chair Bill Redkey, Committee Member Ray Whitchurch, Committee Member Craig Hahn,
Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar**

NAY: None.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion

Committee Chair Bill Redkey made a motion to adjourn.

Committee Member Ray Whitchurch seconded the motion.

The motion carries with the following vote:

**AYE: Committee Chair Bill Redkey, Committee Member Peter Meuzelaar, Committee Member Craig Hahn,
Committee Member Ray Whitchurch.**

NAY: None.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.



BILL REDKEY/COMMITTEE CHAIR