HIDEOUT, UTAH PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
December 17, 2020
Agenda

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of Hideout, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting electronically for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, December 17, 2020

This meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location pursuant to Planning Commission Chair Anthony Matyszczyk December 15, 2020 determination letter (attached).

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

Meeting URL: https://zoom.us/j/4356594739 To join by telephone dial: US: +1 408 638 0986
Meeting ID: 435 659 4739
YouTube Live Channel: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCKdWnJad-WwvcAK75QjRb1w/

Regular Meeting
6:00 PM

I. Call to Order and Reading of Chair Matyszczyk's No Anchor Site Determination Letter

   1. Planning Commission No Anchor Site Determination Letter Reading

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes

   1. November 19, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes DRAFT

IV. Agenda Items

   1. Discussion regarding Dark Skies Initiative
   2. Discussion regarding landscaping needs in public spaces
   3. Consideration of establishing 2021 Planning Commission meeting schedule

V. Meeting Adjournment

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Mayor or Town Clerk at 435-659-4739 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

File Attachments for Item:

1. Planning Commission No Anchor Site Determination Letter Reading

December 15, 2020

DETERMINATION REGARDING CONDUCTING TOWN OF HIDEOUT PUBLIC MEETINGS WITHOUT AN ANCHOR LOCATION

The Planning Commission Chair of the Town of Hideout hereby determines that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location pursuant to Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) and Hideout Town Ordinance 2020-03. The facts upon which this determination is based include: The percent and number of positive COVID-19 cases in Utah has been over 23.21% of those tested since December 9, 2020. The seven-day average of positive cases has been over 2,800 since December 7, 2020. COVID-19 patients in Utah hospitals has risen to 553 current cases as of the date of this letter.

This meeting will not have a physical anchor location. All participants will connect remotely. All public meetings are available via YouTube Live Stream on the Hideout, Utah YouTube channel at: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCKdWnJad-WwvcAK75QjRb1w/

Interested parties may join by dialing in as follows:

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

This determination will expire in 30 days on January 6, 2021.

BY:

Tony Matyszczyk,
Planning Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Clerk

TOWN OF HIDEOUT
CORPORATE
Seal
WASATCH COUNTY, UTAH

File Attachments for Item:

1. November 19, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes DRAFT

Town of Hideout
10860 N. Hideout Trail
Hideout, UT 84036
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
November 19, 2020
6:00 P.M.

The Planning Commission of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in Regular Meeting on November 19, 2020 at 6:00 PM via Zoom meeting.

Regular Meeting

I. Call to Order and No Anchor Site Determination Letter Reading

Chair Tony Matyszczyk called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and read the No Anchor Site Determination letter in its entirety. All attendees were present electronically.

II. Roll Call

PRESENT: Chair Tony Matyszczyk
Commissioner Bruce Woelfle
Commissioner Donna Turner
Commissioner Ryan Sapp

STAFF PRESENT: Thomas Eddington, Town Planner
Polly McLean, Town Attorney
Alicia Fairbourne, Town Clerk
Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Rachel Cooper, Glynnis Tahinsky, Chris Ensign, Dan Dansie, Nasser Shotorbani, James Carroll and Carey Johanson,

Chair Matyszczyk introduced Ms. Rachel Cooper and Ms. Glynnis Tahinsky as new members of the Planning Commission, subject to appointment at the next Town Council meeting. Ms. Tahinsky and Ms. Cooper each introduced themselves to the Planning Commission. Ms. Tahinsky, a new Hideout resident, noted her prior experience serving on a Planning Commission in Pennsylvania. Ms. Cooper recently moved to Hideout from Maryland and has had a long time interest in urban development and planning. Chair Matyszczyk also introduced Mr. Ryan Sapp, a newly appointed member of the Planning Commission. Mr. Sapp shared some of his background in area real estate and home construction.

Draft

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes

September 17, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes.

Motion: Commissioner Turner made the motion to approve the September 17, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes. Commissioner Woelfle made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Turner, Woelfle and Matyszczyk. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

October 1, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes.

Motion: Commissioner Woelfle made the motion to approve the October 1, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes. Commissioner Turner made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Turner, Woelfle and Matyszczyk. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

October 5, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes.

Motion: Commissioner Woelfle made the motion to approve the October 5, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes. Commissioner Turner made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Turner, Woelfle and Matyszczyk. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

IV. Agenda Items

1. Discussion and possible approval of an extension of the Final Plan of the KLAIM project

Mr. Dan Dansie, former Hideout Town Attorney, and Mr. Chris Ensign, developer of the KLAIM project, joined the meeting. Mr. Dansie provided background on KLAIM project and discussed the current status of approvals to be obtained from the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for new road access into the development from SR 248. The project had been underway since December 2017 and the developer and the Town had been working to get the line break approval required to build the access road. One open issue, which was almost resolved, had been deeding land owned by UDOT to the Town where the road break would be created. The developer had requested an extension of the time required to record his plats, under the 2019 Master Development Agreement (MDA). Mr. Dansie cited Section 11.01.113 of the Town Code in effect at the time of the MDA whereby the Planning Commission could grant a two-year extension to record the final plat upon the finding of good cause. Mr. Dansie noted the developer had been diligent in working to obtain the necessary UDOT approvals during a process that had turned out to be longer and more difficult than expected. He recommended the Planning Commission grant the requested extension for good cause.

Mr. Ensign thanked the Planning Commission members and Town Planner Thomas Eddington for their assistance in working with UDOT and expected to obtain the approvals for the road permit soon.

Draft

In response to Chair Matyszczyk's question regarding the number of completed units in the development, Mr. Ensign responded that of the twenty-eight (28) units within Phase 1 of the KLAIM project, seven units had been completed and another seven were under construction. All twenty-eight (28) units had been sold, however, the Certificates of Occupancy could not be issued until the final plats were approved which required the construction of the access road. Mr. Ensign noted the right of way approvals from UDOT were common for any new development and did not know why the approval had taken so long.

Commissioner Woelfle asked if the delay in the UDOT approval was related to not having a turning lane. Mr. Ensign explained a turning lane would be constructed after obtaining the right-of-way and under a separate permitting process. He noted the plans for the road and lane construction were approved a year and a half ago. The turning and acceleration/deceleration lanes would be identical to the one leading into the Soaring Hawk development.

Mr. Dansie added a suite of engineering documents had been provided to UDOT regarding the lane work, but no construction could be conducted prior to issuance of the limited line break. The delay in constructing the new lanes was due to the delay in approval of the limited line break.

Commissioner Woelfle asked whether homeowners would be able to move prior to completion of all the lane work from SR 248. Mr. Ensign and Mr. Dansie clarified once this right of way is obtained, the roadwork and final platting could be done concurrently and under the guidance of the Town Engineer Ryan Taylor.

Commissioner Woelfle asked if there would be just one access point into the development. Mr. Dansie responded part of the approval process for the KLAIM project required a secondary emergency access point, which would be the current construction road (i.e., at mile 7.48). This secondary access would have a crash gate installed and would not be for general use access per UDOT stipulations.

Mr. Dansie confirmed the extension approval being requested was for an additional two years. Mr. Ensign added during original discussions with the Town it was agreed that he would request plat approval as construction was completed, rather than requesting all at the onset of the project.

Mr. Ensign stated he did not expect completion of the project to take more than the two years requested.

Commissioner Turner asked what would happen if two years were not sufficient time to complete the project. Mr. Ensign stated this had been a unique situation with UDOT and he was motivated to finish the project. The extension request was not based on delays with financing or sales, but rather for a specific good cause that had been outside of his control.

Mr. Ensign confirmed once the UDOT approval was received, he would be able to record Phase 1 plats. He would proceed with three to four phases to finish the remaining units.

There being no further questions on the matter, Chair Matyszczyk asked for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Woelfle made the motion to approve extension of the final KLAIM plan for two years. Commissioner Sapp made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Turner, Woelfle, Sapp and Matyszczyk. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

Mr. Dansie and Mr. Ensign were excused from the meeting at this time.

Draft

2. Discussion of proposed Venturi Plat development

Mr. Nasser Shotorbani, developer, Mr. James Carroll, architect, and Mr. Carey Johanson, engineer, joined the meeting to discuss the proposed development and sub-dividing the Venturi Plat and solicit feedback from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Carroll shared two drawings of the property under discussion that Mr. Shotorbani would like to sub-divide from two 1.3 acre lots to four 0.57 acre lots in order to build four single family homes. The homes would each be approximately 2,400 square feet with walk-up basements and two or three car garages. They have had initial meetings with the Town Engineers to discuss a potential extension of Shoreline Court and understand that a full topography review would need to be conducted to determine if grading requirements could be met. He shared two road proposals: 1) build a road off Shoreline Drive to dead end into a hammerhead turnaround or 2) extend Shoreline Court all the way through the property which could provide better emergency access.

Chair Matyszczyk asked whether there were sufficient water rights for four homes. Mr. Carroll responded there were two currently approved, per his discussion with the Town, and they would need to speak with the mayor regarding approval of additional rights. Chair Matyszczyk noted it was a moot point to advise further until water rights were obtained.

Mr. Eddington added the grade of the proposed road would also impact feasibility of the project and noted he had discussed the project with the Town Engineer.

Commissioner Woelfle asked if these two lots were approved a year ago, to which Mr. Eddington responded yes. In response to Commissioner Sapp's question on why the developer was proposing four units for the property versus other potential numbers, Mr. Carroll and Mr. Shotorbani noted that in discussion with the Town Engineers, it was advised that an eight-unit town home development would be too many, given concerns over water shares and road connectivity. Commissioner Turner also asked about location of power line easements, road widths and pathways in the surrounding common area.

Mr. Carroll shared his discussions with Town Engineers regarding road widths, and noted that while Shoreline Court did not meet the Town's current width requirements, extending it could provide for improved emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Shotorbani's decision to purchase the property would be dependent on whether this development was acceptable to the Planning Commission. They would like to know if there were other considerations in addition to the water rights and road issues discussed.

Town Attorney Polly McLean asked if the lots were part of an existing subdivision, to which Mr. Eddington responded no, they were separate from other Hideout developments, and were platted as the Venturi subdivision.

Ms. Cooper noted access through Shoreline Court would be better for traffic than driveways on Shoreline Drive, and asked from the developer's perspective would it matter whether two or four lots were developed. Mr. Carroll responded that it would come down to spreading the cost of building the new road over more properties, although a long private drive would not come under the same restrictions but might not be as efficient.

Draft

Mr. Shotorbani did not have details on potential price points for the proposed homes, and noted he put land under contract three weeks ago.

Ms. Tahinsky asked for confirmation the proposed development would meet setback requirements, to which Mr. Carroll responded yes, the 0.5 acre lots should be sufficient even with the twenty foot power line easements and road widths encompassing fifty feet of property on the east side.

Commissioner Sapp asked about connectivity for utilities; Mr. Carroll responded this was still under discussion with the Town Engineers. Mr. Johansen shared details on how the sewer, power and water utilities would be connected from Shoreline Drive and Shoreline Court.

Mr. Eddington stated if the Planning Commission considered the project to be feasible, he would work with the development team and the Town Engineer on the specific issues regarding the slope of the road and retaining walls for the four lots. This review would require detailed topography and slope information. Chair Matyszczyk reiterated the issue of water rights would need to be answered first. Ms. McLean stated the Planning Commission could not provide any conditional approvals at this stage.

Commissioner Woelfle noted the roads under discussion did not meet the new town code for road widths, and if the project was approved, there may be a need to create additional parking spots. He also inquired about who would be responsible for maintaining any new roads.

Commissioner Turner stated she liked the concept of connecting to the roads as discussed and the plan for home access from Shoreline Court.

Mr. Eddington noted the property was outside of the Town's Master HOA and therefore would not require Design Review Committee approval.

Mr. Shotorbani agreed to provide answers to the questions raised in advance of the December Planning Commission meeting when the matter would be discussed further. Messrs. Shotorbani, Carroll and Johanson were excused from the meeting at this time.

3. Other Business not included in the agenda

Chair Matyszczyk reported the Mayor had asked the Planning Commission to create a Dark Sky Ordinance for the Town to be presented at the February Town Council meeting, and asked Commissioner Woelfle to take the lead with assistance from Commissioner Sapp. Ms. McLean and Mr. Eddington agreed to assist with this project as well.

V. Meeting Adjournment

There being no other business Chair Matyszczyk called for the meeting to be adjourned.

Motion: Commissioner Woelfle made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Turner made the second. Voting Aye: Commissioners Turner, Woelfle, Sapp and Matyszczyk. Voting Nay: None. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Draft

_____

Kathleen Hopkins, Deputy Town Clerk

Draft