Date: August 16, 2024

To: City Council & Planning Commission
From: Mike Scott
Re: Review & potential changes to Recreational Vehicle Resort Requirements in City Code

Hidden Springs Resort is in violation of several of our City Code requirements. There will be a public hearing at the Planning Commission's September 17th meeting to consider potential changes to Sections 16.17.201 through 16.17.211 of City Code related to Recreational Vehicle Resort Requirements, followed by Planning Commission recommendations that evening and another public hearing on September 19th at the City Council meeting.

Please review the following issues related to the current code, in addition to any other concerns that may arise:

1. **Landscape plan violations (Section 16.17.209 (1) (b)).** The submitted landscape plan proposes approximately 100 trees along the Hwy 91 property line, while the code requires "three (3) trees clustered every thirty (30) linear feet." Given that the Resort's frontage on Hwy 91 is at least 1,500 feet (we need to confirm the exact length), this means at least 150 trees are required by code. Would the Planning Commission consider amending this section of the code to address the landscape plan's non-compliance?

    a. Note: I had a well-respected landscape architect review the landscape plan. He liked the plan and said there were sufficient trees, but suggested specifying that trees planted should be at least 24-inch boxes, with at least one-third of the trees being multi-trunk varieties to enhance the intended screening effect.

2. **Tree plan for other property lines (Section 16.17.209 (1) (b)).** I have not yet reviewed the full set of plans, so I am unsure how many trees are proposed for the west property line (adjacent to the Pendleton property) or the east property line (adjacent to the Hafen property). The same formula applies: clusters of three trees every 30 feet. We will need to verify the tree count and calculation for these property lines to ensure compliance with the code. If the plan does not comply, a recommendation from the Planning Commission will be necessary.

3. **Clubhouse unit rentals (Section 16.17.211 (1)).** The Resort's owner has expressed interest in renting the three units in the clubhouse, but the code currently prohibits this. Would the Planning Commission consider revising this section to allow for rentals? If so, should there be a stipulation that rentals are limited to no more than 29 days?

4. **Restroom facilities (Sec 16.17.211 (3)).** The code anticipated separate men's and women's restroom facilities, but the developer has instead built fewer bathroom facilities, all of which are "family" bathrooms. While this approach provides greater flexibility, it does not meet the current code requirements. I personally believe that the family bathroom design is preferable. Would the

Planning Commission consider amending the "Restroom and Shower Facilities" section to allow for fewer facilities, provided they are family bathrooms?

5. **Concrete pads for RV sites (Section 16.17.204 (5)).** The current code requires concrete pads for all RV sites, but none of the pads at the Resort are concrete, which constitutes a code violation. The owner would prefer adding concrete pads only for the approximately 30 pull-through pads, but is uncertain of timing. The City Council appears divided on whether to maintain this requirement. Your input on this matter will be valuable in determining the best path forward.

6. **Tiny house on property (Sections 16.17.202 and 16.17.206).** A “tiny house” has been placed on the property, raising questions about its compliance with our code. If current code allows it, where should it be located, and for how long? The current code defines a “cabin” in Section 16.17.202, but the tiny house does not fit this definition. If it qualifies as an RV, we need to determine whether it is classified as a “dependent RV,” which would limit its stay to 29 days and require it to be placed near tent sites, or as an “independent RV,” which would also subject it to the requirements of Section 16.17.206(2). Clarification is needed from the Commission.

7. **Cabins.** During the initial discussions on the RV Resort requirements, it was suggested that approximately 20 to 25 cabins would be located along Panorama Point Drive (near Hwy 91 on the eastern portion of the property) as a buffer. My recollection is that the owner requested that smaller RVs be allowed to park in these sites temporarily until sufficient funds were available to construct the cabins. However, the current code does not mandate that cabins be built or specify their locations. While this is not a violation issue at this time, it is a matter that remains unresolved and should be addressed by the Planning Commission, with the possible inclusion of limiting the types of RVs (size, height, etc.) that can use pads along Panorama Point Drive, which I believe is the owner’s intent.