

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

May 13, 2025

Mayor Carla Merrill called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm.

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A. Roll Call

Mayor Carla Merrill

The following were present at the anchor location, which constituted a quorum: Brent Rummmler, Jessica Smuin, Kelli Law, Chrissy Hannemann, and Jason Thelin.

Staff: Shane Sorensen, Ryan Robinson, Chief Brian Gwilliam, Chief Brian Patten, Steve Doxey, DeAnn Parry

Others: Thomas Olsen, Michelle Schirmer, Ken Berg, Andy Spencer, Heidi Smith, Derek Rowley, Clark Burgess, Will Jones, Bill DeGroot, Bob Schirmer

B. Prayer

Jason Thelin

C. Pledge

Jessica Smuin

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of Minutes for the April 22 City Council Meeting

B. Resolution R2025-10: Contract Extension – Lobbyist Agreement

C. Resolution R2025-12: Update to the Consolidated Fee Schedule – Excavation Bond

D. Consideration for Approval of Double Frontage Lot with More than Five Sides – at Country Manor Lane and Bald Mountain Drive

Motion: Jason Thelin moved to approve the Consent Calendar as proposed. Jessica Smuin seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin

Chrissy Hannemann

Kelli Law

Jessica Smuin

Brent Rummmler

No

Excused

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were offered.

IV. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

A. Financial Report through April 2025 (This item was moved up on the agenda, ahead of the Trails Committee report.)

Shane Sorensen reported that the Year Over Year (YOY) number on the Sales Tax Revenue graph should be -1.85, (instead of -0.22%). This number represents eight months of revenue collected. We will likely still receive our projected budget amount for sales tax. There are several projects that should be completed by the end of June, and some where the funding will roll over. We will talk more about the details and funds as we go through the budget approval process.

The council members did not have budget questions at this time.

B. Trail Day Report

Will Jones said he biked the 25 miles of trails that were improved on Trail Day. The volunteers were incredible. Trent Edwards was not able to participate at the Saturday event, so he coordinated a work group on an evening. They estimate that 175-200 volunteers offered 400 hours of service. Often the groups consisted of parents and their teens. Some were from Alpine, but there were also volunteers from Highland, Cedar Hills, and members of the mountain bike team at Lone Peak. It was great to have the

youth involved. Will suggested it would be nice if the mayor sent a letter to the Lone Peak principal to thank them for the service performed by Lone Peak students.

Will specifically commented on Judy's Trail, along Box Elder Drive where water had washed away part of the trail, and it was a major effort to reroute it at the place where the trails converge with a bike crossing. Alpine City's Landon Wallace came to help and completed the work of about 40 volunteers in two hours. The volunteers filled up two full dumpsters with trees limbs on Saturday and made the area look beautiful.

Will expressed his gratitude to Shane Sorensen and Landon Wallace. He also appreciated Mayor Carla Merrill and council member Brent Rummier for working alongside everyone. Heidi Smith (Communications) helped with advertising and banners to get the word out and keep things organized. Will said that the cleanup in Three Falls turned out well, and that they also rerouted the Forbidden Trail at the top by the water tank, adding four switchbacks so we do not encroach into Lehi City's watershed. Will thanked his amazing Trails Committee and everyone who helped.

C. Discussion Item: Consideration for the Expansion of the Lambert Park South Parking Lot

Shane Sorensen said that at the last City Council meeting on April 22, 2025, the possibility of expanding the south parking lot at Lambert Park was discussed during Communication. Council members requested additional information prior to giving staff directions on the proposed project. The following is a brief analysis from our city attorney, Steve Doxey, outlining the approvals required for the expansion of an unpaved parking lot in Lambert Park:

1. *The Lambert Park Conservation Easement does not prohibit the expansion of the parking lot or require special approval. Section 5.A(2) of the conservation easement reserves the city's "right to identify, maintain, reroute, relocate, improve, and construct . . . trailhead parking areas in the park for the benefit of the public."*
2. *The management plan attached to the conservation easement has a similar provision.*
3. *The conservation easement **does** require unanimous approval of any amendment to the management plan that would involve the addition or expansion of a paved parking area (see Sections 5.B and 5.D; see also Management Plan, Section 8). But I understand that neither the existing parking nor the proposed expansion involves any paved parking.*
4. *DCA 3.16.040.2 provides:*
 - a. *Land included in these parks shall not be materially changed, improved, altered, disposed of in any manner or used for any other purpose except after a recommendation of the Planning Commission following a public hearing and by a supermajority vote of the City Council (4 positive votes out of 5 City Council members are required). A material change shall include, but is not limited to, a change to the park's present and essential defining characteristics, creation of **or improvement of roadways or parking lots within the park** (emphasis added).*

Based on these provisions, I believe the City Council should refer the proposed parking lot expansion to the Planning Commission for a public hearing and recommendation. The council would then have to approve the expansion by a supermajority vote.

A concept plan for the expansion of the parking area was included in the packet. Shane said that an elm tree at the intersection may need to be removed, along with encroaching vegetation.

This project would add approximately 23-26 stalls. The new lot would be just like the current parking lot, constructed of road base and gravel with a border of larger rocks. The connecting trail from the west will be considered when planning the layout for the parking stalls.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Review the requirements to expand the south parking lot at Lambert Park, the concept plan, and provide directions to the staff if there is a desire to move this project through the approval process.

Chrissy Hannemann said that when she read the minutes from the last meeting, she noted that Jessica Smuin had asked that the Trails Committee give their opinion to the council.

Will Jones was invited to the microphone. He said that the Trails Committee is 100 percent in support of the additional parking. There are often extra cars parked around on evenings and weekends, as well as when the poppies are in bloom. They do not want all the cars to create a nuisance for the neighbors. The committee also has extra fencing materials they can donate to the project.

The council talked about asking older biking teams to park at the Rodeo Grounds and recognized that the slope is too steep for most children to ride. It was also suggested that the bike teams, including children's teams, could help with the landscaping portions of the project.

Shane Sorensen clarified the timing. Because this project requires a public hearing, a recommendation from the Planning Commission, and City Council approval, it cannot be completed in time for the poppy viewing this year. However, after the approvals, the actual construction should only take a few days, and money is available in the FY2026 budget. Shane said that the Public Works crew can do the construction, but we may choose to have the gravel hauled in by a vendor. Volunteers could help install the fences.

Ryan Robinson said that the June 3 Planning Commission meeting would be the first opportunity to address this project and still meet the notice requirements.

Council members expressed their approval for the project to move forward.

V. ACTION/ DISCUSSION ITEMS**A. Approval of Lone Peak Public Safety District Budget**

Shane said that at the April 29, 2025, board meeting, the Lone Peak Public Safety District Board (LPPSD) heard a proposal from staff for a FY 2025-2026 Tentative Budget. The board approved a motion with some modifications that included assessments due from Alpine City of \$121,057 for Administration, \$1,516,641 for Police, and \$1,460,073 for Fire/EMS. The approved tentative budget includes a wage increase of 6 percent to be allocated at the respective chiefs' discretion. In addition, three engineer positions will be created within the fire department which will be promotion opportunities for firefighters to oversee the operation and care of the heavy apparatus. Part-time fire fighters will receive a \$1.00 per hour increase.

Compared to the current year's budget, the assessment to Alpine for Administration will be reduced by \$4,274 (-3.41 percent), Police will be increased by \$18,665 (+1.25 percent) and Fire will be increased by \$120,946 (+9 percent), for a combined increase of \$135,337 (+4.6 percent). These numbers will be adjusted slightly for benefits.

The LPPSD Interlocal Agreement includes the following provision related to the budget:

"The annual budget increase or decrease for the District shall not exceed the average property tax revenue increase or decrease for both cities' budgets of the previous fiscal year, excluding any new revenue increases, without the majority vote of each City Council. Said vote of each City Council shall occur prior to the adoption of the final budget."

The intent of the interlocal agreement amendment was to prevent either city from forcing, through a majority vote, a large increase on the other city. The LPPSD tentative budget was approved by the board at the April 29 board meeting. The final budget will be considered at the May 14 board meeting. Since the average property tax revenue increase of the two cities for the last fiscal year is less than the increase in the proposed assessments to fund the District, approval of both City Councils is required prior to the

district adopting their final budget in May. The Highland City Council voted to approve the tentative budget at their May 6 meeting.

The approved FY 2025-26 tentative budget and assessments for each city were included in the packet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Review and approve the Lone Peak Public Safety District tentative budget for FY2025-2026.

Chrissy Hannemann noticed that the salary increase for staff in Alpine City's proposed budget is 4 percent, and Lone Peak is asking for a 6 percent increase. She requested an explanation from the LPPSD Board.

Police Chief Brian Gwilliam said that they conducted a wage study and found that we are at or near the bottom of the list compared to the 10 closest agencies. This rating is for starting wages, mid-range wages, and top-out wages, and we are losing officers to these other agencies. Lone Peak originally asked for 8 percent, but it was cut to 6 percent. We are playing catch-up with wages, and Lone Peak would like to be in the middle of the range by July. Chief Gwilliam also clarified that the comparison was only for agencies in Utah County, not Draper (which is much higher), nor the Highway Patrol.

Chrissy Hannemann commented that typically wages in the private sector go up first, followed by federal jobs, and that local government is the last to catch up. If our wages are lower, it is difficult to compete for qualified staff.

The council discussed the following:

- Budget numbers – The accounting process was explained, along with some corrected calculations.
- Additional personnel – There are no requested additions for the police department, and additional requested positions for the fire department were previously denied.
- Large increase in overtime and standby wages – Chief Patten said that to maintain staffing at seven they often must use overtime. With the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), overtime is required for this kind of shift work, and the department also needs weekend battalion coverage so someone is in charge.
- Overtime split between cities – The cover sheet lists only Alpine's totals, but the attached documents show the details. The \$249,000 increase in overtime/standby is for both cities.
- Summer season – This time is busier because of fires and staff vacations. Overtime is required to keep personnel working, even if it is below the minimum level. Fire fighters work two days on, four days off. These cycles are established by the FLSA, and extra hours worked are paid out at 1.5 percent.
- ILA City Council approval requirement – Every year the public safety budget is brought to the council because the requested increases are higher than our property tax revenues. Alpine has consistently been covering the increase for public safety, and because we have not raised property taxes, these increases change what is available for other projects. A portion of the increase can be covered by increased sales tax revenue.

Shane Sorensen summarized Page 9 which shows adjustments to each city's assessments and reiterated that Alpine's total increase is 4.6 percent.

Motion: Kelli Law moved to approve the tentative budget for the Lone Peak Public Safety District for FY2025-2026. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Jason Thelin		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Kelli Law		
Jessica Smuin		
Brent Rummier		

B. Resolution R2025-11: Acceptance of Tentative Budget for Alpine City

Shane Sorensen explained that as per Utah Code, Alpine City has prepared the following tentative budget for FY2025, which begins July 1, 2025, and ends June 30, 2026. The proposed tentative budget is balanced, meaning that operating expenses do not exceed operating revenues. In some cases, funds are being pulled from reserves for capital projects.

After tonight, Shane will meet with council members individually to answer their questions before the final budget is voted on at the June 24 City Council meeting.

The following budget highlights were presented:

Revenues

- New homes continue to be built at a slow pace. In calendar year 2024, 22 new homes were built. Through March 2025, 21 new homes have been built in FY2025, with only 3 of those homes being built in calendar year 2025. Some revenue increase is still expected for property tax. The certified tax rate should be released in mid-June. When our certified tax rate is determined, the property tax revenue amount will be updated. Shane has already adjusted the expected revenue to show a reduction in plan checks and other building department revenues.
- While sales tax has flattened over the last year, we still anticipate reaching our budgeted revenue of \$2.1M for FY2025, however we have not projected a sales tax revenue increase for FY2026.
- The PARC Tax was approved during the 2024 election. Fiscal Year 2025 will be the first full year for PARC Tax revenue. It is expected that we will finish the year near the budgeted amount of \$100,000. No increase in PARC Tax revenue has been included in the FY2026 Budget.
- The city has received grants for various projects and anticipates additional grant revenue through awards.

Salary Increases - Funds have been allocated in the budget for up to a 4 percent merit increase for employee salaries. Some market adjustments have also been included. The city relies heavily on our nine seasonal parks crew members, and we needed to increase their wages to contend with neighboring cities. Staying competitive with wages is important with the demand for highly qualified and talented employees.

Benefits – Medical and dental insurance rates will increase 7.4 and 5 percent, respectively, but our rates are still low compared to other cities.

Capital Projects – Several capital projects are planned for the upcoming year. The project chart is on Page 37 of the materials.

- Improvements 3 is the Canyon Crest Road project. This was estimated at \$5.2M and will span the 2026-27 budget years. Alpine will work with Highland City on the 6 percent required matching funds. A meeting is scheduled tomorrow with Highland about the project design and kickoff.
- For annual projects like street maintenance (\$1M) we are working on a grant for projects which could bring in additional money for crosswalks and trails.
- The Lambert Park east turnaround area which was rolled over from the last two budgets is included.
- The purchase of the Carlton Shop is in the budget for FY2025. We plan to close on this property the first part of June, so this will not affect next year's budget.

- We have applied for grants for some Three Falls downhill trails. We also have a verbal commitment from the Corner Canyon Trails Foundation to match the grant, so if it is awarded, the new trails will not cost the city anything.
- We have various master plans to work on.
- The fund balances have been added at the bottom of the spreadsheet.

Equipment Replacement – This budget anticipates the purchase of a new pickup and a 10-wheel dump truck. Two equipment lease payments are also included. The older trucks are typically used by our seasonal workers.

Fire Station Addition/Remodel – This project is anticipated to cost around \$5M. We estimate that the project will cross budget years and be completed in FY2027. Three million dollars are included in the budget for FY2026, which includes funds that have been rolled over from previous budgets due to project delays. Our preliminary recommendation is to bond for the remaining \$2M.

Personnel – The city has been short-staffed for over a year, until recently. Due to family changes, our utility billing clerk is leaving around June 1. We have already been considering moving the part-time Public Relations/Recreation Coordinator position to full-time. Heidi Smith has a large workload in a variety of categories and has been doing a great job for us. After some consideration, we decided to post the utility billing clerk position as part-time (up to 30 hours/week). Heidi will transition to full-time and provide backup in the front office when the billing clerk is not here.

Solid Waste – A new contract renewal was completed in FY2025 with Ace Disposal. Based on the contract, there will be a 2.4 percent increase in costs for FY2026. Garbage and recycling rates will need to be adjusted to cover the increase. These rate increases will come back to the council for approval.

Emergency Services – The Lone Peak Public Safety District (LPPSD) recently approved their tentative budget. An increase was needed to fund wages, to purchase some equipment, and to cover other increased expenses. The overall increase to Alpine City for the LPPSD budget is \$135,337 or 4.6 percent.

Shane Sorensen said he will refine the budget before the second meeting in June. A property tax increase will not be required to fund the proposed budget because we can use existing revenues.

Chrissy Hannemann said that grants are a huge contribution to improvements in the city and we should continue to apply for them. She appreciated the fund balances being added to the chart, and thanked Shane for all the extra time spent on budget details, especially when he has so many responsibilities for the city.

Shane Sorensen explained that sometimes we have to wait a few years to complete a large project, but we have been able to do many projects in the past without bonding. Parks improvements are a good example of this. Large water projects and other similar endeavors (including the fire station) cannot be completed without a bond.

Motion: Jason Thelin moved to approve Resolution R2025-11 accepting the FY2026 Tentative Budget. Kelli Law seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Jason Thelin		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Kelli Law		
Jessica Smuin		
Brent Rummler		

C. Mass Gathering Permit – Crumbl Cookies

Ryan Robinson explained that according to Alpine Municipal Code 8.06.020 (Mass Gathering Ordinance), a mass gathering is defined as:

“... an assembly of more than 200 people on public property, or 300 people on private property, for a purpose different from the designated use or usual type of occupancy of the property. A mass gathering does not include an assembly of people at a location with permanent facilities designed for that specific assembly, such as a funeral or religious conference, unless the designed occupancy level is exceeded.”

Crumbl Cookies submitted an application for a mass gathering permit for an event to be held on Thursday, June 5, at Creekside Park from 6:00-9:00 pm. The event is expected to attract approximately 500 attendees. A site plan is attached, identifying locations for activities, including face painting, caricature artists, balloon artists (who will be roaming rather than stationed), a DJ, cornhole, spike ball, and 9-square. The reservation is for park pavilions only, so members of the public may still access other park amenities such as the pickleball and tennis courts.

The code allows the City Council to review the application if an event will host more than 500 people. The general review standards, listed below, have been evaluated and met by city staff.

GENERAL REVIEW STANDARDS:

The city will review a mass gathering permit for approval only if the applicant demonstrates compliance with the following:

- The application complies with all applicable provisions of the Alpine City Municipal Code, as well as state and federal law.
- The use is not detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare.
- No alcohol will be allowed on public property.
- The Lone Peak Police Department has approved the use.
- The applicant has provided general liability insurance covering the event.

ADDITIONAL STANDARDS:

- **Parking:** Creekside Park offers 143 parking stalls. Staff recommend that if off-site parking is needed, there will be no parking allowed along the south side of Village Way, the east side of 600 East, and the north side of 100 North. This will allow for the safe passage of vehicles and pedestrians.
- **Amplified Sound:** Loudspeakers have been approved by the Lone Peak Police Department. Sound levels must be kept below 80 dB (comparable to a garbage disposal, dishwasher, or vacuum cleaner). If this noise threshold is exceeded at the park's property line, LPPD may be contacted.
- **Restroom Facilities:** The code requires one chemical toilet per 250 people. On-site restrooms are available and are expected to be sufficient.
- **Food and vendor booths:** The event will be catered and no food will be sold.
- **Trash Disposal:** The applicant plans to bag and remove all garbage from the park.

CITY CODE:

- Alpine Municipal Code 8.06.020 Mass Gathering Ordinance

NOTICING:

No public hearing is required by either the State or city code.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The City Council is under no obligation to approve a mass gathering permit if they find the applicant cannot *promote and protect public health, safety, and welfare by regulating events, functions, or other temporary uses, that may have an adverse impact on the surrounding area*. The event can be denied. If the council finds they can address these standards, staff recommend approving the event with the additional standards addressed in the staff report.

Ryan Robinson said that this event does not require police officers to be present, and no roads will be closed. He further explained that the city charges \$2,500 for a mass gathering sponsored by a business, with the rental for park pavilions as an additional cost. A \$1,000 deposit is also required, and our Parks

Lead will inspect the grounds after the event. Any problems caused by the event will be deducted from the deposit amount.

The council discussed parking issues and estimated that street parking could provide an additional 100 parking places. Heidi Smith is currently working on the parking plans for Alpine Days, and those solutions may be applied to this event as well.

Motion: Brent Rummler moved to approve the mass gathering permit for Crumbl Cookies as proposed. Jessica Smuin seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Jason Thelin		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Kelli Law		
Jessica Smuin		
Brent Rummler		

D. Off-Street Parking Exception: Request for an Exception to off-site parking requirements at 645 S. Alpine Highway

Ryan Robinson explained that Cherry Hill Farms at Burgess Orchards currently operates a produce stand located at 625 S. Alpine Highway. The lot to the east, across from Bateman Lane (491 S. Alpine Highway), was purchased to add additional parking spaces.

According to Alpine Development Code 3.24.020 – *Parking Lot Characteristics*, specific conditions must be met for off-site parking approval. However, exceptions may be granted if the applicant addresses these requirements adequately.

The applicant seeks exceptions to the following requirements:

- Surface Material - Rather than paving with asphalt or cement, the applicant proposes using a hard-packed surface, similar to their existing main parking lot.
- Striping - Parking spaces will be designated by (railroad tie) wheel stops instead of painted lines.
- Lighting - No additional lighting is proposed, as their current Conditional Use Permit (CUP) requires the fruit stand to close at sunset.

As required by Alpine Development Code 3.24.030, the applicant has submitted a separate memo addressing the standards for exception:

- The unique nature of the lot configuration or use justifies the exception.
- No historically significant structures or natural features will be removed or altered. A structure is considered historic if it is over 100 years old or listed on a federal, state, or local historical registry.
- The exception will not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare.
- The design includes adequate measures to mitigate any potential adverse effects caused by the exceptions.

The applicant is also requesting an exception under Alpine Development Code 3.24.060 – *Location of Required Off-Site Parking*. To be granted, the following conditions must be met (addressed in a memo submitted by the applicant):

- The proposed parking lot and the lot it serves are under the same ownership. If not, a legally binding agreement (e.g., easement, lease, or covenant) recorded with the Utah County Recorder's Office must be provided.
- All off-site parking spaces must be on an adjacent lot or within 200 feet of the main use, measured across or along a public street.
- Safe, accessible pedestrian routes must be provided between the parking area and the main use. This may include ADA-compliant sidewalks, lighting, and marked crosswalks.
- A traffic and parking plan must demonstrate that off-site parking will not cause undue congestion or negatively affect nearby residential areas.

The Planning Commission reviewed this item during their April 29 meeting. The Commission made a recommendation to deny the request. Reasons included that the proposal did not address safety sufficiently, did not address privacy and screening for the neighbors sufficiently, and did not provide enough parking. The commission shared their desire to see a plan that increased parking on the same lot as the produce stand, before an off-site exception is considered.

Although separated by Bateman Lane, the applicant is requesting that these two lots be viewed as adjacent lots. This would not require the proposed parking area to be limited to within 200 feet of the building. This would allow them to add an additional 18 parking spaces for a total of 43. They believe that this would keep parking closer to the produce stand than by any adjoining property and be in compliance with the spirit of the ordinance.

CITY CODE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.24 Off-Street Parking

NOTICING:

No public hearing is required by either State or city code.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Review the proposed application against the current standards as found in the Alpine City Code. Staff recommend the following be included in a motion by the City Council:

- **Pedestrian Safety:** The applicant shall install "No Parking" signs approximately every 50 feet along Bateman Lane adjacent to the proposed off-site parking. Signage must be approved by the Alpine City Public Works Department and include the city logo. (The signs could be required for the whole block.)
- **Neighborhood Impact Mitigation:** To prevent congestion and preserve neighborhood aesthetics, the applicant shall submit an example of fencing (e.g., masonry wall or solid visual barrier fence) to be constructed along the neighboring property lines. Staff approval is required before City Council approval.
- **Additional Neighborhood Impact Mitigation:** "No Fruit Stand Parking Beyond This Point" signs shall be placed at the intersection of Bateman Lane and Cascade Avenue. These signs must include the Alpine City logo and be approved by the Public Works Department.
- **Pedestrian Crossing:** The applicant shall work with the City Engineering and Public Works departments to identify potential crosswalk locations or alternative pedestrian crossing solutions for Bateman Lane. This crosswalk could be at the intersection with Alpine Highway or further east on Bateman Lane.

The council, staff, and Engineer Ken Berg (Berg Engineering), who represents property owner Paul Gu, held a lengthy discussion about the issues involved in this application. Those points are summarized below. Public comments were also offered by two neighbors.

Ingress and egress for the new lot

Engineer Ken Berg said that the existing driveway connecting to the Alpine Highway is a culvert crossing and quite steep, so cars slowing to enter there would back up traffic on the highway. The Bateman Lane entrance would be wide and easily accessible for cars that turn in. This entrance could also accommodate cars leaving, but by allowing only one entrance and exit, we reduce the points of conflict for cars and pedestrians. Comments from the Planning Commission suggested that directing the parking lot traffic this way would create an extra level of safety. Ken also recommended that no parking be allowed from the corner of Bateman Lane to the entrance of the fruit stand.

The Planning Commission expressed concerns about the safety of the many pedestrians crossing Bateman Lane to visit the fruit stand. Having a one-way flow of traffic through the parking lot would improve safety for pedestrians.

Council comments: Entrance to the new lot could be restricted to Bateman Lane. Requiring cars to exit onto the highway (right turn only), would direct them through the roundabout for safer travel and reduce the traffic through the neighborhood. It is intuitive for visitors to turn right onto Bateman Lane, rather than going past the fruit stand to the steep driveway beyond.

Ryan Robinson added that a newly passed Utah State law prohibits parking in designated bike lanes on state highways, so vehicles cannot park there.

The crosswalk

Staff: There are two options for a crosswalk location: 1) at the intersection of Bateman Lane and Alpine Highway (this would be the standard approach because it is at a controlled intersection with a stop sign); and 2) a mid-block crosswalk on Bateman Lane. Mid-block crossings are somewhat discouraged because they are not at a controlled intersection. If we decide on a mid-block crossing, bright flags to make pedestrians more visible may be helpful.

Council comments: A crosswalk by the busy highway could be dangerous if motorists are waiting to turn right and not expecting people to cross there. It may be considered best practice, but pedestrians would likely feel vulnerable at that crossing.

Brent Rummeler presented a detailed statement about the petition. He said that Burgess Orchards has become a fun business and a nice addition to Alpine. Their social media campaigns have worked well and increased the number of customers as well as the safety concerns. The owners have made significant improvements to the orchard and their plan for the additional parking area is attractive. They are proactive in looking for ways to alleviate the issues that have arisen.

However, this property is located in a residential zone. The primary purpose of zoning is to segregate uses that are thought to be incompatible and to provide stability to property values. This produce stand was approved as a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), as Alpine allows incidental produce stands in residential zones. CUPs are useful for activities that could potentially have significant impacts on the surrounding community but are beneficial and necessary. CUPs are generally supported in residential zones because they serve the public good, but they require careful regulation to ensure they do not negatively impact the neighborhood's character or infrastructure.

Brent read the definition of a produce stand and the items which can be sold there from Alpine City code. Each residential zone in Alpine deserves the same protection, and just because Main Street runs through this zone does not make it less important.

In 2024, a CUP was requested for a reception center in a residential neighborhood in Alpine. This petition was denied because it did not meet the vision of the General Plan, would cause increased traffic, and would have a negative impact on the neighbors.

The produce stand has become a commercial business well beyond its original intended purpose. The applicant is asking for additional parking accommodation from the city for a business that primarily sells desserts. This business does negatively impact the neighborhood and does not involve activities that are both beneficial and necessary to the community. The 2024 sales tax revenue from this business was less than \$5,000.

The Planning Commission wanted to see a plan to increase parking on the same lot as the produce stand before off-site parking was approved. Removal of some additional trees on the west side along the highway should not compromise the greenbelt status because buildings are considered as part of the calculations. On-site parking would be safer, as visitors would not need to cross the road. The owners have ample room to increase parking on the orchard lot and should bear the burden of addressing a self-created parking problem. The solution should not encroach further into the residential zone by adding a second parking lot across the street. Brent encouraged the council to consider the Planning Commission's recommendations and other possible solutions. If the council wants to approve

the off-site parking petition, Brent suggested increasing the number of parking spaces to better accommodate the many visitors.

Business Commercial Zoning (B-C Zone)

The current zoning map shows the east side of the Alpine Highway near the fruit stand as residential. Across the street to the northwest is a B-C Zone.

Council comments: Some council members think that both sides of the highway should be zoned B-C because this is a main road. This issue cannot be addressed at this meeting but could be discussed in the future. It is likely that B-C Zoning will be approved at some point, as this is the typical progression in cities. The council will need input from the residents as well.

Number of Parking Spaces / Landscape and screening plan

Jason Thelin reviewed the comments and the decision from the Planning Commission and said that this is not a typical residential lot. It is on our main street, four lots away from the existing B-C Zone, and will likely be rezoned eventually.

In 2018, ice cream was first offered at the fruit stand. In 2021, a buyer wanted to purchase the land to construct higher density housing. The neighbors were opposed to that plan. Then Paul Gu purchased the whole orchard to keep it functioning. The popularity of the business grew, and the owners were concerned about the safety of visitors with the small fruit stand located on the curve of the highway, especially with cars parking on both sides of the road. The solution discussed with the City Council was to build a new fruit stand further north. The owners also widened the intersection of Bateman Lane to be a two-way street at a cost of \$300,000. Then because of the parking issues, they bought a \$1M property across the street to expand the parking capacity.

After all the effort and money that the owners have invested to solve problems and make it great, Jason does not understand why we are making it so hard on them. If this business were across the street in the existing B-C Zone, they would only be required to have 13 parking stalls, based on the square footage of the building. This proposal will provide 43 stalls, but in spite of this, the neighbors are still unhappy. He feels that the new lot is a good place for parking because the city owns the property to the south. It is unnecessary to tear down fruit trees when there is a great option across the street for parking.

Kelli Law spoke about our Alpine heritage and how we often discuss the importance of preserving that. Many farms have already been developed into neighborhoods, so this is one of the last orchards we can preserve. The fruit stand is very popular.

Brent Rummler said that the DeGroots are the property owners most affected by the proposed parking lot. They are diplomatic, and desire to have a good relationship with the orchard owners and want them to succeed. The DeGroots have suggested that if the city approves the lot, they should allow the 16 additional stalls to use it to full advantage. Derek Rowley assured Brent that they will not remove the evergreens on the edge of the property, which will help screen the Schirmer's lot. He encouraged the council to consider that the DeGroots have lived in their home for 25 years in a residential neighborhood and now have a proposed parking lot next door. The increased number of cars and visitors makes it more difficult to have a private setting for their pool.

Jessica Smuin said that when we approve a Conditional Use, we do so because it provides a benefit to the city. This Conditional Use provides a tremendous benefit by preserving our heritage, protecting the orchard, and aligns with our goals. After our budget hearing with increasing city costs, even \$5,000 in tax revenue is important to us. We need to be viewed as a business-friendly city, focus on economic development, and increase our tax base. Jessica thinks that the landscape plan is nice, as it screens the lot and improves the area.

Chrissy Hannemann commented that she did not believe parking lots belong in residential areas and intended to follow the Planning Commission's recommendation to deny the petition. However, taking out more trees is not a viable solution either and everyone loves the rural aspects of Alpine. She is

conflicted but does not see another solution, especially with the state law prohibiting parking on the highway. If we deny the parking lot, we will create a different problem and would then have to deny the CUP for the business. That approach would be too extreme.

Chrissy said that we have a solution. It is not perfect, but perfection is the enemy of progress. We want to do the best we can to mitigate the negative impacts of a parking lot in a residential area. Chrissy's goals are to maintain viable businesses in Alpine, maintain public safety, and maintain our residential zones. At our Main Street meetings, residents always comment on preserving the rural and historical elements of Alpine. We cannot accomplish every goal with this decision, but perhaps we can achieve most of them.

Fence issues

Ken Berg said he was not able to explain the fencing plan to the Planning Commission (PC) in their previous meeting and would like to address it with the council. Before the PC meeting, he made appointments with the neighbors and stood in their backyards so he could see their perspective. The DeGroot's property is higher at the east corner and then slopes down to the southwest. The land then angles up to the berm for the Alpine City detention basin. Ken is proposing that a deal be made with the DeGroots and a permit obtained from Alpine City to allow grading so the SW corner would be even with the rest of the lot. The earth excavated for the parking lot could be used to level out the DeGroot's backyard, and this would remove the dip in the corner that exposes the pool area to the view of the parking lot. This would also make the required 6-foot fence more effective for screening and would be a good solution for both parties. This plan would not require a retaining wall.

Public Comment – Bill DeGroot (Cascade Avenue, Alpine)

Bill said they have lived here for 25 years, and they love the orchard. He supports using the Tyler property for parking if the screening ordinance is upheld, with a masonry or solid visual barrier fence. They have counted over 90 cars parked around the fruit stand on several occasions. He would like the city to allow the maximum capacity for cars (43). The Tylers were quiet neighbors, but with a parking lot, the DeGroots will now be dealing with people and cars constantly coming and going. Their family actively uses their pool. A realtor and an appraiser have said that having a business parking lot behind their property could decrease the value by \$100,000.

Bill wants the orchard owners to abide by the city ordinance for the screening. Bill has had conversations with Paul Gu in the past. Initially Paul was very sensitive to their concerns and agreed that their property value would suffer because of the parking lot. A retaining wall was discussed, but a recent text said that the budget would not allow for more than planting some trees. Asking for a visual barrier around the parking lot is a reasonable request. Bill is willing to compromise and does not think it is fair to ask the orchard to take down more trees, especially after all the money they have invested.

Screening and fence specifications

Mayor Carla Merrill asked if Bill was amenable to having trees planted on his side of the property for a visual barrier.

Bill said that trees would not be a "solid visual barrier," unless they were very tightly spaced and were mature trees about 15 feet in height. He thinks that the intent of the ordinance is to screen the lot so that neighbors do not have to view the parking lot.

Chrissy Hannemann said that it is a division between the residents and the commercial parking area, and quoted the city ordinance, "The sides and rear of any off-street parking that adjoins a residence shall be required to be screened by a masonry wall or solid visual barrier fence." She commented that the ordinance does not mention vegetation, but trees have been suggested because of the slope.

The council and Bill DeGroot discussed the topography of the lot, the city ordinance that limits fences to 8 feet, the limit for fences on top of retaining walls at 9 feet, the possibility of creating terraces, and that variances are granted by the Appeal Authority and not the City Council.

Bill clarified that he did not import fill dirt when his home was built, and that the current fence is not on their exact property line because it was installed around existing scrub oak trees.

Steve Doxey agreed that the ordinance is intended to protect adjacent residential properties, but because of the topography, he does not think we can require a 16- or 20-foot fence as a barrier. If the applicant and the neighbor are willing to enter into a compromise to place additional fill dirt on the DeGroot property, it could facilitate the fence installation and the screening of the lot.

Engineer Ken Berg stated that the ordinance requires a site obscuring screen. They are proposing a 6-foot vinyl fence that matches the same requirements in Alpine code for screening around commercial businesses. If they are allowed to grade on the DeGroot property, they propose to move dirt to make the SW corner even with the rest of the yard so a level fence can be installed on top. A retaining wall will not be needed. Their goals is to be a good neighbor and install a level fence.

Ken Berg and Bill DeGroot had a discussion about the grading and fence details.

The council and Attorney Steve Doxey discussed the particulars of a motion regarding this petition.

Steve Doxey said that we do not have a particular elevation nor contour line to reference. Steve also clarified that a variance cannot be included as part of the motion. He said that the council could table the issue to allow time for the neighbors and the engineer to come to an agreement on the proposal.

Kelli Law suggested that to meet the ordinance the orchard owners could simply install a 6-foot fence around the lot. He has a pool at his house and everyone driving by can see it. The ordinance says the parking lot must be screened and he thinks the 6-foot fence is adequate.

Jason Thelin stated that Mr. Olsen is the neighbor to the north of the proposed lot, and asked if he could speak to the council for a few minutes.

Mayor Carla Merrill agreed to have a short comment from Mr. Olsen.

Thomas Olsen (Alpine Highway, Alpine)

Thomas said that he is concerned as he looks at the parking lot proposal because it appears that he will have cars parking 12 feet from his home. He commented on the new fruit stand and the two large homes that have been built. The Olsens like their home and want to stay there, but it will not be enjoyable to have so many cars parking nearby.

Chrissy Hannemann commented that the topography includes a steep grade up to the smaller north parking lot.

Orchard manager, Derek Rowley, said that the orchard is proposing to install a new fence around the parking lot, and hope to do so without removing vegetation.

Shane Sorensen said that the fence will effectively be taller than 6 feet because of the depth of the cut. This would create more of a visual barrier for the Olsens to screen headlights, etc.

Thomas Olsen said that he currently has a fence that is a combination of wood and chain link, mingled with the bushes. The wood section has failed and is leaning against the shrubbery.

Motion: Jason Thelin moved to approve the off-street parking exception request for 645 S. Alpine Highway and that the lots be viewed as adjacent (which would allow 43 additional parking stalls) with the following requirements:

- that the surface material will be hard packed,
- that wheel stops will be used instead of striping,
- that no lighting will be allowed because the fruit stand will close at dusk,
- that “No parking” signs will be installed approximately every 50 feet along Bateman Lane on the east side up to the corner of Cascade Avenue,
- that the applicant will work with the neighbor behind the lot (DeGroots) on grading and fill issues, and provide a fence that is at least six (6) feet tall as a solid visual barrier,
- that the applicant will also work with the City Engineer and the Public Works department to determine the best location for a crosswalk,
- that the new parking lot will have a one-way exit onto Alpine Highway, but that Bateman Lane will allow both ingress and egress,
- that an exception be granted to the 200-foot rule to allow up to 43 parking stalls on the property,
- and that the applicant will work to retain as many mature trees as possible to provide screening for the neighbors.

Brent Rummler asked if Jason would be willing to require “No fruit stand parking beyond this point” signs at Cascade Avenue.

Jason Thelin did not want to add the extra sign requirement to the motion.

Chrissy Hannemann asked if Jason would add a requirement that mature trees be preserved for screening, which he did. Chrissy also wanted to ask that the council review this decision in a year to see how things are going.

Jason Thelin said that our ordinance already allows for review, so it does not need to be included in the motion tonight.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that a motion had been made and asked if there was a second.

Kelli Law seconded the motion.

Kelli Law asked Jason Thelin what happens if the parties cannot come to an agreement.

Jason Thelin said that if they cannot agree, then the 6-foot solid visual barrier fence is what will be installed.

Brent Rummler asked if Jason would be willing to change “neighbor” to “neighbors,” because there are three neighbors that border the proposed lot.

The council discussed the issues of cost to the applicant and that the neighbors already have fences around their yards.

Jason Thelin said he would keep the motion as it stands. Ultimately there will be a 6-foot fence, hopefully with grading that lifts it up. The fence will not completely screen the DeGroot’s property from view, but we are doing the best that we can.

Brent Rummler asked again that Jason include a requirement for additional “No parking” signs for the neighborhood.

Mayor Carla Merrill asked where Brent suggests that overflow parking be provided, as no parking is allowed on the highway.

Chrissy Hannemann commented that overflow parking happens every weekend during baseball season in her neighborhood by Burgess Park.

Jason Thelin commented that city streets are for traffic and parking, and Jason's neighborhood has a lot of traffic during poppy season. He said that our goal is to address the situation the best we can.

Mayor Carla Merrill clarified that the fruit stand is open six days a week for four months.

Chrissy Hannemann said she spoke to Derek Rowley, who said that most of the traffic last season came during the you-pick time. This year the orchard will require tickets so the arrival of guests will be regulated and limited. This is the same system used at the Living Nativity event in December. The orchard is trying to avoid the extreme peaks in attendance they had last year, and they are hopeful that this season will be better.

Brent Rummler said that last summer most people skipped the fruit stand lot and parked in the neighborhood. People turn around in the residential driveways and sit on the lawns. He again suggested that signs for no parking in the neighborhood be required.

Jason Thelin did not want to require additional signs to prohibit fruit stand parking on the neighborhood streets.

Mayor Carla Merrill asked for a rollcall vote.

There were 4 yes votes and 1 no vote, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Jason Thelin	Brent Rummler	
Chrissy Hannemann		
Kelli Law		
Jessica Smuin		

A motion for the extension of the meeting was made at 9:04 pm.

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to have a brief recess and then continue the meeting until 9:45 pm. Jessica Smuin seconded the motion. There were 3 yes votes, 2 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Chrissy Hannemann	Kelli Law	
Jessica Smuin	Jason Thelin	
Brent Rummler		

The meeting was reconvened at 9:14 pm.

E. Conditional Use Permit Request for a Guesthouse: Request for a guesthouse at 1831 N. Fort Canyon Road

A proposal has been submitted to construct a guesthouse on the property located at 1831 N. Fort Canyon Road. The property is currently owned by Mary Young, who owns over 15 acres across various adjoining parcels near her primary residence. The neighboring parcel closest to the proposed guesthouse (due to the slopes on the lot), is not likely to be developed. The side yard has a 12-foot setback, as is required for a guesthouse, and is over 30 feet from the main dwelling.

This property is located within the CE-5 zone, where guesthouses are permitted through a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Additional standards for such uses are outlined in Section 3.23.060, "Review Conditions and Criteria for Certain Conditional Uses," of the Alpine Development Code.

City staff have reviewed the application in accordance with Section 3.23 and found that the required standards can be met, pending the staff recommendations outlined in this report. Since guesthouses are a Conditional Use within this zone, the city may impose additional conditions to mitigate any potential detrimental impacts of the proposed use.

If the City Council approves this application, further review will be conducted by city staff and the Building Department for such things as setbacks, height of building, and building code requirements.

The Planning Commission reviewed this item during their April 29 meeting. The Commissioners were unanimous in their decision to recommend approval to the City Council.

Conditional Use Permits (CUP)

A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is a zoning tool that allows specific land uses listed in each zone, that due to its unique nature may need additional conditions to mitigate any impacts in a given area. Examples of potential impacts may include increased traffic, noise, or environmental effects, and therefore require additional review and regulation.

Under Utah law (Utah Code § 10-9a-507) for municipalities, a CUP must be approved if reasonable conditions can mitigate any anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use.

CITY CODE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.04.030 Conditional Uses
- Alpine Development Code 3.23 Conditional Uses

Guest Houses (Ord. 94-06, 5/24/94) - Guesthouses may be allowed as a conditional use, upon approval of the designated land use authority and subject to compliance with the following:

1. Guesthouses are listed as a conditional use within the zone.
2. The lot or parcel upon which the guesthouse is proposed to be placed shall have a lot area of not less than five (5) acres.
3. The guesthouse shall be located not less than 30 feet to the rear of the primary dwelling and not closer than twelve (12) feet to any side or rear property line.
4. The water and sewer service shall be the same as for the principal dwelling.
5. The hookup fees for a single-unit dwelling with a guesthouse shall be one and one-half (1 and 1/2) times the rate for a single-family dwelling.
6. The guesthouse shall be an integral part of the site plan for the principle dwelling and attendant lot area. Vehicular access to the guesthouse shall be over the same driveway as for the primary dwelling, unless a secondary driveway can be accessed from another public right of way.
7. Prior to approval, a site plan showing the proposed location of the guesthouse and provision for utilities, vehicular access and other standards and conditions shall be submitted and approved by the Planning Commission.
8. Any person desiring to construct a guesthouse shall convey to the city water rights in the amount of one-half (1/2) acre-foot.

NOTICING:

No public hearing is required by the State or city code for this agenda item.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the information provided by the applicant and the review conducted, staff finds that the standards outlined in the Alpine Development Code have been met. If the Planning Commission identifies any detrimental impacts, appropriate conditions may be imposed to mitigate those impacts.

The Alpine City Code prohibits more than one family living in a guesthouse, use of the guesthouse as a short-term rental, or any form of commercial use, so these restrictions do not need to be addressed as a requirement of a Conditional Use Permit.

The current house is on a septic system and is not connected to the city sewer system. However, when the Three Falls development was constructed, a sewer lateral was installed to serve the Young's property. The sewer lateral is located at the southeastern corner of the lot. Staff recommend that both the existing home and the proposed guest house be connected to the city's sewer system based on the following:

- The sewer disposal for the existing home is currently provided by a septic system. However, there is an existing sewer lateral stubbed into the property. State law allows a city to require a homeowner to connect to the city sewer system if a home is within 300 feet of the system.
- Section 14.04.010.F of the Alpine City Municipal Code reads as follows:

USE OF SEWER SYSTEM MANDATORY. It shall be unlawful for the owner or any other person occupying or having charge of any premises within the city that are (1) located within 300 feet of a sewer main line, (2) within a drinking water source protection zone as provided in the following section, or (3) within a hillside protection overlay zone under DCA 3.12.090, to dispose of sewage from the premises by any means other than the city sewer system. Subject to the preceding sentence, the City Council, by resolution, may permit to continue construction, use, or continue the use of any other sewage disposal system, such as a privy, vault, cesspool, or septic tank for premises located more than 300 feet from the city sewer system upon a finding of demonstrated undue hardship.

If the City Council is inclined to allow the continued or new use of a septic system, this ordinance allows them to do so. Several things should be considered in making that decision, including the close proximity of the property to Fort Creek, the availability of sewer service to the property, and the fact that whether the city sewer or a septic is used for sewer service, the owner will experience costs for the solution. In the long term, connection to the city sewer system is recommended.

- Item 4 in the guesthouse ordinance requires water and sewer service for a guesthouse to be the same as for the principal dwelling.

Shane Sorensen reiterated that the owners must spend money whether they remain on a septic system or connect to the city sewer. In the long-term, both the homeowner and the environment will be better off if they connect to the sewer system.

The following issues were clarified:

- The size of the guesthouse is not regulated, but it does need to meet the setback requirements.
- The guesthouse will require fire suppression sprinklers because it is in the Wildland Urban Interface.
- A driveway over 150 feet in length requires a turnaround for fire department use. The Fire Chief will review the plans for safety when they are submitted.

Ryan Robinson explained that the site plan review will address many of the issues brought up by the council.

Motion: Kelli Law moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the guesthouse located at 1831 N. Fort Canyon Road as proposed, with the conditions that the home and driveway conform to all Unified Fire Code laws and are approved by the Fire Chief and staff, and that the home and guesthouse will be connected to the Alpine City sewer system. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin
Chrissy Hannemann
Kelli Law
Jessica Smuin
Brent Rummmler

No

Excused

F. POSTONED - Consideration for Approval of a Sculpture Garden: Proposed sculpture garden in the City Hall block

G. Ordinance 2025-07: Code Amendments to Title 3.07 and 3.01.110: Proposed amendments to Chapter 3.07 (Business/Commercial Zone) to allow Light Manufacturing as a conditional use, and to Chapter 3.01 (Definitions) to add a definition for Light Manufacturing

Ryan Robinson explained that an application has been submitted to allow manufacturing use in the Business-Commercial Zone (B-C Zone) as a Conditional Use. Currently, this zone only permits manufacturing uses that are part of a retail store and only if they are integral to and incidental to the retail operation.

Several other uses within the B-C Zone include additional standards as part of the review process. This proposal includes similar standards, modeled on those used in other communities and tailored to address concerns that have arisen from previous manufacturing operations.

Historically, manufacturing activities have occurred in this zone, such as candy production and mattress manufacturing. However, because no manufacturing business has maintained a valid business license in the last two years, these uses are no longer considered legally nonconforming. By adding specific standards and requiring manufacturing to be approved through a Conditional Use Permit, the city can better mitigate the potential negative impacts of such uses in the B-C Zone.

A definition for light manufacturing has also been created to add to section 3.01.110 Definitions of the Alpine Development Code. Any proposed use would need to meet the definition to be allowed.

This item was reviewed by the Planning Commission, and a public hearing was held on April 29, 2025. The Planning Commission and those who spoke during the hearing recognized there have been some manufacturing uses that were considered a benefit to the community. This included the jobs provided for residents, the economic benefits, and the pleasant aroma from the candy factory. However, the Planning Commission ultimately decided to recommend denial of the request and cited the reasoning as: concerns with additional traffic along Main Street with a manufacturing use, the negative impacts that came with former uses (overflow parking, noises, unpleasant smells), and they felt that with the neighboring properties being residential, manufacturing was not a benefit and would not have a positive impact on the city. The motion to deny was passed unanimously.

CITY CODE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.07 Business Commercial Zone
- Alpine Development Code 3.01.110 Definitions

NOTICING:

A public hearing has been noticed in accordance with State and city requirements and was held during the review of this agenda item by the Planning Commission on April 29.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

As this is a legislative decision, approval or denial should be based on whether the proposed amendment aligns with the standards set forth in the General Plan, as well as the current city codes and policies.

Neighbor Andy Spencer was invited to the microphone.

Public Comment – Andy Spencer (200 East, Alpine)

Andy said that some time ago the City Council decided that manufacturing was not appropriate in Alpine. A change to the code should only be made if there is a compelling reason that manufacturing would be a benefit now. He said that transportation and infrastructure are not at a point where this is the case and encouraged the council to deny the change.

Motion: Kelli Law moved to deny Ordinance 2025-07 Code Amendments to Title 3.07 and 3.01.110 Proposed amendments to Chapter 3.07 (Business/Commercial Zone) to allow Light Manufacturing as a Conditional Use, and to Chapter 3.01 (Definitions) to add a definition for Light Manufacturing because it is contrary to our General Plan. Jessica Smuin seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Jason Thelin		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Kelli Law		
Jessica Smuin		
Brent Rummler		

VI. STAFF REPORTS

Ryan Robinson said that the Main Street traffic planning meeting for tomorrow (Wednesday, May 21) has been postponed.

Ryan received an email from individuals who are interested in the former Purple Mattress property and would like to talk about possible uses next week. Two council members have said they would like to attend that meeting. If there is more interest from council members, please let Ryan know so we can post the required notices for a quorum in attendance.

Shane Sorensen said that Utah County offers a recreation grant to cities in our county every year with tourism tax dollars. We have let ours roll over for a few years, so we have \$29,122 available. One suggestion has been to upgrade the pickleball and tennis court lighting at Burgess Park. The first estimate was around \$50,000, but we are waiting for an updated estimate now. This project is in the tentative budget, using the grant money supplemented with PARC Tax funds. Staff feel that this is a manageable project within the scope of the grant. The application deadline with the County is June 9, and we will not meet as a council before that date. Shane asked if staff could move forward with that application.

After a brief discussion about other improvements at Burgess Park, council members agreed that this project should move forward.

Shane said he has received feedback from two council members about suggested locations for drinking fountains at the South Lambert Park parking lot, the Three Falls Trailhead, and at Moyle Park. A citizen also requested benches be installed along the trail in Burgess Park. Shane showed maps indicating the proposed locations and a sample of a drinking fountain with additional water bottle filling and pet dish capacity. We have about \$30,000 in the budget for miscellaneous park improvements. Smith Steelworks created the metal sign outside of City Hall, and we have requested a quote from them for park benches.

VII. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

Jessica Smuin said that the poppies will bloom early this year, approximately May 21 to June 9. Council members or residents are welcome to sign up to help with the Poppy Patrol.

Jessica also mentioned the wonderful Pioneers in the Park experience at Moyle Park. Visitors tour a cabin, learn how to make soap, and discover interesting facts about pioneer life. Heidi Smith can send out a link if families or youth groups are interested in attending.

Jessica commented on the 90-degree turn on Grove Drive and how visitors coming to hike at Horsetail Falls in the summer months tend to speed there.

Shane Sorensen said that Chief Gwilliam had to leave the meeting because he has an early flight in the morning. Lone Peak Police have been doing a crosswalk sting in town, and we can ask them about suggestions for that intersection.

Brent Rummler suggested a temporary speed bump that could be removed for snow plowing in the winter. Highland City has one of these.

Jessica said that an email has been circulated about the Mountainville Academy site plans. She wondered about the status and if the school is aware of the possibility of a secondary egress on 100 South.

Mayor Carla Merrill commented that Mountainville knows that they need a traffic study and they are working with Hales Engineering.

Ryan Robinson said that he and Shane spoke with the traffic engineer at Hales and their consultant, and they are aware of the city property on 100 South.

Kelli Law commented that Burgess Park looks amazing and said how fortunate we are to live here.

Chrissy Hannemann agreed with Kelli and said that her out-of-town family members marvel at our beautiful parks. She commended everyone who works on our parks and trails.

Chrissy said that with our district split coming up it would be a good idea to connect with our various schools, including Mountainville Academy, and build some bridges. We could invite each school to give a 5-minute presentation to the City Council, so they know that they are an important part of our city.

Mayor Merrill said it would be great to invite the schools to present in meetings where we have adequate time available, possibly one school presentation per meeting.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that she read Attorney Steve Doxey's response to the County regarding a trail issue in our city, and he did an excellent job. She was very impressed. We have not yet heard back from the County.

The active transportation grant from Safe Streets for All is on an indefinite hold for now.

The mayor also thanked Kelli Law for swearing in the Alpine Youth Council members, as she had a MAG meeting at the same time.

Shane Sorensen said that he and the mayor met with a lighting company at Burgess Park and also discussed the pavilion location. While they were there, two residents walked by and ranted and raved about how beautiful Burgess Park is. Shane said that Troy Hacket (new Parks Lead) is doing well. It is difficult to deal with all of these parks and their sprinkler systems, and the repairs are a constant battle. No one can imagine how extensive it is unless you have done the work. Troy is doing a great job.

Motion: Brent Rummler moved to adjourn the meeting. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin
Chrissy Hannemann
Kelli Law
Jessica Smuin
Brent Rummler

No

Excused

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 pm.