



ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

NOTICE is hereby given that the **PLANNING COMMISSION** of Alpine City, Utah will hold a **Public Meeting** on **Tuesday, September 16th, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall, 20 North Main Street, Alpine, Utah.**

The public may attend the meeting in person or view it via the Alpine City YouTube Channel. A direct link to the channel can be found on the homepage of the Alpine City website, alpineut.gov.

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

- A. Welcome and Roll Call: Alan MacDonald
- B. Prayer/Opening Comments: By Invitation
- C. Pledge of Allegiance: Michelle Schirmer

II. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

- A. None

III. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- A. **Public Hearing:** Amendment to Alpine Development Code **3.01.060** – Site Plan requirements for building permits.
- B. **Public Hearing:** Amendment to Alpine Development Code **2.03** – Appeal Authorities, clarifying that fees must be paid before an application is considered submitted.
- C. **Public Hearing:** Amendments to Alpine Development Code **3.02, 3.03, 3.04, 3.05, 3.06, and 3.07** – Allowing schools as permitted uses in each zone, as required by Utah State Code §10-9a-305.
- D. **Public Hearing:** Amendment to Alpine Development Code **3.01.110** – Adding a definition for a front yard on a corner lot.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES:

- A. September 2nd, 2025

ADJOURN

Chair Alan MacDonald
September 12th, 2025

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO ATTEND ALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS. If you need a special accommodation to participate in the meeting, please call the City Recorder's Office at 801-756-6347 ext. 5.

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING. The undersigned duly appointed recorder does hereby certify that the above agenda notice was posted at Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT. It was also sent by e-mail to The Daily Herald located in Provo, UT a local newspaper circulated in Alpine, UT. This agenda is also available on the City's web site at www.alpinecity.org and on the Utah Public Meeting Notices website at www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html.



PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING ETIQUETTE

Please remember all public meetings and public hearings are now recorded.

- All comments **must** be recognized by the Chairperson and addressed through the microphone.
- When speaking to the Planning Commission, please stand, speak slowly and clearly into the microphone, and state your name and address for the recorded record.
- Be respectful to others and refrain from disruptions during the meeting. Please refrain from conversations with others in the audience as the microphones are very sensitive and can pick up whispers in the back of the room.
- Keep comments constructive and not disruptive.
- Avoid verbal approval or dissatisfaction with the ongoing discussion (i.e., booing or applauding).
- Exhibits (photos, petitions, etc.) given to the City become the property of the City.
- Please silence all cellular phones, beepers, pagers, or other noise-making devices.
- Be considerate of others who wish to speak by limiting your comments to a reasonable length and avoiding repetition of what has already been said. Individuals may be limited to two minutes and group representatives may be limited to five minutes.
- Refrain from congregating near the doors or in the lobby area outside the council room to talk as it can be very noisy and disruptive. If you must carry on a conversation in this area, please be as quiet as possible. (The doors must remain open during a public meeting/hearing.)

Public Hearing vs. Public Meeting

If the meeting is a **public hearing**, the public may participate during that time and may present opinions and evidence for the issue for which the hearing is being held. In a public hearing, there may be some restrictions on participation such as time limits.

Anyone can observe a **public meeting**, but there is no right to speak or be heard there - the public participates in presenting opinions and evidence at the pleasure of the body conducting the meeting.

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Code Amendment-Site Plan Requirements

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: September 16th, 2025

PETITIONER: City Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Approval of Proposed Code Amendments

Review Type: Legislative

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Alpine City Staff are responsible for reviewing site plans for proposed construction projects to ensure compliance with City Code. The proposed amendments are intended to simplify the process, eliminate redundant requirements, and clarify compliance with applicable regulations. The proposed changes include:

- Removing the requirement that existing structures on adjoining properties be shown on a site plan.
- Adding language that if the lot is within a recorded subdivision, the average slope of the lot is not required, as the slope of the lot would have been provided in the subdivision proposal.
- Removing a repetitive requirement to show the location of the proposed construction and improvements. This is typically shown in the requirement that they show setbacks and building height.

CITY CODE REFERENCE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.01.060 Building Permits

NOTICING

A public hearing has been noticed in compliance with State and City Code requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Because this is a legislative decision, the standards for approval or denial are that the proposed application should be compatible with the standards found in the general plan, as well as the current city code and policies. A decision for approval or denial should be based on those criteria.

SAMPLE MOTIONS

Motion to Recommend Approval:

I move to recommend approval of the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.01.060, as presented, based on the findings that it is consistent with the General Plan and complies with City Code and policies.

Motion to Recommend Approval with Conditions:

I move to recommend approval of the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.01.060, with the following conditions:

*Insert Conditions

Motion to Recommend TABLE/ Denial:

I move to recommend to table/deny the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.01.060, based on the finding that the proposal is not consistent with the General Plan and/or applicable provisions of City Code and policies.

*Insert Findings

3.01.060 Building Permits

Construction, alteration, repair, or removal of any building or structure or any part thereof, as provided or as restricted in this ordinance shall not be commenced except upon issuance of a building permit by the Building Inspector. The Building Inspector shall verify proper zoning.

1. **Occupancy Permit.** Land, buildings or premises in any zone shall hereafter be used only for a purpose permitted in such a zone and in accordance with the appropriate regulations. A permit of occupancy shall be issued by the Zoning Administrator to the effect that the use, building or premises conform to provisions of this and all related ordinances, regulations and requirements prior to occupancy, for any building erected, enlarged or altered structurally for the occupancy or use of any land. Such a permit is needed whenever use or character of any building or land is to be changed.
2. **Inspection.** The Zoning Administrator or Building Inspector is authorized to inspect or to have inspected all buildings and structures during the course of their construction, modification, or repair, and to inspect land uses to determine compliance with the provisions of this ordinance. The Zoning Administrator or any authorized employee of the City shall exercise the right to enter any building for the purpose of determining the use, or to enter premises for the purpose of determining compliance with this ordinance, provided that such right of entry is to be used only at reasonable hours. In no case shall entry be made to any occupied building in the absence of an owner or tenant thereof without written permission of an owner, or written order of a court of competent jurisdiction.
3. **Site Plan Required.** A detailed site plan, drawn to scale shall be filed with the Building Inspector as part of any application for a building permit. The site plan shall show where pertinent:
 1. Scale and north arrow;
 2. Lot Lines and their dimensions including existing boundary monuments;
 3. Adjacent streets, roads, rights-of-way and easements;
 4. Location of all existing structures on subject property ~~and adjoining properties (completely dimensioned, including utility lines, poles, etc.);~~
 5. Irrigation and/or drainage easements;

6. ~~If not in an approved subdivision,~~ An indication of the average slope of the lot based upon application of the formula provided in DCA 3.01.100 Part 4.

~~7.—Location, proposed construction and improvements, including location of all landscape elements and signs;~~

~~8-7.~~ Motor vehicle access, including individual parking stalls, circulation patterns, curb, gutter, and sidewalk location;

~~9-8.~~ Necessary explanatory notes;

~~10-9.~~ Name, address and telephone number of builder and owner; and,

~~11-10.~~ The above, and any other information that may be requested by the Zoning Administrator or Building Inspector.

~~12-11.~~ Show Setbacks and building height.

~~13-12.~~ Attach a copy of the drainage plan and comply with the overall subdivision drainage plan.

4. **Demolition of Homes.** A demolition permit must be issued before any demolition takes place: (added by Ordinance 2004-13 on 9/28/04)

1. Demolition Permit must be reviewed by the City Engineer and may be referred to the Planning Commission.
2. All Utilities must be notified prior to the demolition.
3. Must comply with site plan requirements.
4. Notify and comply with the Utah Division of Air Quality.

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Code Amendment-Appeal Authority Requirements

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: September 16th, 2025

PETITIONER: City Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Approval of Proposed Code Amendments

Review Type: Legislative

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

This proposed code amendment clarifies the requirements for an application to be considered complete for variances and land use appeals. Specifically, it adds language requiring that the applicable form must be submitted within the designated timeframe and that all fees associated with a variance or land use appeal must also be paid within that timeframe also.

CITY CODE REFERENCE:

- Alpine Development Code 2.03.010

NOTICING

A public hearing has been noticed in compliance with State and City Code requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Because this is a legislative decision, the standards for approval or denial are that the proposed application should be compatible with the standards found in the general plan, as well as the current city code and policies. A decision for approval or denial should be based on those criteria.

SAMPLE MOTIONS

Motion to Recommend Approval:

I move that to recommend approval of the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine Development Code 2.03.010, Appeal Authority Requirements, as presented, finding that it is consistent with the General Plan, City Code, and applicable City policies.

Motion to Recommend Approval with Conditions:

I move to recommend approval of the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine Development Code 2.03.010, Appeal Authority Requirements, subject to the following conditions:

*Insert Conditions

Motion to Recommend Table/Denial:

I move to recommend to table/deny the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine Development Code 2.03.010, Appeal Authority Requirements, based on the finding that it is not consistent with the General Plan, City Code, or applicable City policies.

*Insert Findings

2.03.010 Appeal Authority

There is hereby created Appeal Authorities, consisting of an appointed Hearing Officer, which shall act in a quasi-judicial manner to hear appeals regarding the interpretation or application of Alpine City land use ordinances. For an application for the appeal authority to be considered complete, the required form and all associated fees must be submitted to Alpine City within the designated timeframe.

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Code Amendment- Certain Schools as Permitted Uses

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: September 16th, 2025

PETITIONER: City Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Approval of Proposed Code Amendments

Review Type: Legislative

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Utah State Code § 10-9a-305(7)(a) requires all charter schools, home-based microschools, and micro-education entities to be considered permitted uses in all zoning districts within a municipality. This proposed code amendment brings Alpine City Code into compliance with the State mandate.

We are also removing schools as conditional uses in each zone. The City recently created the Public Facility Zone (P-F). A proposed public school would need to apply for a rezone to the P-F zone if this proposal were adopted as a result.

CITY CODE REFERENCE:

- 3.02.020 -.030
- 3.03.020-.030
- 3.04.020-.030
- 3.05.020
- 3.07.020

NOTICING

A public hearing has been noticed in compliance with State and City Code requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Because this is a legislative decision, the standards for approval or denial are that the proposed application should be compatible with the standards found in the general plan, as well as the current city code and policies. A decision for approval or denial should be based on those criteria.

SAMPLE MOTIONS

Motion to Recommend Approval:

I move to recommend approval of the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine City Code Sections 3.02.020–.030, 3.03.020–.030, 3.04.020–.030, 3.05.020, and 3.07.020, as presented, finding that the amendment is required by Utah State Code § 10-9a-305(7)(a) and is consistent with the General Plan, City Code, and applicable City policies.”

Motion to Recommend Approval with Conditions:

I move to recommend approval of the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine City Code Sections 3.02.020–.030, 3.03.020–.030, 3.04.020–.030, 3.05.020, and 3.07.020, subject to the following conditions:

*Insert Conditions

Motion to Recommend TABLE/Denial:

I move to recommend to table/deny the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine City Code Sections 3.02.020–.030, 3.03.020–.030, 3.04.020–.030, 3.05.020, and 3.07.020, based on the finding that it is not consistent with the General Plan, City Code, or applicable City policies.

3.03.020 Permitted Uses

The following uses of land shall be permitted upon compliance with the applicable standards and conditions set forth in this ordinance.

1. Single-unit detached dwellings when located on a lot in a recorded subdivision and subject to compliance with the applicable conditions within the zone.
2. Agriculture, including the raising of row crops, grains and fruits.
3. The keeping and raising of animals and fowl, subject to the provisions of DCA 3.21.090.
4. Buildings and other structures for the storage and keeping of agricultural products and machinery.
5. Public park and recreation developments and appurtenant structures.
6. Customary residential accessory structures which are an integral part of and incidental to an approved dwelling.
7. Customary household pets.

8. Accessory Dwelling Unit subject to the applicable provisions of DCA 3.14.

9. Charter schools, home-based microschools, and micro-education, as required by Utah State Code §10-9a-305(7)(a), subject to DCA 3.20 -and any additional requirements consistent with applicable provisions of State law.

~~8.—~~

(Ord. 95-24, 11/14/95; Ord. 2014-11, 6/24/14)

HISTORY

Amended by Ord. 2023-27 on 11/14/2023

3.03.030 Conditional Uses

The following buildings, structures and uses of land may be allowed upon compliance with the standards and conditions set forth in this ordinance and after approval has been given by the designated review body. Additionally, no development will be allowed where any part of the zoning lot is above an elevation of 5350 feet mean sea level except as noted in DCA 3.12.

1. Single family dwellings (Conventional construction) when proposed for placement on a lot not in a recorded subdivision, subject to compliance with the applicable conditions within the zone and approval of a site plan by the Planning Commission.
2. Subdivisions projects, subject to compliance with the applicable requirements of the subdivision ordinance, except that: (a) where any portion of the area included within the subdivision shall lie within the territory designated within the Sensitive Lands Overlay Zone (SLO zone) or (b) as the City may designate, the subdivision shall be developed only under the provisions of DCA 3.09 relating to Planned Residential Developments.
3. Planned Residential Developments (PRD), subject to compliance with the provisions of DCA 3.09.
4. Water, sewer and utility transmission lines and facilities required as an incidental part of development within the zone, and subject to the approval of a site plan by the planning commission.
5. Motor vehicle roads and rights-of-way subject to compliance with City standards for design and construction for such uses and upon approval of a site plan by the Planning Commission.
6. Home Occupations, subject to the provisions of DCA 3.23.060 Part 2.
7. Guest Houses, subject to the applicable provisions of DCA 3.23.070 Part 1.
8. ~~Schools, Churches~~, hospitals (human care) and similar quasi-public buildings (except schools) subject to approval of a site plan by the planning commission.
9. Plant nurseries and tree farms, but not including retail sales of materials on site.
10. Civic Buildings
11. Incidental Produce Stands, subject to the provisions of DCA 3.23.070 Part 4. (Ord. 96-05, 4/10/96)
12. Shooting Galleries, subject to the applicable provisions of MCA 9.17 .

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Code Amendment-Corner Lot Front Yard Definition

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: September 16th, 2025

PETITIONER: City Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Approval of Proposed Code Amendments

Review Type: Legislative

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

City Staff is proposing to add language defining what a front yard for a corner lot would be. Recently we have seen house plans submitted for corner lots and due to lesser setback requirements want to designate clear side yards as a front yard. This definition will help identify what would be defined as a front yard vs what is a designated side yard.

CITY CODE REFERENCE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.01.110

NOTICING

A public hearing has been noticed in compliance with State and City Code requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Because this is a legislative decision, the standards for approval or denial are that the proposed application should be compatible with the standards found in the general plan, as well as the current city code and policies. A decision for approval or denial should be based on those criteria.

SAMPLE MOTIONS

Motion to Recommend Approval:

I move to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Alpine Development Code §3.01.110 defining the front yard on corner lots, finding that it is consistent with the General Plan, City Code, and City policies.

Motion to Recommend Approval with Conditions:

I move to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Alpine Development Code §3.01.110 defining the front yard on corner lots, with the following conditions

*Insert Conditions

Motion to Recommend TABLE/ Denial:

I move to recommend to table/deny the proposed Code Amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.01.110, based on the finding that the proposal is not consistent with the General Plan and/or applicable provisions of City Code and policies.

*Insert Findings

YARD, CORNER, FRONT For corner lots, the front yard shall be designated based on the following criteria:

- a) The orientation of the principal building primarily facing the yard.
- b) The official address assigned to the property.
- c) The location of the front door or main entrance of the principal building.
- d) If none of the above clearly identifies a front yard, the yard adjacent to the street with the longest continuous street frontage shall be deemed the front yard.

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT
September 2, 2025

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

- A. Welcome and Roll Call:** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Alan Macdonald.
The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Chair: Alan Macdonald

Commission Members: Troy Slade, Michelle Schirmer, Jeff Davis, John MacKay, Greg Butterfield, Susan Whittenburg

Excused:

Staff: Ryan Robinson, Jason Judd, Marla Fox

Others: Mike Glauser, Brent Pace, Laurie Loder, Dan Jimenez, Joy Jones, Robert Jones, Andrew Young, Janette Kennedy, Wes funk, Justin Cloward, John Magnusson, John Nash, Lon Lott, Loraine Lott

- B. Prayer/Opening Comments:** John MacKay

- C. Pledge of Allegiance:** Jeff Davis

II. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Laurie Loder, resident, said Alpine is a bedroom community that is quiet and beautiful, and the leaders were voted in because the citizens wanted to keep it that way. She said the leaders are not listening to the residents and are letting these people pay all this money and giving them whatever they want. She said you don't fight for us when you're supposed to speak for us. She said the city is letting more people come in when we don't have water. She said she is concerned about her trees dying because she is required to cut down on watering and the traffic is bad.

John Magnusson, resident, said he is interested in what the city wants to do with area south of Main Street. Alan Macdonald said the Planning Commission does not make any decisions. He said we listen to the petitioner, we review the application to see if it fits with our ordinances, we discuss the facts and send our recommendations to the City Council with a good basis to make a determination. He said a lot of times this involves a Public Hearing which a re-zone would include.

Justin Cloward, resident, asked who the petitioners were. Alan Macdonald said he assumed it was the property owners. Ryan Robinson said there were four owners who wanted to re-zone to the business commercial zone. He said the application was made by Burgess Orchards and they have to involve the other property owners so there is a continuation of the business commercial zone. Otherwise, just one property would be considered a spot zone, and we don't allow that. One of the owners had questions and wanted to work some things out, and we told them to get this figured out and come back with a new proposal. They canceled last Thursday and asked to be off the agenda. The city will post this agenda item again if it is brought back and we will send out letters to residents within 500 feet of the proposed re-zone.

III. ACTION ITEMS

- A. Action Item: Home Occupation Permit: Clear Water Aesthetics**

Ryan Robinson said Makelle Waters has submitted an application for a home occupation business license for *Clear Water Aesthetics*, to be located at 154 N 500 E. The business will provide aesthetic services to clients within the residence.

The applicant states that only one client will be served at a time, with a maximum of 10 clients per week. Parking will be provided in the existing driveway, located on the southern boundary of the property. The parcel also borders the northeastern portion of Creek Side Park along its southern and eastern property lines. No additional employees are proposed as part of this home occupation.

City staff has reviewed the application and found it to comply with the Home Occupation Business standards in Alpine Development Code (ADC) 3.23.060. Because this use is classified as a Conditional Use, the Planning Commission may attach conditions to “mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards” (Utah Code 10-9a-507).

Applicable standards are found in ADC 3.23.030. Any conditions imposed must be directly tied to these standards and stated on the record as part of the approval. These standards include:

- a) Compliance with applicable provisions of City, State, and Federal law.
- b) Compatibility of structures with surrounding uses in terms of use, scale, mass, and circulation.
- c) No detriment to public health, safety, or welfare.
- d) Consistency with the Alpine City General Plan.
- e) Traffic conditions not adversely affected.
- f) Sufficient utility capacity.
- g) Adequate emergency vehicle access.
- h) Compliance with off-street parking standards.
- i) Appropriate fencing, screening, and landscaping to mitigate conflicts.
- j) Compliance with exterior lighting standards.
- k) Compliance with signage standards, aquifer protection, slope retention, and flood mitigation.
- l) Reasonable limitations on hours, methods of operation, and building size.

MOTION: Planning Commission member John Mackay moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for *Clear Water Aesthetics*, located at 154 N 500 E, based with conditions, based on the findings that the application complies with the standards of Alpine Development Code 3.23.030 and Utah Code 10-9a-507.

- 1. No more than one client can be on the premises at a time.
- 2. Retail sales are prohibited except for incidental products directly related to the service.
- 3. No on-street parking during hours of operation.
- 4. Hours of operation from 8:00 am to 8:00 pm.

Jeff Davis seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Michelle Schirmer
Troy Slade
Alan Macdonald
Jeff Davis
John MacKay
Greg Butterfield
Susan Whittenburg

Nays:

Excused

B. Action Item: Review of Proposed Exceptions Request by Mountainville Academy for a STEM Building.

Ryan Robinson said Mountainville Academy, located at 195 S Main Street, has submitted an application to expand its current school footprint by constructing a new STEM building on property at 147 S Main Street. A site plan has been submitted and is included with this report.

Utah State Code §10-9a-305(7)(a) requires that a charter school, home-based microschool, or micro-education entity be considered a permitted use in all zoning districts within a municipality. While cities must allow charter schools in all zones, §10-9a-305(10)(a) authorizes municipalities to regulate:

- Parking
- Traffic
- Hours of operation
- Municipal ordinances and regulations consistent with the statute
- Project locations when necessary to avoid risks to health or safety

The Alpine Development Code §3.20 (Standards for Schools) provides local standards to regulate these areas. Section 3.20.010 allows exceptions to these standards to be granted following a Planning Commission recommendation and City Council review.

Ryan Robinson said the applicant has requested exceptions to the following requirements:

- Setbacks
- Bulk & massing
- Parking

Attached to this report is a staff-prepared memo reviewing the applicable code standards where exceptions have been requested. The applicant has also provided documentation outlining its reasoning for the proposed exceptions. In addition, Alpine City has contracted a third-party engineering firm to review the applicant's traffic study. This review was not completed prior to this meeting but will provide additional information regarding proposed traffic solutions once finalized. The City Engineer will then review the submitted studies and give a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Ryan Robinson said there is no issue with the height of the building, but we need to review the bulk and massing to make sure the buildings do not exceed what can fit on the property.

Alan Macdonald said we will table this item tonight until a traffic study is completed. In fairness to Mountainville, the city will review the proposed application and the exceptions they are asking for and give some feedback on the bulk and massing and parking.

Ryan Robinson said Mountainville Academy is proposing a new STEM building to their campus. We are looking at building size and what the impact would be. The new building would go on the old Carlisle lot. New parking stalls would be added along with the new building.

1 Brent Pace, Odyssey Builders and Charter School Developer, Dan Jimenez, City Relations Chair and
2 resident were introduced and asked to come to the podium to answer questions.

3 Ryan Robinson said the new STEM building would be built over the property line and obviously not meet
4 the side yard requirement and would need an exception. Jeff Davis said he would like to clean this up and
5 an option would be to make this one parcel. In doing this, the setback issues go away.

6 Dan Jimenez said the one reason why they wouldn't want to combine all three parcels is because it makes
7 a bulk and massing problem and the new property couldn't be built on which is a waste of the schools
8 money. He said we would need an exception on the bulk and massing.

9 John MacKay said he would like to see the lots combined so the setback ordinance could be met. Dan
10 Jimenez said they could combine two of the properties and meet the setback ordinance and the bulk and
11 massing, but it can't be done by combining all three parcels.

12 Dan Jimenez said we would have 159 parking spaces which would accommodate parking most of the
13 time. He said we need 164 parking spaces, and we could get there if we took out more green space. Greg
14 Butterfield said he disagrees because he has been to the school three different times during the day and
15 there were no open parking stalls. He said this was on regular school days with no events going on.

16 Dan Jimenez said the new STEM building would be used for the current students, and it wouldn't be used
17 to grow the head count. Greg Butterfield asked why the school couldn't be better stewards of the city and
18 use that new parcel for parking and better ingress and egress. He said parents have said they want a
19 cafeteria and asked if that was the reason for the new building. The applicant said they want the building
20 to be able to spread out to do their projects.

21 Alan Macdonald said the school has produced a lot of traffic problems and could alleviate those problems
22 by using the new property to help solve the traffic and parking issues. He said the school is choosing to
23 have convenience for their students and to provide a cafeteria over fixing the traffic problems.

24 Mike Glauser, applicant, said the STEM building is needed to help the kids get a good start by enhancing
25 the program with a better facility. Greg Butterfield said in Seattle, Amazon has large buildings with no
26 parking. The employees park somewhere else and are shuttled in. He watched fifty cars go into the
27 school today with one student in the car and wanted to know why the kids are not walking or being bused.
28 He said these solutions would be cheaper than putting in a median or a traffic light.

29 Alan Macdonald said this area has a difficult egress with the bank right there and 100 South, and parents
30 trying to turn left on Main Street. The applicants said this is a difficult problem to solve but said they
31 want to work with the city to solve it. They said they could move the egress over if that helped. They
32 said they view this as an improvement with the additional parking spaces.

33 Susan Whittenburg said other schools have programs for drop-off and pick-up or have off-site pick-up.
34 She said something like this would keep the traffic off Main Street.

1 Ryan Robinson said schools are zoned for permitted uses, but they are asking for exceptions. Alan
2 Macdonald said we are dealing with parking, traffic, safety of the students and the residents. He said the
3 proposal is that the city needs to compromise with the school to fix problems that the school created.

4 Greg Butterfield said if this was denied, it would force the applicants to come back with other solutions.
5 Ryan Robinson said it would still go to the City Council, so by tabling, you could look at this again after
6 the traffic study comes back.

7 Jeff Davis said parking is an improvement with what is proposed, but we need to discuss bulk and
8 massing. Ryan Robinson said the bulk and massing has to do with one building to the acreage. He said
9 we look at this school as one property just as we look at other schools.

10 Troy Slade said it doesn't make sense to have separate lots. He asked if the lots were separate, could they
11 sell off one of the buildings on the separate lot. John MacKay said he didn't know how they would be
12 able to get a bank loan having separate lots. He said he would also like to have a report back from Dan
13 Jimenez showing how the board would solve the traffic problems.

14 John Mackay said he is in favor of all three lots being combined and recommending the exception on the
15 bulk and massing.

16 Greg Butterfield asked if the school could scale back to lower head count to fit the space rather than
17 putting another building and more head count in a problem area. He said this is just for profit and it could
18 be scaled down. Dan Jimenez said their funding is based on the head count.

19 Alan Macdonald said the school is looking at what's best for the students and not what's best for the
20 residents. He said Greg Butterfield is alluding to the fact that you could use that property to alleviate
21 traffic problems, but you are choosing not to because you would rather not inconvenience the kids, and
22 you want a cafeteria. So, you're looking at what's best for your kids versus what's good for the residents
23 of Alpine. And solving traffic problems that your school has created, you're more or less saying maybe
24 the city will let us use that property they own and put an easement on it. He said you have a simple
25 option; you're essentially just choosing the convenience of your students and a cafeteria over the traffic
26 problems you've created on Main Street for the citizens of Alpine.

27 Dan Jimenez said the board had a fiduciary duty to its students to provide the best possible education and
28 safe experience. The intent of this is to continue to help establish this school as the number one charter
29 school in the state as it was last year. The school is STEM certified, and the mission of the school and the
30 differentiator is to focus on STEM and leadership.

31 Dan Jimenez said we feel like it's a smart investment to put dollars into ensuring that for the long haul,
32 this could be done. He said as a concerned citizen of Alpine, he wants to put forth a plan that helps
33 improve, maybe not fix, but helps improve the challenges that have been brought up.

34 Jeff Davis asked if the new STEM building was built, could you house 7th, 8th, and 9th graders. Dan
35 Jimenez said they used to have those grades a few years ago but reduced down to kindergarten through 6th
36 grade. Alan Macdonald asked if they have more square footage, could they bring in more students. Dan
37 Jimenez said they could.

Michelle Schirmer said they are already building for future expansion. They told us they would add two pre-K classes.

Jeff Davis said he would like to see one property which solves the problems with the setback. He said he likes the concept but has concerns about increasing the enrollment. He asked if we could come up with a win-win situation with a drastic improvement on the traffic. He said he believes the traffic can be improved if we don't allow left hand turns.

Susan Whittenburg said there is so much inconvenience to the city and the residents. She would like to see some education on the part of the parents and the students with parking rules, standards and awareness. The residents don't want another building when we can't get the current traffic under control.

Greg Butterfield said he is not as lenient with the bulk and massing. He said we always grant approval to exceptions and sometimes it doesn't make sense to do so.

John MacKay said he likes staggered start times with Timberline.

Michelle Schirmer said new rules and routes are not an option. She said this is what parents must do if their kid goes there. The parents are used to going where they want, and parking where they want. This behavior would need to change.

Ryan Robinson said we are supposed to get a traffic study draft this week.

MOTION: Planning Commission member Jeff Davis moved to table the exception request for Mountainville Academy until the third-party review of the submitted transportation study is completed and submitted to Alpine City and with the following conditions:

1. The Cities Master Traffic Plan is presented to the Planning Commission.
2. An understanding with the city on the easement going to first south.
3. Evidence from the board to bring forth additional ideas to deal with the traffic.
4. Willing to Consolidating the three lots to one parcel.
5. An agreement to not increase the head count.

Troy Slade seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 1 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Michelle Schirmer
Jeff Davis
Alan Macdonald
John MacKay
Troy Slade
Greg Butterfield
Susan Whittenburg

Nays:

Excused

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

John Mackay said the potholes are being fixed with asphalt thrown on them and creating a bump. He said they are not tamping it down and it's not the best job.

V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: July 29, 2025

MOTION: Planning Commissioner Susan Whittenburg moved to approve the minutes for July 29, 2025, as written.

Greg Butterfield seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Nays:

Excused:

Michelle Schirmer
Troy Slade
Alan Macdonald
Jeff Davis
John MacKay
Greg Butterfield
Susan Whittenburg

MOTION: Planning Commissioner Jeff Davis moved to adjourn the meeting.

Susan Whittenburg seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Nays:

Excused

Michelle Schirmer
Troy Slade
Alan Macdonald
Jeff Davis
John MacKay
Greg Butterfield
Susan Whittenburg

The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.