

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

January 13, 2026

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 Rummel, Jessica Smuin, Sarah Blackwell, Chrissy Hannemann, and Andrew Young

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

Others: Susan Gunby, Curtis Gunby, Thomas Olsen, Jeff Squires, Dan Blackwell, Sullivan Love, Mason Bennett, Sheryl DeGroot, Steve Burrows, Will Jones, Taj Young, Derek Rowley, Bob Schirmer, Katherine Johnston, Ken Berg, Lawrence Hilton, Sheryl Dame, Ross Welch, Kristin Eberting

B. Prayer

Chrissy Hannemann

C. Pledge

Brent Rummler

II. SWEARING IN OF NEWLY ELECTED OFFICIALS

Re-elected Mayor Carla Merrill and new City Council members Sarah Blackwell and Andrew Young were sworn in by City Recorder DeAnn Parry.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to change the order of the agenda to hear the presentation from the One Kind Act a Day Foundation. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes Chrissy Hannemann
No Andrew Young
Excused Brent Rummler
Jessica Smuin
Sarah Blackwell

III. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

A. Presentation: One Kind Act a Day Foundation

Mason Bennett explained that One Kind Act a Day is a non-profit organization funded by the Semnani Family Foundation to inspire daily acts of kindness. They have enjoyed the partnership with Alpine City and our three schools. Alpine's Youth Council enthusiastically installed more signs than any other city, and the Foundation was pleased to be included in the Alpine Days parade. Jen Wadsworth and Juliette Ensign have served as wonderful liaisons, but as Juliette has moved from Alpine, they would like to recruit another representative.

Mason presented the city with an attractive framed proclamation and congratulated everyone on achieving official status as a City of Kindness,

Brent Rummler commented that he appreciates the daily texts sent out by the foundation with kindness quotes and suggestions.

III. WORK SESSION

A. Presentation of Culinary Water Master Plan Update – Horrocks Engineers

John Schiess from Horrocks Engineers provided an update on the Culinary Water Master Plan. He explained that the purpose is to review state and federal requirements, analyze current water usage, and use a computer model to evaluate how the existing water system is performing. The model is also used to project future growth and anticipated water demand, and to identify the improvements needed to meet

those future needs. John said that this process is required by the State in order for the city to set impact fees.

John explained that the update includes three main components. The first is the Water Master Plan, which looks at how the city meets current needs, plans for future culinary needs, and identifies other needed improvements. The second is the Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP), which identifies specific infrastructure projects needed to serve growth. The third is the Impact Fee Analysis (IFA), which assigns costs to those projects and determines what portion can be attributed to growth and recovered through impact fees.

John reviewed a map of the current water system and explained that, overall, the system is in good condition with only minor deficiencies. He discussed facilities including the Box Elder, Grove, and Willow Canyon tanks, and the various waterline improvements around the city that are intended to improve fire flow.

John pointed out the need for a larger waterline on the east side of the city and explained that many of the planned improvements will benefit both current and future residents. Project costs are split between those that address existing needs and those related to growth. Only the growth-related portions are eligible to be funded through impact fees.

John explained that fire flow standards are set by the International Fire Code and they change regularly, which makes long-term planning a challenge. Water tanks that met standards when they were built may be considered too small with new requirements. Fire flow needs are calculated based on the size of the largest structure in an area and whether it has fire sprinklers.

The Box Elder and Willow Canyon tanks were evaluated assuming the largest homes in those areas do not have sprinklers. John explained that if those homes *do* have sprinklers, the required fire flow storage would be lower, and existing tanks may be adequate. He recommended taking a closer look at those areas with the Fire Marshal to better understand the actual requirements and if adding tanks or booster pumps would be best for each area.

Since the previous master plan was created, the city has installed electronic water meters which have provided much better usage data. This data was used in the updated model, giving us a more accurate analysis of the system and future needs.

John explained the concept of level of service, which describes the standard the water system is designed to meet. The plan first looks at whether the existing system meets that standard and then suggests improvements to maintain the same level of service as the city grows. Only improvements that go beyond the existing level of service can be funded through impact fees.

John reviewed the project costs and timelines included in the plan. He explained that project costs are shown as total costs, with portions assigned to existing needs and growth. The recommended timing of projects is based on engineering judgment, but staff can adjust the schedule to account for the budget, priorities of other projects, or construction timing. The water system was close to breaking even with user fees in 2024, and the plan does not propose current changes to water rates, although adjustments may be needed in the future.

The expansion of the Grove tank is the most expensive project identified in the plan. It receives water from Grove Spring and has functioned well for approximately 60 years. This is beyond the typical life for a concrete tank. The current capacity is adequate, but future growth is expected to exceed that capacity. Other pressure zones rely on booster pumps that draw from the Grove tank, and increasing storage there would reduce the water spilling into the PI system and allow the city to keep more spring water in the culinary system. We will need further study before deciding whether to replace the tank or add to its storage capacity.

The council discussed fire flow standards, the necessity of fire sprinklers in reducing infrastructure needs, and the city's responsibility to provide adequate fire protection for everyone. Large homes that are not in

the Wildland Interface also affect the calculations for fire flow. Culinary water must be used for fire protection because it is available all year and is free from mud and debris that can damage the equipment.

Mayor Carla Merrill thanked John Schiess for his presentation. The mayor also mentioned that Jason Judd, our new City Engineer, was at the meeting tonight and she appreciated him attending.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. **Approve City Council Minutes from the December 4th Training and December 9th Meetings**
- B. **Approval of Proposal to Conduct Main Street Crosswalk and Related Items Warrant Study – Fehr & Peers: \$16,700**
- C. **Partial Payment No. 1 – CDBG ADA Ramp Project, Pronghorn Construction: \$38,081.60**
- D. **Final Payment – CDBG ADA Ramp Project, Pronghorn Construction: \$76,229.71**
- E. **Resolution R2026-01: Reappointment of Trail Committee Members**
- F. **Resolution R2026-02: Reappointment of Prime-Time Committee Members**
- G. **Resolution R2026-03: Approval of Amended Consolidated Fee Schedule – TSSD Impact Fee**
- H. **Resolution R2026-04: Appointment of Brent Rummel and Chrissy Hannemann to the Lone Peak Public Safety District Board**
- I. **Resolution R2026-05: Appointment of Shane Sorensen to the Timpanogos Special Service District Board**
- J. **Resolution R2026-06: Appointment of Ryan Robinson and Mayor Carla Merrill to the Central Utah 911 Board**
- K. **Ordinance 2026-01: Adoption of the 2006 Wildland Urban Interface Code**

A discussion about the Consent Calendar resulted in the following clarifications:

- The warrant study will look at relocating the Main Street crosswalk as well as other traffic mitigation ideas such as staggered school release times and direction of travel implications. The study by Fehr & Peers will be completed soon and should give the council a bigger picture view of the issues.
- The Trails Committee has done an excellent job in the past, and Andrew Young has been assigned to work with them going forward. If additional members are needed after an evaluation period, the committee can work with the mayor to request additional help.
- TSSD is planning to spend a billion dollars on projects in the next ten years. Someone on the board, who is also an engineer and works for another city, said they could accomplish all the projects at a much lower cost. This other city administrator feels fiduciary responsibility in the same way Shane Sorensen does, and he wanted the support of another engineer to help find lower cost options for the required improvements. This is the reason for Shane's appointment to the board. Brent Rummel has done a great job in his time on the TSSD Board.
- Assignments for the LPPSD Board will be updated in 2027 so that terms of service can be staggered.

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. There were 4 yes votes and 1 no vote, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Chrissy Hannemann		
Brent Rummel		
Jessica Smuin		
Sarah Blackwell	Andrew Young	

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Steven Burrows – Meadowlark Drive, Alpine

Steven said this is a historic meeting with the new City Council members being sworn in. He has lots of confidence in the city staff and appreciates the improvements made on Canyon Crest Road. He supports the continued effort to make positive changes in the water systems, which are like a three-legged stool. Mother Nature provides water at high or low levels; retention helps us use what we receive and takes planning and funding; distribution and conservation help in the effort to meet water needs. We are experiencing the lowest snowfall in 25 years, so Steven looks forward to continued discussions about our water systems.

VI. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

B. City Council Assignments – 2026

Mayor Carla Merrill said she attends as many city events as possible and encouraged the council members to do the same and be involved in our community.

The following committee assignments were announced:

Board or Committee	Assigned
Mayor Pro Tem	Jessica Smuin
Aging Advisory Council	Carla Merrill
Alpine Days Rodeo Parking	Andrew Young
Alpine Water District	Andrew Young
Alpine Youth Council	Sarah Blackwell
American Fork Canyon Work Group	Carla Merrill
American Fork Chamber Executive Council	Carla Merrill
American Fork Chamber of Commerce	Sarah Blackwell
American Fork Hospital Outreach	Carla Merrill
Aspen Peaks School District Superintendent Candidate Review Committee	Carla Merrill Chrissy Hannemann
Corridor Preservation Review Committee	Carla Merrill
Council of Governments (COG)	Carla Merrill Alt: Chrissy Hannemann
Finance Committee	Chrissy Hannemann
History Committee	Jessica Smuin
Joint Policy Advisory Committee	Carla Merrill Alt: Jessica Smuin
Lone Peak Public Safety District	Brent Rummel Carla Merrill Alt: Chrissy Hannemann
Metropolitan Planning Organization	Carla Merrill
MAG Budget and Audit Committee	Carla Merrill
Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG)	Carla Merrill Alt: Chrissy Hannemann
Mountainland Continuum of Care	Carla Merrill
Moyle Park	Jessica Smuin
Trails Committee	Brent Rummel Andrew Young
Utah County Boundary Commission	Carla Merrill
Wasatch Front Regional Council	Carla Merrill

It was noted that training for council members will take place April 22-24 and again in October. Detailed information should be available later this month. Those planning to attend should coordinate with Carolyn Riley for hotels and registration.

VII. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Approval of Contract with Landmark Design for Parks Master Plan Update: \$50,635 (additional optional items \$43,160)

Ryan Robinson explained that the current Alpine City Parks Master Plan was created in 2004 and needs to be updated to meet the current needs and demands of the city. A master plan is a long-range document that guides how a city will develop, improve, and manage its parks, trails, and recreational facilities. It evaluates existing park assets, identifies current and future community needs, and establishes goals, standards, and priorities for land acquisition, facility improvements, and maintenance. The plan will serve as a policy framework to help elected officials and staff make consistent decisions, coordinate capital improvement

projects, and ensure that park investments align with population growth, recreation demands, and the community's overall vision.

Three consulting firms submitted bids for this project, with bids ranging from \$50,000 (with additional options and costs), to \$199,130. Staff reviewed each proposal in detail and checked with multiple references for each firm. Heidi Smith, Parks & Recreation, has a background in design and marketing and also reviewed the proposals. Staff recommend that the council approve Landmark Design for the Alpine City Parks Master Plan. Their bid came in at a base price of \$50,635, with additional optional services not to exceed a total of \$93,795. The options should be evaluated carefully to determine if they are needed. This project is planned for a six-month timeline but can be adjusted. Public surveys and resident feedback are an important element.

Public Notice

No public hearing is required for this agenda item.

General Plan Reference

Pages 20-27 of the Alpine General Plan cover high level goals and policies associated with the various parks.

Staff Recommendation

Approve Landmark Design as the consultant for the Alpine City Parks Master plan.

Shane Sorensen said that in order to charge impact fees we must have justification. He suggested that we do not include the operations and management option at this time, as we can add it in the future if it is beneficial. Entities like Landmark create these plans as part of their business so they know the rules, requirements, and how to analyze existing deficiencies and figure out the needed growth-related improvements. Annual updates to the plan can be paid for from impact fees. One concern is staff bandwidth. Even when using a consultant, there is significant staff time involved in providing information, attending meetings, and preparing presentations for the City Council.

Alpine added significant infrastructure and completed major projects with impact fees during our high growth period. This benefits the city now, as construction costs are much more expensive today.

The projects submitted by council members for the budget include a significant number of parks projects. To be eligible for impact fee use, they must be in the master plan. By State law, changes to impact fees do not go into effect for 90 days after approval by the City Council.

Brent Rummller said that it is important that we create a thorough survey for residents and have really good advertising. Staff can determine which additional services would be best included in this plan. The Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) suggested using consultants to write proposals to be more successful. It is important to have resident input on this matter, but when we advertised the option to form a Parks Committee, we only received one application. There are not many people ready to step up and volunteer. Another benefit of the master plan will be to make sure our impact fees are defensible.

Ryan Robinson said that with the surveys we have conducted recently (Main Street and community wellbeing), the team from Utah State was impressed with our citizen level of response. We can create the survey questions ourselves and submit them in February. It will require funds to create the plan now but will help us get grants in the future. Some grants are a 50 percent match, but Federal matches are lower. Our Main Street plan only cost the city \$6,000, and the remaining \$100,000 was paid from a grant through the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG). Ryan appreciated that Landmark gave us a base price with optional add-ons.

Andrew Young was concerned about the cost for the plan update and said he would like to see an example of a master plan for another city previously created by Landmark. He suggested we have residents work on the plan to save money. Andrew said we could gather resident ideas, form them into goals,

submit the goals for feedback, and then send the results to a designer. He expressed criticism of the Main Street plan design, and recommended tabling this proposal.

Jessica Smuin liked the idea of an interactive map so people can find the various parks. She thinks we need a way to educate residents about our assets.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that Draper City has interactive map for their trail system which lets people know if a trail is open or closed. There is some federal funding available for this type of project, but it is drying up quickly.

Shane Sorensen clarified that the interactive map mentioned in the proposal is for the master plan process and would allow designers to move photos around. The map is not proposed as an end-user experience at this time.

Chrissy Hannemann confirmed that some of the payment for this study could come from PARC tax funds and suggested it would be helpful to have some park-related questions on the survey. She would like to see a five-year plan for parks so we can plan when we will address which needs. The previous plan is 20 years old, so this will be a big improvement. The Parks Master Plan was included in the budget because the council saw the need.

Sarah Blackwell confirmed that updating the master plan will help us identify and qualify for more grants. She wondered if Landmark could also guide us to specific grant opportunities for the city.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to approve Landmark Design for the Alpine City Parks Master Plan with a not-to-exceed amount of \$64,500 and the additional service of the parks related financing and funding analysis. Brent Rummel seconded the motion. There were 4 yes votes and 1 no vote, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Chrissy Hannemann	Andrew Young	
Brent Rummel		
Jessica Smuin		
Sarah Blackwell		

Brent Rummel mentioned the email sent out recently listing upcoming projects to be considered for the budget. He appreciated the work staff have done to send information to council members so they can ask questions and be prepared to make informed decisions.

B. Resolution R2026-07: Approval of Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement for the Lone Peak Public Safety District to Amend the Fire Funding Formula

Shane Sorensen said that over the last several months, the city has been working with Highland City, through the Lone Peak Public Safety District (LPPSD) Board, to address some of Highland's concerns with the LPPSD Interlocal Agreement (ILA), particularly with the fire funding formula. Late in 2025, an ILA amendment was approved by both cities clarifying the process for changing the funding formula.

Once the ILA was amended to clarify the process, the LPPSD Board considered a new fire funding formula at their November 19th board meeting. Three options were considered, all of which were based on the taxable value of all real property within the city in comparison to the aggregate taxable value of all real property within the district. These options are summarized as follows:

- Option 1 – Based on taxable value with the change going into effect July 1, 2026 (FY2027).
- Option 2 – Allows for a transition into the new formula over a two fiscal year period, with a 50 percent step in for year one and the full amount in year two.
- Option 3 – Allows for a transition into the new formula over a two fiscal year period but uses the LPPSD fund balance to make up the difference of Alpine's assessment in year one and provides a payout to Highland in year one in a proportionate amount to the fund balance used by Alpine in that

year. (Note: Pending the conclusion of the FY2025 audit, there is approximately \$3.4M in the fund balance, with \$830,000 being assigned to administration. Even with next year's budget numbers not being known, it appears that sufficient funds are available from the fund balance for this option.)

After a lengthy discussion by the board, Option 1 was approved. Based on the current FY2026 fire budget, this option would be an increase of \$281,251 for Alpine City, with a decrease of the same amount for Highland City. Highland City did mention that there is some support from their council for Option 3, and that it could still be an option. This increase would take effect in the new budget year in July.

With Option 1 based on this year's fire budget, the funding allocation for each city would be as follows:

City	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Alpine	\$1,529,294	\$1,810,544	\$281,251
Highland	\$2,817,049	\$2,535,799	(\$281,251)

The Highland City Council approved Option 1 at their December 2nd City Council meeting. The proposal is now being presented to the Alpine City Council for consideration. The 2026 Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement that was previously approved by the LPPSD Board and the Highland City Council was included in the packet.

Staff Recommendation

Review and consider approval of Resolution R2026-07, approving an amendment to the Lone Peak Public Safety District Interlocal agreement, changing the fire funding formula to be based on the taxable value of property.

Staff and council members shared their opinions:

Shane Sorensen clarified that it was Highland City that proposed the new funding formula, not the fire department. An additional fire fighter position was approved, but will not be filled until the funding is also approved. If a funding change is proposed for the police department as well, it would have to come from one of the cities.

Chrissy Hannemann said that the police and fire chiefs do not discuss funding, as that is the City Councils' responsibility. The LPPSD has built up adequate funds in their balance to soften the financial blow while we do more research and consider police funding. We have time to study the issues. The district receives revenue from Alpine, wildland deployment, and reimbursement from the school district for officers assigned to the schools.

Chrissy personally likes Option 3. If the council approves Option 1 tonight, portions of the fund balance could be allocated to cover some of the revenue for the next few years. We could also add a stabilizing clause to the motion.

Andrew Young stated that public safety is the most expensive thing we will pay for in the next few years. Alpine's property tax value is higher than Highland's, and if we do not go along with the new funding formula Highland said they will consider leaving the district. He is concerned that a large property tax increase will be needed to fund public safety. Andrew thinks that Alpine could run their own fire department with similar costs. He feels that the new funding formula is like a mortgage for Alpine. Andrew would like to see the funding formula locked in for more than three years.

Brent Rummel commented on staffing levels for the fire department. Seventy percent of the time Highland has had only three fire fighters and Alpine has had four, but Highland has been paying 66 percent of the costs. This is why they asked for a funding formula adjustment.

The police department situation is different because SR-92 is in Highland, and they have more traffic accidents, more commercial properties, and more crime. Highland receives more police services than Alpine.

Highland City basically required this funding adjustment be approved or they may pull out of the combined public safety district. Withdrawing requires a two-year window for either city. If we lock in the formula for three years it would not eliminate our option to withdraw at some point.

Jessica Smuin said she would like to lock in the formula for a time period. We also need to calculate how many more homes will be built in Alpine. The formula could work in our favor, because Highland has more open land and could experience more growth.

Sarah Blackwell wondered if we kept the formula the same for five years, would it help or hurt Alpine. She liked the idea of a timeline to lock in the formula and commented that Alpine's property values are significantly higher than those in Highland.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that budget discussions for the police department will likely happen in March or April. Both cities have a fire station, but the police department is housed entirely in Highland City. The new fire department funding formula will go into effect in July with the new fiscal year. In this meeting we are just voting on the fire department funding formula based on property tax values, not on a precise budget amount.

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to approve Resolution R2026-07 an amendment to the Lone Peak Public Safety District Interlocal Agreement changing the fire funding formula to be based on the taxable value of property, with a stipulation that we will set the funding formula for three years, including the intent that through the budgetary process we allow a transition time using the fund balance. Brent Rummel seconded the motion. There were 3 yes votes and 2 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Chrissy Hannemann	Andrew Young	
Brent Rummel	Sarah Blackwell	
Jessica Smuin		

C. Pine Grove Annexation Petition

Ryan Robinson explained that Ken Berg with Berg Engineering has submitted an annexation petition to annex four parcels totaling 153.09 acres into Alpine City limits. This area is included in the city's annexation declaration. Inclusion in the declaration does not mean the City is required to annex it, only that it is eligible to be considered because of past studies and decisions made by the City Council.

The decision before the council at this time, in accordance with *Alpine Development Code 5.03 City Council Review and Action*, is to determine if they would like to send the application to the Planning Commission, staff and/or consultants for recommendations. If the petition is approved for further study and review, the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing before making a recommendation to the City Council to accept or deny the annexation.

As part of the review done by the Planning Commission, a concept plan with subdivision layout is typically submitted, after a review of needed infrastructure (roads), and a slope analysis to determine that the minimum lot size and frontage requirements can be met. The surrounding area is zoned CR-40,000 so it is anticipated that that this property will also be CR-40,000, if approved.

Noticing

A public hearing will be held during future meetings after the required notices have been posted.

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.

Ross Welch, representing the landowners, was invited to the microphone. He said they previously completed a slope analysis of this property which generated about 41 lots. They are currently planning 36 lots, but this number may decrease as trails are included. They will provide everything staff requires, so the city can evaluate the pros and cons of annexation, including the water system analysis. Ross stated that the previous annexation issues were very different from this situation. He knows that when you join a city you need to show that you are bringing value to that city. There will be opportunities for public hearings and resident input as the process moves forward.

Ryan Robinson explained that there are standards in our code that must be considered during the evaluation process. Staff will work with the developer and the landowner to obtain any information needed. There is plenty of time for further study of the petition.

Andrew Young said there is a time scheduled to walk this property with residents and the developers, and he appreciates that opportunity. He is concerned about the need to heal from past problems and wondered if the developer will be willing to balance property rights with the health, wellbeing, and safety of the community. He wants this to work but is concerned because of previous litigation with the landowner.

Chrissy Hannemann commented that we should not bring in issues from the past, but that every petition should be considered on its own merit. It is the council's job to balance the needs of landowners with the residents of Alpine.

Jessica Smuin said that when we accept a petition for study, we are also committing our staff to a significant amount of work. Every petition should be evaluated on its own merit, but we are making decisions representing our constituents. We need to decide if an annexation is in the best interest of Alpine.

Brent Rummller reiterated that the decision to study the petition does not bind us to a final result. He did not see any value in tabling the petition.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that we should not be making assumptions. Any petitioner should be considered as a brand-new entity, without baggage. This is a clean slate. If the council votes for further study, we can address trails, density, and water. If we cannot agree with the developer on these issues and it comes to a vote, the council can deny the annexation. It does not make sense to table this now. The County has made changes to their zoning map, and this area is now a one-acre zone. The previous situation was much different.

Attorney Steve Doxey clarified that this action is to accept or deny the petition (not the annexation itself). The council can accept the petition for further study or deny it.

Motion: Brent Rummller moved to accept for further study the petition to annex parcels 49:810:0200, 49:764:0003, 11:043:0015, and 49:764:001, and to send the petition to the Planning Commission for review. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. There were 4 yes votes and 1 no vote, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Chrissy Hannemann		Andrew Young
Brent Rummller		
Jessica Smuin		
Sarah Blackwell		

Motion: Brent Rummler moved to extend meeting until the city business listed on the agenda is complete. 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>
Chrissy Hannemann		
Andrew Young		
Brent Rummler		
Jessica Smuin		
Sarah Blackwell		

D. Ordinance 2026-02: Guest House Amendments

Ryan Robinson said that the petitioner, Ezra Lee, has submitted a request for a text amendment to Alpine Development Code (ADC) 3.23.060 – Guest Houses, specifically regarding the minimum lot size on which a guest house may be constructed. The current standard requires a minimum lot size of five (5) acres for a guest house.

The proposed amendment would allow guest houses on lots as small as two (2) acres within the CE-5 Zone only, subject to additional standards intended to address potential impacts associated with smaller lots:

1. A guest house may not be subdivided from the primary residence.
2. The guest house must share the same address as the primary residence.

After reviewing the proposal, staff recommend adding the following additional requirement:

3. For any guest house located on a lot smaller than five (5) acres, the guest house shall not exceed forty percent (40%) of the square footage of the primary dwelling or 1,500 square feet, whichever is smaller.

These standards are intended to maintain neighborhood compatibility, preserve the low-density character of the CE-5 Zone, and ensure accessory units remain subordinate to the primary residence.

Public Notice

This item required a public hearing to take place and has been noticed according to State and city requirements.

General Plan Reference

Land zoned as CE-5 shall consist of areas primarily located in mountainous areas of the city considered appropriate for very low-density residential development. These areas as a result of the presence of steep slope, adverse soil characteristics, flood hazard, mud flow, earthquake potential, wildfire hazard or similar critical and sensitive natural conditions, are considered environmentally fragile. As a result of the large amount of area that is considered environmentally fragile, development will be clustered and interspersed with large and undisturbed open space areas.

City Code Reference

- Alpine Development Code 3.23.060 - Guest Houses

Staff Recommendation

As this is a legislative decision, the City Council should evaluate whether the proposed amendment aligns with city policies and maintains consistency with the Development Code. If the council chooses to recommend approval, staff recommend that the additional standards listed above be included in the final ordinance language.

The council and staff discussed the following:

- There is already a guest house on this property, and the owners would like to make it legal. It was shown on the original plans as a large office-like space but was then turned into a guest house.

- We do not want to set the precedent that someone can build whatever they want and then ask for a change in the ordinances to make it okay. Granting exceptions can be a slippery slope.
- If the amendment does not pass, the city can impose fines or a tax lien on the property for non-compliance.
- The city currently allows only internal ADUs (like basement apartments).
- At some point the State may require cities to allow detached accessory dwelling units. We could wait and see what they require, or we could set our own guidelines first.
- Detached ADUs would increase the impact on our sewer system and other infrastructure.
- A reduction in the parcel size required for a guest house may affect others area in town besides Three Falls.
- The Three Falls HOA is not in favor of this code change.

Motion: Andrew Young moved to deny Ordinance 2026-02 the proposed amendments to Alpine Development Code 3.23.060 – Guest Houses based on the finding that the proposal does not adequately support the very low-density residential development in the Alpine General Plan CE-5 Zone that states, “These areas, as a result of the presence of steep slope, adverse soil characteristics, flood hazard, mud flow, earthquake potential, wildfire hazard or similar critical and sensitive natural conditions are considered environmentally fragile. As a result of the large amount of area that is considered environmentally fragile, development will be clustered and interspersed with large and undisturbed open space areas.” Sarah Blackwell 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>
Chrissy Hannemann		
Andrew Young		
Brent Rummel		
Jessica Smuin		
Sarah Blackwell		

E. Ordinance 2026-03: Farmstand Definition

Ryan Robinson said that the owners and operators of Burgess Orchards have submitted an application requesting the creation of a new conditional use of “Farm Stand” within the CR-40,000 Zone. This code amendment would create a formal definition for “Farm Stand,” identify the land use authority for future applications, and set forth required development standards for the use.

At this stage, the request is only to create the land-use category, definition, and accompanying standards. If the Planning Commission recommends approval and the City Council adopts the amendment, the applicant must then submit a separate Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application for their specific farm stand proposal. Because this use would be added to the CR-40,000 Zone as a conditional use, any property meeting the minimum requirements in this zone would be eligible to apply for a CUP as a farm stand.

To implement the proposed land use, amendments are required in the following sections of the Alpine Development Code:

- ADC 3.01.110 – Definitions: Add a definition for “Farm Stand.”
- ADC 3.04.030 – Conditional Uses in the CR-40,000 Zone: Add “Farm Stand” as a conditional use.
- ADC Chapter 3.23 – Conditional Use Permits: Establish specific standards for the use and designate the land use authority.

The draft ordinance language reflecting these changes was included in the meeting packet. Public comments offered during the Planning Commission meeting raised questions regarding the scope of the definition, agricultural qualifications, potential impacts to surrounding properties, permitting and enforcement, and traffic and safety concerns. One resident spoke in favor of the farm stand concept, citing its contribution to Alpine’s rural character and community identity.

Following the public hearing, the commission discussed the differences between a produce stand and the proposed farm stand, expressing concern that the new definition was overly broad and could resemble a

commercial retail or food service use within a residential zone. Key issues included potential food preparation, increased traffic, longer visitor stay times, and the lack of detailed analysis on safety impacts.

Planning Commission member Jeff Davis moved to recommend denial of the proposed amendments to the Alpine Development Code 3.01.110, 3.04.030, and Chapter 3.23 to create a “Farm Stand” use in the CR-40,000 Zone as proposed, for the following reasons:

1. It expands too much on a residential zone.
2. It carries with it increased safety concerns which have not been mitigated nor studied.
3. The language of products including baked goods and meats, and the handling and preparation of fresh food could lead to the possibility of restaurant food being prepared and sold.

The Planning Commission voted 6–1 to recommend denial of the proposed amendments.

Public Notice

This item required a public hearing held by the Planning Commission, which was noticed and took place according to State and city requirements.

General Plan Reference

(Country Residential – 40,000 square foot minimum lot size) shall include, but is not exclusive to, land generally located around the periphery of the city center considered appropriate for low-density residential development. These areas should provide for the perpetuation of the rural and open space image of the city. (Policy 2.5).

City Code Reference

- Alpine Development Code 3.01.110 Definitions
- Alpine Development Code 3.04.030 Conditional Uses in the CR-40,000 Zone
- Alpine Development Code 3.23 Conditional Use Permits

Staff Recommendation

Because this request is legislative in nature, the council should consider whether the proposed code amendment is consistent with General Plan policies supporting rural character, and whether the amendment aligns with the purpose and standards of the Development Code.

Staff recommend that the council review the proposed language and determine whether the creation of the “Farm Stand” conditional use appropriately supports agricultural operations and rural preservation within the CR-40,000 Zone.

Council members shared their opinions:

Sarah Blackwell said she spoke with the stand owners, and they would like this location to be like Ballerina Farms in Midway. That stand is in a commercial zone. Oliver’s Place in Pleasant Grove is also in a commercial zone, and the farm stand in Kamas is located in an agricultural/tourism zone. A farm stand seems to fit better in a commercial zone.

Andrew Young said that residents in the neighborhood are not against the agricultural endeavor, but the commercial use of the stand has expanded beyond its bounds. He referenced a letter submitted by neighbors about their concerns and opposing the farm stand change. He said that more discussion is needed with the neighbors.

Brent Rummel said the neighbors have provided examples of how the produce stand has negatively impacted them. Expanding this venture into a farm stand and allowing additional items for sale is not appropriate. If this area is zoned commercial in the future, expansion could be considered.

Chrissy Hannemann said there was significant support for an agricultural feel in Alpine when residents were consulted at the Main Street open house. While it is helpful to give the orchard owners room to succeed, the rules will apply to all applicants on large farming parcels. Greenbelt regulations are specific and require that almost 100 percent of the land be dedicated to agriculture with a reasonable expectation of profit. If farm stands were only allowed on parcels with greenbelt status it would limit

the possible locations. She also said that at some point, the city will need an updated plan for the south end of town

Jessica Smuin said that the current venture is more like a farm stand, and she has not seen a farm stand that became a restaurant. She did not think adding a few more items for sale would increase the traffic significantly.

Jessica Smuin and Sarah Blackwell both said that they have received positive comments about the produce stand from Alpine residents.

Motion: Andrew Young moved to deny Ordinance 2026-03 the proposed amendments to Alpine Development Code 3.01.110, 3.04.030, and Chapter 3.23 to create a “Farm Stand” use in the CR-40,000 Zone based on the findings that it does not appropriately support agricultural operations and residential rural preservation within the CR-40,000 Zone by broadly expanding into scaled commercial operations incongruent with the CR-40,000 residential rural zone, and that it expands traffic, parking, and crowds near Bateman Lane and Alpine Highway, negatively impacting the health and safety of the surrounding community. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. There were 4 yes votes and 1 no vote, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Chrissy Hannemann	Jessica Smuin	
Andrew Young		
Brent Rummel		
Sarah Blackwell		

F. Consideration for Approval of Setback Encroachment – Larry Hilton

Ryan Robinson explained that Larry Hilton has submitted a request for a reduced side yard setback for the property located at 333 S Main Street. The request involves expanding the existing balcony across a drive-through lane to provide weather protection for patrons and an extended balcony for the second floor. The project also includes the construction of a new outdoor staircase to create an alternative access point for the second floor condo.

Applicable Code: Alpine Development Code §3.07.050 – *Location Requirements* provides that in commercial developments adjacent to other commercial areas, the side yard and rear yard setbacks shall not be less than ten (10) feet, unless recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council where circumstances justify.

- The current side yard setback is approximately 20 feet (measured from the property line to the building foundation).
- If approved, the proposed setback exception would reduce the setback to approximately zero feet, with the building expansion located on or near the property line.

The Planning Commission reviewed this item during their October 7, 2025, meeting. Commission members expressed concerns about the setbacks proposed and the potential impact of placing a solid wall along the property line, which could create an undesirable alleyway effect. The commission noted that the proposal did not meet the city's requirement of a justified circumstance for the reduced setbacks. Following the discussion, Jeff Davis moved to recommend denial of the requested side yard setback exception, and John MacKay seconded. The motion passed unanimously, with all seven members voting in favor of denial.

The applicant has submitted two options to consider based on the feedback from the Planning Commission. Option A was reviewed by the Planning Commission. Option B is a smaller version, with a reduced landing off the balcony that will also be extended.

This application came before the City Council on October 28th, 2025, and was tabled with the following requirements:

- A recorded document will be submitted that would transfer with property ownership and title.

- Signs on the building will be brought up to current sign code guidelines for the Main Street Historic District.
- The property owner to the north will be notified and their input sought.

The applicant has submitted documentation from the ownership of the development stating that they approve this extension. Staff have also reviewed the existing signs on the building and found that they currently comply with the sign ordinance for business commercial buildings. The building owner to the north has also been contacted and made aware of this request on the agenda.

Alpine City Code

- Alpine City Code 3.07.050 Location Requirements.

General Plan

- Gateway Historic District Guidelines
 - Orientation of new construction should be to the street to establish a pedestrian-friendly quality. Chapter 1 pg. 3 Design Standards
 - The use of stone, brick, wood, or stucco is encouraged for use as the primary exterior material. Chapter 3 pg. 5
 - The use of color schemes should be compatible with the surrounding area. Simplicity is encouraged – excessive amounts of different colors should not be used. Chapter 7 pg. 9
 - The natural colors of brick masonry, stone, or other existing building materials should dominate the color scheme of the building. Other colors should be respectful of adjacent buildings. Chapter 7 pg. 9

Public Notice

City and State Codes do not require a public hearing or additional notice for this agenda item.

Staff Recommendation

The City Council should review the proposal and determine whether circumstances justify the reduced setback.

The council discussed the following points:

- The addition of the balcony and stairs could balance the visual aspects of the building.
- In a previous meeting the Fire Chief stated that we cannot have residential units without safe ingress and egress.
- The business HOA is in support of the proposal.
- The business neighbor to the north already has a basement stairway that encroaches into their setback. They are also in support of the proposal.
- Acceptance of a zero-foot setback could seem to set a political precedent, but this is a unique situation that is not likely to arise again.
- Option A is preferable to provide higher truck clearance in the drive-through.

Motion: Brent Rummel moved to approve the requested side yard setback exception at 333 S. Main Street with Option A as presented, based on the finding that the circumstances justify the reduced setback under Alpine City Code 3.07.050. Jessica Smuin seconded the motion. There were 3 yes votes and 2 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Brent Rummel	Chrissy Hannemann	
Jessica Smuin	Andrew Young	
Sarah Blackwell		

VIII. STAFF REPORTS

Due to the late hour, no staff reports were given this evening.

IX. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

Due to the late hour, no council communications were offered this evening.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to pause the regular meeting and move into a closed meeting to be held in the Conference Room at City Hall to discuss property disposal, and that at the end of the closed meeting the open City Council meeting would be adjourned. Brent Rummller 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>
Chrissy Hannemann		
Andrew Young		
Brent Rummller		
Jessica Smuin		
Sarah Blackwell		

The open City Council meeting was paused at 10:16 pm.

X. CLOSED MEETING: To discuss property disposition

The closed meeting began at 10:22 pm and was adjourned at 11:25 pm.