

**ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT**  
**March 3, 2026**

**I. GENERAL BUSINESS**

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

Chair: Alan Macdonald

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

Excused: Jeff Davis

Staff: Ryan Robinson, Marla Fox, Jason Judd, Heidi Smith

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

- C. Pledge of Allegiance:** Troy Slade

**II. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

None

**III. ACTION ITEMS**

- A. Proposed Modification of the Conditional Use Permit for the Friends of the Alpine Library**  
Ryan Robinson said on November 18, 2025, the Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit for a quasi-public library located at 491 S. Alpine Highway. The following conditions were imposed to mitigate potential detrimental impacts and ensure compliance with applicable City standards.

Approved Motion: Planning Commission Member John MacKay moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the Friends of the Alpine Library, located at 491 S. Alpine Highway, subject to the following conditions to mitigate anticipated impacts and ensure compliance with Alpine Development Code Section 3.23:

1. Hours of operation shall be limited to 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday, and 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. on Friday, with no operation on weekends during the Burgess Orchards produce stand season. When the orchard is closed, hours may be extended to 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday.
2. A minimum of fourteen (14) parking spaces shall be dedicated exclusively for library patrons during operating hours, with appropriate signage installed. If required parking is not available, operations shall cease until parking becomes available.
3. Non-library events shall be limited to no more than fourteen (14) attendees and must occur during regular operating hours.
4. Fundraising activities shall not occur in the parking lot.
5. ADA-compliant access, entrances, and parking shall be provided prior to occupancy. ADA-compliant restrooms shall be installed within twelve (12) months of opening.
6. The applicant shall coordinate with City staff to evaluate Alpine Highway access for safety and consider a one-way entrance configuration if determined necessary.

During discussion, Commissioner Michelle Schirmer asked whether retail sales within the library would be permitted. Commissioner Greg Butterfield indicated that limited incidental sales, such as artwork or similar items, would not create significant concern.

Commissioner Jeff Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed with five (5) votes in favor and one (1) opposed. The Friends of Alpine Library are now requesting amendments to the approved conditions (see attached materials).

Ryan Robinson said he spoke with Jen Wadsworth, and she wanted to make some changes because she believes what was recorded was not what was approved by the Planning Commission. They are proposing a clerical cleanup on this and have changes to condition.

Ryan Robinson said for Condition #2, which is the parking spaces, the change is instead of it saying *fourteen parking spaces shall be dedicated to library patrons only*, it should say *parking is available for library patrons during the hours of operation*. Remove the part about appropriate signage installed. *If parking is not available, the applicant shall discontinue hours of operation*.

Ryan Robinson said as staff we didn't see any issue with that because if there's not enough parking spots, the library's got to close. He said on #3 the other change there is that the applicant will *regrade the entrance of the Alpine Highway to mitigate unsafe ingress and egress and entrance from Main Street*. He said if there is snow, it would be a slick entrance going out, so we recommended regrading that so it's an easier exit and entrance going in and out. Even without snow, it's hard to get in and out of.

Ryan Robinson said there was also ADA compliance stuff that they were working on. The original language said prior to occupancy or prior to them being open full time. The language said the ADA compliance shall be made available within 12 months of opening. He said we would go from the November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2025, approval date, so by next November they would need to have that cleaned up.

Ryan Robinson said they removed item #6 which is the ingress and egress from Alpine Highway which we covered in item #3. He said going back to #3 Where it says non library events shall be limited to no more than 14 attendees and held during regular operating hours; he said we may have removed that, but his recollection was that we still required that 14 limit to get in and out.

Alan Macdonald said under the background information there are six conditions listed and he said his recollection was that those were the six conditions that were drawn up during that Planning Commission meeting and voted on by the commissioners. He asked if these six items were not what we actually voted on and discussed. He said he did not understand and asked if the motion was not written correctly.

Ryan Robinson said he thought this was an amendment to their original conditional use permit. In speaking with Jen Wadsworth, she thought that what was recorded as the conditions was not accurate as to what was on there. He said they would like to make these changes to the conditional use permit to the conditions they thought were approved that night.

Alan Macdonald asked if the applicant could discuss that. He said he recalls, for example #2, we wanted to make sure and there was an intent that there would be a minimum of 14 parking spaces dedicated for library patrons during hours of operation with appropriate signage so that the parking lot being used overflow for Burgess Orchards, there would nevertheless be parking spaces for children, parents, and families to utilize the library. He said a change to #2 would do away with those dedicated parking spaces. He said this is an amendment and didn't think it was correcting a mistake.

Alan Macdonald said he does recall, for example #3, one of the things that was important to the Commission was that non library operating events shall be limited to no more than 14 attendees and held during regular operating hours. He said he thought that was in there intentionally and didn't believe taking those things out is making this accurate to what was discussed and voted on that night. He said this seems more like changes and an amendment than cleaning up what was voted on.

John MacKay said he remembers that we agreed that we shouldn't have exclusive parking signs for the 14 slot parking spaces. He said he liked the idea of having them open and said that was an error the way it was captured. He said he didn't remember talking about the limitation on 14 attendees, but said we said they couldn't have fundraisers. Ryan Robinson agreed and said fundraisers couldn't be in the parking lot. Susan Whittenburg said probably the 14 was because we said 14 people could park there. John MacKay said he didn't believe we put a requirement of a minimum of 14 spaces that are dedicated.

Greg Butterfield said he recalled a fairly lengthy conversation about limiting fundraising or having events outside, not just in the parking lot but also on the property. He said he thought there was something proposed relative to trying to make sure, especially during peak hours during the summer, that there was some limitation. He said it may not have been 14 spaces specifically, but there was a good dialogue that was part of the resolution. He said this was limiting fundraisers and large groups gathered at the library at the same time people could be over at the fruit stand. He said this he didn't know that this accurately represents that dialogue.

Alan Macdonald said he didn't know if this was an amendment or a cleanup of the language. Either way, we need to discuss it and make a motion. Jennifer Wadsworth, applicant, said she believes this is a misunderstanding and some of the language is incorrect according to John Mackay's verbal motion he made that night and the one the Planning commission voted on.

we asked them to re-grade the parking and we still require fourteen parking spaces but the Planning Commission wasn't sure about discussing signage. He said by next November, they would need to have all their ADA compliance items done.

Alan Macdonald asked why we are changing the motion, when this is what was discussed and voted upon. He said this isn't a misunderstanding of what was discussed. Greg Butterfield agreed and said he remembers limiting events in the parking lot and discussing parking.

Ryan Robinson said we should view this as an amendment to the original motion. Jennifer Wadsworth, applicant, said the language in the motion is incorrect. She said the language she is asking to amend is word for word from the motion. She said she could see how this happened because sometimes the conversation gets diluted into the actual motion. She said the motion that John Mackay made was very clear and some language was not part of the motion.

Troy Slade said he remembers having a discussion about having dedicated parking spaces and labeling them as library parking, but then we thought if they are dedicated to the library and the fruit stand needs them that wouldn't make sense. John Mackay said Jen Wadsworth had read the minutes and found these errors and said he was going to rely on her expertise.

**MOTION:** Planning Commission member John MacKay moved to approve the amendment to the Conditional Use Permit for the Friends of the Alpine Library located at 491 S Alpine Highway based on the findings that the proposed amendment continues to comply with the Alpine Development Code Section 3.23. subject to the following changes:

After incorporating the changes, the Conditional Use Permit reads as follows:

**Motion:**

John MacKay moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the Friends of Alpine Library located at 491 S Alpine Highway.

The following conditions were imposed to mitigate anticipated impacts and ensure compliance with Alpine Development Code Section 3.23

1. *Hours of operation shall be limited to 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and 10:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m. on Friday, with no operation on Saturdays while the Burgess orchards produce stand is open. When the Burgess Orchards is closed, hours of operation shall have the ability to be open 10:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday.*
2. *A minimum of 14 parking spaces shall be available for library patrons during hours of operation. Should a conflict of interest arise where adequate parking is not available, the applicant shall discontinue hours of operation.*
3. *The applicant shall regrade the entrance on Alpine Highway to mitigate unsafe egress and entrance from Main Street.*
4. *No fundraiser or fairs activities may occur in the parking lot.*
5. *ADA-compliant parking shall be required prior to occupancy. ADA access and restrooms shall be created within 12 months of opening. (Starting from November 18, 2025).*

The Planning Commission pulled up the November 18, 2025, Planning Commission meeting and listened to the motion.

Michelle Schirmer asked if we needed to put a time limit on #3. Alan MacDonald said he didn't think we could because that was not the purpose of this item, he said we are just cleaning up the motion, not modifying it.

Troy Slade seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u>	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused:</b></u>
Michelle Schirmer		Jeff Davis
John MacKay		
Greg Butterfield		
Troy Slade		
Alan Macdonald		
Susan Whittenburg		

---

Communication from a concerned citizen.

Sherly Degroot, resident on Cascade Ave, asked about the sign that was put up on the corner of Bateman and Alpine Highway. She said it is very far from the entrance of the library and makes it look like the parking lot is designated for the library. She said she is very concerned once that orchard opens, that patrons to the orchard are not going to know that that is orchard parking. She said she thought that sign should be over by the entrance by Alpine Highway and not over on the corner where it is.

Ryan Robinson said the sign meets the sign requirements for a quasi-public use. He said because the sign was not for a commercial business, it didn't need to come to the Planning Commission for approval.

### **B. Review Commercial Business Sign Application for Alpine Physical Therapy**

Ryan Robinson explained that Alpine Physical Therapy has submitted an application for a commercial building sign located at 235 S. Main Street. The proposed sign will be installed on the south side of the building and will total 30.48 square feet, occupying less than 15% of the building façade on which it is mounted. The sign is proposed as non-illuminated, individually routed lettering, constructed of ½-inch solid aluminum with a vertical brushed finish and stud-mounted installation.

Staff have reviewed the application and find that, as proposed, it meets the applicable provisions of the Alpine City Code, specifically Alpine Development Code (ADC) Section 3.25.080, which establishes the following standards:

- Signs shall be painted on, attached to, or erected on the building that houses the business or on the property occupied by the business. A maximum of one (1) sign is permitted per business.
- Internally illuminated signs that project light outward through the sign face are prohibited. Signs may include lighting positioned behind the sign to create a halo or outline effect.
- Sign illumination shall not increase ambient lighting conditions by more than 3.3 lumens when measured perpendicular to the sign face at the distance specified in City Code.
- All building-mounted signs must receive City approval to ensure compliance with applicable building and electrical codes.
- The total area of all signs on any building façade shall not exceed fifteen percent (15%) or sixty (60) square feet of the building side on which the sign is displayed, whichever is less.
- The area of a sign shall be measured as the overall background area. Signs without a background (such as individual letters or numbers) shall be calculated as though attached to a background depicted in the application rendering.
- The color, size, number, lighting, and placement of business signs are subject to Planning Commission approval and must be consistent with the Gateway Historic District Design Guidelines.

The Planning Commission is responsible for reviewing the proposed sign's color, size, number, lighting, and placement to ensure consistency with the Gateway Historic District guidelines and compatibility with the surrounding area.

Greg Butterfield said he noticed a light has been installed that looks like it will be facing upwards toward the sign. He said he didn't see that light on the application plan. Ryan Robinson said we don't have language in the sign ordinance that states you can't have an upward facing light. Alan Macdonald asked about or monument signs and if there was specific language about upward lighting in the Gateway Historic Design Guidelines. Ryan Robinson said it is not in the Gateway Historic Design Guidelines.

Troy Slade said he is concerned that the light hitting the chrome sign might be too bright on Main Street. He asked if the applicants' other sign had the same lighting. Alan Macdonald said we already have an ordinance that states that sign illumination shall not increase ambient lighting conditions by more than 3.3 lumens. So as long as it is not overly bright or overly reflectively bright, any motion we make should state that it needs to comply with all of the standards of the Alpine Development Code Section 3.23.080.

Ryan Robinson said he just looked and we don't have language in the business commercial that says lighting has to be downward facing like we do in the other zones. Jason Judd said in the code under 3.25, there is a sign illumination section of the code. It says that lighted signs are permitted provided the lighting is contained in the immediate vicinity of the sign. There shall be no spillover onto adjacent properties. Lumen shall not create a shadow of greater than 30 feet from the existing sign.

Ryan Robinson said that's for the quasi-public and school signs. He said the applicant would have to meet all the standards found in the sign ordinance if this were to be approved.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Sign Illumination Code and Alan Macdonald said we've gotten hung up on the lighting that is pointing upwards. He said he is not seeing anything in the 3.25 sign ordinance or within the Gateway Historic District Guidelines that would void the application that's before us.

**MOTION:** Planning Commission member Greg Butterfield moved to approve the Commercial Building Sign Application for Alpine Physical Therapy, located at 235 S Main Street, finding that the proposed sign complies with Alpine Development Code Section 3.25.080 and is consistent with the current Gateway Historic District Design Guidelines.

Susan Whittenburg seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u>	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused:</b></u>
Michelle Schirmer		Jeff Davis
John MacKay		
Greg Butterfield		
Troy Slade		
Alan Macdonald		
Susan Whittenburg		

Susan Whittenburg said it's getting really bright around this town and said when you drive around, it has changed a lot. She asked what our ordinance was on our lighting as far as sports courts and things like that. Alan Macdonald said we have a lot of ordinances around sport courts and lumens and the times that you can turn them on and spillage. He said regardless, a lot of people have moved in, and they have brought light with them. Susan Whittenburg asked if we have any other restrictions on Main Street. Can businesses keep their signs lit all night? Ryan Robinson said he didn't think we had anything that said they couldn't do that.

Greg Butterfield said this is a subject we could discuss when talking about the Main Street Master Plan and decide if we want to limit Christmas lights, Jelly Lights, to certain hours of operation.

### **C. Approval of a Conditional Use for a Single-Family Dwelling**

Ryan Robinson explained that the Battaglia family is under contract to purchase the property at 1873 N. Fort Canyon Road. Their plan is to demolish the existing home on the property and to reconstruct a new home. Pursuant to Alpine Development Code 3.22.070, a non-conforming building may be reconstructed on a lot subject to prior approval of the City Council, after recommendation from the Planning Commission and compliance with several conditions. The reason for the non-conforming status of the existing home is that it is located on a 1.29-acre property in the CE-5 zone.

Ryan Robinson said the City Attorney reviewed this and it's in the CE-5 zone, there's no minimum lot size there. He said it's not in a PRD or a platted subdivision. He said instead of this being a legal non-conforming, it sounds like it's a legal parcel, but in the CE-5 zone, it says a single-family dwelling is a conditional use in that zone. He said we're not looking at it as a legal non-conforming anymore, we're looking at it as a conditional use in the CE-5 zone. He said the Planning Commission is the land use authority granting a conditional use for a single-family dwelling as per the code.

The conditions outlined in 3.22.070 are as follows:

**3.22.070 Extension (Enlargement) And Reconstruction Of Non-Conforming Buildings; Conditions**

*A non-conforming building or structure or a building housing a non-conforming use may be extended or enlarged or reconstructed, subject to the prior approval by the City Council, after recommendation of the Planning Commission and such compliance with the following:*

1. *The proposed extension or replacement shall be located entirely on the same lot or parcel as the present non-conforming structure and will conform with all current setback and location requirements.*
2. *The applicant shall submit a detail site plan showing the location of existing and proposed structures on the site and in the vicinity, existing lot boundaries, roads, driveways, parking areas, utilities and other significant features on the site and in the immediate vicinity.*
3. *A finding made by a majority vote of the Council that:*
  1. *The proposed enlargement or extension will not significantly alter the character of the building or use or its impact upon the area.*
  2. *The building or use, if extended, will not have the effect of diminishing the value of property or the quality of living environment of adjacent properties.*
  3. *The proposed enlargement will not significantly increase the number of vehicles or pedestrians, or result in the establishment or increase of a safety hazard to the area.*
  4. *The proposed enlargement will not result in the establishment of a condition incompatible with the neighborhood area and the stated objective of the zone in which it is located.*

*The Council may attach such conditions to its approval as are necessary to adequately protect the property and uses in the surrounding territory and the intent of the zone, including but not limited to, the providing of off-street parking access ways, landscaping features and additional setback of structures.*

*Porches and external covered stairs shall be permitted within setbacks so long as they do not extend beyond the original setbacks of the non-conforming structure (i.e. the setbacks from the time of the original build), and may be approved at a staff level.*

Ryan Robinson said the applicant would like to tear down the old home and build a new one. He said they still have to meet all the building requirements, like setbacks, and height, so you don't have to add conditions as part of the motion.

Mr. Battaglia is in his due diligence time period, so an exact site plan has not been prepared. However, he has provided two possible site plans to illustrate his intentions. The two options include a home that would comply with location and setback requirements. He has also provided a site plan to show the required features in the vicinity of the lot. In making their recommendation to the City Council, the Planning Commission could consider the same list of findings outlined for the City Council in 3.22.070.

Ryan Robinson said in addition, single family dwellings in the CE-5 zone are listed as a conditional use. It appears that since the existing home would be demolished and a new home built, that a conditional use permit would be required. As per Section 3.23.070 of the development code, the Planning Commission is the land use authority for granting a conditional use permit for a single-family dwelling.

As per this section of code, the approval process and items to consider area as follows:

*The designated land use authority may approve, approve with conditions, or reject the permit as set forth:*

1. *A conditional use shall be approved if reasonable conditions are proposed, or can be imposed, to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards.*
2. *If the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions to achieve compliance with applicable standards, the conditional use may be denied.*
3. *With each decision to approve or deny a conditional use permit, the designated land use authority shall include a written explanation of their decision.*

Staff recommend that the Planning Commission consider recommending to the City Council the allowance for reconstruction of a home at 1873 N. Fort Canyon Road. In addition, staff recommend that the Planning Commission, as the land use authority, consider approval of a conditional use permit for a single-family dwelling at the same location.

Alan Macdonald asked what the CE-5 zone was, and why you can only build a home in the CE-5 zone via a conditional use permit. Ryan Robinson said this area is up by the Three Falls area. It is a critical environment zone to protect the hillside with larger lots. He said many of these lots were built before we had this requirement, but any new houses would need to come in and do this as well.

Alan Macdonald asked if there were any conditions that would attach to a conditional use permit to build a single-family home in the CE-5 Acre Zone that we need to think about or be aware of. Ryan Robinson said none that were brought up or that we are concerned about.

Susan Whittenburg asked what the protected lands would have to do with this house. Ryan Robinson said this critical environment area is a hillside area, so we wanted to protect the area by saying if you want to develop up here, you have to have bigger lots. Alan Macdonald said the applicant is doing his due diligence and is replacing one home with another. He said we already have ordinances in place for height and setbacks so he's not seeing an issue.

Jahn Mackay asked if this would be considered a corner lot. Ryan Robinson said it would be considered a corner lot especially where that 1800 North and Fort Canyon meet. John MacKay asked if the applicant was aware of the 30-foot setback from both sides. Ryan Robinson said we would definitely want to make them aware of that. Marla Fox said the applicant is aware. She said she checked the setbacks with Shane Sorensen, and he confirmed they would need a 30-foot setback from both roads and on the rear side as well.

Jason Judd said we need to look at the utility requirements for culinary and firefighting purposes with the pressure not less than 40 psi. Ryan Robinson agreed and said the applicant would have to meet all the utility requirements.

**MOTION:** Planning Commission member Troy Slade moved to approve the construction of a single-family dwelling at 1873 N Fort Canyon Road subject to the following condition:

1. Subject to existing ordinances, engineering, and utility requirements.

Michelle Schirmer seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<b><u>Ayes:</u></b>	<b><u>Nays:</u></b>	<b><u>Excused:</u></b>
Michelle Schirmer		Jeff Davis
John MacKay		
Greg Butterfield		
Troy Slade		
Alan Macdonald		
Susan Whittenburg		

**D. Proposed five-sided lot submittal**

Ryan Robinson explained that an application has been received to combine lot 1 of the Thelin Estates Plat A subdivision (Serial No. 53:281:0001) with parcel no. 11:054:0464. There is an existing home on lot 1, while the odd shaped parcel to the west is a legal parcel. A plat amendment has been provided to combine the two properties.

Alpine Development Code definitions, Section 3.01.110, a Lot is defined as follows:

***LOT.** A tract of land regardless of any label, that is created by and shown on a subdivision plat that has been recorded in the Office of the County Recorder. Lots shall be generally rectangular in nature, and shall have no more than five sides without an exception being recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council; the front of a property, located at the front right of way, does not count against this requirement.*

As situated today, lot 1 has four sides, but when combined with the odd shaped parcel to the west, it would have more than five sides. City staff has reviewed the plat amendment and has given conditional approval, subject to the recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council of the lot having more than five sides.

Rick Christensen, contractor, said the applicant wants to build a barn on the vacant piece of property. He said the lot already has five sides, but they are hoping it can be grandfathered in because the lot was already in that shape when the owner bought it. He said the owner bought this piece of property from the neighbor and wants to add it to his current property. He plans to scrub the line and combine the lots into one property.

Alan Macdonald said this is an existing lot that is surrounded and there is no way to it. The owner to the east wants to incorporate the funky lot into his lot existing lot and said it makes sense.

**MOTION:** Planning Commission member Troy Slade moved to recommend approval of the five-sided lot associated with the proposed Thelin Estates Plan B plat amendment.

John Mackay seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u>	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused:</b></u>
Michelle Schirmer		Jeff Davis
John MacKay		
Greg Butterfield		
Troy Slade		
Alan Macdonald		
Susan Whittenburg		

#### **E. Review of Draft Main Street & Gateway Corridor Master Plan: Main Street Design**

Ryan Robinson explained that last time we went through the implementation chapter and tonight we're looking at the design guidelines. He said these are intended to replace our existing Gateway Historic Design Guidelines, but if we like part of the old guidelines, we can still make a recommendation to use portions of it. He said what this does is focuses more on the design and the layout and the feel of Main Street and will simplify the process when applicants come in to build and hopefully save us some time in reviewing commercial buildings going forward.

Ryan Robinson said we are breaking down these chapters into the things the Planning Commission primarily wanted to deal with. He said this is the last of the sections we've broken up. In the future we will hold another Public Hearing, so the public has a chance to hear and review all the work that has been done. After the Public Hearing, we'll go back through the minutes and put all the motions together and review the suggested changes.

Ryan Robinson said with the consulting firm that put this together, they gave us three rounds of edits, and we have used one from the steering committee. He said once the Planning Commission makes a recommendation, he'll send it to the committee, and they'll give us another draft with those changes incorporated. Then once the City Council reviews this and makes any amendments, we'll use that as the final edit.

Ryan Robinson said there's a Main Street Civic and Mixed use, and then the Town Center. He said we've talked about a third area by the church owned property having a buffer transition between residential and commercial. He said we talked about the property down by the Art Center and that general area being a transition area where there's residential to commercial, and Main Street's commercial transition to residential to the north.

Alan Macdonald said in a prior meeting we discussed the area to the south to be residential, a flex area for housing with mixed density. He said this area won't be subject to the Main Street type guidelines because those are residential. Ryan Robinson said the guidelines will only apply to commercial and said State Code limits us and we can't dictate design standards for residential unless it's in a specific designated historic district. Alan Macdonald said we did do a little bit of that with the Montdella homes on Main Street.

Alan Macdonald said if hears a complaint from people about Alpine, it's that Alpine looks so hodge podge. He said this is because it has been developed over many decades and has been subjective as to what people like. He said we don't know what the Alpine aesthetic is. Some like mountain modern,

some like traditional, like red brick. He asked if we want something more cohesive, more uniform and said in the future, buildings could be torn down and rebuilt. If this is an issue, the way we amend this is to decide what we want it to look like. We need to be more specific, for example stating we want red brick with black windows. This would give a traditional, timeless Utah-looking city as we go forward. If you just say wood, brick, masonry, and stone you will get all kinds of different styles and looks. He said the best example of this is the u-shaped office complex where every single building is made up of something different. He said if the vision for Alpine is a cohesive look, we need something traditional and timeless similar to what has been built along North County Blvd.

John Mackay agreed and said he would say small red brick and wood. Alan Macdonald said we need to limit the building materials. Troy Slade said we are not professional designers and are not trained. Alan Macdonald said, “we know what looks good”.

Greg Butterfield said we need to narrow the choices and come up with an architectural design, so we don't end up with something trendy. Michelle Schirmer said she thinks a mix of flat roofs and gabled roofs look nice. This is something you would see on a traditional Main Street in other cities.

Ryan Robinson said Park City has strict design standards which everyone must follow. He said some of the best examples are the ones that were built when the city was founded. Greg Butterfield said we are missing the architectural style and said we need to decide that first before we get to colors and materials. Alan Macdonald said he likes the traditional, federal look and said it would help to have a description in the design standards.

Michelle Schirmer asked if we are trying to be traditional from the Federal Georgian era, or a Utah Traditional. Greg Butterfield said we need to decide our traditional look and not a Washington DC or Boston Traditional. Susan Whittenburg asked if we could tell an applicant what building materials they can use. Alan Macdonald said we can in the Historic Gateway.

Michelle Schirmer asked if we can pull the Town Center on the map down to the Art Center so that all of these design standards keep wrapping the corner because we removed that mixed use to bring the field up with the residential. Alan Macdonald said that had been modified to reflect that.

Michelle Schirmer said she knows we have talked a lot about lighting but wanted to address the dark sky because it is missing from our code. She said she would like to see a dark sky code with downlight and no permanent lighting especially when it's on chasers. She said she would like businesses to be able to designate their business but in a calm way. Alan Macdonald said the more well-lit areas are the downtown commercial areas up to a certain time.

Troy Slade asked what the process would be to drill down on this and get it locked in. Alan Macdonald said what we would do is incorporate this into the Alpine City Main Street Gateway Corridor Small Area Plan. Once that is done, and we have a plan, then we can make amendments to the Gateway Historic Design Guidelines and say this is our plan.

Troy Slade asked if this would just be the Planning Commission doing this or would we get professional help. Alan Macdonald said eventually everything we have done will be sent as a recommendation for approval by the City Council. We will then need to go back and review the current Gateway Historic Guidelines and bring those current with this plan and amend those design guidelines. He said those design guidelines are what future developers would look at and say okay, this is what I've got to do. They'll see if our idea of a Utah Historic Traditional look, red brick etc. ends up in the plan and in our design guidelines, then that's the aesthetic going forward.

Marla Fox asked if this would include homes in the Historic Gateway. Ryan Robinson said no, in the name of affordable housing, the State says cities can't dictate design standards. He said if the home is in an HOA, that could be different or if the home was designated as a historical home. It would have to meet certain criteria to designate historic.

**MOTION:** Planning Commission member Michelle Schirmer moved to recommend Tabling the Main Street Corridor Gateway Historic District Design Standards until future compilation with the following conditions:

1. The building style be considered for our Gateway Historic District as Utah Historic Traditional.
2. Remove secondary materials totally from the design plan. Materials that will be allowed for construction on Main Street would be red brick, wood, and black framed windows.

Troy Slade seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u> Michelle Schirmer Greg Butterfield Alan Macdonald Susan Whittenburg John MacKay Troy Slade	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused</b></u> Jeff Davis
--	---------------------	-------------------------------------

The Planning Commission had a discussion about coming up with design standards and said they would have to have further discussions about what it is they want, the architectural style, and overall design,

**IV. COMMUNICATIONS**

None

**V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES:** February 17, 2026

**MOTION:** Planning Commissioner John MacKay moved to approve the minutes for February 17, 2026, as written.

Greg Butterfield seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u> Michelle Schirmer John MacKay Greg Butterfield Troy Slade Alan Macdonale Susan Whittenburg	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused:</b></u> Jeff Davis
--	---------------------	--------------------------------------

**MOTION:** Planning Commission member Greg Butterfield moved to adjourn the meeting.

Susan Whittenburg seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u><b>Ayes:</b></u> Michelle Schirmer John MacKay	<u><b>Nays:</b></u>	<u><b>Excused:</b></u> Jeff Davis
---	---------------------	--------------------------------------

Greg Butterfield  
Troy Slade  
Alan Macdonald  
Susan Whittenburg

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.