

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING
April 14, 2026

Mayor Carla Merrill called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A. Roll Call Mayor Carla Merrill

The following were present at the anchor location, which constituted a quorum: Jessica Smuin, Sarah Blackwell, Chrissy Hannemann, Andrew Young, and Brent Rummmler.

Staff: Shane Sorensen, Caden Lyon, Steve Doxey, Chief Brian Gwilliam, Chief Brian Patten, Heidi Smith, and DeAnn Parry. Ryan Robinson attended by Zoom.

Others: Jo Lambert, Susan Paiser, Mike Paiser, Kelly Workman, Cori Fabian, Steve Burrows, Catherine Johnston, Wolf Schirmer, Jim Hobbs, Tiffany Frazier, Roman Frazier, Kent Parry, Rob Crawley, John Nash, Angelia Nash, Josh Walker, Nache Nielson

B. Prayer Jessica Smuin

C. Pledge Sarah Blackwell

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approve Minutes from the March 24 City Council Meeting

B. Resolution R2026-15: Approval of Municipal Wastewater Planning Program

C. Resolution R2026-16: Appointment of Sarah Blackwell to Alpine Water Citizen Advisory Committee

~~**D. Approval of Funds to Remove Bricks from Olsen Home**~~ *(removed from the agenda)*

E. Ordinance 2026-08: Approval of 2026 Water Management Plan

F. Ordinance 2026-10: Amendments to Municipal Code 8.04 Cemeteries *(moved to Action Items)*

G. Approval of Electrical Work Proposal for 300 N. Well VFD System, I-D Electric: \$26,560

H. Approval of New Pump and Equipment for Busch Well, Nickerson Company: \$71,188

Shane Sorensen explained that Item D–Removal of bricks from the Olsen Home has been removed from the agenda, as our public works crew is doing the work. Our sewer system is in good condition, but we want to take care of a specific line repair in a timely manner. The amount for the 300 N. Well previously approved by the council was for components. Item G is for specialized electricians to install the parts.

Regarding Item E, Andrew Young said that turning off a resident’s PI water if they violate the rules seems harsh.

Council members and staff responded:

- We need the ability to enforce the rules, and Alpine has had this plan for 10 years.
- There are warnings and fines before water is shut off, and this is a logical step for noncompliance.
- Other utility companies regularly shut off service for non-payment.
- The water committee is meeting weekly and wants to help educate the residents about the rules and conservation.

Attorney Steve Doxey reminded the council that these items are on the Consent Calendar for a reason. If discussion is needed, the item should be moved to the Action Items section.

Motion Andrew Young moved to delete Item D-the Olsen Home Bricks from the Consent Calendar and to move Item F-Ordinance 2026-10: Amendments to Municipal Code 8.04 Cemeteries to Action Items. Jessica Smuin seconded the motion. There were 4 yes votes and 1 no vote, as recorded below. The motion passed.

Yes
Jessica Smuin
Sarah Blackwell
Andrew Young
Brent Rummmler

No
Chrissy Hannemann

Excused

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to approve the Consent Calendar as noted, with the deletion of Item D and moving the cemetery code changes to the Action Items portion. Andrew Young 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>
Jessica Smuin		
Sarah Blackwell		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Andrew Young		
Brent Rummier		

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Carla Merrill explained that the Public Comment portion is typically for items that are not on the agenda. She allowed some comments.

Jim Hobbs – Dry Creek Lane, Alpine

Jim said that Landon Wallace and Jaden Gull recently came to his street to replace a hydrant. The guys were very professional and did a great job. They were efficient, communicated well, and cleaned up nicely. The city should be proud of them in our Public Works department.

Mayor Carla Merrill commented that we are very proud of our employees who work very hard and are multitaskers. These same guys are now helping to preserve the bricks from the Olsen Home. It is not something they normally do, but they have taken this project on to save the city money.

Steve Burrows – Meadowlark Lane, Alpine

Steve is the chair of our Citizen Water Committee and said they take their responsibilities seriously. They have met four times in the last 14 days and want to identify an educational process to help people want to conserve water. Steve expressed his support for the water management plan on the agenda tonight.

Mayor Merrill thanked Steve Burrows for his work on the water committee.

IV. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

A. Financial Report through Third Quarter

Shane Sorensen shared some highlights at the end of the third quarter. We are in good financial shape. The graphs show trends, projects, and revenues from property taxes. The second graph is for the utility funds. The pressurized irrigation balance has dropped because of the project on Canyon Crest Road. Money from five funds was used to purchase the Carlton shop. Storm Drain funds were used to pay for projects in the fall of 2025. Upcoming projects will use funds from our water impact fees, and the Streets budget was used for the purchase of property for future street improvements. Sales tax revenue goes up and down but looks positive.

Upcoming expenses include the fire station, for which construction drawings are due this week. Construction will begin in by late May. Other capital projects for this year are well repairs, parks improvements, and sprinkler repairs. We have a positive financial status and are working with Zions Bank regarding potential bonding for large projects.

Shane answered council questions:

- Money available for council projects will be discussed during the budget process before July.
- We have about five years left on our PI bond. We previously added \$1M to the bond for a filter building and pipes to bring CUP water to Alpine.
- We will consider a bond for the fire station and some large water projects. Bonds are in the planning stage and will be brought to the council at a future meeting. A parameters resolution will be needed for any bonds.
- The tentative budget for FY2027 will be presented to the council on May 12. The final budget will be presented for approval on June 23.

- Shane will send out a calendar soon so council members can schedule individual meetings with him to go over budget details.

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to table the Golf Cart discussion until the April 28 meeting. Andrew Young seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mayor Carla Merrill introduced new Assistant City Administrator/City Planner, Caden Lyon, to the council.

Shane Sorensen said that we are excited to have Caden join us.

Former City Planner Ryan Robinson was in an Enoch City Council meeting with his new job, so Item B– Review of Main Street and Gateway Corridor Master Plan was delayed until later in the meeting when Ryan could join. The council continued to Item C.

C. FY2027 Budget Projects

Shane Sorensen said as part of the draft for the FY2027 budget for City Council review, the capital project spreadsheet has been prepared with estimated costs. This spreadsheet includes the typical annual maintenance projects, the projects proposed to roll over from FY2026, and the council member/staff projects that were discussed at the budget retreat. Staff would like further directions on prioritizing projects leading up to the preparation of the FY2027 tentative budget, which will be on the May 12th City Council agenda. This spreadsheet is not finalized.

Shane Sorensen explained details and answered questions:

- The fire station project will span three fiscal years and will likely require a bond for part of the funds. We have \$3M currently set aside for the project.
- We typically budget around \$1M for street projects and are closer to being caught up. We are doing fewer overlays and concentrating on crack seal and chip sealing. For valves and manholes, we can use some funds from the utilities.
- We have not been able to get to hillside fire mitigation yet. Wet years cause more growth and create fire hazards.
- The council can decide how much they would like to budget for sidewalks.
- Three Falls mudslide mitigation: We had a wet winter in 2024 and over one week's time we had a mudslide over the road. The city put markers in the ground and surveyed the location. There was no further movement after a year. A house sits below this area, so mitigation will be needed. The city was without an engineer for 15 months, so there is some catch up to do. A consultant can help us determine the best and least expensive solution. We have \$500,000 set aside for this in the Capital Improvement Fund.
- The \$5.4M for the Canyon Crest Road MAG project will be split with Highland City. This project will likely start in the summer of 2027 and may include the proposed roundabout. We have applied for a grant to help with this.
- We have finished installing weather-based sprinkler controls in the large parks and are working on the smaller ones now. Trees in some parks need to be trimmed by a contractor. Rocky Mountain Power trims the trees along their own power lines.
- Bonds will likely be needed for the Heritage Hills Well and the 400 West booster station, including pipes. Annual payments would come from the utility enterprise funds, not property taxes. These upgrades will allow us to redirect water where it is most needed. Mark Anderson from Zion's Bank will attend a future meeting to give the council more details about bonds. The bond evaluation looks at both culinary and PI systems, but there will likely need to be an increase in PI fees to pay for the improvements.
- The mayor has done a ton of work on a grant application for a culinary water tank. It would be great to receive that grant, and we should find out in the next few weeks.
- The Parks Master Plan is in the beginning stages, and we will hold a public meeting on May 13 to get feedback. The meeting will be advertised in the Newline, with banners, and on social media. Residents can also sign up for notifications for meetings and other announcements on our website.
- The council can set a budget for traffic-calming measures for the year, and we will do what we can to maximize the funds.

- We are still working on surveillance cameras for our parks. Adequate internet access is still a problem. CentraCom is consulting on the possibility of installing fiber at our larger parks. Cameras are needed to discourage vandalism and provide data when it occurs.
- Flock traffic cameras are used to identify vehicles involved in criminal activity.

The council talked about the PARC tax funds specifically. As discussed at the budget retreat, the council may allocate a portion of those funds each year for historic preservation and cultural efforts, including the Relic Hall.

There will be more detailed financial information coming in the next months. Some funds are restricted, like Parks and Class C Roads, but the Capital Improvement Fund is more flexible.

B. Review of Main Street and Gateway Corridor Master Plan

Ryan Robinson (on Zoom) explained that we will not take action tonight but are looking for feedback. The city was awarded a grant to help with the Main Street Master Plan. The Planning Commission (PC) reviewed each section and suggested edits. A public hearing was held at the beginning of the process, and again as they finished the review. We are allowed three rounds of edits with our consultants, and then they will provide the final draft.

This plan is not written in stone and is not proposing new code. It is a vision document to help when considering new proposals. We are waiting for second edits from the consultants before putting the plan on the council agenda for action.

The council discussed

- They want to see the redline copy to evaluate the edits, just as we do for code changes.
- It would be best to divide the plan into sections for review, possibly with a work session before or at the end of City Council meetings. Council members can be prepared to discuss each section.
- Residents have been very involved in the process and are invested in the outcome.
- These sessions will be properly noticed so the residents know what is being reviewed.

Brent Rummeler suggested staff send out an email explaining the schedule and procedure for the Main Street Plan review.

Motion: Brent Rummeler moved to put Discussion Item B (the Main Street Plan) after the Action Items and before Staff Reports, if time allows. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. Consideration of Approval for the Reconstruction of a Non-conforming Building – 480 East 100 South

Shane Sorensen said that the applicant, Cori Fabian, purchased the property at 480 East 100 South, with an existing home and two other accessory buildings. These have since been demolished. The owner has applied for a building permit to construct 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 the home was considered non-conforming was that it was located on an 8,150 sq ft property with 80 feet of frontage in the TR-10,000 zone, where the typical minimum lot area is 10,000 sq ft and the minimum frontage is 90 feet.

Note: The numbering for Item 3 subsections in the code was incorrect in the packet (as 1-4). Those subsection references (a-d) have been corrected in the minutes and in the discussion held by the council.

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 detailed 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:*
 - a. *The proposed enlargement or extension will not significantly alter the character of the building or use or its impact upon the area.*
 - b. *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.*
 - c. *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.*
 - d. *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.

Ms. Fabian provided a site plan and house plans, which were included in the packet, and a proposal to construct a new home that meets the current location and setback requirements of the zone. This request was presented to the Planning Commission at their March 31, 2026, meeting. After consideration of the request, the following motion was made:

MOTION: Planning Commission member Troy Slade moved to recommend approval of the proposed site plan for reconstructing the home at 480 East 100 South as per the submitted site plan.

Susan Whittenburg seconded the motion. There were 5 Ayes and 0 nays. The motion passed.

The request is now coming before the City Council for their consideration subject to ADC 3.22.070.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE:

- N/A

CITY CODE REFERENCE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.22.070: Extension (Enlargement) And Reconstruction Of Non-Conforming Buildings; Conditions

PUBLIC NOTICE:

This item does not require a public hearing but was posted as an Action Item on the City Council agenda.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend that the City Council consider approval for the reconstruction of the home previously at 480 East 100 South.

Mayor Carla Merrill explained that the staff report will be followed by an opportunity for council members to ask technical questions, a motion, a discussion of the motion, and a vote by the council. Neighboring residents who wish to speak about the proposal will be given the opportunity before a motion is made.

Attorney Steve Doxey suggested that if there is a motion to approve it must be based on the specific findings in the staff report (packet pages 246-247, including findings a-d). Alpine's ordinance requires that the approval for reconstruction of a non-conforming building must have the findings clearly stated.

Shane Sorensen clarified that any addition to or rebuilding of a non-conforming structure must meet the current setbacks, but the new structure is not required to be built on the footprint of the previous home. Shane reviewed Section 3.22.070 of the code with the council.

Jessica Smuin asked how much of the lot was left after the improvements would be made.

Shane Sorensen said that in the TR-10,000 zone a lot cannot have more than 50 percent impervious area. The calculations are listed on the site plan and show the impervious area as just under 45 percent.

Jessica Smuin asked if the future accessory structure of 97 sq ft. was included.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that if the accessory structure had not been included in the calculations, it still would not exceed the 50 percent maximum for impervious surface.

Sarah Blackwell asked about recourse for the landowner if the proposal is denied.

Steve Doxey said they can file an appeal with the appeal authority.

Andrew Young suggested they could refine the design to meet the criteria.

Mayor Carla Merrill said further action is up to the landowner. If they appeal, staff will present the code, and the appeal authority reviews all the information and makes a decision. Sometimes the decision goes the way we think and other times it is opposite. It is up to the appeal authority.

Sarah Blackwell commented on Item 3(a) under 3.22.070 "The proposed enlargement or extension will not significantly alter the character of the building or use or its impact upon the area." The proposed home is technically a three-story home that would be built next to one-story homes. She did not think this met the neighborhood nor the character.

Item (b) "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." Looking at the height and views, she thought this home would diminish some of the quality of living of adjacent properties.

The Utah League of Cities and Towns says that both property rights and community rights need to be respected. When we look at our overall vision and Master Plan, under Land Use it says, "Preserve and protect specific community characteristics such as hillsides, scenic views, and critical lands in a historic small town. Sarah likes the style of the home and thinks it fits well, but the height does not fit.

Sarah understands that an individual approached the city previously to purchase this home and was told that if they rebuilt, it would have to be on the same foundation. They did not purchase the home. Granting an exception now seems contradictory to that previous discussion.

Shane Sorensen said that typically those conversations take place in our Monday morning (DRC) meetings. Over the last few years, individuals have come in to ask about this property. Shane did not remember the conversation Sarah mentioned. The requirement is what is in the ordinance, and that is why it is on the agenda tonight.

Chrissy Hannemann clarified that the reason the lot is non-conforming is because of the width of the frontage and the square footage, but the proposed home setbacks and height are within our guidelines and are compatible with the zone.

Shane Sorensen said that was correct.

Chrissy Hannemann said that this seems somewhat subjective with regard to diminishing the value of property. She cannot see how the proposal does not conform to the four findings, and this is still a single-family home. She asked about the fence that was removed during the demolition process and brought to the attention of staff.

Shane Sorensen said that the city did not issue a demolition permit for the fence. The city issued a demolition permit for the home because the requirements for asbestos mitigation and utility disconnection were met. The fence issue is a civil dispute between neighbors. The city is not a player in that discussion as the fence is not on city property. When neighbor issues arise, sometimes there is an ordinance regarding the situation and sometimes there is not. We do not have code that addresses this fence issue.

Steve Doxey reminded the council that if they decide to approve the petition, the findings must be made expressly. He read from code: *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.* If the conditions are reasonably related to potential detrimental impacts, they would be appropriate. The Planning Commission did not attach any conditions to its recommendation.

Chrissy Hannemann felt that the petition met conditions (a-d), and that resolving the fence issue could be a condition, but it sounds like the city does not have standing to address the fence issue.

Steve Doxey said that Shane is correct. The city does not typically get involved in a dispute between neighbors about a fence, as it is a civil matter. If an issue can be reasonably tied to “protecting the surrounding territory and the intent of the zone,” then council could attach such conditions.

Mayor Carla Merrill said her interpretation is that the council could attach fence requirements as a condition of approval.

Jessica Smuin mentioned Chrissy Hannemann’s work on bulk and massing standards in Alpine and asked about them in reference to item (a) and the proposed enlargement affecting the character of the building or its impact on the area. It was originally a small home and that was the character. Council members have suggested that item (a) is arbitrary, but because a small home was torn down, we can measure the increase in size of the proposed home. This measurement is concrete in showing how a larger home impacts the character of the area.

Chrissy Hannemann said that the Planning Commission has talked a lot about character as part of the Main Street Plan. A multi-family dwelling describes character. This is still a single-family home, so the character is not really altered. The council does need to address massing, because we see more and more residents filling up their entire lot with structures, but this petition is not extreme. The homes across the street are similar size.

Chrissy mentioned that it is not within our ordinances to force everyone to stay the same size. Many residents are putting large expansions on their homes. We cannot limit landowners to something unreasonable. We may not like their decisions, but we do not have that authority. Chrissy did not want to put the city in the middle of a situation where we do not have authority, like with the fence.

Andrew Young mentioned his draft fence ordinance and would like staff to help improve it. Andrew thinks the petition fails on 3(a), (b), and (d). This proposal is very different from what was originally built

and will greatly impact the adjacent properties. Item (c) was fine, but the proposed home is not compatible with adjacent homes. Andrew said this home has already broken the laws of the zone.

Steve Doxey clarified the difference between an illegal use and a legal non-conforming use. A legal non-conforming use is still legal. This lot does not comply with Alpine's current, more recent ordinance, but that does not mean it was illegal when the home was built.

Andrew Young said he meant that we were not adhering to the zone code. Under the current conditions, the petition does not meet the criteria.

Property owner Cori Fabian was invited to the microphone. She was joined by her General Contractor, Jared Bishop.

Andrew Young asked Cori Fabian if she would be open to modifications requested by neighbors, as they are worried about negative impacts.

Cori Fabian said she was curious to hear about the negative impacts.

Andrew Young suggested lowering the height of the home to be more in line with homes that have been there a long time and reducing the square footage.

Jared Bishop passed out maps that showed nearby two-story homes.

Cori Fabian explained that the homes highlighted in yellow on the map are mostly new builds. The homes directly behind her property sit higher, and three of the four homes are two-story. The home she wants to build is two-story, not three. The homes on each side of her lot are one-story homes. Regarding neighborhood impact, Cori said the most defining feature of the area is Creekside Park. Around the perimeter of the park there are 12 two-story homes and 8 single-story homes, most of which are new builds.

Cori has not taken the design of her home lightly and spent three years on it. She approached the city and asked questions to make sure the home she wanted could be built here. Cori referred to a previous comment about someone inquiring about rebuilding the home being told it would have to be on the same footprint. The foundation was professionally inspected and found to be failing and the house was tipping. The house could not be rebuilt in place.

Andrew Young commented that new builds are drastically different from historic homes, which he is trying to preserve. He asked about a large pine tree and a chain link fence that was removed. He asked if Cori were planning on replacing or fixing those things.

Cori Fabian said the large pine tree she is aware of is on Kelly Workman's property on the other side of the fence. Cori said she spoke with Kelly about the fence dispute and offered several suggestions. She understands that this is a separate and civil matter and should not be weighed as part of the decision on the reconstruction of her home, but she would respond.

Cori said she was under the impression that all the fencing around the property belonged to her, but she was wrong. Kelly Workman said that the block wall was hers. Cori had already hired a mason to inspect the wall, and he said the interior had rotted out. Cori offered to replace the wall if it was removed. Kelly was not open to that suggestion. There was also a three-foot chain link fence on the side yard in the front of the house that was crushed in one area and in disrepair. When Cori asked about it, Kelly said she did care about the chain link fence. That fence was removed the next day.

Andrew Young asked if Cori would be willing to work with the adjacent neighbors to make some adjustments that would create harmony in the neighborhood.

Cori said she would be willing.

Andrew Young said he would be happy to table this item until they come to an agreement.

Mayor Carla Merrill told Cori Fabian that Andrew Young was asking if she agreed to change the height and square footage of her home. The mayor wanted to make sure everyone was on the same page.

Cori Fabian said she is willing to work with the neighbor about the fence. She disagreed with Andrew's interpretation of the four findings. She checked with the city at DRC and Planning and Zoning many times to make sure she was in compliance with all of the codes and ordinances and was told repeatedly that she was. She is hundreds of thousands of dollars into this project at this point, and the only thing keeping her from breaking ground is the building permit. This approval is supposed to be a technicality because the home had legal non-conforming status.

Cori said that the new home will not bring down the value of the properties or the adjacent neighborhood, it will actually improve the value. She designed the home to have the same character as the adjacent neighborhood. She again mentioned the homes behind her that are mostly two-story.

Brent Rummler referenced his training in law school and land use practice. People have a constitutional right to own and use their property as they would like. He noted that this is a reconstruction, which is very common in older neighborhoods. He believes it meets finding (a). For finding (b) he agrees with Cori that smaller homes increase in value as larger homes are built in a neighborhood. Regarding finding (c) the home is compatible because the neighborhood is made up of single-family homes. Brent's own neighborhood has a mix of one- and two-story homes. People have the right to build on their property as long as it is within the required height, setbacks, and lot coverage ratio. Just as we cannot dictate home color, we cannot dictate size. A prior building was built in compliance with the existing ordinances, or there was no applicable ordinance at that time. Now that it is time to replace an older building, a similar use of that property can be accommodated under an exception or ordinance modification. In this case is it the approval of a non-conforming building. Brent thought the petition met all of the criteria. He reminded the council that the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval.

Jessica Smuin commented on land use. The council has legislative authority in this situation. We are not prohibiting the property owner from using the land. We are in the middle of evaluating bulk and massing, and at each crossroad we make decisions for 100 years in the future.

Mayor Carla Merrill said she would now accept comments from neighbors Susan and Mike Paiser, and Kelly Workman.

Susan Paiser – 100 South, Alpine

Susan said she was opposed to the reconstruction of the home. She and her husband have had many discussions, and he will provide his thoughts.

Kelly Workman – 100 South, Alpine

Kelly gave a handout to the council members. She requested that they think about this as if they were the neighbors. This home was built in 1895. When the lot next door went up for sale, she called the city several times to ask about buying it, because her property goes behind the lot. The city said she could only build on the same footprint because it was a non-conforming lot. She did not buy it because of that.

Then Cori Fabian purchased the lot and now she can propose whatever house meets the setbacks. This is not what Kelly was told. The two-story homes behind the lot are in River Meadows and are newer. The homes on 100 South are one-story. Kelly's home is 3,200 sq ft on a larger lot. The proposed home is 3,700 sq ft on a tiny lot and the house is too tall.

Shane Sorensen clarified that our code allows a home to be 34 feet in height to the mid-point of the roof. Chimneys and ancillary structures can be taller. Staff have checked and the plan is in compliance.

Mike Paiser – 100 South, Alpine

Mike said the proposed home is to the east of his home and will have the same setback. He understands that the height meets the ordinances, but he will be in shade all afternoon and evening because of the height. Mike asked when the plans were submitted and when they were approved by the commission.

Shane Sorensen said plans were submitted within the last month, and the proposal was put on the Planning Commission agenda. Approval was recommended by the PC on March 31.

Mike Paiser asked if the Building Department could notify adjacent neighbors when they are reviewing plans. Mike worked in construction for 40 years, and most cities notify adjacent property owners when something will affect them. He asked why Alpine does not do this.

Shane Sorensen said that the city does not notify neighbors for a typical home building permit, and those permits do not go on a City Council agenda but are reviewed through an administrative process in the Building Department. This one is here because of the non-conforming status. Currently there is no code requiring notification for building permits, and the definition of “affect” would be different for everyone. The council can make a change to the code regarding notification if they feel it is necessary.

Brent Rummler confirmed that if this lot had 1,800 additional square feet and 10 more feet of frontage, this decision would never have come to the council. The home could just be built.

Shane Sorensen said that was correct.

Motion: Brent Rummler moved to approve the proposed site plan, including the reconstruction of the home at 480 East 100 South, noting that it meets the four findings noted in the 3.22.070. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. There were 2 yes votes and 3 no votes, as recorded below. The motion failed.

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

Jessica Smuin pointed out that most homes in the highlighted yellow area on the map are on half-acre lots (20,000 sf).

Shane Sorensen clarified that seven or eight homes south of the lot are in the TR-10,000 zone.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to deny the approval of the non-conforming building based upon the finding that the proposed enlargement or extension will significantly alter the character of the building or use or its impact upon the area as found in the TR-10,000 zone. Andrew Young seconded the motion.

Regarding the legal definition of character, Chrissy Hannemann read the following: "The character is defined as the combined effect of all visual aspects that constitute its appearance, style, and identity. Defining features could be the quality of materials, craftsmanship, rooflines, setting, including landscaping and relationship to the street." She interprets this to mean that the style of the home is compatible with the neighborhood. In addition, the impact of the home is in line with all other homes in the neighborhood as single-family homes.

Jessica Smuin and Andrew Young focused on the impact of home due to the square footage, height, and proximity to other homes.

Brent Rummler pointed out the home would meet all city ordinances if the lot was conforming in square footage and frontage.

The council voted. There were 3 yes votes and 2 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed.

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

Motion: Brent Rummler moved to extend the meeting past the 9:00 deadline to discuss Action Items B, C and D and the cemetery ordinance, but to table the discussion of the first part of the Main Street and Gateway Corridor Master Plan. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Ordinance 2026-09: Proposed Code Amendment to Allow Indoor Self-Storage Units and Condo Luxury Garages

Ryan Robinson (on Zoom) said an application has been submitted to amend the Alpine City Development Code in the Business Commercial (B-C) Zone to allow indoor self-storage units and condo luxury garages. The applicant has a specific location under consideration (119 East 200 North, the former Purple Mattress building) for this use; however, if approved by the City Council following a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the amendment would apply to any property within the B-C Zone that meets the established standards.

The applicant has worked with staff to propose code language that would allow these conditional uses within the zone. The draft language was included in the packet. If the amendment is approved, any future applications for these uses will still be subject to the standard review process for setbacks, building height, and architectural compliance in accordance with the Gateway Historic design guidelines.

The early draft of the Main Street Master Plan identifies the subject area as a Main Street Civic and Mixed-Use area. Proposed characteristics for this area were included in the packet.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing for this agenda item during their November 18th, 2025, meeting. Discussion focused on consistency with the area’s envisioned mixed-use character, and potential impacts related to traffic, parking, and site design. Public comment raised concerns about setting a precedent for code changes driven by individual projects and compatibility with the community’s identity. The applicant emphasized the low-traffic nature of the use, compatibility with surrounding commercial properties, and the potential demand for enclosed storage.

The commission discussed operational considerations such as parking, landscaping, screening, and restrictions on business activity within units, as well as the need for compliance with design standards. While some concern remained regarding creating code changes for a single site, others noted the potential community benefit and reuse of a vacant building. A motion was made to recommend approval of the proposed code amendment finding it consistent with the General Plan and Development Code standards. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The item was taken to City Council on March 24, 2026, as a discussion item. Comments were focused on the proper use of the site, with both positive and negative sentiment from council members. It was also suggested that a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) may not be the proper method to apply for such a use, and that an overlay zone might be more appropriate.

APPLICABLE CITY CODE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.07.030 Conditional Uses (B-C Zone)
- Alpine Development Code 3.01.110 Definitions
- Alpine Development Code 3.23 Conditional Uses

GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Land zoned as B-C (Business Commercial) shall consist of professional office, retail and other commercial uses serving the community and situated within an environment which is safe and aesthetically pleasing. Limited residential shall be permitted as set forth in the Alpine City Development Code.

PUBLIC NOTICE

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

As a legislative decision, the City Council should consider whether the proposed code amendment is compatible with the city’s General Plan policies and Development Code standards.

Staff recommend that the council review the proposed language in the packet and determine if additional standards should be added, language revised, or a different land use designation considered. In approving or denying this code amendment to Conditional Uses in the Alpine Development Code, staff also recommend the council include findings regarding their decision.

Motion: Brent Rummler moved to approve the proposed code amendment to allow indoor self-storage units and condo luxury garages in the Business-Commercial zone as presented in the staff packet, finding that the amendment is consistent with the city’s General Plan policies and Development Code standards, with the use and construction subject to future approval of a site plan, a development agreement, and CC&Rs with covenants, conditions, and restrictions that are satisfactory to the city and which include the city as a party or an expressly intended third party beneficiary that can enforce the CC&Rs. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion.

After a lengthy discussion the council voted.

There were 3 no votes and 2 yes votes, as recorded below. The motion failed.

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

Jessica Smuin said that the council’s job is to make sure a CUP is compatible with the vision and community. She looked at the General Plan and the Gateway Historic Zone and cited several details with the conclusion that the scale is not compatible with the businesses on either side. New construction should be compatible with surrounding structures (a rustic event center and a small dance studio). This project is not moving in the right direction. Many other cities do not allow storage units at all, or only in their industrial and manufacturing zones. They have higher restrictions than Alpine. This use may create less traffic, but we do not have a traffic study to support that. She appreciated Brent’s motion but does not see how it meets the General Plan or Historic Gateway guidelines. The Planning Commission is a recommending body, and are not elected officials. The City Council represents the voice of the community.

Sarah Blackwell said she has studied this issue in depth because when we look at land use there are many subjective issues that can be argued either way. Looking at economic development in the Master Plan, the city would not receive a lot of tax revenue from storage units. Sarah asked about how this business would benefit the city financially in the B-C Zone.

Mayor Carla Merrill clarified that Highland has the Highland Hideaway, which is a storage facility. With a commercial property we receive property tax revenue at 100 percent of the value, as opposed to primary residential homes for which there is a 45 percent discount. The luxury condo garages would not be primary residences so they would at taxed at 100 percent of the unit value.

Chrissy Hannemann commented that the value of land in Alpine has gone up greatly which also impacts what can be built on a property. A project in a commercial zone will have to earn money, and the applicant is trying to see what will work. It would be great if the city could expand the cemetery, but we do not have \$8M to spend on this. A vacant building is also not in the best interest of the city. Some residents have suggested a rec center, but we do not have the resources for that. We need to

think out of the box to find the best use for this particular property. This will be the only such use in the city, and we have the opportunity to put restrictions on aesthetics.

Sarah Blackwell noted that the property owner has priced this at a high level and does not feel that it is the City Council’s responsibility to accommodate the use based on the price point.

Chrissy Hannemann responded that, as Brent mentioned, landowners have the right to develop their property within our ordinances. We do not have an ordinance that allows the use in a commercial way, and we do not have the resources to use it for the public, so we are trying to be creative to see how this land may be used. This will have a lasting effect on our city. Tonight we are voting on an ordinance, not a particular project. We have more opportunities to put additional restrictions on the appearance of the final product. Chrissy thinks we need to open the door to something different. The applicant is not maxing out the height, and they seem willing to adjust the site plan and the CC&Rs. We have not allowed storage units before, and the ordinance prohibits another such facility within a mile.

Jessica Smuin commented that in the many hours she has spent in meetings and talking with the public, no one has asked for storage units.

Andrew Young said the council is here to balance property owner’s rights with the wellbeing of the community. We are trying to represent the people. Andrew felt that there are many uses that are allowed here and would pencil, such as a funeral home, residential units, animal care, senior homes, and professional uses. Changing the code could create massive problems.

Brent Rummler said he agrees that the role of the legislative branch is to utilize land to create a harmonious community. Ordinances are a work in progress, and the CUP list is not complete. When it was written, the council could not anticipate all the future uses, and the city previously expanded the list to include automotive shops. The previous code allowed manufacturing, which is now prohibited. Alpine residents do not want the return of manufacturing or industrial uses. If the large building were not there, this would be a different situation. Staff presented this proposal that could be viable in Alpine to serve the public good and provide storage close by. The Planning Commission has lots of experience in land use and interpreting the Master Plan. This plan has a low traffic and parking impact. Dog grooming could work, but not in a 40,000 sq ft building. The storage units would remove the eyesore, and the developer would have to follow the Gateway Historic guidelines. The council would approve the CC&Rs. With other uses (commercial condos, a nursing home, restaurants) most would not fit on this lot. Brent liked applicant’s plan for landscape screening and adequate parking. Having available storage units could limit the need for residents to build accessory structures on their own lots. We do not want traditional storage sheds here, and the city does not have the budget to buy this property. Some residents have suggested that this use is better than having the property remain vacant.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to deny the proposed code amendment to allow indoor self-storage units and condo luxury garages in the Business-Commercial zone, finding that the amendment is not consistent with the city’s General Plan policies, Development Code, and Gateway Historic guidelines. Andrew Young 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>
Jessica Smuin	Chrissy Hannemann	
Sarah Blackwell	Brent Rummler	
Andrew Young		

C. Consideration for Membership in American Fork Chamber of Commerce/Lone Peak Business Alliance or Highland Alpine Chamber of Commerce

Shane said Representatives of both the American Fork Chamber of Commerce/Lone Peak Business Alliance and Highland Alpine Chamber of Commerce attended the March 24, 2026, City Council meeting and made presentations to the council about the benefits of being a member of their organizations. The presentations that were included in the packet.

Council members Jessica Smuin and Brent Rummeler requested that the council determine whether to be a member of one, both, or neither of these organizations. Annual membership dues for the American Fork Chamber of Commerce/Lone Peak Business Alliance are \$3,500 and for the Highland Alpine Chamber of Commerce dues are \$2,500.

Jessica Smuin said she attended the Highland Chamber luncheon, and business owners are excited about having a local chamber. Jessica said that Josh with the American Fork chamber has been awesome over the years, but it is just time to bring things closer to home.

Sarah Blackwell said a local chamber makes sense to her, but she is on the fence about whether the city needs to be a member. The money for dues could perhaps be used toward our own events.

Jessica Smuin said that it is not often funding that keeps us from hosting events, it is manpower. The chamber leadership is an extension of staff, like when they have helped with the Main Street Trick or Treat event. Heidi Smith, our Events Coordinator, has a lot on her plate.

Sarah Blackwell asked if we have a list of businesses in Alpine.

DeAnn Parry said the city does have a current list of businesses, which are the home occupations and commercial entities that have complied with the rules and registered their business.

Heidi Smith commented that the benefit historically has been the chamber's help with our Trick or Treat event, and she felt that the city could handle the activity ourselves. Heidi also said that the past support for Alpine Days has been less than what we asked for, but any help is welcome.

Chrissy Hannemann said that she has spent many hours with different chambers. Their purpose is not focused on the city but to benefit the businesses. We want to have viable businesses in our city that provide employment, pay property taxes, and work together as partners. Chamber events are designed to allow business owners to meet, network, and help each other. If we are a member, we are supporting a chamber that supports our businesses. Chrissy observed that Alpine businesses seem to think the local chamber will better serve them.

Andrew Young observed that people who have successful businesses want peace and quiet. They come here because they want to get away from industrial areas. We have that peace here and once it is gone, we cannot get it back. We are trying to protect that peace in Alpine. Andrew likes American Fork, but Highland is cheaper and closer. If Highland guarantees a three-year lock on the dues price and a yearly evaluation, they will have his support for chamber membership.

Brent Rummeler said he likes the energy of the Highland Alpine Chamber, and it would be worth it to try it and see. This seems like a low investment for the potential return. There are already more businesses participating, and Brent liked the idea of a publicized list so residents can patronize local businesses.

Mayor Carla Merrill said she can see the value of a smaller, more local chamber. She also sees value in a chamber that has been around for 80 years and has a strong heritage. It may be best to let the business owners choose their membership, and we can evaluate after the first year.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to approve membership in the Highland Alpine Chamber of Commerce and instruct staff to budget funds to cover the expense, with an evaluation the following year to determine the continuation of our chamber membership. Andrew Young seconded the motion.

Andrew Young suggested an amendment to add a three-year lock on the membership fee and a written document that showcased the vision of the Highland Alpine Chamber of Commerce to also uphold the Alpine plan in preserving peace, quiet, and views, while supporting businesses.

Jessica Smuin accepted the three-year lock on membership fees.

Amended Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to approve membership in the Highland Alpine Chamber of Commerce and instruct staff to budget funds to cover the expense, with an evaluation the following year to determine the continuation of our chamber membership, and with a three-year lock on the membership fee. Andrew Young 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>
Jessica Smuin	Sarah Blackwell	
Andrew Young	Chrissy Hannemann	
Brent Rummmler		

D. Approval of Lone Peak Public Safety District FY2027 Budget

Shane Sorensen said that at the April 1, 2026, board meeting the Lone Peak Public Safety District Board (LPPSD) heard a proposal from staff for the FY2026-2027 tentative budget. The board approved a motion which included a 5 percent wage increase, funding for a sergeant position, and an additional \$20,000 for implementing AI technology into police reports. The staff report and approved tentative budget, along with assessments for each city, were included in the packet.

The approved tentative budget implemented the new fire funding formula previously approved by the board, with a 50 percent step-in for FY2027. The full increase will take effect with the FY2028 budget. For this budget year, 50 percent of the increase due to the funding formula change will come from the city, while the other 50 percent will come from the LPPSD Administration fund balance. Highland City will receive payment from the same fund balance, pro-rated based on their contribution to the overall fire budget.

Compared to the current year’s budget, the assessment for Administration will be increased by \$18,659 (+15.4 percent), Police will be increased by \$74,787 (+4.9 percent) and Fire will be increased by \$361,962 (+23.7 percent), for a combined increase of \$455,408 (+14.4 percent). Note that the city will get a payment of approximately \$143,000 from LPPSD that will cover 50 percent of this increase.

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

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

The intent of the interlocal agreement amendment was to prevent either city from forcing, through a majority vote, a large increase on the other city. The LPPSD tentative budget was approved by the board at the April 1 board meeting. The final budget will be considered at the May 13 board meeting. Since the average property tax revenue increase of the two cities for the last fiscal year is less than the increase in the proposed assessments to fund the district, approval of both City Councils is required prior to the district adopting their final budget in May. The Highland City Council will consider the item at their April 21 meeting. Highland City’s Administrator, Erin Wells, is in attendance tonight.

Sarah Blackwell expressed appreciation for Brent Rummmler and Chrissy Hannemann serving on the LPPSD board and said we are all on the same team with staff and elected officials and public safety personnel and want our cities to be safe. Sarah did not want to discount what the public safety staff or the council members do. She noted that the comparison was for starting salaries and not for a step in grade scale. Even at the reduced 5 percent, the increase still seems high. Also, the timing of the proposed budget increase did not allow adequate time to research this decision. If possible, it would be great to see these budget proposals earlier so there is more time to be educated.

Chrissy Hannemann said she appreciates the work that went into the budget. The police department originally wanted to add two staff members, but they agreed to one position. The fire department has a step in grade chart so they know what to expect from year to year if staff stay in their current roles. The board asked the police department to create a similar chart. They want to smooth out the process, look at benefits, study the best way to utilize fund balances, and establish a Capital Improvements Fund. Chrissy visited each station to watch the operations. They are efficient and the staff have good

camaraderie. She appreciates our chiefs for the great work they do in creating a positive environment, which is very important in public service. She thanked Erin Wells for all her work, especially because she wears lots of hats like Shane does here.

Police Chief Brian Gwilliam explained that the staff increase is for an experienced sergeant position. This officer would be in uniform and would supervise and offer suggestions to help keep the department out of lawsuits. Lone Peak currently has three patrol sergeants, which leaves them lacking 54 hours of coverage each week. This position will provide 40 hours toward that deficit. There will also be one-time costs for equipment and a vehicle.

Chief Gwilliam said they originally asked for a wage increase at around eight percent but settled on five. There was a time in 2021-22 where Lone Peak was 30 percent lower in wages than surrounding departments. Over time, with the support of the cities and the board, they have been able to make small increases to be more competitive, so they are not just a training ground and do not lose officers to other agencies. Chief Gwilliam said the police department has a great relationship with the fire department. The five percent increase is an average across the board. Some employees will get a little more and some a little less, depending on their position.

Andrew Young asked if the sergeant position will increase the department's ability to slow traffic.

Chief Gwilliam explained that this is a supervisory position, with approximately 40 percent of time available for enforcement. The remainder of time is to be on scene approving reports, giving directions, and helping officers. The AI report software will free up more time for the officers to handle enforcement.

Jessica Smuin asked if the wage study could be converted into a step in grade plan.

Chief Gwilliam said he has spent a significant amount of time putting together pay scales in the last two years, and they last for a while and then the board gets rid of them. He is working on a scale for next year that will include total compensation and has received information from 15 agencies for comparison.

Jessica Smuin said she appreciates the council members and the mayor for time they serve on the LPPSD board.

Brent Rummeler asked about officers writing reports and if they could park where their vehicles would be more visible.

Chief Gwilliam said he often parks on a main road to file his reports. Longer reports are typically written at the station. They ask the officers to be visible as often as they can, which tends to slow traffic.

Sarah Blackwell asked if the chief anticipates the same 5 percent increase each year.

Chief Gwilliam said they would like to arrive at average compensation. Other public safety departments will increase in July, and we do not know yet what that percentage will be.

Jessica Smuin asked if this were a total benefits package, including retirement and health insurance?

Fire Chief Brian Patten said not yet, but he is looking forward to it. Chief Patten said that in his five years as chief they have been chasing wages and losing staff the whole time. They have done a lot of work to try to get to a market average, and they are still behind. They should know where they are regarding comparable wages in August. If we want qualified firefighters, we have to be competitive. If staff can go to another city and get \$15,000 more a year, they will do it. Lone Peak is wildly understaffed, which creates an unsafe work environment. The chief was a firefighter in Pleasant Grove for 21 years, and most homes maxed out around 6,000 sq ft. They had seven firefighters at a station, and they were not dealing with the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). Alpine has 40,000 sq ft homes up against the hillside. Nearby cities are not dealing with this situation while being understaffed.

Brent Rummler commented on the federal government and private sector approach to step in grade pay scales. Step in grade gives more clarity for planning wage increases for training and experience levels and value for our communities.

Chief Patten said he would not want an automatic increase because of varying motivations. There are certifications that need to be done in the first year, but after that he prefers to let firefighters decide based on their level of motivation. Previously staff were required to receive certifications and had to cancel vacations and such. Now they are standing in line to get their classes done because they are motivated to improve and receive a pay raise. It also saves the department money because they are not paying overtime for mandated training.

The chief said they are not yet at the average mark when compared to other departments. They just want to stay in range. This increase really is not a COLA, but a market adjustment.

Brent Rummler said that next year they want to compare all the steps in grades, including benefits, so they can make informed decisions. We should look at the same comparisons for staff.

Erin Wells, Executive Director for LPPSD, said that salaries are easy to research because of databases. Benefits are much more complicated and require numerous phone calls. There are other considerations like tiers, Social Security contributions, and the like. Though they sent out requests to HR departments, they did not get the response they needed. They are working to compare Utah County departments, and South Salt Lake cities, like Bluffdale and Draper.

Sarah Blackwell asked how many firefighters have left for better wages, and how many have been hired.

Chief Patten said he lost a captain to another department and hired two new firefighters. For those positions he had 17 qualified applicants. For the first time in five years, they also had two paramedics apply. The market has slowed down somewhat, so this gives them a chance to catch up. He would love to get to a place where they are competitive, and then just look at a 3 percent merit or COLA each year.

Chrissy Hannemann said it is important to understand the needs of our public safety departments. If we are not keeping up and are unable to keep a qualified staff, then it falls to us to find the resources to meet their needs. She appreciated the chiefs and their input. Chrissy went over the ILA statement again and mentioned that property taxes are not our only source of revenue. A property tax increase may be needed to fund public safety in the future.

Andrew Young said he feels his job is not to meet the chiefs' needs but to meet the residents' needs. Andrew said our fire department is not the same as other cities. We are not the same in population, demographics, or level of crime. Alpine is unique. He researched the ILA and does not think it is sustainable and the right fit for Alpine. Our current system for fighting fires, transporting people by ambulance, addressing crime, and dealing with traffic is a model that works in South Salt Lake or parts of Utah County. Five percent is too much. No other industry is getting that. Andrew said the needs of Alpine are fire prevention and traffic calming. We have an older population that needs ambulance services and their property taxes are already too high. He cannot support this because there needs to be a change. The fire department is just like the schools, always asking for more money. It is never enough, but we do not see a change in quality.

Chief Patten asked when Alpine had its last big fire – 2012, and said, “You’re welcome.” The chief asked how Andrew would like to see a change.

Andrew Young said the change would be by getting in front of a fire before it happened and doing the correct fire mitigation that we are pleading for.

Chief Patten said that if the city wants to have fire mitigation, he will need additional employees. He hires firefighters, not fire mitigators. Fire mitigation can be discussed, but it will not bring the costs down.

Andrew Young said if we could use traffic safety funds for fire mitigation, we could avoid a fire that would risk lives. He thinks the model should change.

Chief Patten commented he is amazed that all of Alpine complains about speeding, but who is speeding? It is the neighbors, because this is a dead-end community.

Brent Rummler said the majority of firefighter response is for accidents and medical emergencies. In Pleasant Grove they have more structure fires, which you cannot mitigate. We have the WUI here, and there is room for mitigation through programs we are exploring. Mitigation is not the firefighters' primary role. They have to be available for medical emergencies that are 80-85 percent of their calls. The chief has staffed our Alpine fire station with four firefighters because of our aging population.

Shane Sorensen commented that the fire department did not ask for open spaces in the subdivisions in Alpine. We have 500 acres of open space in Three Falls, along with Lambert Park, and bike trails that the residents enjoy. The fire department did not ask for any of this, and they did not create the need. A lot of the issues were created by city ordinances.

Chief Patten said the responsibility for fire mitigation rests on the landowners. We can help residents, but we cannot force them to do mitigation, nor can we remove brush and cut down their trees.

Brent Rummler thanked the chiefs for all they do. He noted that employees get raises in all industries and we need to be competitive. The primary responsibility of government is public safety and infrastructure like utilities. Everything else can be set aside. We have had an increase in population, but the police department has not added any staff in over ten years. Fire department staffing to meet minimum OSHA standards is also critical for Alpine.

Motion: Brent Rummler moved to approve the Lone Peak Public Safety District Tentative Budget as proposed for FY2026-2027. 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>
Jessica Smuin	Andrew Young	
Sarah Blackwell		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Brent Rummler		

E. Ordinance 2026-10: Amendments to Municipal Code 8.04 Cemeteries

Shane Sorensen explained that staff are proposing several amendments to Sections 8.04.060 and 8.04.090 of the Alpine Municipal Code to clarify the ordinances and to bring others in line with current operations. Following are highlights of the proposed changes:

- Clarify requirements for grave markers.
- Clarify requirements for flat headstones in certain sections and other related items.
- Clarify requirements for raised headstones.
- Clarify the number of individuals and type of interments allowed in an individual grave.
- Clarify rules for decorations.

The intent of requesting approval of the amendments is to allow new signage to be installed at the cemetery prior to the upcoming Memorial Day weekend. Our existing signs at the cemetery allow two weeks for decorations to remain after the holiday, but our code states only one week. Current code also says that if a family does not install a headstone within a year after interment the city will do it for them. This has never been done, and we do not want to keep this requirement in the code. The Cemetery Sexton and Maintenance Supervisor compiled the suggested updates and have reviewed the policies of other cities and found this proposal to be in line with local cemeteries.

The council talked about the proposed changes and balancing the needs of maintenance staff with families' wishes to remember their loved ones. Other details were also discussed and explained:

- Raised monuments are not allowed in the North Cemetery because of topography and maintenance.

- Double-deep burials are not possible because of our soil composition and the danger of trench collapse. We have to meet OSHA standards.
- The 18-inch decoration limitation is to prevent large decorations from interfering with maintenance or infringing on other graves, not as a punitive regulation. It will not be enforced unless individuals clearly exceed reasonable decoration placement.

Chrissy Hannemann said she feels that those who work with the cemetery know best and she did not understand why the council was inserting themselves into the issue.

Mayor Carla Merrill said she looked at cemetery decoration policies on other cities' websites, and they are almost the same.

Cemetery Sexton DeAnn Parry explained that the proposed changes are for consistency. She and Troy Hackett (Maintenance Supervisor) receive most of the phone calls with cemetery questions and issues, and they had a meeting to go over all the wording. These changes are based on experience and how other cities handle their cemeteries. Some people decorate the entire grass space, which makes it difficult when the city is trying to prepare a new grave and workers must drive over the decorations. We want people to be able to memorialize their loved ones, the decorations just need to be confined to the headstone and border so the mowers can work, burials can happen, and visitors can get through. The goal is not to remove their decorations, it is to let people know about expectations ahead of time, so they are not surprised or upset.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that the council looks at ordinances and tries to mitigate possible future issues. If decorations are within reason, there will not be a problem. If something is excessive and infringing on another gravesite or is impeding the staff's ability to prepare a grave, then it can be removed. This change allows us to anticipate future situations and have the ability to respond to problems.

Chrissy Hannemann reminded the council that their role is not to micromanage.

Motion: Sarah Blackwell moved to approve Ordinance 2026-10 including amendments to Sections 8.04.060 and 8.04.090 of the Alpine Municipal Code. Brent Rummler seconded the motion.

Andrew Young proposed that the code be changed to allow decorations for two weeks after interment and suggested that after "... items that obstruct maintenance will be removed and disposed of without prior notice" wording be added to say, "if not able to be reasonably placed on the monument's headstone or cement border."

Jessica Smuin suggested that the 18" height limit be removed.

Sarah Blackwell did not accept the proposed changes.

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

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

VII. STAFF REPORTS

Shane Sorensen said he will send an update email tomorrow.

VIII. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

Mayor Carla Merrill said that Council Communication is to report on committee assignments and the like. If council members have questions, requests for repairs, or suggestions for projects, they should email Shane.

Brent Rummler said the Trails Committee service day is this Saturday, April 18th. Everyone should meet at the Lambert Park Bowery at 8:00 am.

Sarah Blackwell said she spent spring break cleaning out the Olsen home and looking for artifacts for the Senior Center. The water committee is meeting weekly and working on positive messaging. Chrissy Hannemann has great marketing ideas. Sarah will meet with the AYC tomorrow at 10:00am as they refine and update their goals.

Chrissy Hannemann reported that the water committee will have a public education night on May 6 at Westfield Elementary. They will use all available messaging options. She encouraged council members to send texts to their neighbors. The ULCT conference is April 23-24 in St. George.

Andrew Young displayed a Green Grass During Drought flyer. The mayor suggested he send it to the water committee.

Mayor Carla Merrill said she is looking for someone who can install our trail cameras. She asked council members for suggestions.

Motion: Brent Rummler moved to adjourn the meeting. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 pm.