

**ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AT
Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, Utah
June 6, 2017**

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

- A. Welcome and Roll Call:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman Steve Cosper. The following Commission members were present and constituted a quorum.

Chairman: Steve Cosper

Commission Members: Jason Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, John Gubler

Staff: Jason Bond, Marla Fox

Others: Councilman Ramon Beck, Councilman Roger Bennett, Brenda Webb, Randy Austin, Leslie Austin, Megan Hacking, Blair Buswell, Julie Buswell, Lucas Mueller, Boston Hill, Vickie Mueller, Gale Ruldolph, Ed Bush, Jessica Smuin, Arlene McCulloch, Rose Fjeldsted, Chrissy Hannemann, Will Jones, Scott Hacking, Cheri Palsson, Richard James, Lisa Southwick,

- A. Prayer/Opening Comments:** John Gubler

- B. Pledge of Allegiance:** A Scout, Lucas

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

No Comments.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. General Plan Update – Lambert Park Master Plan

Jason Bond explained that Lambert Park was a very important asset to Alpine City for several different reasons. It was the location of several important City utility facilities and often used for several different types community events and recreational activities. Ideas to improve the park were expressed regularly by passionate residents and non-residents, City Council members, Planning Commission members, staff, etc. Hundreds of volunteers regularly made a difference by doing service in the park to maintain trails and address noxious weeds. There were several common goals for the park but also some conflicting opinions. The Planning Commission and City Council needed to create a new master plan for the park that would provide clear direction on what the City would like to see done to enhance, maintain and preserve Lambert Park for the future.

In the past, the City had officially taken action on specific changes within the park (i.e. signage, boulders, retention areas, etc.) but there had not been a broad master plan for the park adopted or updated since June 25, 2002. The existing plan was relatively simple and many of the items in the plan had already been realized. The minutes from the meeting when the plan was adopted and the plan itself are attached.

One of the biggest action items that the City Council had taken on Lambert Park in recent years was the sale of a very small section of the park (8,110 square feet) on the west side next to Moyle Drive. It was sold for \$200,000. The City Council decided that 40% of that money would be used for some flood mitigation projects and 60%, or \$120,000, would be used for other improvements to Lambert Park. None of that money had been spent yet and it should be considered in the future plans for the park.

Some recent changes and ideas discussed by the City Council for Lambert Park included, but were not limited to, the following:

- New restroom at south end of park
- Discussions about trailhead parking area at south end of park
- Discussions about a split-rail fence in areas to delineate the boundary of the park
- Discussions about implementing appropriate signage for the trails
- Discussions with the Division of Natural Resources about a deer revegetation project

Jason Bond recommended breaking their actions into three sections: establishing a vision, creating a plan, and implementing that plan. Previous discussions about Lambert Park had been scattered and no action was ever taken, which was why he felt the need for a plan. The master plan should be a living document that was continually revisited and updated. He said the City Council would be more involved in the implementation part of the plan because they would need to budget for the future projects. One thing the City Council was anxious to do was to define the boundaries of the park, and they asked the Planning Commission to give a specific recommendation on that.

Jason Bond asked the Planning Commission to discuss their general vision for the park. He would take their direction and begin work on a master plan.

Steve Cospers said that the City hadn't drifted too far from the goals listed in the General Plan that was adopted in 2002. He felt that the Moyle Park Master Plan had been successful and suggested creating something similar for Lambert Park. Jason Bond said that they needed to discuss general goals, get something on paper, and work from there. One issue that needed to be discussed was the poppies, because that area of the park was being abused. He asked the Planning Commission what they wanted to see happen to Lambert Park.

Troy Stout said that Lambert Park had protection under super majority from the City Council, which meant that it would take four out of the five votes to propose or pass any major change to the park. He was a little insecure with that because he wanted to see the park permanently protected as a wild open space. He considered Lambert Park as the crown jewel of Alpine City, as the park was a wild open space, uninterrupted by development, and currently accessible to the public. Another concern was that there was some private property in the area that was being confused as part of the park. The property owners had been gracious in allowing public access to the trails that run through their properties, but the City needed to be cautious. He suggested that the borders of the park be properly delineated, that they establish the main points of access to the park, and they create parking areas. He also proposed that the City extend some sort of recognition to the land owners who had allowed access to the park through their properties.

Troy Stout said that the City should create trailhead parking to the east of the Stake Center. He would like to see the park remain semi-improved without paving but rather bringing in a road base, and without removing the trees. He said people could continue to park at the rodeo grounds and possibly in the park at the end of Moyle Drive. He showed on a map the boundaries of the park and identified the trails running through private property.

Troy Stout suggested ways to delineate the boundaries of the park. He said he wanted to see a large arch across the entrance of the park with a split rail fence. Troy Stout again referenced the map and identified the different points of entry to the park.

Troy Stout reported that people were coming from Spanish Fork, Sandy and every point in between to visit Lambert Park. It was a beautiful, well-known park and a great place to ride bicycles. Jason Bond said the park was roughly 255 acres.

Troy Stout suggested including some language about the use of fire arms near Lambert Park on Forest Service land. The City needed to take a solid stance on that issue. It was also suggested that the City prohibit motorized vehicles. Steve Cosper said that the firearms issue was controversial and it should be discussed another night. Troy Stout said his goal was to preserve the park as a wild, natural park that should not be disturbed unless it served the City's needs, such as drilling a well.

Ramon Beck said the City should leave the park as it is, but make it more accessible for everyone.

Jason Thelin said he would like to see an actual plan brought to the Planning Commission and then make changes from there.

Steve Cosper felt that the City may need some help from professional architects, as was done with Moyle Park. Jason Bond said he needed to hear their ideas first so that he could put it down on paper. After that, the City could seek professional assistance with the road. Jane Griener asked if the City should form a committee to help create the master plan. Steve Cosper recommended starting with establishing the boundaries, parking, and trails.

Jason Bond said the City budget would be adopted at the next City Council meeting and they wanted to know the Planning Commission's recommendation on what those monies should be used for. Troy Stout said the City already had \$120,000 to spend in the park and that money didn't have to be budgeted for a specific project.

Jason Thelin asked Will Jones if there was still a plan to connect the trails into Corner Canyon. Will Jones said the connection was already happening and it was going to be incredible.

B. PUBLIC HEARING – The Corridor Open Space Land Swap

The Alpine City open space, referred to as “The Corridor”, had a few stretches of trail that were currently on private property. Work had been done to coordinate with property owners to ensure that those areas were either within the City’s open space or within a dedicated easement. Some sections of the trail had already been rerouted and other sections of the trail were expected to be acquired in the form of an easement.

The attachments show a section of trail that was on the property located at 175 West Canyon Crest Road. The property also had part of their landscaping on Alpine City open space. It was the City’s understanding that the development of the trail and landscaping was coordinated between the original developer of the site and Alpine City. Unfortunately, an easement for the trail was never recorded and the property had since changed hands a few times. The current property owner would prefer to adjust the property line and do a 1:1 trade of property, which would place the trail/bridge on Alpine City property and the landscaping on the private property.

Section 3.16.4 required that land in open space shall not be disposed of in any manner or used for any other than specified in the ordinance except after a recommendation of the Planning Commission and a public hearing and by a super majority vote of the City Council (four positive votes are required).

Steve Cosper opened the Public hearing.

Ramon Beck asked if there was a lien on the subject property. Jason Bond said the land owner was looking into that and would take care of any issues.

Steve Cosper closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Jane Griener moved to recommend that the proposed land swap of a segment of Alpine City open space and a segment of property located at 175 West Canyon Crest Road be approved.

John Gubler seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous with 5 Ayes and 0 Nays. Jason Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, and John Gubler all voted Aye.

C. PUBLIC HEARING – General Plan Update – The Corridor Master Plan

The City open space that runs along Dry Creek and Fort Creek had been discussed previously by both the Planning Commission and City Council. The open space was now being referred to as “The Corridor”. Direction had been given to staff to start working on improvements to the trail within the open space. With the central location in the City, this trail and open space had incredible potential to be a venue for community events, create a variety of recreational opportunities, and support future development on adjacent vacant land.

Jason Bond explained to the residents how the trail came about and how it related to the zone that they were currently living in. He said he would like this trail to be an urban trail that would be eight feet wide and paved with asphalt. He said he hoped that this trail would one day connect with other major trails in the City.

Jason Bond said the City was currently working on the trail and working with other owners to obtain easements where the trail deviated off of City property. He referenced the map and identified the accesses to the trail, the parking areas, and a trail head parking area at the south end. Jason Bond pointed out locations that would be ideal for a natural playground and a few workout stations along the trail. He also identified the location of a bridge and an area for a possible gazebo.

Steve Cospers opened the Public Hearing.

Brenda Webb, a resident, was concerned that the plan was already in motion before it had been presented to the residents. She said that the existing pathway needed some work, but it should not be widened, paved, or lighted. These improvements were unnecessary and unwanted. She said she would like to see a more natural path and emphasized the importance of regular maintenance. Mrs. Webb explained that the trail was not appropriate for strollers or wheelchairs, as it ran very close to the river and there were some steep areas. She did not like the exercise or playground ideas because of potential liability issues and unwanted drug problems. She was also opposed to adding extra parking at the trailhead. Mrs. Webb encouraged the Planning Commission to preserve the natural resources in the area.

Rose Fjeldsted, a resident, addressed the erosion of Dry Creek, which ran next to her property, and the danger associated with it. She requested that some maintenance be done to the area when the Creek dried up.

Steve Cospers said Alpine City could not address the creek because it was under the protection of the State. Jason Bond said they would have to get a stream alteration permit from the Division of Water before they could touch the stream.

Chrissy Hannemann, a resident, said that the trail was very valuable but she would rather see the current parks properly maintained rather than having this trail developed. She liked the idea of having parking at the trailhead to help with traffic, but she wanted that area to be gravel rather than asphalt. She said that the City had enough asphalt and they couldn't maintain what they already had.

Randy Ostler, a resident, said that paving the trail would encourage more on-street parking, which was a safety issue. He also said that the erosion problems needed to be addressed before more people were invited into the area by the trail.

Blair Buswell, a resident, said that the City needed to put gravel on the trail and maintain the other park areas. He talked about how the brush and branches were overwhelming the area, and suggested ways that the trail could be better maintained.

Richard James, a resident, explained where the Bonneville Shoreline Trail existed in Alpine and asked how the City was planning to maintain that trail. He commented on the poor condition of the trail. He also said that the trail ran across an aqueduct owned by the Federal government. Mr. James offered information about contacting the Federal government about that aqueduct.

should the City start working on the trail. Mr. James also spoke about traffic along the road and parking issues.

Steve Cospers closed the Public Hearing.

Jane Griener asked if the property was designated as a park. Jason Bond said it was listed as natural open space.

Jason Thelin said he liked to run on this trail, but it would be difficult to run on asphalt. He said he would rather see the trail left unpaved.

The Planning Commission had a discussion about the condition of the trail and determined that they wanted to remove the paved trails, acquire land or easement, work to control erosion, and better maintain the existing trails. They also discussed the lighting plan and Jason Bond said that lighting could come in several years down the road. Having a conduit there would provide the opportunity for lighting in the future. Steve Cospers recommended that the conduit be removed from the plan as well.

MOTION: Jason Thelin moved to recommend approval of the proposed master plan for “The Corridor”, with the following changes:

1. No paved trails
2. Remove electrical conduit
3. Remove natural playground
4. Address stream erosion
5. Grade trail

David Fotheringham seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 Ayes and 0 Nay. Jason Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cospers, Jane Griener, and John Gubler all voted Aye.

D. PUBLIC HEARING – Amendment to the Appeal Authority Ordinance (Article 2.3)

The purpose of the proposed amendment was primarily to discontinue having evidentiary hearings (except on variances) and only have arguments based on the record of proceedings. This would make for shorter and less expensive hearings. The amendment would require that the Zoning Administrator keep and prepare a good record of all proceedings. It would also be important for the City to adopt findings of fact for important decisions so that City records made sense. The amendment also attempted to update other provisions of the code to conform to new State Laws.

The Planning Commission asked why the change was being proposed. Jason Bond explained that the change would make it so the City did not have to start from scratch on an appeal, but they could utilize records from previous proceedings.

Steve Cospers opened the Public Hearing. There were no public comments. Steve Cospers closed the Public Hearing

MOTION: David Fotheringham moved to recommend that Article 2.3 of the Development Code be amended as proposed.

John Gubler seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 Ayes and 0 Nay. Jason Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cospers, Jane Griener, and John Gubler, all voted Aye.

E. Amendment to the Site Plan to Comply Ordinance (Article 4.14)

Site plans for single family residential dwellings not located in an approved subdivision were required to go to both Planning Commission and City Council for approval. Many site plans for single family residential dwellings were straightforward but the process for approval could be cumbersome for the applicant. The proposed amendment would allow the City Planner and City Engineer to approve site plans for single family residential structures and streamline the process. Therefore, time would be saved for the applicant and the Planning Commission, and staff would be able to spend more time on other issues.

The proposed amendment would also clarify the site plan process for commercial structures in a separate section from single family residential dwellings. There were no proposed changes to the approval process for commercial structures.

Jason Bond presented the ordinance and explained what language had been altered. He said that if a site plan was out of the ordinary or if serious problem arose, staff would still be able to bring the site plan to the Planning Commission for approval.

Jason Thelin was concerned that some developers may have favor with staff and be treated differently because of those relationships. Jason Bond said that staff members did everything they could to be professional and follow the ordinances.

Roger Bennett said if an application met the ordinances, whether it went to the staff or to the Planning Commission, the City had to approve it.

MOTION: John Gubler moved to recommend that Article 4.14 of the Development Code be amended as proposed so that Site Plans for single family residential dwellings not located in an approved subdivision may receive final approval from the City Planner and City Engineer.

David Fotheringham seconded the motion. The motion passed with 4 Ayes and 1 Nay. David Fotheringham, Steve Cospers, Jane Griener, and John Gubler, all voted Aye. Jason Thelin voted Nay.

IV.COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: May 16, 2017

MOTION: David Fotheringham moved to approve the Planning Commission Minutes for May 16, 2017, as written.

Jane Griener seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 Ayes and 0 Nays. Jason Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, and John Gubler, all voted Aye.

Adjourn

Steve Cosper stated that the Planning Commission had covered all of the items on the agenda and adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.