



Town of Alpine Planning & Zoning Commission MINUTES

DATE: July 11th, 2006

Attendance: P&Z members: Scott Reed, Don Sherman and Paula Stevens; Dave Gustafson absent & excused. Others in attendance: see attached sheet.

1 - CALL TO ORDER at 7:02pm

2 - ROLL CALL & ESTABLISHED QUORUM BY PAULA STEVENS

Don S. motioned to table minutes until later in the meeting, Scott R. seconded. VOTE: 3- Yes; 0- No; 0- Abstain; 1- Absent.

3 - P&Z MINUTES: June 13th, 2006 and June 27th, 2006

4 - COUNCIL MINUTES: June 20th, 2006

5 - TONIGHT'S APPOINTMENTS/ NEW BUSINESS:

- **BARDIER, Joan - LOT #8 Palisades Heights Subdivision** - Ms. Bardier is interested in a possible replat of her B-1 lot, she would like to make it into two lots and also seek a variance for single-family residential housing. Karl Scherbel is assisting her with this project. Rather than have her pay any fees at this time, they would like to describe the project and see where they should start. Karl Scherbel is speaking on behalf of Ms. Bardier; he explained that she owns lot 8 of the Palisades Heights subdivision. Ms. Bardier is intending to seek a variance to have residential use on a lot zoned B-1, she intends to split the lot and have two buildings. Paula S. stated that she will need to start with a subdivision. One for commercial use and one for residential use. Karl S. explained that she intends to have the commercial lot closer to the existing businesses and a residential lot on the back half. The commercial lot will have an entrance off of one road and then wrap around to another entrance. Paula S. informed Karl S. that the owner will need to demonstrate that the lot can be split and meet all the requirements for the lot size. Also she will need to seek a variance for the residential unit on a B-1 lot. Don S. informed them that a variance request has a \$400.00 non-refundable fee.
- **ALPINE DEVELOPMENT GROUP - Snake River Junction** - Nik Fiore of Jorgensen and Associates presented the Preliminary plat review for Phase I of the development. Please reference the letter and attached preliminary site plan from Damien Mavis. Paula S. confirmed with Nik F. that Mr. Mavis would be available by phone as explained in his letter, Nik F. informed the board that due to health issues Mr. Mavis would not be available by phone but his partner Brad would be. Nik F. also explained he could answer all the technical questions. He informed the committee the county requested that the project be shown to the town first. Paula S. asked if the plans before them were consistent with what they had seen previously. Nik F. stated there have been a couple of changes to the master plat they had previously seen. The south access closest to the bridge and the access on the west end by the Flying Saddle have been removed per WYDOT. Scott R. confirmed that the plan has a total of three curb cuts.

Don S. asked if they still intended to use lot 10 or 11 for a museum, Nik F. believed that was still a possibility. Scott R. also inquired if they still intended to have a Recreation Center; Paula S. stated that the letter included the plans for a Recreational Center. Don S. commented that the biggest concerns with housing developments are snow removal and proper access for the fire department. Don S. informed them they must deal with their own snow storage. He also inquired about how long it will take to complete the entire development, Nik F. estimates 3-5 years. Paula S. referenced the notes on the plat and what Lincoln County's policy was in regards to central water and sewage, Nik F. stated that the plan was to have water and sewer service from Northstar Utilities. Paula S. inquired if Lincoln County would require proof of provision of these services before they will allow them to plat, Nik F. replied the DEQ chapter 23 asks for a commitment from the water and sewer provider. He has the impression that they won't require a DEQ permit to construct. Before they break ground on the water and sewer they have to demonstrate they will have services and DEQ permits.

Paula S. questioned the plans, Nik F. explained that lot 8 is designated for open airspace condominiums; she also noted that the open space exceeds the town's requirement. Don S. asked if there were any pre-manufactured buildings going in; Nik F. stated that is not the plan at this time. He also explained that the larger commercial lots will be sold and the purchaser will develop them as they see fit this also will apply to the smaller commercial lots. Don S. asked if the developer desires to annex, he stated that if they desire to annex then he wishes they would follow the Town's building codes. D.R. Hutchinson informed the board that an application for annexation has already been received and the procedure has been started to annex all four projects at one time. Don S. again suggested that the developer should follow the Town's codes, and that they are in the process of adopting the IBC codes. Paula S. inquired if the development was within 1 mile of the airstrip, and if it is then that should be noted on the plat. Don S. noted that the board was very pleased with the first presentation of this development,

and liked that the developer was interested in what the Town would like to see within the development.

Scott R. questioned why there was a difference in the lot numbers from the letter Mr. Mavis wrote and the plat Nik F. explained that some of the information had just changed that day. Lot 31 is designated for the Recreational Center. Don S. commented that lots 19-30, all the parking would be on the inside and no parking would be towards the highway, Nik F. clarified this. Don S. also inquired how they will urge the purchasers to abide by this parking plan; Nik F. stated that the CCR's are in the process of being developed now. Paula S. asked when the project would be presented to the county; Aug. 9th, 2006 is the date that has been set. They will go before the Town council on July 18th, 2006. Paula S. asked for a motion to approve and if they had anymore comments they can bring it up at the Town council meeting. **Scott R. motioned to approve the preliminary plat for lots 1-6, 8 and 9. Don S. seconded. VOTE: 3- Yes; 0- No; 0- Abstain; 1- Absent.**

- **McSORLEY, Mary - Sterling Land Co.** - Conceptual plat review, for a Planned Unit Development for a proposed project on 15 acres to be divided into approximately 100 residential townhouse units. The development is within a 1 mile radius of the Town limits. Marlowe Scherbel introduced the developer Mary McSorley, VLA Designer Heath Kuszack, and engineer Bob Ablondi of Rendezvous Engineering. Marlowe S. explained that the development is north of town and within a mile of the town boundaries. This is a county approval project and will be called Targhee Landing, an 89-unit townhouse development. He explained where the 15 acres parcel is located at, east of the highway. On Thursday July 13th, 2006 they had planned to have community meeting to answer any questions and offer any insight into the project. Marlowe S. stated that this is basically an overview then he would turn it over to Heath. He also explained that this is a three phase development over the next six to seven years and that the project will have central sewer and water.

Heath K. continued the presentation by describing the units and how the project would have a small neighborhood type feel. They achieved this goal by introducing some side streets; he also passed out a sketch reflecting the proposed neighborhoods. He noted they have central access to each unit, on street parking, designated green space and sides of the roads for snow removal. The landscaping for the project will provide a buffer from the storage units, the highway and screen the utility areas. Scott R. asked if the density was 4.4 per acre, Heath K. replied yes and that includes the upper lots from Palisades Pines which will be included in the development. He further explained that they are allowed 8 units per acre in the mixed use zone; if you removed the Palisades Pines lots then the density would 6 units per acre. Marlowe S. pointed out that the 3 lots on top allows for extra space to have building envelopes for single family homes, lots 1,2 and 4. Paula S. clarified that these 3 lots were reserved for single-family homes and inquired about the access to these lots. Marlowe S. explained the access would be from Jordan Canyon Road.

Paula S. asked them to again clarify how snow would be handled. Heath K. explained that in the winter there would be no parking allowed on the roads, the utility locations will be used for snow storage, and there is an area to the north that was not incorporated into lots and will be used for snow storage. Paula S. confirmed the fact that there would be no on street parking in the winter because that area would be used for snow storage not just snow removal. She also questioned what the typical cross section width of the streets, Heath K. replied that on the streets up front on the units there is a thirty three foot cross section curb-to-curb. Two twelve-foot traffic lanes and a nine-foot parking stall.

Don S. in concerned about the 30 foot slope behind the last set of units in regards to access for fire vehicles, Heath K. replied that assuming you have a fire truck with a hose you could pull the hose between the units. Don S. explained that you can't always fight a fire with just a hose; the fire department needs proper access so they can utilize the ladder truck and other equipment. With proper access the fire department will have a better chance of protecting homes and its occupants. Paula S. inquired if the units were modular units, yes they will be built by SMS (Superior Modular Systems).

Bob A. explained the water and sewer utilities, the upper lots were pre-platted and have a right to tie into the north Alpine water system. This system is located up on the hill in the Rees subdivision and services the Ridge subdivision and the upper lots have taps that tie into this system. The source is behind the Nordic Inn where there are three wells. There is also a 200,000 gallon tank on the hill that will provide fire protection, usage is however limited to the upper lots only. The rest of the development has to adhere to the county's requirements, which is 1,000 gallon minute flow two hours minimum to meet the fire requirements. The most logical thing from preliminary costs stand points and preliminary planning is to tie into Northstar and possibly with the Town of Alpine at some time. Northstar is intending to build a tank above the Flying Saddle on forest service property, then in the future adding another tank. This development would be looking at a 10" line to connect to these utilities, and it would also service others that wish to tie into the line. The property currently has a pretty productive well; it produced 90 gallons a minute with a very minimal amount of draw down.

Bob A. commented that they have had discussions with the North Alpine utilities and they seem to be a little hesitant to take on such a large project and this is why the developers are looking towards Northstar Utilities. The developers preference is to tie into the community system that Northstar is building, they also have to look at other options and costs. The costs favor an on site system, by on site he means providing high level treatment and going into injection wells, this is not however the route they wish to take. The costs favor this option because they will have to pay tap fees and the cost to extend sewer to the development. Timing is another issue; they would like to start a first phase which could be as many as 24 units. This would then result in a timing issue with the waste water plant; the development would need to install a temporary system to accommodate the first phase.

Paula S. asked if WYDOT is requesting the applicant to do a traffic study, because they are seeing a lot of traffic loaded onto this intersection. Marlowe S. explained that there is an application into WYDOT for the approach to the subdivision; they have not heard back from WYDOT at this time. He stated that WYDOT may require a traffic study. Paula S. inquired about the back units and how the developer intended to deal with the sloped hillside, the initial plan was to tuck the units into the slope and use the building wall as a retaining structure. They also intend to grade as little as possible in order to keep the aspen and spruce stands behind the units by keeping the trees they would be adding to the design of the project.

Paula S. commented that she is concerned about the density of the project. She noted that other communities have had functionality and circulation issues with such dense projects the street widths, circulation systems don't work, cars cannot be adequately parked during the winter and snow storage. Paula S. was also concerned about the intersection and the lack of a traffic signal, all the new developments in this area will have a profound effect at the intersection. As a planner she does not feel this project is appropriate at this time and for this location. From an environmental stand point she would like see the back row of condos eliminated so that there are no impacts to the steep slopes and this area could be used for snow storage. Don S. commented that he is also concerned about the 30-degree slope right behind the units and if they were eliminated then the development would have more room to spread out and have less density.

Don S. and Scott R. commented they see a lack of snow storage for the development. Scott R. stated that he likes the overall idea and layout except that the project is too dense. He also agreed the high impact this development and neighboring ones will have on traffic at the intersection. Marlowe S. questioned why the board thinks the designated snow storage areas were not adequate; Paula S. commented that the utility areas don't show an access and the utility areas are shown to be fully landscaped. Heath K. replied that the landscaping is very conceptual at this stage, and the removal of a tree here or there will not be a problem. Don S. commented that if in the future the development wished to be annexed into the town he would not recommend approval; the density is a major concern. The snow removal is also a concern. Don S. asked them to point out a driveway on the sketch; he then inquired where each owner would put their snow. Heath K. replied in the front yards, to which Don S. commented it would be 20 feet high. Paula S. reminded them they wished to have a community feel about the development and she finds it hard to overcome the idea of snow being piled up in front of these homes and keep the community feel.

Don S. stated that he personally does not like the looks of the project and has concerns about snow removal and fire protection. Scott R. questioned the open space areas at a minimum of 6.3 acres; he feels that would be sufficient but he does not see 6.3 acres. Paula S. commented that it included the currently undeveloped upper lots. D.R. Hutchinson commented that he agreed with concerns about the density and suggested that they put some of the units together and make some of them two stories. Heath K. informed Hutch that all the units were two stories. Hutch also questioned that if in the future they would like to seek annexation what would happen to the lots that are on a different water system, Bob A. replied that they would keep them out of the annexation.

John Woodward with the Lincoln County Planning & Zoning commented that he had spoke with Tory Thomas at WYDOT in regards to the traffic studies, and it looks like there will be a traffic signal installed if Alpine Meadows proceeds with an approach. He stated that it will be paid for by Alpine Meadows and the Snake River Junction project. It is a work in progress and a signal will happen. Paula S. inquired if the county had a recommendation at this point and where they are at in the process, the county's staff report is due out the next day. John W. commented that it was a little preliminary because the community needs to weigh in at the community meeting on Thursday and the next Town Council meeting. He stated that he left his recommendation open ended so the county P&Z can consider all the input at the end of July. He stated that they need to hear comments about density, snow removal and fire safety. Scott R. questioned what the densest project they currently have on the county level; John W. informed him that the condominium development Cedar Springs at Star Valley Ranch is a 122 unit on 35 acres. He noted that this is about half the density that is allowed, he believes that 10 years from now we will wish we had developed things more dense. Don S. disagreed he feels people will wish it was less dense. Paula S. commented that she is not against the idea of density but feels there are appropriate locations for it under the right circumstances, but at this point in the evolution of Alpine and in this area of the community this is not the appropriate time and location. She supported Alpine Meadows and the Mavis Groups project. Marlowe S. asked what the density was of the Junction project, Nik F. replied that it had a 198 condo units plus the potential of apartments in the main street area. He also commented that the county required for them to lose the frontage roads or mechanically remove the snow.

Marlowe S. wanted to know if the main concern of the board is the density in regards to the snow removal, Don S. replied that this is what he is most concerned with. Bob A. asked what they thought of the street section because it's a pretty wide section and the street does not need to be that wide. Scott R. thought the wider roads were more appropriate. Paula S. inquired if the county had a parking requirement because the street parking that supports the units will go away in the winter time to accommodate the snow storage, she wondered if the parking requirement can be met year round. Heath K. stated that each unit has two spaces; there will be a mix of single car and two car garages. Paula S. referred to the question addressed earlier about the density and snow storage/removal issue, she stated that this is only part of the issue and feels the development does not fit the character of the area regardless of what the zoning is. She is for single family residential developments and keeping the rural environment in this area. Marlowe S. commented that this is a conceptual plat and the county will consider their concerns but will make the final decision on the plat.

Scott R. commented that the snow will slide from the buildings onto the driveways and entrances to the homes. Don S. stated

that removing the snow from these areas will be a problem. Scott R. agreed with Paula S. about the impact on such a small acreage. Marlowe S. questioned the board's idea of density up to the intersection; Paula S. stated that there is a logical transition area after the intersection. She explained that the surrounding areas to this development are all single-family residential areas.

6 - UNFINISHED/ONGOING BUSINESS:

- **LANPHEAR, Gary & Marietta - S-06-06 - 20 Hwy. 89: DBA Yankee Doodle's Cafe and Red, White & Brew -** The Lanphears are the new owners of the restaurant that was formally the Red Baron, they are applying for a sign permit. The restaurant will be called Yankee Doodle's Cafe and the sign will be placed on the roof. The sign is a double-sided lighted cabinet sign. The lounge will be called Red, White & Brew, and the sign will be attached to the front of the building. This sign is a temporary vinyl sign. *FYI: This is a non-compliance issue. The signs have been installed and the clerk sent a letter to the owner's explaining the Town's sign codes. The letter is included in the application packet.* Please reference letter from the Mayor.

Paula S. thought the issue would require a variance; Hutch informed the board that a variance is not needed. He explained that in the past Ed Browning was given permission to replace the sign that had blown down. Paula S. inquired as to when this approval was granted, Hutch stated about eight years ago. She inquired that after an eight years period how they would still be considered grandfathered. Hutch explained that according to the Mayor they are grandfathered, Paula S. was very disappointed with the decision. Don S. stated that he would resign right now if the sign stayed. He commented that they could have this job and this sign totally goes against the codes. Hutch stated the Lakeview had a larger sign up; then the Red Baron had a sign that got blown down. The current owners used the same hooks to place their new sign.

Hutch went on to further explain that Frankie Browning had gotten very ill, and then Ed B. passed away before a new sign could be installed. Don S. commented that building permits are good for one year and then they have to get an extension for an additional year. He stated that the signs are also a permitted process and that the permit to replace the sign on the building's roof expired six years ago. Paula S. agreed with Don S. Paula S. inquired if the council discussed this or if the decision came from the Mayor, Scott R and Don S. both feels this goes against the procedures and codes for the Town. Scott R. thought the sign should have been replaced along time ago. Paula S. commented that to allow someone special consideration just because they appealed to the Mayor or council on a personal level is not right when you have other members of the community who go through the proper procedures and follow the codes. Scott R. stated that there is no record of the current signage on this building; he also has trouble being on this committee.

Paula S. again questioned if this was a council decision or an individual decision, Hutch replied that this issue has not come to the council yet. Paula S. commented that this sign has been derelict for quite some time and it is very clear in the regulations about the procedures for the replacement of signs and there is a time limit on it. The board follows the procedure and regulations. Don S. stated he is drastically upset over this situation; they went through the procedures with this business owner who knew nothing about the sign from eight years ago. Then all of a sudden the Mayor states the sign is grandfathered, the sign can't be grandfathered because there were two different lessees' in this location. Hutch explained that through sickness and death the permitted sign was not reinstalled. Don S. stated that there is no relationship between the new owners and Ed B. The new owner does not even know who Ed B. was; Don S. does not see any relevance to using Ed B.'s name in regard to this sign permit. Don S. and Scott R. felt that if Ed B. daughter still ran the business then they would not have an issue with her putting the sign up, but she sold the business.

Don S. stated that what the council does is their business, Paula S. inquired is it the council or the P&Z who approves the sign permits, and she believes this is their job. They have been entrusted by the council and the community to uphold the codes and procedures. Scott R. inquired if they can make a motion on this he was informed that the decision has already been made. He confirmed with Hutch that the Mayor has made this decision about the sign. Scott R. feels that if the Mayor is going to be making these decisions then he should come and sit on the board with them. Don S. commented that the new owner did not know Ed B. and wanted none of Ed B. paraphernalia left in the building, but now he wants his sign. Don S. reminded everybody that the owners put the sign up without a permit, and informed them that it was a \$750.00 a day fine until the issue is resolved. Scott R. wanted to know if there was another reason besides the grandfather clause why the sign should be allowed; Hutch replied that to his understanding the former P&Z gave permission to Ed B. to be put back up. Don S. and Scott R. wanted to know if the permission was granted to Ed B. or Don Getz who purchased the property, Hutch did not know the answer to this.

Hutch further explained since the current owners used the existing hooks and the sign is smaller than the previous signs then there should not be a problem now. Don S. quoted the codes that states there should not be anything on the ridge of any roof. Hutch asked why the sign was up there to begin with, to which Paula S. stated the original sign probably predated the codes. Don S. thought this was the time to cure the problems within the infrastructure of the Town, the sign was down and the codes need to followed and enforced. Don S. asked Hutch what they were to do if Kringle's came in and said they had a sign on the roof of their building and they have now chosen to put it back up, Hutch stated that they have not had a sign on their roof. Don S. pointed out he is only using this as an example; he asked what they are supposed to tell other business owners when they request to have signs on their roofs? If the Mayor approved this one how can they tell other business owner that they

cannot put signs up on the ridge of the roofs? Don S. stated that this sign is totally against the building codes and is against the law. Paula S. stated that the board has lost their right to regulate the signage on the building. Don S. commented that if the Mayor makes these types of decisions why does he need them, Paula S. stated that this is something they all need to think about. Hutch informed the board that Don Wooden was looking for pictures of the previous signs, but had not been able to find them yet. Paula S. suggested that they give Dave G. an opportunity to read the letter and then they will decide as a commission if they want to do anything. Don S. does not see why they were even asked for their opinion; he believes it is a Town council issue since the Mayor over turned the board's decision.

- **DAVIS, Eugene R. - REPLAT APPLICATION – PRELIMINARY REVIEW - REP-02-06- Lot # 325, 326, and 327- Located at 192, 194, 196 Trail Drive:** The property owner has chosen to table this issue until the July 25th, 2006 meeting. The rezoning is to go before the Town council, then Christine Wagner will bring the replatting back to the board. Don S. informed Hutch that they recommended the property not be rezoned.
- **BATES, Larry - Lot #34 Grey's River Village #2 - 441 Grey's River Loop:** Larry Bates is applying for a building permit and a septic permit. *FYI: The excavation work for the lot has been done and a letter sent to Mr. Bates regarding work done w/out a permit.* Secretary has not heard from Mr. Bates regarding his corrections. Don S. informed the board that he had been to the building site and the excavation work has left a dirt bank that will be higher than the house. Scott R. commented that the plan did not reflect the landscape whatsoever. Don S. said there is a straight bank behind where the house will sit; Scott R. mentioned that Larry B. was talking about pulling down the bank. Don S. informed Hutch of the situation, he also suggested to the other board members if they have not seen the property they should go and look at it.
- **P&Z MINUTES:** June 13th, 2006 - **Don S. motioned to approve minutes. Scott R. seconded. VOTE: 3- Yes; 0- No; 0- Abstain; 1- Absent.**
- **P&Z ATTENDING COUNCIL MEETINGS:**
 - 1) July 13th, 2006 - All Attending
 - 2) July 18th, 2006 - Dave Gustafson

7 - **ADJOURN MEETING- Paula S. called for a motion to adjourn meeting. Don S. motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 P.M., Scott R. seconded. VOTE: 3- Yes; 0- No; 0- Abstain; 1- Absent**

AFTER MEETING REVIEWS/WORKSHOPS: *None*

Items mailed to P&Z before tonight's meeting:

- P&Z MINUTES: June 27th, 2006
- Legal/Public Hearing Notice regarding the draft of the Municipal Master Plan
- LINCOLN COUNTY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT NOTICE: Re; Mary McSorley, Sterling Land Co.

Items given to P&Z during tonight's meeting:

- COUNCIL MINUTES FOR REVIEW: June 20th, 2006
- WILSON, Todd - Lincoln County Planning & Zoning Commission Rezone Application, Minor Subdivision Applications for Etna Trade Park I & Etna Trade Park II.
- Scofield, Steve & Dianna - Lincoln County Planning & Zoning hearing notice regarding a variance request.
- Krautter, Don - Lincoln County Planning & Zoning hearing notice regarding conditional use permit for a planned unit development to be named Longview Ranch Resort

Paula Stevens, P&Z Member

Date

Attest:

Kimberlee Jansen, Secretary

Date