

**WORK SESSION  
ALTA TOWN COUNCIL  
MONDAY – JUNE 9, 2008  
3:00 PM  
ALTA COMMUNITY CENTER  
ALTA, UTAH**

The Mayor called the work session of the Alta Town Council to order. All members of the Alta Town Council were present.

The Mayor announced that this meeting will address the continued discussion on the proposed land use ordinances changes and amendments that have been recommended to the Town Council by the Alta Planning Commission. The Town Council will also incorporate any comments that were received at the Public Hearing on this matter held on June 3, 2008.

The Mayor commented that the Council's ended its last discussion on the issue of parking. Consistent with some of the comments coming out of the Public Hearing on June 3, 2008, the Council felt that following the proposed parking regulations to the letter of the law was pretty burdensome. The Mayor also commented that the recommendations forwarded to the Town Council from the Planning Commission on the parking regulations were really trying to make the parking regulations in the Base Facilities Zone ( BFZ ) consistent with the actual parking ordinance itself.

The Mayor reviewed what was required of the Rustler Lodge when they expanded in the 90's: one parking space per eight rooms of expansion. In the proposed ordinance if you build a new building, the requirement would be ½ parking spot for each guest room and must take into account requirements for parking as it relates to additional employees and ancillary uses such as restaurants. Taking into account the comments from the public hearing, the Mayor suggested that we stay with the requirement of one parking space per two guest rooms and eliminate the parking requirement as it relates to ancillary uses and new employees.

Steve Gilman deferred to the Mayor and Cliff when it came to the necessary requirements as it relates to guest rooms but he feels that the parking requirements as it relates to employees should stay. The Mayor and Cliff had to agree that about ½ of their live in employees have cars that are parked in Alta. So it was suggested that the Town require ½ space for every live in employee. Cliff asked if should require any additional parking for live out employees. Steve mentioned that for every parking space that is taken by live out employees, represents a lift ticket that is not sold.

Paul Moxley asked if there had been any consideration to charging for parking in the Town of Alta. It would affect an employee's willingness to have a car. Many cities charge through parking meters to park on public streets.

Dave Richards commented that in order to make these proposed parking requirements more feasible, the Council should think about the possibility of increasing potential coverage of a particular lot. If you increase your potential coverage, it gives an owner/developer more room to address the parking requirements.

Paul Moxley stated that it does not seem advisable to pass an ordinance where certain businesses can not really meet the requirements. He felt that by not requiring all developers, regardless of the circumstances (add on to an existing building vs. a new building) to meet the same parking standards, we are creating a competitive disadvantage.

For the record, Kimberly Chytraus and Katie Lewis, Town Counsel, have arrived at the work session.

For the record, it was explained that the proposed changes and amendments on parking requirements in the Land Use Ordinances will make the requirement consistent throughout. That requirement will be ½ parking space for each guest room. This requirement would apply to all new hotels not what is already in existence. If you add on to an existing project, there is another standard. Kimberly commented that she felt the goal of the parking requirement recommendations is to minimize the impact of parking on the street and leave those parking spots for skiers.

It was also mentioned, to the extent that a new hotel project cannot meet the proposed parking requirements, the Planning Commission left in the option that the owner could propose a “Parking Management Plan”.

There was discussion on how the proposed parking requirements would apply to different situations such as an addition to an existing building, a tear down and rebuild of a development, and reconstruction after a disaster such as a fire or avalanche. Kimberly explained that the Planning Commission interpreted the parking requirements such that if you wanted to add to an existing building then you would use the expansion requirements but they always felt that if there was a tear down even to the foot print it would be defined as a new structure. Many cities require buildings to meet the new requirements if the building is destroyed by fire, for example. There was a conversation as to how the Town treated the Hellgate Condos.

There was suggestion that in the event of a disaster, if the owner rebuilt without adding any new rooms, that they would be grandfathered in as they relate to requirements such as parking. If they expanded the number of rooms, they would have to meet the new parking requirements as it relates to the additional rooms.

Cliff asked why we would require that an add on to an existing hotel only provide one parking space per eight additional guests rooms but a new development be required to provide one parking space for every two guest rooms that they build. Why put a new hotel at a competitive disadvantage by requiring more parking than to an existing hotel that is expanding.

The Council went over the language as it relates to the parking requirements for new employees.

There was a lot of discussion on whether the same parking requirements should apply to a new hotel as apposed to a hotel that, for example, burns down and has to rebuild to its original footprint and number of rooms. The question was posed that if a current hotel does not provide one parking space per eight guest rooms and it burns down and rebuilds, would it have to meet the one space per eight guest rooms or would it only have to meet the standard that it currently provided before it burned down. It was felt that the Town would only require it to meet the standard it met before it burned down. If they are building an equivalent building, they would only need to provide parking as it existed before they met with this disaster.

The Mayor stated that he is comfortable with the requirement of one parking space per eight guest rooms being applied across the board to all types of situations.

Dave Richards calculated that if we require one parking space for eight guest room units, which translate into one space for every 4,800 sq ft of living space. If you were to use 400 sq ft for each guest room or key then you require one parking space for every 600 sq ft and you would have one and ½ parking spaces for every 12 guest rooms. The Council agreed that that was a sufficient number of parking spaces for that number of guest rooms.

The Council agreed that it would move forward on requiring one parking space for every eight guest rooms added to an existing project, moving forward, across the board and alternatively allow the owner/developer to provide an alternative in the form of a Parking Management Plan if they cannot meet that standard.

As far as parking requirement for employees, Dave Richards suggested that the Town require one on site allowable over night parking space for every two additional live in employees.

As parking relates to employees, it was suggested that one parking space be provided for every employee room. For example, if a hotel adds 25 guest rooms to their hotel, the hotel has to provide housing for five additional employees. A hotel could put all five employees in one room therefore the hotel would have to provide one additional parking space for that one employee room. Currently the proposed ordinance says you have to have one parking space per each additional employee.

Dave suggested that we count the maximum number of employees during a peak winter day and say that the hotel has to provide ½ parking space for each employee: the number of employee beds.

The Mayor summarized the parking situation by stating that we would require one parking space for every additional eight guest rooms and ½ parking space for every live in employee bed. These requirements will be universally applied for every re-model and

re-construction with the option that an owner/developer may submit a Parking Management Plan to address parking.

Kimberly asked how the Council wanted to treat the requirements for adding employee housing in new construction vs. remodels and additions.

The Council felt that the Town should be consistent in requiring housing for one employee for each five additional guest rooms or five new guest rooms.

The Council moved on to address coverage requirements in the Base Facilities Zone. The Mayor felt that they did not have anything quantifiable to base that decision on at this time. Dave felt that because we are asking owners to provide, for example, more parking, that we should consider changing the coverage requirements spelled out in the ordinance. The Council discussed some options on the percentage of coverage. Cliff asked why we have coverage regulations. The coverage regulations found in our zoning ordinances were brought over from Salt Lake County's ordinances when we incorporated in 1970. The Council addressed some of the reasons behind the coverage regulations.

The Mayor felt the Town should look at the coverage factor in our Land Use Ordinances but felt that we are not ready and equipped to pursue that discussion at this time. The Council agreed to that approach.

Dave Richards wanted to discuss Section 22-8A-9 in the Base Facilities Zone proposal relating to height restrictions in this zone. This language states that the maximum height of any building shall be 20 ft or one story above street level with an option that the proposal can be review by the Land Use Authority. This was the recommendation from the Planning Commission. First Dave feels that this is an arbitrary figure and second he would like to be able to drive through the Town of Alta and not see from the road just roof tops with all the associated HVAC fixtures. Steve thought that if hotels are allowed to only build one story above street level, the one story will have to be some sort of parking structure to accommodate the parking requirements.

There was discussion on how many stories are enough and how many feet are in a story or should be counted in a story.

The Town Council agreed that in Section 22-8A-9 Height Regulations, the maximum height of any building shall be sixty feet above street level instead of twenty feet.

Cliff referred to the definition of guest room under General Provisions, Section 22-1-6 Definitions. Under #35: Guest Room, Cliff would like to see this definition made clear as to what is not included within 600 sq. ft... He has drafted language that he will give to the attorneys to review.

Cliff also addressed #40: Hotel in the definition section and would like to see a statement that a condo is not a hotel.

Under the definition section of the General Provision, Cliff is still not certain as to what constitutes a land use application. His question is why is a building permit application is not a land use application. Kimberly stated that if you look at other areas of the code it does specify who the reviewing authority is when it comes to building permits. There is no process in the code which specifies that a building permit is reviewed or must be reviewed by the Land Use Authority.

Cliff asked if we have a well defined trigger point for an appeal from an action of the Land Use Authority. Kimberly stated that there was a well defined trigger point and the comment in the public hearing stated that the proposed time allowed to make the appeal (10 days) should be longer. The Council could allow more time but the proposed ordinance, as it is written, does comply with LUDMA.

Kimberly stated you have a couple of options. The Town of Alta could lengthen the time allowed to make the appeal and the Town of Alta could change the point in which the Appeal Authority's decision is final, which is the trigger point for an appeal. The Appeal Authority's decision could be final either upon a vote, or upon the adoption of the written findings of the Appeal Authority. There was a discussion of these two options of when the Appeal Authority's decision is final and the Council decided that it was final upon the vote of the Appeal Authority. Therefore that was the trigger for the filing an appeal which was ten days. Kimberly reminded the Council that they decided that if the vote is the trigger, then written findings would be in place before the made their decision.

The Council agreed to increase the time period for an appeal from ten (10) calendar days to 15 calendar days.

Dave Richards wanted to confirm that the Council agreed to increase the height regulation to 60 ft. above street level. He questioned whether that was from the lowest or highest point of the building site. Cliff suggested that it say that it cannot exceed 60 ft. above road level at any point. The Council agreed to this language.

Dave recommended that we outline in a map all the right-of-ways in the Town of Alta and relate those rights of ways to property ownership.

Kimberly stated that when the ordinances are prepared in their final form, they will have correct Chapter numbers as they now appear in the Town's Code(s).

Hearing no further comments at this work session, there was a motion by Steve Gilman to adjourn the meeting. Paul Moxley seconded the motion and it was carried.

Passed and approve this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2008 by the Alta Town Council.

Katherine S.W. Black  
Town Clerk

