

From: [Hooper](#)
To: [Piper Lever](#)
Cc: [Margaret Bourke](#); [Cliff Curry](#); [Sheridan Davis](#); emorgan@gmail.com; [John Guldner](#); [Chris Cawley](#); [Margaret Bourke](#)
Subject: Alta Resident Parking
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 1:57:39 PM
Attachments: [IMG_1746.jpeg](#)
[IMG_1747.jpeg](#)

Member of Alta Town Council-

Paying over \$22,000.00 a year in town property taxes, it is just wrong not to provide at least 2 auto spaces specifically for town residents in an permitted "overnight" parking area close to the Summer Rd.

Space during the day should be available for all to use but only residents with a permit in the front dash be allowed to park in this area overnight especially after dark. Simple clean signage below works, but only works with strict enforcement backed by stiff fines. Make it \$250.00 a violation and tow at own expense.

Any of this pay to park talk is only as good as enforcement!

If the town allows only 1 space per residence it will surely curtail family and guest livelihood. It will have a huge impact on property values.

Thanks for your time,

Kim & Paul Hooper
401-864-1544

8620 S. Hawk Hill Rd
Grizzly Gulch, Alta Ut



From: [Whitney McReynolds](#)
To: [Piper Lever](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Town of Alta Parking
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 2:11:49 PM

Hi Piper - below is our public comment for the Town Council meeting to be held on October 13, 2021.

The Fehr & Peers study does not allow for sufficient parking permits for Residences/Cabin owners who currently park in the North Grizzly Lot.

For homes with multiple families residing, it is **not feasible** to have only one parking pass. Most properties in the Albion Basin and Summer Road areas are used by more than one family at the same time during the ski season months. Our family is a good example - with my parents and our family of four living there. We also have guests and additional family come visit!

As Alta taxpayers, residences and cabin owners should have priority when it comes to parking. Cabin owners have a historic use of parking in the Grizzly lot - and they don't have only one car or family, with no guests.

100 spots designated for lodges seems excessive. Lodges have the ability to minimize the number of guests renting cars or employees parking up the canyon. Residences can only minimize to a certain extent.

Given that we are Alta taxpayers (and Alta ski pass holders), this should merit having **at least two to three parking permits per residence** with the option for a guest pass.

Thank you - we appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Whitney and Dave McReynolds

John and Leslie Reynolds

From: [Larry Williams](#)
To: [Piper Lever](#)
Subject: Fwd: Parking
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 2:41:00 PM

Piper,

Can you please submit this version with typos corrected.

Thanks,

Larry

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Larry Williams <lwilliams@redstonevt.com>
Date: October 12, 2021 at 4:28:36 PM EDT
To: plever@townofalta.com
Subject: Parking

Hello Piper,

I would like to comment on the Town's proposed parking plan for cabin owners.

My view is that one seasonal pass per home is not sufficient and does not adequately protect the value and utility of the private homes that have historically depended on the Grizzly Gulch lot for parking. It seems to me that we homeowners are being inequitably treated and unduly impacted. It also seems the the Town is dedicating a disproportionate share of available parking to the lodges at the expense of homeowners.

I am asking that the Town reconsider its plan and allow for a minimum of 2 parking spaces per house and also provide a discounted rate for guest passes.

Thanks in advance for submitting my comments.

Larry Williams

Sent from my iPhone

Jen Clancy

From: Dan Colangelo <woodman859@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 3:38 PM
To: Jen Clancy
Cc: keri Gardner
Subject: Comments for 10/13 TOA Meeting

We would like to start by voicing our appreciation for the hard work and effort that went into formulating a plan under tough conditions, on a tight time line.

Unfortunately, the Parking Plan, as presented, does not meet the needs of our family and we do not believe it will ultimately be successful.

Hopefully, our reasoning can be fully detailed and discussed in a more appropriate, less time sensitive, forum.

We do find it to be interesting, however, that in a Town which to a large degree has been paved for parking, homeowners and residents are left to scrounge for spots.

We strongly urge the Mayor and the Council, hopefully with the participation of the future Mayor, to reconsider the underlying terms of the proposed MOU and to rethink the Parking Plan and Permit allocation.

Thanks for your time,

Dan Colangelo and Keri Gardner