The Moab Planning Commission held its regular meeting on the above date in the Council Chambers at the Moab City Center located at 217 East Center Street.

**Regular Planning Commission Meeting:** At 5:00 PM, Planning Commission Chair Allison Brown called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM. In attendance were Planning Commission Chair Allison Brown and Commission Members Kya Marienfeld, Jeanette Kopell and Jessica O’Leary. Staff in attendance were Planner Nora Shepard, Assistant Planner Cory Surtleff, Engineer Chuck Williams, and Recorder Sommar Johnson. Five members of the public and media were also present. An audio recording is archived at: [www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html](http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html). A video recording of the meeting is archived at: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bIH8V6902Zk&t=18s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bIH8V6902Zk&t=18s).

**Citizens To Be Heard:** There were no citizens to be heard.

**Hillside Development Permit For The Expansion Of The Parking Lot For Hampton Inn 488 N. Main Street, Moab, Utah**

**Discussion**

Planner Shepard presented the request from Hampton Inn. The HWY 191 widening will eliminate the on-street parking currently used for oversized parking. Hampton Inn is requesting to be able to remove a hillside area to put in 24 new parking spaces, 15 of which would accommodate oversized vehicles. It would remove a section of the hill that their current parking lot wraps around and is not part of the existing hillside to the east. They would be required to provide a retaining wall of an estimated 21 feet in height. The lot cannot be expanded to the east due to a steep slope that continues up the hillside and would be visible from the surrounding area. Options for action include: 1. Recommend Conditional Approval of the permit to the City Council by recommending approval of Resolution #56-2019, the City Engineer has reviewed the plan and supplied a list of conditions that would need to be satisfied in order to move forward. 2. Postpone or continue the item based on a request for additional information. 3. Recommend Denial of the Hillside Permit to the City Council based on specific findings.

Commission requested Engineer Williams input. Kopell said that when more and more development applications were coming up, one of their questions was, “where is the oversized parking going and no one really thought about it that at that time.” She said that the Commission did the hillside development before the Hampton was built and it doesn’t sit well with her to change it now. She doesn’t know if a 21-foot retaining wall is going to fix it if the hill is removed and asked Williams his opinion. Williams said that if the Resolution is approved, it could be engineered with a retaining wall made out of materials that look different than standard gray concrete and it would provide oversize parking, to some degree, that they will lose with the HWY widening because there will be no parking on either side there. Marienfeld clarified that code would allow the mound to be removed without needing to change it. Shepard said that she believed that the Commission has enough flexibility, especially on the size of a retaining wall and the cut, to decide on an exception. Williams said that they have given it a thorough review and he has confidence that it can be resolved from an engineering perspective if it moves forward. There was discussion of why this wasn’t done in the original site plan.
Commission asked to hear Charlie Shew of SET Engineering. Shew said that he was there on behalf of SET Engineering and the property owner. He said that it was originally an interpretation of code that left the mound where it was with the parking lot built around it. However, he didn’t think that this hill was intended to be referenced in what that code is talking about. There was further discussion concerning the height of the retaining wall, what vegetation, if any, could be grown on the mound and soil type. The manager of the property said that they have attempted to green it, seed it, water it and take care of it and they’ve failed. He said that they do need additional parking. As a manager of the hotel, the safety of their guests is a concern because of the parking situation and how congested it is, as well as the congestion on Main Street.

**Motion and Vote:** Councilmember Marienfeld moved to Recommend to the City Council on Resolution 56-2019 Approving a Hillside Development Permit for the Expansion of Parking at the Hampton Inn subject to the following conditions: 1. Prior to any construction or grading occurring on the site, the Planning Commission must review and approve the Amended Site Plan application. That application will not move forward until all the information currently being requested by the City Engineer and the criteria from 17.55.130 are submitted, reviewed and approved. 2. Prior to consideration of the Amended Site Plan application by Planning Commission, the applicant shall submit additional information on the retaining system for the cut slope that will result from the removal of the hill. Commission member O’Leary seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1 with Commission members Brown, Marienfeld and O’Leary voting yes and Commission member Kopell voting nay.

Planning Commission Chair Brown adjourned the meeting at 5:38 PM.

**JOINT MOAB CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION:** at 6:00 PM, Planning Commission Chair Allison Brown called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. In attendance were Planning Commission Chair Allison Brown and Planning Commission Members Kya Marienfeld, Jeanette Kopell, Brian Ballard and Jessica O’Leary, Mayor Emily Niehaus and City Councilmembers Tawny Knuteson-Boyd, Kalen Jones, Karen Guzman-Newton, Mike Duncan and Rani Derasary. Staff in attendance included City Manager Joel Linares, Assistant City Manager Carley Castle, City Attorney Chris McAnany, City Planner Nora Shepard, Assistant City Planner Cory Shurtleff and City Recorder Sommar Johnson. Twelve members of the public and media were also present. An audio recording is archived at: www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html. A video recording of the meeting is archived at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Yo-W9l54htpjFrR%3A6.

**Development Standards for Overnight Accommodations Discussion**

Planner Shepard briefly reminded everyone of the Development Standards that were voted on in August. Both the City and the County Planning Commissions have been working on refining the development standards. There is a fine line between getting the product wanted and not making it cost prohibitive for someone to ask to do overnight accommodation. Shepard was to draft language to the C-2 and the RC zone to allow new overnight accommodations to apply under new development standards. Councilmember Duncan didn’t think that design standards will address the root problem of too many visitors in town on any day during the high season. Councilmember Jones said that there are outcomes that were identified during the Moratorium, including economic resiliency and equity and the need to address tourism impacts for the community and still have a great experience for visitors.
Annual metering of new overnight accommodations
Brown asked Council if they would like the Commission to do annual metering and if so, where to start? Shepard said that the County already does metering for their high density overlay with stipulations. After they receive a certain number of square footage or units, they cut off applications for that year and she gave them a chart of sizes of units. They County has also talked about smaller hotels such as, the Apache and Sage that are around the 15,000 square foot range. Mayor Niehaus said that she would like to make metering as simple as possible. She isn’t as concerned about having a metering metric if an applicant complies with all the other limits they have set. Brown said that the purpose of metering is to limit the amount of development per year. Discussion ensued regarding the challenges and tools that could assist in metering and the need for legal advice on extent to which Council can use it. Council agreed that annual metering would be good and to have some sort of dashboard that shows them where they are. Councilmember Duncan said that he supports having metering restrictions and the possibility of overlay application tools available to be used if they need them.

Discussion of limitations on project/building size and scale
Commission Chair Brown said that the Commission has briefly discussed limitations on projects, and/or the building size in those projects, and asked Council what they would like to see. She asked if they wanted to put in limitations, and if so, how they are going to implement them. Councilmember Derasary said that she liked the idea of going in the direction of the County but felt that she needed a little more information/guidance. Discussion ensued regarding the limited buildable land within city limits, mixed use and keeping Moab’s character. Council determined that the size of projects is important, and they would like to have a visual example of what mixed use would like and to know if other communities have made something like this work.

Overlay vs. zoning
Commission Chair Brown said that the Commission had assumed that they were going for city code-based zoning rather than overlay zones. Mayor Niehaus asked for clarification of overlay zones. Shepard said that overlays provide an extra level of regulation to the base zoning standards in certain areas. It is common to use them in flood protection zones and aesthetic purposes and other things that relate to natural features like geology. Mayor Niehaus asked if every development project would need to go before Council for final approval, or having taken the conditional uses out, they won’t have the legislative piece. Shepard said that the direction she had received from both the Commission and the Council was to make the process as simple as possible for developers would be to modify the zones so that they can look at the zones and know what is expected and what they can do regardless of whether it’s in the code or as an overlay in the code. There would be a clear set of rules. Discussion ensued regarding what process would be preferred and the advantages and disadvantages of each. McAnany said that in overlay zones a new set of rules will apply in every case and there are some problems with lack of predictability. If you have clear standards, they can be applied on a case by case basis. Council would have more discretion and their decision making would be more likely to hold up. Linares agreed and said that goals could be achieved through their other ideas and that he didn’t think that an overlay was necessary. It was decided that they would move forward with city code rather than overlays.

Next steps
It was decided that they would have another workshop to work through development standards.

Adjournment:
Commission Chair Brown adjourned the meeting at 6:17 PM.