

MOAB CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 23, 2020

The Moab Planning Commission held its regular meeting on July 23, 2020 via a Zoom Meeting. An audio recording of the evening meeting is archived at: <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html> and a video recording is archived at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6vkHZsxrWUI>

The Moab Planning Commission Chair Kya Marienfeld called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm. In attendance were Planning Commission Chair Kya Marienfeld, Commission Members Rubin Villalpando-Salas, Jessica O'Leary, Marianne Becnel, Becky Wells and Luke Wojciechowski. Commission Member Brian Ballard was absent. Staff in attendance included Moab City Assistant Planner, Cory Shurtleff, and Moab City Recorder, Sommar Johnson.

Citizens to Be Heard:

There were no citizens to be heard.

Approval of Minutes:

Commission Member Rubin Villalpando-Salas moved to approved agenda item 3.1 Approval of Minute from June 11, 2020. Commission Chair Kya Marienfeld seconded this motion. The motion passed 5-0 with Commission Members O'Leary, Wells, and Wojciechowski voting aye.

4. Action Item

4.1 Action Item - Consideration and Possible Recommendation of Moab City Resolution #34-2020 - A Resolution Conditionally Approving the Lawrence Minor Subdivision of Property Located at 479 Bowen Circle, Moab, Utah 84532

Moab City Assistant Planner, Cory Shurtleff, presented the information regarding this item. He stated that this was for a flag lot minor subdivision at 479 Bowen Circle which is in the R2 zone. This would be a two-lot subdivision. Shurtleff presented the recorded plat and the purposed plat. He stated that there are a "few intricacies" with this proposal. These included that currently there is a double-wide home on the lot, as well as a single wide home which is acting as an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). He stated that the applicant hopes to remove the single wide ADU and develop the back lot either a single household or a two-household duplex. Shurtleff continued, stating that once the rear parcel development is complete, the applicant would like to remove the double-wide and develop the first parcel as well. He said that the original submittal had a 5000 square foot front lot but because of setback requirements, the applicant resubmitted it to meet these requirements. He added that the current submittal shows that the existing ADU is blocking access to the back lot. He stated that there will be a condition of approval associated with this subdivision, which would state that the applicant would be required to remove the existing ADU before the plat could be officially recorded with the county. Shurtleff went over the narrative and background. Shurtleff yielded time for the Planning Commission to have a discussion and stated that the applicant is willing to answer questions but was not able to attend this meeting.

Discussion:

Commission Member Rubin Villalpando-Salas asked for clarification that the building on the back lot would be removed, the back lot would be developed first, and then the front lot would be developed. Shurtleff stated that this was correct. Villalpando-Salas asked if there were plans for the structure.

Shurtleff answered that this would be the first step and that the applicant would want to make sure he could accomplish his plan before he spoke to an architect or contractor.

Shurtleff added an additional note stating the reason the applicant's initial submittal showed a closer rear property line on the front residence was to allow for a greater back parcel, which is likely where the applicant will reside. He stated that when the applicant removed the home currently on the front parcel, he would most likely position the new structure closer to the front of the lot and possibly make a lot line adjusted back to where his original submittal indicated. He stated that to get to this end goal, he needs to go through this process to ensure that if the front property is not redeveloped, that it still can operate, and it complies and does not become a non-conforming use.

Commission Member, Marianne Becnel, asked if utility easements had to be 15 feet or if it is 7 or 10 feet. Shurtleff stated that they can be shared between properties and that it is often that one property may have 5-foot utility easement and it is shared with the adjacent property. He stated that there are several utility easements that are shared this way. In this case, it depends on how it was originally recorded. He stated the notes are written into the plat.

Commission Member, O'Leary, asked if the rear set back on an R2 lot is 12 feet, not 25 feet. Shurtleff stated that in an R2 zone the rear setback is 12 feet from the building to the rear property line. He said that what is being shown on the plat is a 10-foot utility easement, so this would not denote what the setback would be. Shurtleff explained what the setbacks would be in the R2. He continued explaining discussions concerning flag lots and provisions regarding flag lots in the code. O'Leary stated that it looks good with the contingency to remove the existing ADU to be compliant. Shurtleff stated that the applicant's process was to remove it but the way it is being written into this condition of approval is that he can either remove it or relocate it somewhere on the lot where it would be in compliance.

Motion and Vote:

Commission Member, Becky Wells motioned to move to Recommend Moab City Resolution #34-2020 – A Resolution Conditionally Approving the Lawrence Minor Subdivision of property located at 479 Bowen Circle, Moab, UT, subject to the following condition: The existing structure located on Lot 2 of the Lawrence Minor Subdivision must be removed or relocated in compliance with property setbacks within Lot 2 of the Lawrence Minor Subdivision before final recording of the Plat. Commission Member Ruben Villalpando-Salas seconded this motion. The motion passed 6-0 with Marienfeld, O'Leary, Becnel, and Wojciechowski voting aye.

5. Future Agenda Items:

Commission Chair Kya Marienfeld asked if the Planning Commission will see a subdivision or lot combination for five townhomes on the lot located at the corner of 100 S 300 E. She stated that community members have asked her regarding the current groundwork being performed on this lot. Shurtleff answered that this project is titled the Third Street Moab Development and that it is a "by-right" project. He added that in the R3 this five-unit townhome fits the computation for R3, so the Planning Commission does not need to see it, but they are going through more of a staff internal review. There was a brief discussion about this lot.

Marienfeld asked for other future agenda items. Shurtleff stated that there are a few things that are waiting to be submitted. He said that reviews have begun on preliminary plans for two subdivisions that are very similar to the subdivision reviewed earlier. He added that he felt individuals are accessing what their

options are for their land or the land they hope to develop. He said there is a lot of communication coming into the office regarding this, but two applications have been received. Currently, these applications are waiting on more material before they can be submitted. Marienfeld asked if these are subdivisions. Shurtleff confirmed that these are minor subdivisions.

Marienfeld asked if there was anything anyone would like to discuss before the meeting is adjourned. Commission Member Villalpando-Salas asked if he wanted to make a recommendation for overnight accommodations if he could tell them now. He continued to ask if there could be a design requirement that every hotel have a centerpiece of stained glass. Marienfeld asked if this would be for new developments. Villalpando-Salas confirmed it would be for new developments. Shurtleff said this could be added to the discussion during the aesthetic discussions.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 6:18 PM.