

Grand County Planning Commission

September 10, 2019

A regular meeting of the Grand County Planning Commission convened on the above date at the Grand County Courthouse, 125 E. Center St., Moab, UT 84532

Members Present: Gerrish Willis, Robert O'Brien, Christine "Cricket" Green, Kevin Walker, Emily Campbell, and Rachel Nelson (via phone)

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Zacharia Levine and Kaitlin Myers

Council Liaison: Terry Morse

Approval of Minutes: No minutes were presented for approval at this meeting.

Citizens to be heard: None.

Ex Parte Communication: None.

Action Items:

Public Hearing: Peak View Subdivision (HDHO-25 / Preliminary Plat):

Review and consider application materials provided to the Planning Commission related to the proposed Peak View Subdivision. Staff recommends a favorable recommendation for the HDH 25 Overlay to be applied to the subject parcel, and approval of the Preliminary Plat, contingent upon Council approval of the development agreement and the developer's final plat and building standards complying with the requirements outlined in Section 4.7 of the Land Use Code. Approval of the Preliminary Plat does not constitute legislative action applying the HDH overlay to the subject parcel. The applicant will be required to seek legislative approval of the High Density Housing (HDH) overlay from the County Council in order for the conditional Preliminary Plat approval to be valid if the Planning Commission grants it. A conditional Preliminary Plat approval does not constitute a final approval of the subdivision's technical elements either; the County will require the applicant comply with all engineering requirements and receive a final approval for infrastructure improvements.

Emily Campbell and Kevin Walker asked staff about traffic concerns on Spanish Valley Drive, required road improvements for Peak View, and how this and other proposed developments relate to the standards outlined in the County's Transportation Plan. Gerrish Willis asked staff about drainage and water easements on adjacent properties and the requirement of active trails infrastructure.

Applicant Terrill Johnston addressed the Commission to explain their intentions with the project, the additional voluntary deed restrictions placed on 40% of the lots in the development, drainage, and support they have received for the project.

Gerrish voices desire for approval to be conditional upon the drainage easement across White's Ranch. The applicant is working with the owner of White's Ranch to dedicate a permanent public easement on the property.

Staff will continue to work with the applicants to explore various ways to design these voluntary deed restrictions.

Public comments:

Judy Carmichael – previous owner of the property, supports the project, thanks staff for the assistance to the Johnston's through the application process

Motion: Cricket Green motions to send a favorable recommendation to the County Council for applying the High Density Housing Overlay (HDHO-25) to the parcel located at 3640 Spanish Valley Drive, conditioned upon the following:

- a) The applicant shall designate the HDHO Lots and additionally restricted lots prior to a public hearing with the County Council; and,

- b) The applicant shall fully comply with all County engineering requirements, including stormwater runoff/drainage and transportation improvements.

Bob O'Brien seconds the motion. During discussion, Kevin and Cricket voice support for the project, expressing that it follows the spirit of the HDHO. The motion carries 7-0.

Motion: Cricket motions to approve the proposed preliminary plat for Peak View Subdivision HDHO Development contingent upon the following:

- a) The County Council approves the development agreement committing developer to the deed restriction requirements of Section 4.7 and applies the HDHO-25 to the subject parcels;
- b) The developer's final plat and building design standards comply with all other requirements of Section 4.7 – High Density Housing Overlay.
- c) The development shall include a drainage easement satisfactory to County standards across White's Ranch.

Emily seconds the motion

Cricket motions to amend the motion to include the following:

- d) The applicant shall fully comply with all County engineering requirements, including stormwater runoff/drainage and transportation improvements.

Emily seconds the amended motion. With no further discussion, the motion carries 7-0.

Emery Telcom Yard (Conditional Use Permit):

The applicant wishes to expand the existing facilities and operations located at 1728 S Rocky Road, including extension of utilities to the proposed office/equipment building, the addition of a parking lot, and the addition of storm drain facilities. Staff recommends the Planning Commission move to forward a favorable recommendation to the Grand County Council with the noted conditions above.

Applicant representative Mike Behling addresses the Commission to state that Emery will not do a retaining wall but will resurface the road and clarifies that the expansion will not increase visitation or traffic to the site. Abby Scott asks Mike to define the equipment to be stored on the site.

Public comment:

Colleen Beaver – shares the driveway with Emery and KZMU. Asks for speed limit to be enforced, expresses noise complaints for the operation during business hours because of the steepness of the hill.

Emily asks about staff concerns for drainage with the steep driveway, and staff explains that these concerns are outside of the scope of the expansion of the use.

Motion: Cricket motions to forward a favorable recommendation to the Grand County Council with no further conditions. Emily seconds the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carries 7-0.

Discussion Items:

Possible Amendments to the Red Cliffs Lodge PUD Master Plan:

Before Gerrish opened up the item for discussion, Cricket disclosed that she owns the cemetery on the property but has no financial conflict of interest with this item.

Zacharia summarizes possible amendments to the Red Cliffs Lodge PUD Master Plan based on conversations with property owner Colin Fryer, including the construction of twenty additional overnight accommodations, a new museum with features, a spa, and deed-restricted employee housing units, and the dedication of 150 acres to a conservation easement.

This item is coming before the Planning Commission as a discussion item because the Overnight Accommodations Overlay prohibits the expansion of existing OA developments, and because the applicant wanted to hold a conversation with the Commission before formally proceeding with amendments. Additionally, the new overnight accommodations would be subject to Grand County's assured housing ordinance.

Property owner Colin Fryer addressed the Commission to further explain why he is bringing this item as a discussion and demonstrates on a map where the aforementioned changes would be located.

This Commission discussed and expressed support for the employee housing and theater and acknowledged general support for the overnight accommodations, though currently they cannot be approved due to the recent Overnight Accommodations Overlay ordinance that prohibits the expansion of current uses. The Commission also discussed the merits of the conservancy easement compared to an open space designation.

Zacharia says he does not think it will be feasible to get this updated during this calendar year due to lack of mechanism to build more overnight accommodations. The Commission recommends Colin continue to move forward with the amendment, and especially to move forward with the employee housing, spa, and museum.

Overnight Accommodations Standards:

Zacharia gave a brief overview of what was ultimately passed by the Council, as follows:

The Grand County Council adopted Ordinance 595 on July 18, 2019, which restricted overnight accommodations to the newly created use-specific overnight accommodations overlay zones. Immediately after adopting Ordinance 595, the County Council adopted Resolution 3180, which notifies developers of overnight accommodations of the County's intent to adopt new standards related to mixed use, design, and operational performance within the following 180 days. As such, any overnight accommodations development applications submitted within the 180 day period following July 18, 2019 will be subject to any new standards.

The motivations for this discussion are to adopt development standards before the expiration of the pending ordinance resolution, and to create these use-specific standards to give the Planning Commission and County Council the grounds to support or deny development projects as appropriate for the Moab area.

Nora Shepard joined this meeting because the City and County are working together to create development standards, including energy and water efficiency, multimodal transportation, design/aesthetic, and mixed-use. The City is addressing these standards by changing the standards of particular zone districts, not via an overlay. The Commission could also consider adding other standards, like limiting the number of units allowed in a development.

Emily suggests within the mixed-use, fluidity or allowance of public to use these facilities. Kevin suggests notion of drawing eligible areas for the overlay, similar to the HDHO boundaries, and giving guidelines to the Council for approval in addition to these standards (like a unit cap, estimated number of tourists, square footage cap). Bob also suggests adding language for supporting projects that provide additional affordable housing, open space, etc.

Staff started by studying model codes and then created a simplified outline of these standards. These standards, and the associated discussion points are as follows:

Energy Efficiency

- Staff designed standard to follow a benchmark like net zero, rather than defining specific standards in the code
- Emily would like to see offsite improvements for bullet 2 of energy
- Would have to think functionally over time about energy performance standards – how to track without eating up a bunch of staff time? Requirement of an energy audit?

Water

- Follow Utah code for a lot of the requirements
- Discussion indicates perhaps a shaded pool requirement is not needed

Multimodal Transportation

- Encouragement of bike and shuttle infrastructure

Aesthetic/form

- Less based on a set standard, more sets specific standards in code. Nora is developing standards on color, durability of roofing, hiding mechanical equipment, height/bulk requirements, and stepping of heights. They are also considering adding standards for the following:
 - No more than a certain number of square feet in a building
 - Breaks in facades, both horizontally and vertically

- Siting standards – building to the site, not just cutting a pad
- Gerrish suggested encouraging earth tones and to consider protecting from light escaping from the building, not just outdoor lighting
- Enhancing eclectic character of Moab, especially on pedestrian level

The Commission also discussed creating a cutoff for smaller hotels (approximately 30,000SF or less) and/or developing a gradation of standards for developments at various sizes.

The City Planning Commission will discuss these standards on Thursday and will have a joint meeting between the Commission and Council in first week of October.

Next steps: continued coordination between City and County staff to have a similar version of material to present to each respective Planning Commission and Council.

Emily requested notes from Nora from the upcoming City Commission meeting.

The County Planning Commission will meet with the Council on October 2 at 2:00 to further discuss these standards.

Future Considerations: None.

Community Development Department Update: None.

County Council Liaison report:

At the most recent meeting, the Council heard a presentation from USU to create a building for Extension and other agencies. USU still needs funding but is relatively close to meeting its goal. Most meeting business included public hearings sent from the Commission and a discussion of the Viewgate HDHO project. Terry anticipates the developer will continue to revise the plan to ensure it passes.

Adjournment: Bob motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:19p.m.