MOAB CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
October 8, 2026

Call to Order and Attendance: Moab City Planning Commission held its regular meeting on the above date in City Council chambers. Audio is archived at www.utah.gov/pmn and video is archived at www.youtube.com/watch?v=r_mwDfspZa8. Commission Chair Kya Marienfeld called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Commission Members Shalee Holland, Robin Vinson and Matt Hebberd attended as well as several members of the public. Also in attendance were Community Development Director Cory Shurtleff, Associate Planner Johanna Blanco, Junior Planner Kaytlin Poynter, Strategic Initiatives & Sustainability Director Alexi Lamm, Planning Technician Kelsi Garcia and City Manager Michael Black.

Citizens to be Heard:
Corey Foy stated he was opposed to the proposed annexation map. He said the City wanted more revenue and said residents of Spanish Valley do not need a mayor or more taxes.
Shane Firestack asserted he was against the annexation plan. He said he does not need any more services or government.
Lynn Jackson stated he has been following the annexation process. He said he had read the statute and questioned whether the proposed map reflected potential future developable land. He said that sometimes annexation was legitimate and asserted that the County was problematic due to red tape for developers. He said he was opposed to the annexation plan and noted it involved an overlap of issues.

Approval of Minutes: Commission Member Holland moved to approve the minutes of the September 17, 2026, Special Meeting and the September 24, 2026, Regular Meeting. Commission Member Vinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Guide for Emissions Action—Presentation and Discussion
Strategic Initiatives & Sustainability Director Lamm introduced a team of graduate students from the University of Colorado; they presented a draft guide for emissions action to help meet the City's strategic goal of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2040. It was explained that, while the City has a sustainability action plan that guides strategic planning, there is no detailed plan to achieve the GHG reduction target. The students explained that Moab's emissions inventory has increased slightly since 2018, and that GHG sources measured included on-road vehicles and residential, commercial and industrial energy. They explained that farmland and off-road vehicles were not measured. The timeline and public engagement process, including stakeholder interviews, as well as peer city research, a literature review, and a feasibility analysis were all conducted along with a cost analysis for their proposed action steps. The students emphasized the proposed actions were low cost with significant emission reductions and included estimated metric tons per year of GHG reductions. Actions steps proposed included public education regarding existing energy saving programs, alternative transportation education and promotion, the Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy (C-PACE) financing program, net-zero standards for new construction, solar powered municipal facilities, a community bike share program and a community volunteer planting program for open spaces. The students predicted a 50 percent reduction in GHG by 2032 and 80 percent by 2040. They estimated a seven percent reduction in 2027 if all the proposed actions were adopted. They said it was imperative to adopt the proposals soon to achieve the City's GHG goals.

Annexation Plan—Presentation and Discussion
Associate Planner Blanco presented the process and proposed changes to the City's annexation plan and boundary map included in proposed **Ordinance 2026-21**, an ordinance adopting an updated annexation policy plan, future annexation boundary map, and the anticipated land use of future annexation area map, as Appendix C of the City Of Moab General Plan. She explained the annexation process is usually applicant-driven and reflected state code regarding affected entities. She said sometimes annexations are initiated by the municipality for unincorporated islands and peninsulas adjacent to existing City limits. The boundary commission was described, which decides protested annexations. Blanco explained whether annexation can occur without property owner's consent and outlined the extensive process for annexation. She stated several

factors influenced an annexation request, including the City's ability to provide services, and she noted the process usually takes six months. It was explained that, on average, one property per year was annexed into the City and Community Development Director Shurtleff explained the most common reason for an applicant to seek annexation into the City involved more flexible development standards inside City limits. It was explained that annexation and services are not guaranteed to applicants, and approval of the City's future annexation boundary map will not change existing property taxes, zoning or land use rules in the unincorporated county. Blanco reviewed the timeline for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider the proposed ordinance, and she explained the importance of comments and testimony from stakeholders. Commission Member Holland stated she had asked County Commissioners for input and found none had opinions on the City's proposal.

Public Comments:

Rory Paxman raised question about whether or not Arches Special Service District was included in the list of special service districts of affected entities for the Annexation Policy Plan. Community Development Director Shurtleff explained that they were not on the prepared list of special service districts in the area and that if they were found to meet the affected entity definition, they would be added.

John Marsh had questions about the process and the pending riverfront resort preliminary municipality on Kane Creek Road. Community Development Director Shurtleff explained the Echo Canyon area was included in the draft annexation boundary map in case the preliminary municipality collapsed.

Aaron Lindbergh spoke about unintended consequences, raised taxes and forced annexations.

Leigh Singleton asked for a justification regarding the annexation boundary map extending to the San Juan County line.

Discussion:

Commission Member Holland brought up citizen concerns about urbanization of the rural residential area and the specter of raising property taxes. City Manager Black spoke about the process, the City Council's strategic goal of expanding the annexation boundaries, and the approach to prevent further preliminary municipalities in the County, especially in Spanish Valley. Commission Chair Marienfeld urged staff to conduct a public workshop to help residents understand the proposed annexation map. Community Development Director Shurtleff explained the reason for extending the boundary to the County line. He cited the cohesive service model of one community. He stated there would likely be no commercial core in the southern part of the County. He added that, if predictions were incorrect, the annexation map could be altered. Commission Chair Marienfeld raised a concern about large-scale dense developments in unincorporated Grand County.

Presentation and Public Hearing regarding development agreement for Henry Shaw Hotel:

Associate Planner Blanco presented a review of definitions and circumstances regarding variances, exceptions and development agreements. She said variances are rarely presented to the Planning Commission, and exceptions are common and usually relate to sidewalks, landscaping and parking exceptions. She reviewed conditions for the proposed development for the Henry Shaw Hotel, including a retaining wall exception, a boundary line adjustment, and compliance with the Assured Workforce Housing ordinance (WAHO). She stated the developer has opted to construct 28 workforce housing units. She explained the WAHU ordinance requires workforce housing to be provided within City limits, and the developer has requested an exception to construct the housing units in unincorporated Grand County, with an average unit size of 450 square feet (sf). Blanco explained the City's benefits include 28 units rather than the required 14 units, with a deed restriction for very low income residents. Discussion ensued regarding the usual 600 to 800 sf size of studio apartments in the community, and Blanco further explained the County would oversee the site plan review and construction of the units; if the units were not constructed to the satisfaction of the City, the full fee-in-lieu would be required from the developer.

Commission Chair Marienfeld opened a public hearing at 8:23 p.m. She said written comments were received and would be entered into the public record.

Madison Snow spoke and asked for a negative recommendation from the Planning Commission to Council. He pointed out the agreement allows for 450 sf units, outside the City limits, and the hotel site plan allows for no employee parking so his neighborhood would be impacted by employees parking on surface streets. He stated the proposal conflicts with existing code. He said no more exceptions should be allowed and the proposal was unreasonable. He implored the Commission to not allow outside developers to dictate development plans.

John Marsh spoke in favor of workforce and affordable housing. He referred to existing code, which he said clearly does not allow units smaller than 1,000 sf. He said building 28 units at 450 sf is not in keeping with the purpose of the ordinance. He said if the developer did not like Moab's code, they could go elsewhere.
Aaron Lindbergh spoke about the fee-in-lieu option for the developer.
Martin Snow stated he was a neighboring property owner. He said he had made a legal appeal against the City due to the lack of notification regarding the project. He mentioned a prior screening exception for the project and said he received no notification for that and noted several noncompliance issues. He said he was told it was too late to file an appeal. He mentioned the hillside retaining wall, slope and drainage, and said the building exceeded a 40-foot height limit. He suggested it was a major commercial development and urged the City to engage a third party review of the development plan. He requested the Planning Commission to not approve the development agreement.
Melanie Snow stated she was not notified and noted aspects of the development agreement are not in the code. She urged the Planning Commission to vote no on the development agreement. She cited an emissions study, neighborhood traffic congestion and parking issues. She spoke against the proposed exceedingly small units. She said the developer had alternatives, including paying the fee-in-lieu or complying with City code. She mentioned rooftop air conditioning units on the hotel are not screened, as required, and there were too many lights as well as light trespass on her property.
Commission Chair Marienfeld summarized written comments that were submitted from some of the evening's in-person speakers, as well as comments in opposition to approval of the development agreement from Melanie Snow, Ken Fedel, Angel Hanson, Ross Hanson, Elizabeth Eliason and Jim Webster (who wrote regarding the annexation policy). Commission Chair Marienfeld closed the public hearing at 8:45 p.m.

Development Agreement for the Henry Shaw Hotel—Negative Recommendation to Council
Discussion: Discussion ensued between Commission Members and staff regarding notification of the neighbors. Commission Member Holland stated she was not as concerned about the proposed workforce housing in the County rather than in the City limits due to the lack of developable land. She stated she was uncomfortable with the small workforce housing units proposed by the developer. Associate Planner Blanco clarified the development agreement is at the developer's request and they would build or pay the fee-in-lieu. A representative of the developer spoke about the developer's interest in building affordable housing. He said his experience suggested that employees would rather have a small private unit rather than a larger unit shared with others. He explained the Silver Sage units were not viable, and the proposed site was 4.6 miles from the hotel. He noted even adjacent properties to the hotel were outside the City limits and pointed out the developer was proposing more units than required. Renters beyond just Henry Shaw employees were discussed, along with income levels. Commission Member Vinson asked about the size of comparable rental units and Commission Chair Marienfeld noted the smaller units were in demand. Marienfeld also brought up the County oversight of the housing and the intent of the WAHO. The protest was discussed and Commission Members weighed in on the size of the units; Holland said residents want privacy, Marienfeld concurred, and Hebberd said 450 sf was too small. Marienfeld also noted the County location was problematic.
Motion and Vote: Commission Member Holland moved to forward a negative recommendation to City Council for approval of a development agreement for the Henry Shaw Hotel Located at 836 and 840 South Main Street, Moab UT, 84532, Parcels 01-0012-0011 and 01-0012-0017 between GP 836 LLC and the City of Moab, Utah. Commission Member Hebberd seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Master Fee Schedule—Positive Recommendation to Council
Presentation: Associate Planner Blanco explained proposed planning department amendments to the master fee schedule, including sidewalks, development agreements, development code amendment applications and more. She shared examples of other municipalities' fees. Community Development Director Shurtleff noted that in the last audit of fees, Moab had the lowest fees of any resort community in Utah.
Public Hearing and Planning Commission discussion: Commission Chair Marienfeld opened a public hearing at 9:58 p.m. regarding amendments to the master fee schedule. There were no public comments. Commission Member Vinson asked about the low development agreement fees. Commission Chair Marienfeld stated her confidence in the staff recommendations and noted that adjustments could be made if needed. She closed the public hearing at 10:02 p.m.

Motion and Vote: Commission Member Holland moved to forward a positive recommendation to City Council regarding **Ordinance 2026-20**, an ordinance amending Title 3 of the Moab Municipal Code to update Chapter 3.50, master fee schedule and modifying certain fees and rates charged by the City. Commission Member Vinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Future Agenda Items: Staff briefly noted upcoming agenda items, including the proposed annexation amendments, a potential public annexation workshop, and a pending landscape exception.

Adjournment: Commission Chair Marienfeld adjourned the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Written Public Comment:
Melanie Snow: The Council should vote NO on the Henry Shaw Hotel agreement. I understand the intent to secure housing units, but this agreement compromises both worker dignity and the logistical reality of our town. The Council passed the employee housing code to help our workers and allowing variances adds to the crisis in our city. Reject this agreement based on three critical issues. Worker Dignity: Our community is facing a housing crisis, but the solution cannot be to lower living standards. Forcing Moab's working class into 425 sq ft micro-units strips away basic dignity. It treats the people who keep our economy running as secondary citizens who deserve the bare minimum amount of space to sleep. Our workers deserve real, livable homes. Forced Commuting and Traffic Impacts: Allowing the developer to build units out of city limits, the City is actively generating traffic, creating a forced daily commute. It will funnel dozens of employee vehicles onto Highway 191 during peak morning and evening rush hours, worsening the congestion we battle every day. The developer is offloading the infrastructure, emergency services and social impacts of a city-approved hotel onto the county. Moab city should not establish a precedent where developers reap 100% profit while the county gets burden. The Main Street Parking Crisis: Moab's parking is already at its absolute limit. If these employees cannot walk/bike to work, they must drive & park. The Henry Shaw Hotel site plan has no employee parking; adding the burden of employee parking that will spill over into neighboring residential streets. The developer is passing their parking and traffic issues directly onto the public and our local neighborhood. Doc Allen Street and David Court will become the overflow parking lot for hotel staff. Our narrow residential streets cannot handle the safety hazards and congestion of commercial overflow. The developer can pay the $2.62m fee or build homes within the city limits that meet the employee housing code. There is no reason to grant them exceptions that will ultimately be harming our city and quality of life. The Hotel is already a highly profitable project. The city does not owe them concessions that degrade worker dignity, worsen traffic, and congest residential streets. If you agree to pass you are setting a future precedent. Please protect our neighborhoods, uphold our zoning standards, and vote NO on this Development Agreement.
Jim Webster: At this time, I support the proposed annexation policy that will be discussed on 10/8/26.
Ken Fedel: I urge the City Council to vote NO on the proposed Development Agreement for the Henry Shaw Hotel project. Moab should not grant custom zoning workarounds that allow the developer to shrink required workforce housing down to 450-sq ft units and construct them outside of city limits. This is a variance under another name. Municipal code sets clear standards for housing size to ensure quality livability for Moab's workforce. Using a Development Agreement to bypass a 1,000 sq ft standard down to 450 sq ft is a policy loophole. If a traditional zoning variance cannot legally be granted for economic convenience, the Council should not use a Development Agreement to deliver the exact same unfair advantage. Especially since they are asking them to be located outside city limits where there is a vast amount of land for building. You passed the WFH code for a reason, to help out local workers, why go back on that now? Moab City should not establish a precedent like this. Hotels that have already paid their housing fees and/or hotels currently owing fees would surely be entitled to a partial refund if you are going to grant exceptions like this. The Henry Shaw Hotel is already vested under highly profitable, legacy overnight accommodation rules. The city does not owe them any concessions. Please uphold our community standards, protect the integrity of our zoning code, and vote NO on this Development Agreement. Let the developer either build to our full municipal standards or pay the $2.62 million fee into our housing fund.
Angel Hansen: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement for workforce housing. I believe the City Council should carefully consider the long-term impacts of this agreement on surrounding neighborhoods, infrastructure, zoning, and the overall character of Moab. In particular, the agreement would increase vehicle traffic from workers commuting to and from the property, as

well as create additional parking demand and pressure on already limited parking in the surrounding area. Any workforce-housing solution should be appropriately planned, comply fully with applicable zoning and development standards, and protect the interests of existing residents and neighboring properties. The impacts on traffic, parking, neighborhood safety, and quality of life should be fully addressed before approval.
For these reasons, I respectfully ask the City Council to vote against the Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement as currently proposed. Thank you for considering the concerns of Moab residents.
Ross Hansen: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement for workforce housing. I believe the City Council should carefully consider the long-term impacts of this agreement on surrounding neighborhoods, infrastructure, zoning, and the overall character of Moab. In particular, the agreement would increase vehicle traffic from workers commuting to and from the property, as well as create additional parking demand and pressure on already limited parking in the surrounding area. Any workforce-housing solution should be appropriately planned, comply fully with applicable zoning and development standards, and protect the interests of existing residents and neighboring properties. The impacts on traffic, parking, neighborhood safety, and quality of life should be fully addressed before approval.
For these reasons, I respectfully ask the City Council to vote against the Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement as currently proposed. Thank you for considering the concerns of Moab residents.
Elizabeth Eliason: We are fighting this huge resort that is going in below our house in Moab. We know it's going to be built but we don't want to city giving them variances and exceptions. Will you fill out this form, today as meeting is tomorrow, for us? I have written it all out for you to just copy and paste and send in. We would appreciate it. If you know of others that could send in opposition letters pass this on. Thanks!
I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement for workforce housing. I believe the City Council should carefully consider the long-term impacts of this agreement on surrounding neighborhoods, infrastructure, zoning, and the overall character of Moab. In particular, the agreement would increase vehicle traffic from workers commuting to and from the property, as well as create additional parking demand and pressure on already limited parking in the surrounding area. Any workforce-housing solution should be appropriately planned, comply fully with applicable zoning and development standards, and protect the interests of existing residents and neighboring properties. The impacts on traffic, parking, neighborhood safety, and quality of life should be fully addressed before approval.
For these reasons, I respectfully ask the City Council to vote against the Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement as currently proposed.
Thank you for considering the concerns of Moab residents.

Timestamp	Your Name	Your Comment
10/6/2026 20:30:56	Melanie Snow	The Council should vote NO on the Henry Shaw Hotel agreement. I understand the intent to secure housing units, but this agreement compromises both worker dignity and the logistical reality of our town. The Council passed the employee housing code to help our workers and allowing variances adds to the crisis in our city. Reject this agreement based on three critical issues. Worker Dignity: Our community is facing a housing crisis, but the solution cannot be to lower living standards. Forcing Moab's working class into 425 sq ft micro-units strips away basic dignity. It treats the people who keep our economy running as secondary citizens who deserve the bare minimum amount of space to sleep. Our workers deserve real, livable homes. Forced Commuting and Traffic Impacts: Allowing the developer to build units out of city limits, the City is actively generating traffic, creating a forced daily commute. It will funnel dozens of employee vehicles onto Highway 191 during peak morning and evening rush hours, worsening the congestion we battle every day. The developer is offloading the infrastructure, emergency services and social impacts of a city-approved hotel onto the county. Moab city should not establish a precedent where developers reap 100% profit while the county gets burden. The Main Street Parking Crisis: Moab's parking is already at its absolute limit. If these employees cannot walk/bike to work, they must drive & park. The Henry Shaw Hotel site plan has no employee parking; adding the burden of employee parking that will spill over into neighboring residential streets. The developer is passing their parking and traffic issues directly onto the public and our local neighborhood. Doc Allen Street and David Court will become the overflow parking lot for hotel staff. Our narrow residential streets cannot handle the safety hazards and congestion of commercial overflow. The developer can pay the $2.62m fee or build homes within the city limits that meet the employee housing code. There is no reason to grant them exceptions that will ultimately be harming our city and quality of life. The Hotel is already a highly profitable project. The city does not owe them concessions that degrade worker dignity, worsen traffic, and congest residential streets. If you agree to pass you are setting a future precedent. Please protect our neighborhoods, uphold our zoning standards, and vote NO on this Development Agreement.
10/7/2026 11:53:08	Jim Webster	At this time, I support the proposed annexation policy that will be discussed on 10/8/26
10/7/2026 15:29:43	Ken Fedel	I urge the City Council to vote NO on the proposed Development Agreement for the Henry Shaw Hotel project. Moab should not grant custom zoning workarounds that allow the developer to shrink required workforce housing down to 450-sq ft units and construct them outside of city limits. This is a variance under another name. Municipal code sets clear standards for housing size to ensure quality livability for Moab's workforce. Using a Development Agreement to bypass a 1,000 sq ft standard down to 450 sq ft is a policy loophole. If a traditional zoning variance cannot legally be granted for economic convenience, the Council should not use a Development Agreement to deliver the exact same unfair advantage. Especially since they are asking them to be located outside city limits where there is a vast amount of land for building. You passed the WFH code for a reason, to help out local workers, why go back on that now? Moab City should not establish a precedent like this. Hotels that have already paid their housing fees and/or hotels currently owing fees would surely be entitled to a partial refund if you are going to grant exceptions like this. The Henry Shaw Hotel is already vested under highly profitable, legacy overnight accommodation rules. The city does not owe them any concessions. Please uphold our community standards, protect the integrity of our zoning code, and vote NO on this Development Agreement. Let the developer either build to our full municipal standards or pay the $2.62 million fee into our housing fund.
10/7/2026 16:01:46	Angel Hansen	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement for workforce housing. I believe the City Council should carefully consider the long-term impacts of this agreement on surrounding neighborhoods, infrastructure, zoning, and the overall character of Moab. In particular, the agreement would increase vehicle traffic from workers commuting to and from the property, as well as create additional parking demand and pressure on already limited parking in the surrounding area. Any workforce-housing solution should be appropriately planned, comply fully with applicable zoning and development standards, and protect the interests of existing residents and neighboring properties. The impacts on traffic, parking, neighborhood safety, and quality of life should be fully addressed before approval. For these reasons, I respectfully ask the City Council to vote against the Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement as currently proposed. Thank you for considering the concerns of Moab residents.
10/7/2026 16:03:08	Ross Hansen	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement for workforce housing. I believe the City Council should carefully consider the long-term impacts of this agreement on surrounding neighborhoods, infrastructure, zoning, and the overall character of Moab. In particular, the agreement would increase vehicle traffic from workers commuting to and from the property, as well as create additional parking demand and pressure on already limited parking in the surrounding area. Any workforce-housing solution should be appropriately planned, comply fully with applicable zoning and development standards, and protect the interests of existing residents and neighboring properties. The impacts on traffic, parking, neighborhood safety, and quality of life should be fully addressed before approval. For these reasons, I respectfully ask the City Council to vote against the Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement as currently proposed. Thank you for considering the concerns of Moab residents.
10/7/2026 17:35:02	Elizabeth Eliason	We are fighting this huge resort that is going in below our house in Moab. We know it's going to be built but we don't want to city giving them variances and exceptions. Will you fill out this form, today as meeting is tomorrow, for us? I have written it all out for you to just copy and paste and send in. We would appreciate it. If you know of others that could send in opposition letters pass this on. Thanks! I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement for workforce housing. I believe the City Council should carefully consider the long-term impacts of this agreement on surrounding neighborhoods, infrastructure, zoning, and the overall character of Moab. In particular, the agreement would increase vehicle traffic from workers commuting to and from the property, as well as create additional parking demand and pressure on already limited parking in the surrounding area. Any workforce-housing solution should be appropriately planned, comply fully with applicable zoning and development standards, and protect the interests of existing residents and neighboring properties. The impacts on traffic, parking, neighborhood safety, and quality of life should be fully addressed before approval. For these reasons, I respectfully ask the City Council to vote against the Henry Shaw Hotel Development Agreement as currently proposed. Thank you for considering the concerns of Moab residents.