



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

04 APRIL 2013

Item **Page**

Consent Agenda:

- 1. Erickson Subdivision..... 2**
- 2. AT&T Hyrum CUP Expansion..... 2**

Regular Agenda:

- 3. Legacy Mountain Estates 3rd Amendment..... 2**
- 4. Clint & Leslie Ward Homestead Subdivision..... 6**
- 5. White Pine Subdivision..... 9**
- 6. North Valley Landfill Conditional Use Permit..... 10**
- 7. Discussion: Dark Sky and Signage Ordinance 13**

Cache County Planning Commission

Minutes for 04 April 2013

Present: Chris Harrild, Josh Runhaar, Jason Watterson, Phillip Olsen, Chris Allen, Chris Sands, Clair Ellis, Jon White, Diane Ciebien, Marsha Giles

Start Time: 5:32:00

Sands welcomed and **Allen** gave opening remarks/pledge.

5:34:00

Minutes

Passed

Agenda

Passed

05:35:00

Consent Agenda

#1 Erickson Subdivision (Dave Erickson)

Mr. David Erickson is requesting a recommendation of approval from the County Council for a 1-lot subdivision and agricultural remainder with an existing home on 132.49 acres of property in the Agricultural (A10) Zone at approximately 7410 North Highway 81, Smithfield.

#2 AT&T Hyrum Conditional Use Permit (Justin Hadley)

Mr. Justin Hadley is requesting approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow up to 12 antennas on an existing telecommunications tower located on a .083 acre leased portion of an approximately 128 acre parcel in the Agricultural (A10) Zone and Public Infrastructure (PI) Overlay Zone at approximately 5800 South 2400 West, Hyrum.

Allen motioned to recommend the Erickson Subdivision request for approval to the County Council and to approve the AT&T Hyrum CUP; *Ellis* seconded; **Passed 5, 0.**

05:37:00

Regular Action Items:

#3 Legacy Mountain Estates 3rd Amendment (Holly Hardy)

Harrild reviewed Ms. Holly Hardy's request for a recommendation of approval from the County Council for an amendment to an existing subdivision on 19.10 acres of property in the Agricultural (A10) Zone at approximately 8135 South 3600 West, Wellsville. There is an

existing home on the property. A great portion of the area consists steep slopes and isn't developable. The applicant would like to separate the 19.10 acres into two pieces; one piece with the home on it and the other as an ag remainder. The ag piece would be non-developable. Access is sufficient because there isn't an increase in development. There are water rights in place and Bear River Health Department has stated there are no issues. The only change is the division of the property to add an agricultural parcel.

Staff and Planning Commission discussed the application. More of these types of applications are coming in to development services. The ordinance currently is mute on the subject of Ag remainder lots. There is an option to consider these types of applications as a boundary line adjustment and to allow those to be handled administratively. Ag remainder parcels do not qualify as a developable lot. This subdivision was originally planned out under the old ordinance.

Vern Fielding I am the agent representing Holly Hardy. Basically this is what they are attempting to do. They would like to sell the property and this is one way they could reduce the price and make it sellable in today's market. They recognize that it's a non-developable lot and that it would have no voting rights in the subdivision.

Ellis is this one that requires unanimous consent by the other subdivision occupants?

Runhaar state law does require that we either have consent from the other homeowners or set a public hearing at the County Council to hear any concerns. The Planning Commission is hearing it to make a recommendation to the County Council. At this time they do not have unanimous consent so when it is forwarded to the County Council there will be a public hearing and we will notice that.

Staff and Commission discussed that the subdivision homeowners have been notified of this. There is an HOA for this subdivision with attached CC&R's and the planning commission cannot address those, it becomes a civil matter. Currently there are no buildable lots south of this parcel; all the land is agriculture. At one time a group home was possibly going to use the property but that has not happened and staff has heard nothing about it for awhile.

Brent Hansen I live in this subdivision and am also the president of the HOA. I do have a letter from our attorney which I will share. Essentially what the letter states is that according to the HOA and CC&R's, Holly cannot do this without the express consent of the other property owners and there are a number of us who are opposed to this. Holly did talk to me a number of months ago and at that time I didn't see any opposition to it. Several weeks after that Vern Fielding called me and told me that they were going to go through with it. At that time I emailed Holly and told her the proper way to do this was to meet with the HOA attorney to make sure it was legal and to find out what her position would be in our HOA since she would still own property and several other things. She never did contact our attorney, Vern did, but our attorney cannot speak to him. She hasn't done what we've asked her to so at this point all the other property owners are opposed to this.

Brent Parker I help guide the Hardy's through the subdivision process and helped them acquire a well permit. I guess my question is do we need to respect the different levels of government

and are there certain procedures that should be followed? I guess Mr. Hanson and the attorney identified that and the first thing that would be recommended would be to get the approval of the HOA and then come here. Whatever economic force that is driving this should be discussed, and do you trump the HOA and the CC&R's? I perceive that this is totally economic. As I remember the discussion that was held when I sold those lots is that the 19 acres would be held with that home and that is how the homeowners bought it. I think it's splitting hairs to state it is a lot, not a parcel. This will still receive a parcel ID just like any other parcel. We're creating a new lot there, going against what the other property owners have bought and I don't think that's the role of government to ignore and squash agreements and perceptions when others bought into this development. As far as greenbelt, it is in greenbelt. They have a local farmer who uses that land. Trying to base the argument that this is for greenbelt doesn't work. If you look at the 10 acre lot of where this is, there is a gravel pit there on the eastside. Those would be my concerns: should they get the HOA approval before coming to you? I think it should kick back to them and they should make things right with the neighbors. If the HOA doesn't approve I think it ought to be denied.

Dee Williams I own lot number three. When it was presented to us as potential buyers I actually tried to convince Holly to sell me a little more land and she absolutely refused because this was going to be her dream home. So we bought the lot we did. We live in Bountiful, not Cache Valley and we had heard this might happen and then we got this letter last Saturday about this meeting and we went berserk. We were promised that everything would be governed by an HOA and that is part of the reason we bought here and that doesn't seem to be happening.

Staff and Planning Commission discussed the public hearing required by state law. That is something that will happen at the County Council level. In these types of situations the planning commission takes comment and then looks at the application in terms of the county subdivision ordinance. If there is opposition at that point then the County Council would make note of that and take it beyond the county ordinance to look at the state law. Because of the opposition staff will provide legal notice for County Council meeting. Typically the County is not an enforcer in HOA disagreements; however the County Council does have more flexibility in how they handle things like this.

Mr. Hansen this is the third amendment. The second amendment took place in the fall. There was a no build zone on the south end of the parcel to the north of this. The homeowners worked with Chris and Holly to make it work but in order for that to move forward however every homeowner had to agree and sign an agreement for that. So I think there is precedence that every homeowner has to agree for this type action. That was a very minor thing compared to this. This moves us from 5 lots to 6 lots in the subdivision. I'm not sure really why we even would want to go further than this.

Runhaar it's a requirement.

Mr. Hansen okay, it doesn't make sense for a little thing like that to require agreement and this not to.

Runhaar if we had total agreement it wouldn't be an issue. However, where we don't have total agreement we are required to move forward with a public hearing.

Mr. Hansen okay, so after that public hearing we still all would have to agree would we not?

Runhaar no.

Mr. Hansen no? That's surprising, and why not?

Runhaar the county does not enforce HOA covenants. Those covenants are civil agreements. When I receive an application, I look at county code and state code and those codes state that if there is not unanimous consent, then this moves to a public hearing. At the hearing it's going to be a yes or no based on what we hear in regards to public comment, the ordinance and then there is a decision made. If we were to approve, then the HOA has civil options as to what they can do; otherwise the revised plat would be recorded.

Mr. Hansen wasn't the purpose of all of us signing a revised plot plan part of the government's requirements?

Runhaar right. It requires a public hearing unless all the homeowners sign a revised plat. If everybody signs it then we go through the process without a public hearing, since you have not, it is pushed to a public hearing and that will be done at County Council. At this level we just look at in terms of whether it meets the ordinance.

Mr. Hansen I understand, thank you.

Ellis as I recall a similar discussion, there was a difference. As I remember the ordinance did not distinguish between a non-developable parcel or remainder or any other lot. So at this point I would be inclined to recommend denial, but it still would go on to the County Council. My feeling about this has nothing to do with the HOA. I believe as I recall, and as I read it, the subdivision would be limited to the five lots, and secondly if everyone bought their lots under a certain agreement, I think the ordinance does, or should I think, allow that to be not changeable without their approval. That would be my feelings on this right now, and that's the way I remember it.

Staff and Commission discussed how to decide the issue. The commission can pass on a dual recommendation. The commission is a recommending body and the Council does not have to follow the recommendation from this body. The County Council meeting will be held May 14 or 28.

Ellis motioned to recommend denial to the County Council of the Legacy Mountain Estates 3rd Amendment; Motion died due to lack of a second.

Olsen motioned to recommend approval of the Legacy Mountain Estates 3rd Amendment to the County Council with the stated conditions and findings of fact; Watterson seconded; Passed 3, 2 (Ellis, Allen - nay).

06:10:00

#4 Clint and Leslie Ward Homestead Subdivision (Clint Ward)

Harrild reviewed Mr. Clint Ward's request for a recommendation of approval from the County Council for a 1-lot subdivision with one agricultural remainder on 79.76 acres of property in the Agricultural (A10) Zone at approximately 9400 North 1600 East, Richmond. The applicant could build a home there as it stands, but they would like to divide the property. Water, septic, and fire access aren't issues. But there are some problems with road access. There is a culvert that crosses under 1600 East and the roadway around the culvert is sloughing off and eroding. That makes the road ~14 feet wide. Beyond the culvert the road averages ~18 feet wide with a one foot wide shoulder. The road is inadequate as regards the standard. The applicant is willing to make the needed improvements for the road and because the applicant has provided a written statement of his intent to improve the roadway, a condition for approval has been included that identifies that improvement. The other improvement also to be addressed by the proponent is the frontage of 9400 north. Improvement of the entirety of the frontage of subject property is not proposed, only south shoulder of the extent of the proposed Lot #1.

Staff and Commission discussed the road improvements. The road leading to the subdivision and the piece in front of the applicant's property will need to be widened and improved to a gravel standard. The culvert will also need to be extended.

Clint Ward I grew up in this area and farmed for several years. I would like to take off the bottom five acres for financial reasons and build a home on it. The rest of the land will remain in agriculture. That's my plan and the only thing I want to do with it. When it comes to the access they've talked through it and I'm willing to make those improvements.

Ellis as I understand this, and so that you understand, this does qualify for more lots than one and after you do this it won't meet that pre-1970 standard anymore and will fall under the new density standard.

Mr. Ward I understand that and have no future plans for development.

Rosaline Saunders My husband and I own 90 acres east of this property. About 15 years ago we wanted to make about 5 lots of about 10 acres each on the hill and we had an engineering firm look at and help us decide how to do this. When it became known what we were doing, Boyd Tripp and Winn Ward both strenuously objected to this and got all the water people in the state and county involved with the result that we dropped the plans and it ended up with the state saying we could only have one well up there. I would like to know what has changed. Where is all this water coming from all of a sudden and what is all this about zoning?

Runhaar this discussion in the staff report is the maximum developable lots, but they are only asking for one. As far as water rights, the state makes those decisions. I know that I don't know your specific case, but it could have been that there are a number of parcels out there that are allowed by right on a single well prior to 1996 and after 1996 you would have to transfer them and buy more well rights, but you would still have to go to the state for well permits. If Mr. Ward did want to develop seven more lots he could buy more water rights and transfer them but he would still have to go through the state for the other well permits. The county does not have

any authority on well permits and water rights. He will have to prove that he has the well permit and water rights before he can build on it. Does that make sense?

Mrs. Saunders no.

Runhaar sorry, that's the best way I know how to explain it.

Staff and commission discussed the amount of lots allowed and water rights. This application allows for the applicant to build one house on the property. If the applicant wants to develop more he would have to come back through the process for more lots. The applicant does have water rights for this lot and is in the process of those water rights being transferred.

Scott Tripp I can answer some of the questions regarding waters rights as I'm head of the Skyline Irrigation Company so I know where he is getting his water rights. My concern is here today; I'm the property on 1600 east all the way along. It is an unimpeded county road. Five years ago they widened the road, and all of it was done in my direction, all to the south, and none to the north. I've been a considerate citizen and have set my fences back thirty feet. My concern is am I going to have to build a new fence and the trees that are there. As the water has been diverted I'm concerned about those trees. Is there any mitigation for those trees? As you can see in the pictures my fence is way off the road, the property owner to the east is very unhappy and is not planning on moving his fence. But that road, depending how you go, impacts me. I'm also the homeowner of the home on the corner. That corner is blind and I'm very familiar with it because I drive farm machinery on it constantly but I don't see that that has been addressed. So my concerns are that is an un-deeded county road, how does it affect my property whether you go two feet to east or six feet to the west, does that impact the center of the road? Does my fence come in compliance anymore? What happens to the trees and the fence? And what is not in that site plan is a personal discussion; there is an access road to Day's property that continues on. It tags over to mine and around the fences and goes to the eastside of fence all the way down and there is no discussion about that that grants him continued access. The water right actually comes from an unnamed spring that the Stoddard's own. I know it very well because of family history with it, Stoddard's own it entirely. So that's where the water is coming from. My questions are, how do I protect my rights as far as widening the road that is not on his property whatsoever? It's mine and when do I find out which way it's going to go and does he move my fence if he impacts me? And who pays for an un-deeded county road? Is it eminent domain?

Staff and commission discussed the questions that have arisen. As far as the widening, the initial discussion was to go all in one direction. The problem is that the road is part gravel and part pavement which makes constructability in widening difficult. So staff is looking at an equal widening on each side, so that would mean three feet on each side of the road. If fences do have to be moved that would be the responsibility of whoever is doing the roadway improvement, in this case it would be the developer and they would pay for that to be put back in. If trees are impacted, and there are a number of trees in this situation, some trees might have to be removed and if there needs to be replanting that would be done as well. The road did exist on the 1914 county road map. It was a legal county road and at that time it would have had a 66 foot right of way and that map is what has been used in the past to establish right of ways. So while the road maybe un-deeded there is an established county right of way. A legal memorandum and an

assessment from the county engineer will move forward to the County Council. Staff will have to review the blind corner that was brought up.

Mr. Tripp it's an issue of height.

Harrild we will revisit that corner.

Mr. Ward Scott's right about the current access to that property. I have had a survey done and my plans are that that fence would be moved at my cost and I would access my property that way. Scott's right that there is an implied right of way to Day's property that they've always used and if they still want to continue to use it I'm not going to cut that off. The access will be from my property.

Sands so the access will be on the west of the property there, and what you're saying is that the fence is on the west side and you're going to switch to the east side?

Mr. Ward the gate goes straight in from the road. It's a lane and then it goes down 150 feet and then the fence jogs back to the property line. The plan is not to impact the Tripp's.

Harrild staff would recommend an easement would be drawn up that would recognize that access to Day's property.

Sands does that make sense Mr. Ward?

Mr. Ward explain that again please?

Harrild if there was an easement written up to identify that access.

Mr. Ward it's not recorded at all.

Harrild it's not right now.

Mr. Ward it's a prescriptive easement.

Harrild but if we added it to the plat, is that in line with your thinking?

Mr. Ward for the Days'?

Harrild yes.

Mr. Ward if they want it, sure. I don't want to be a bad neighbor.

Mr. Tripp the reason it's a big deal is because of the way the county pushes snow. My fence gates have been bent every single year because they push it straight down into that fence. So to get the proper setback and get the corner fixed would be great so I can stop buying gates.

Allan Day according to this survey, it looks like that part we call Knowles's waste basket, I've been paying taxes on.

Harrild the part you're asking about is east of the road?

Mr. Day no.

Harrild to the south.

Mr. Day I've been paying taxes on it if it's his.

Harrild its not, according to this it's yours.

Mr. Ward that fence that comes down near the water drains, that fence is on your property and needs to be straightened, and it will be.

Allen motioned to recommend the Clint and Leslie Ward Homestead Subdivision to the County Council with approval based upon the conditions and findings of fact; Watterson seconded; Passed 5, 0.

Staff and commission discussed a change to the ordinance to allow one lot subdivisions on existing lots to be approved administratively. There isn't very much difference between a boundary line adjustment and this type of situation. Noticing, comments, and discussion would not be eliminated but hearings would be held in the office and it would also decrease the financial burden for applicants in this type of situation. There would be a threshold at which the application would have to come before the commission but many applications would be handled administratively.

06:47:00

#5 White Pine Subdivision (Kelly Newman)

Harrild reviewed Kelly Newman's request for a recommendation of approval from the County Council for a 3-lot subdivision and one remainder on 140.55 acres of property in the Forest Recreation (FR40) Zone, Logan Canyon. Access is from SR 89 across the bridge. However, the bridge is inadequate. The width of the bridge is currently 9 feet and the requirement for fire access is 12 feet. Staff has identified a need for the bridge to be widened and because at this moment the applicant has not provided additional information regarding the possibility of widening the bridge staff has to recommend denial. If the bridge were not an issue staff would recommend approval, but because the bridge staff cannot recommend that.

Staff and commission discussed noticing, all the neighbors were noticed about the proposal.

Shawn Smith I'm here on behalf of my in-laws. I guess I will need to let them know the bridge doesn't meet the standards for what they are trying to do.

Sands if you give them the staff report that should have enough detail for them.

Mr. Smith where can I get that report? (Harrild provides report)

Runhaar instead of doing a recommendation of denial we could postpone.

Sands we can continue this to give you time to look into improving the bridge. If we vote denial and the County Council does the same thing that you have to go through the whole process again and pay the fee again.

Smith okay, so we would come back here?

Sands right.

Smith okay, thank you.

Olsen motioned to continue the White Pine Subdivision for up to 90 days; Allen seconded; Passed, 5, 0.

Sands so the item has been continued for up to 90 days but you don't have to wait the full 90 days to come back.

06:58:00

#6 North Valley Landfill Conditional Use Permit (Issa Hamud)

Runhaar there is a lot of information that has been provided and there is another piece of information in front of you at your desk. We want to go through as much as we can as we go through this and find out what the commission wants in regards to extra information and what staff can handle. Staff is also asking that we set a public hearing for our May meeting. But today I would like to get a list of topics and how we should work through them and have a discussion through the application.

Staff has tried to identify applicable county ordinance as to what is required and include any staff comments that are relevant. The first thing is who has authority to approve the landfill and the definition of a solid waste facility. What zone it is permitted in, CUP requirements, and the requirement for the DWR, the requirements specific to a solid waste facility, and that list continues. That is where most of the specifics are found. Staff has also contacted the DWR but hasn't received comment back at this point. Second, specific to the solid waste facility staff has identified that site specific drainage and grading plans are needed; these have been submitted to the state and been approved at that level and will be reviewed by the engineer on staff at the county. Access is a little different for this project. The applicant has been trying to identify the best route and staff has broken that into two pieces. North of SR-142 and Clarkston and South of SR-142 and Clarkston. The main issues are how to get to Clarkston and once you reach Clarkston how to travel around or through town. Staff is breaking it up this way because that is how it has been presented to staff.

Staff and Planning Commission discussed SR-142. In regards to SR-142 the county cannot restrict access along SR-142 because that is a State road and the County has no land use

authority over that. The Planning Commission can make recommendations as to what route to the north of SR-142 can be used to access the solid waste facility.

Harrild reviewed Mr. Issa Hamud's request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow the placement of a solid waste landfill on 320.26 acres of property in the Agricultural (A10) Zone and Public Infrastructure (PI) Overlay Zone at 14200 Stink Creek Road, 4.50 miles north of Clarkston. The maintenance and landscape plans have been reviewed and staff has requested additional information for those plans.

Staff and Commission discussed the landscape plan. A commercial grade landscape plan isn't expected but some sort of weed and erosion control will be expected.

Harrild cont. Logan City has been approved for a solid waste landfill permit through the state. They've met and exceeded the land requirement for a landfill. Staff also required a site suitability analysis and approval of that analysis. An analysis was completed in 2004 and has been reformatted to reflect the format of the county requirements. That is currently being reviewed by staff. The applicant is also required to complete closure and post-closure plans. That is also being reviewed by staff. If the commission has questions while going through this information please email those to staff and they will be forwarded to the applicant for answers.

Staff and Commission discussed that all the information that has been handed out to the Commission is available online for the public to review. Staff can run a question and answer forum on the website so the public can also view that information. Most of the enforcement is going to be done by the state. For things that the county is requiring beyond the state, the county will have to enforce. The county does have a weed department that can help with some of the enforcement there, but the rest will have to be a regular maintenance drive by to check on. Erosion can be a problem and something that staff will look for in their operations and maintenance plan. Hopefully staff will be able to make a yearly site visit for this type of project. Staff would like everything reviewed and all questions answered and doesn't expect a decision on this item before June.

Rosemary Christiansen we've been put off many times as far as what we can address in this meeting. Is it safe to assume what has been discussed here will be addressed but you won't address access south of SR-142?

Runhaar correct.

Ms. Christiansen the other items, like the wildlife habitat, are those things that we can address and bring our concerns?

Sands as part of the public hearing, yes.

Ms. Christiansen so we can access that on the computer and those will be the only things we can address as the public hearing?

Runhaar the only thing we've taken off the table for discussion is the access south of SR-142. Everything else is open whether it was on the list or not.

Ms. Christiansen and that can all be heard by this board?

Sands absolutely. Also it's important to note that it doesn't end with us; the County Council will also weigh in on this application.

Ms. Christiansen but at the County Council last time, the last words we heard were really that the County Council couldn't do anything; the final say was that it would go before Logan City Council.

White what?

Ms. Christiansen we were told this would also go before Logan City Council.

White no, the Logan City Council will have no say.

Ms. Christiansen we were confused about that at the end of the last County Council.

White Logan City is the applicant. The location is in the County and the permit will be issued by the County. Logan City has no say.

Runhaar the final authority lies with the County Council. We do have a limited scope as to what we can use for making our decision.

Ms. Christiansen okay but we can note the fact that you located the landfill 4.2 miles north of Clarkston on unimproved roads, we can address that?

Runhaar yes.

Ellis we do have a limited scope but that doesn't mean we won't find things that are important that are outside our scope.

Ms. Christiansen we just want to make sure our comments are effective and relate to what can be done.

Runhaar bring your comments in and we can list them out and quite honestly there are some things we can't address because we don't have the authority and we can see if your questions fall in those areas.

Ms. Christiansen okay, will the format for the meeting be the same as a couple of years ago where we'll have three minutes or will we be able to do a presentation?

Sands it's at the commission's discretion and what we are challenged with is that our meeting has to end at eight o'clock. However, if a group of individuals want to put together a presentation, we have the discretion to allow that format to proceed. The presentation format seems to work better for the commission rather than hearing the same thing stated 10 times.

Ms. Christiansen okay.

Runhaar if you want to do a presentation let staff know and we can work with you.

Ms. Christiansen okay

Heidi Hodgson I appreciate a few minutes of your time. Recognizing that you are the planning commission and an extension of planning and zoning, sometimes it's been a little frustrating that there isn't a pro-active plan and that the parameters are a little restrictive in the things you could talk/vote about regarding material things. At the time of the rezone we we're told that you would be able to look at all aspects including all the roads considered as a route for the landfill and all essential topics would be discussed before the rezone and we hope there is ample time for those issues to be discussed. You do have the ability to recommend the CUP not be granted. We are disappointed, as you have pointed out Logan City makes millions of dollars due to the landfill, and the site study was paid for by Logan and not the county, and that is a serious conflict of interest. From their own study they mentioned that good faith negotiations would be undertaken with citizens and an agreement would be reached, that hasn't happened, the ensuing agreement regarding development and operation and we are way down that road from when this study was done and it hasn't happened. Besides that, Chris mentioned the DWR is looking for information. The study the DWR asked for 12 years ago hasn't been done. The point is, in 12 years if Logan had a willingness to comply with that, they would but they haven't. The only way that is going to happen is if you make it a requirement for a CUP. In their own plan it states there is an area for asbestos, we don't want that! There is also an area for demolition and construction waste, in the first place they said they weren't planning to do that. There are inconsistencies which are important. In the Herald Journal in Feb. Logan City stated they had no interest in going through Clarkston, but they were working with an engineering firm for that purpose. The landfill was recommended for that site if Clarkston and Newton were bypassed. There are a lot of inconsistencies that are alarming. Initially they stated with eight to ten trucks would travel that road, then they said 60 to 70 trips, four days a week and then it came out that it would be six days a week. More information is coming out that is contradictory in regards to earlier information. We ask you to carefully consider the conditions that you would recommend to the county council; the application is vague and does not have enough information. Thank you for your time.

Staff noted that there is more detail for some of the issues raised tonight in the application. Notification was discussed. Staff cannot do a special case notification for this application but will follow all the notification requirements.

Ellis motioned to continue the North Valley Landfill Conditional Use Permit for up to 90 days; Watterson seconded; Passed 5, 0.

07:44:00

#7 Discussion: Dark Sky and Signage

Runhaar staff will bring this back at the next meeting.

Staff and commission briefly discussed signage. Some commission members expressed concern about not allowing electronic message displays (EMDs) in the commercial and industrial zones. However, the county does not have the staff to deal with all the enforcement issues that come with EMDs.

07:49:00

Adjourned