



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

02 JUNE 2016

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Whittier Subdivision	2
2. Agriculture Protection Areas	2
3. Public Hearing (5:45 p.m.) Morley Rezone.....	3
4. Public Hearing (6:00 p.m.) Hansen Rezone	5
5. Maple Rise Campground CUP.....	6
6. Nautica Subdivision.....	7
7. Darrell’s Appliance Subdivision 1 st Amendment	11
8. Discussion—Agritourism	12
9. Discussion—Telecommunications.....	12

1 **Present:** Jacob Adams, Chris Harrild, Josh Runhaar, Lane Parker, Brady Christensen, Rob
2 Smith, Jason Watterson, Chris Sands, Nolan Gunnell, Megan Izatt, Tony Baird

3
4 **Start Time: 05:30:00**

5
6 **Smith** welcomed and **Christensen** gave opening remarks

7
8 **05:33:00**

9
10 **Agenda**

11
12 Approved.

13
14 **Minutes**

15
16 *Watterson* motioned to approve the minutes; *Gunnell* seconded; **Passed 6, 0.**

17
18 **05:33:00**

19
20 **Consent Items**

21
22 **#1 Whittier Subdivision**

23
24 *Sands* motioned to approved; *Christensen* seconded; **Passed 6, 0.**

25
26 **05:35:00**

27
28 **Regular Agenda**

29
30 **#2 Agriculture Protection Areas (Jace K. Ballard, Todd N. Ballard)**

31
32 **Harrild** reviewed Mr. Jace K. and Mr. Todd N. Ballard's request for a recommendation to the
33 County Council for Agriculture Protection Areas in six separate locations including multiple
34 properties and a total of 1,884.91 acres located in the Agricultural (A10) Zone at approximately
35 8600 North 800 West, 5800 North (Sam Fellow Road) 4800 West, 5100 North 4200 West (Sam
36 Fellow Road), 3200 West 4600 North, 3200 West 4100 North, and 2600 North 2400 West.
37 Notice to surrounding property owners has been provided as per State and County Code. At this
38 time, no public comment regarding this proposal has been received by staff. All areas of the
39 Agriculture Protection Area must meet six criteria: Is the area proposed greater than 5 acres in
40 size; Is the land currently being used for agricultural production; is the land zoned for
41 agricultural use; what is the extent and nature of the existing or proposed farm improvements;
42 and water are the anticipated trends in the agricultural and technological conditions. Each area
43 meets the minimum requirements of the State and County Code.

44
45 **Jace Ballard** we filed for the Agriculture Protection Area a few months ago because sometimes
46 livestock and people don't always get along well. There was nothing that triggered us filing just
47 decided one day that this is what we wanted to do and wanted to get it taken care of.

1
2 **Staff and Commission** discussed building an Agriculture Protection Area Overlay to show on
3 the GIS maps. Agriculture Protection Areas are required to be reviewed every 20 years and staff
4 will start those reviews soon. Agriculture Protection Areas are created to protect the rights of
5 agriculture production lands from neighbors who claim they are a nuisance.

6
7 *Christensen* motioned to recommend approval to the County Council for the Ballard
8 Agricultural Protection Area with the findings of fact, conclusions, and conditions as noted in
9 the staff report; *Watterson* seconded; **Passed 6, 0.**

10
11 **05:46:00**

12
13 **#3 Public Hearing (5:45 PM) Morley Rezone**

14
15 **Adams** reviewed Mr. Ken Morley's request for approval to the County Council for a rezone of
16 9.09 acres of property at 686 East 10850 South in Avon from the Agricultural (A10) Zone to the
17 Rural 2 (RU2) Zone. The surrounding parcels reflect an average parcel size of 20 acres for
18 properties without a dwelling and 9.3 acres with a dwelling. Access to the property is from count
19 roads 800 East and 10940 South and is currently not adequate. Creating adequate access may be
20 feasible but may require substantial improved to the road surface and width, modification of the
21 bridge, and obtaining an extension of services per County Council Resolution 2015-20. Water
22 will be through wells; this property does not have access to any large-scale culinary or sewer
23 system. Public notice was sent out and no public comment has been received by staff.

24
25 **Staff and Commission** discussed the roads. There is a possibility for a private road for a
26 subdivision if the applicant is willing to improve the roads. The County did some improvements
27 a year or two ago but the road will still need to be widened and a pavement surface may be
28 required. The bridge is not owned by the County but the bridge would still need to meet the
29 requirements that the Fire District would require for emergency vehicles to access a subdivision.
30 There is a possibility for a design exception but more detail for road improvements would be
31 given and decided on when they applicant comes back for a subdivision application.

32
33 **05:55:00**

34
35 *Watterson* to open the public hearing for the Morley Subdivision; *Gunnell* seconded; **Passed 6,**
36 **0.**

37
38 **Ken Morley** I am the owner of the property. The properties on the rights side are all two acres
39 parcel but I'm not sure what zoning they are, do you know?

40
41 **Harrild** they are A10 and were done under an earlier code.

42
43 **Smith** they would predate what we are talking about here.

44
45 **Mr. Morley** I do have a proposed site plan and would like that to be passed out. On the paper
46 sent to me in the mail regarding the requirements for a 22 foot road, my originally proposed plan
47 is four parcels but if it were three would that road improvement requirement change?

1
2 **Runhaar** the width would still be required for fire access but the surface requirements could
3 change.

4
5 **Parker** there are a lot of people in the county who expect it's easy to develop their land but
6 ordinances have changed. To be able to build two more homes on your property is going to
7 require a lot of expense for the road. I like to see people to be able to use their property the way
8 they would like but because of ordinance changes there have been a number of people who
9 realize they can't due to the ordinance changes and road improvement requirements. I guess I
10 would like to know if you have looked into that.

11
12 **Mr. Morley** would I need to improve 800 and 10940 to 22 feet?

13
14 **Harrild** with the rezone we don't get to delve into that but will with the subdivision application.
15 You could anticipate it could happen but it might not. After the meeting, tomorrow or next week,
16 you can come in and discuss the roads.

17
18 **Mr. Morley** if it were a private road, how wide would the bridge have to be?

19
20 **Harrild** it's that 20 foot width. Typically it's a minimum for fire access. As soon as it goes to a
21 public road and you are serving more than a certain number of homes the road width changes so
22 it depends.

23
24 **Gunnell** who owns the bridge?

25
26 **Mr. Morley** I don't know.

27
28 **Gunnell** on some of those bridges they are owned by the canal company or the U.S. Government
29 and it can be a lengthy process to go through if the government does.

30
31 **Sands** it's more likely than not that it is the land owner's bridge. If down the road, the fire
32 district would have to approve the design exception?

33
34 **Harrild** yes, the biggest thing is weight bearing capacity so the fire district is hesitant to take big
35 equipment over bridges where they don't know the weight bearing capacity.

36
37 **Mr. Morley** I have had a liquid fuel truck that is fully loaded over that bridge.

38
39 **06:03:00**

40
41 **Watterson** motioned to close the public hearing; **Sands** seconded the motion; **Passed 6, 0.**

42
43 **Staff** and **Commission** discussed if the rezone change fit the general area. Many members of the
44 Commission felt that the RU2 zone seemed to fit into the general area that is being applied for.
45 The general intent when the RU2 zone was created was that the higher densities be closer to
46 cities. However, there are some areas in the county that due more represent a municipality or a
47 town that is moderately dense where the RU2 zone seems to fit.

1
2 **Staff and Commission** discussed language for findings of facts in support of the rezone.

3
4 ***Christensen** motioned to recommend approval to the County Council for the Morley Rezone*
5 *based on staff's determination and the discussed findings of fact; **Gunnell** seconded; **Passed 6,***
6 ***0.***

7
8 **06:11:00 pm**

9
10 **#4 Public Hearing (6:00 PM) Hansen Rezone**

11
12 **Adams** reviewed Mr. Gary A. Hansen's request for a recommendation to the County Council for
13 a rezone of 8.76 acres of property at approximately 6500 North 400 West, north of Smithfield
14 from the Agricultural (A10) Zone to the Rural 2 (RU2) Zone. Within a one-mile radius of this
15 property, the surrounding parcels within the county (not including properties within Smithfield
16 City itself) reflect an average parcel size of 11.6 acres, and an average parcel size of 5.7 acres or
17 properties with a dwelling. Access to the property is from county road 400 west and is not
18 currently adequate. Creating adequate access may be feasible but would require substantial
19 improvements to 400 west and will be reviewed when a subdivision application is submitted.
20 There is existing county winter maintenance on 400 west. Smithfield City has stated that no city
21 utilities are accessible or have access for the property.

22
23 **Staff and Commission** discussed the roads. There would need to be improvements to the road
24 for a subdivision to go in.

25
26 **06:16:00**

27
28 ***Sands** motioned to open the public hearing for the Hansen Rezone; **Watterson** seconded; **Passed***
29 ***6, 0.***

30
31 **Gary Hansen** about the city plowing, they are usually earlier than the county. The city will come
32 out past their city boundaries and turn around in an individual's driveway, but the county will go
33 right into 400 North and turn around and plow it both ways.

34
35 **Sands** Mr. Hansen, you are aware that there may be a requirement if a subdivision were applied
36 for to improve the road?

37
38 **Mr. Hansen** yes.

39
40 **Parker** the property right to the south, is that your property or someone else's?

41
42 **Mr. Hansen** that is owned by someone else.

43
44 **Sands** the ones to the south, they must be 3 acres?

45
46 **Mr. Hansen** they are 2.5 acres.

1 **Sands** are you intending there to be 4 lots?
2
3 **Mr. Hansen** at the max, most people we talk to only want two acres.
4
5 **Parker** your intent in getting the rezone is to go ahead and sell or develop?
6
7 **Mr. Hansen** yes, the only reason to do this is to settle a family estate and that is what my father
8 suggested.
9
10 **Sands** so presumably they would be like the lots to the south 2-2.5 acres?
11
12 **Mr. Hansen** yes.
13
14 **Christensen** what is the frontage on that acreage?
15
16 **Mr. Hansen** 650 to 670.
17
18 **Christensen** are you attentively proposing splitting this into 4 lots?
19
20 **Mr. Gary** that is what the county suggested. I was told there was a minimum of 200 feet for
21 frontage.
22
23 **Harrild** the county's requirement is 90 feet. Whatever your configuration is you can make work.
24 **Christensen** it's not pertinent to this decision tonight but was just curious if you had a design in
25 mind.
26
27 **Mr. Hansen** that's what I was thinking was the 4 individual lots.
28
29 **06:20:00**
30
31 ***Sands** motioned to close the public hearing for the Hansen rezone; **Watterson** seconded the*
32 *motion; **Passed 6, 0.***
33
34 **Staff** and **Commission** discussed the application. It does seem to fit the area but the potential
35 cost for the road could be prohibitive.
36
37 **Mr. Hansen** the two houses to the south are in the County and then it turns to City. The road
38 asphalt is the same but those houses did gravel the road. It is the same road width the whole way
39 through.
40
41 ***Parker** motioned to recommend approval to the County Council for the Hansen Rezone with the*
42 *stated findings of fact and conditions; **Gunnell** seconded; **Passed 6, 0.***
43
44 **06:25:00**
45
46 **#5 Maple Rise Campground CUP (Ben Anderson)**
47

1 **Adams** reviewed Mr. Ben Anderson's request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the
2 establishment and expansion of an existing non-conforming use on 214.12 acres of property at
3 6000 West 3400 South, southwest of Mendon, in the Agricultural (A10) and Forest Recreation
4 (FR40) Zones. After receiving the information for adding showers and restrooms staff
5 discovered there was no permit for the campground. This application is for the permit and the
6 expanded facilities. The campground owner wishes to add a restroom/shower facility for the
7 upper campsites and RV pads for the volunteer camp hosts (who are on site full-time during the
8 summer camping season) near the lower campsites. Specific details for the existing campground
9 may be found in the letter of intent and site map accompanying the application. Access to the
10 property does not meet the County Standards but staff is suggesting a design exception for the
11 paved width and overall road width as the campground use was established prior to the current
12 county standards and proposed expansions will not increase the traffic impact of the
13 campground. Bear River Health Department (BRHD) has stated that the site is feasible for the
14 proposed septic fields. County Fire has stated that access is adequate. There are sensitive areas
15 across the majority of the site. Staff has identified a landslide hazard across the majority of the
16 site. The applicant has submitted a geotechnical report stating the areas for the proposed
17 restroom/shower facility and the RV pads are not within the landslide area. There are moderate
18 and steep slopes identified and the geotechnical report identifies the areas for the proposed
19 facilities as flat or nearly flat. There is a fault line that has been identified on the far western edge
20 of the subject parcels. The geotechnical report notes that this fault is 960 feet from the site of the
21 proposed restroom/shower facilities and does not include requirements in relation to this fault.
22

23 **Mr. Ben Anderson** I am representing the applicant, the LDS Church, for this project.
24

25 **Parker** my understanding is the owners don't plan any major changes for this?
26

27 **Mr. Ben Anderson** yes, we tried to make sure anything in the foreseeable future was on this
28 permit.
29

30 Many commission members spoke in favor of this project.
31

32 *Sands* motioned to approve the Maple Rise Campground Conditional Use Permit with the stated
33 findings of facts and conditions; **Watterson** seconded; **Passed 6, 0.**
34

35 **06:35:00**

36 **Smith** excused himself from the meeting and turned it over to **Watterson.**
37

38 **#6 Nautica Subdivision (Bob Wright)** 39

40 **Harrild** reviewed Mr. Bob Wright's request for a recommendation of approval to the County
41 Council for an 11-lot subdivision and agricultural remainder on 129 acres of property located at
42 1550 West 6700 South, Hyrum in the Agricultural (A10) Zone. This has previously been
43 reviewed by the Commission; however, the County Council extended a design exception for the
44 request and then remanded the request back to the Planning Commission for further review.
45 Staff has revised the staff report format. On existing reports, findings of fact are usually
46 conclusions not findings of fact; legal counsel has asked that Staff fix that and be consistent with
47 the language. For the Nautica Subdivision in the staff report what would typically be listed as the

1 staff summary is now findings of fact and the section that used to be identified as findings of fact
2 now consists of conclusions and conditions.

3
4 This application is for an 11-lot subdivision south of Hyrum. Access to this subdivision is across
5 the Spillway over the Hyrum Dam which is not adequate and also is from the West and that does
6 meet the County standard. The applicant has committed to making the needed improvements to
7 the Western access. The County Council has stated that the County will extend maintenance no
8 more than 200 feet beyond the existing end of winter maintenance at the end of pavement at the
9 intersection with private road 6500 South is appropriate in this case. The applicant would like to
10 extend the services 800 feet but will have to discuss the bigger extension with the County
11 Council. The extension of services allows there to be a turnaround for maintenance trucks. After
12 the turnaround there would be a private road that would parallel the county road to provide the
13 access for the subdivision. However, the applicant does not own the property where the
14 turnaround would be required to happen. The main reason for this application being remanded
15 back to the Planning Commission was because the previous report supported a recommendation
16 of denial, and therefore appropriate findings, conditions, and conclusions had to be drafted and
17 reviewed. The question for the Planning Commission now is this: Are there concerns with a
18 private road servicing an 11-lot subdivision with no improvements to the rest of the county road,
19 does that work for this subdivision?
20

21 **Staff and Commission** discussed the subdivision. Concerns regarding access were discussed.
22 The County stated that access is from the West but the subdivision occupants can make the
23 decision how they choose to access the subdivision. Some members of the Commission felt the
24 solution proposed by the County Council wasn't a smart decision. The subdivision would have to
25 have an HOA in effect to help maintain the private road. The issue comes that private roads need
26 to remain private and public roads need to remain public and there cannot be a mixing of the
27 two. It doesn't work to mix them up and that has been proven in other areas of the state. The
28 Council has tried to come up with a middle ground for this application and it doesn't seem like it
29 is going to work. The Commission is constrained to what the Council has given them but the
30 Commission can make an additional motion with recommendations and suggestions beyond
31 what constraints have been given. There is extremely limited maintenance down this road; if the
32 county were to abandon the road the only thing the County would need to ensure is that property
33 owners to the south would be able to maintain the current condition of the road for farm
34 equipment to access their land. The Commission does have the ability to change the conditions
35 that have been written to meet what they think is correct. Staff and Commission discussed the
36 turnaround. For the turnaround to work, the applicant would have to secure the rights for there to
37 be a private road across the property that the applicant does not own.
38

39 **Gary Otterstrom** the turnaround, when we were granted that by the Council we saw that as a
40 ray of light. We made preparations and more engineering and did what you were talking about.
41 We invited the other landowner in and discussed this with them. They are landlocked also. They
42 believe they have access on the private road but the law and the way that it is recorded and the
43 easements make it appear they don't have access on the private road. The landowner bought that
44 property with surrendering the right of way and not receiving back an easement; so they are
45 blocked off of that private road. We've had some title people who have researched that; they are
46 pretty upset about it.
47

1 **Gunnell** which property is that?

2
3 **Mr. Otterstrom** the property right to the north.

4
5 **Gunnell** how much do they own there?

6
7 **Mr. Otterstrom** the county road goes through their property and they have about 15 acres there.
8 We thought this would be a win-win situation because we would provide the road if they would
9 allow us the turnaround. That would have given them access to 6500 where they currently don't
10 have access. It's very complicated and unfortunate for that party that they didn't do their due
11 diligence. So when we suggested this solution, we thought they would like this and it didn't work
12 out that way. We suggested to them that we would build the road and would grant them instant
13 access but they saw it as a way to make some money. Also, as we explored this the ears of that
14 turn around circle may spill into another landowner so it got even more complicated to the point
15 we didn't think it was doable. That is why we are asking to go the additional 500 feet rather than
16 just the 200 and then the turnaround would be on our property and we are amenable to doing this
17 several ways. One would be that we would deed that property, it's a 90 foot circle with an extra 5
18 to 6 foot right of way that would allow the snow plow to push the snow off, over to the county or
19 we would keep it and maintain it. We are open to either of those relationships. There were some
20 complexities that one of the attorneys brought up. It's possible, as indicated by Mr. Swink, there
21 are some legal ways to accomplish that but it would have to go back to the council.

22
23 **Sands** it sounds like the 200 foot solution isn't going to work. So you would like to see the 800
24 foot extension, and that extension would be county road, and then you would build your private
25 road?

26
27 **Mr. Otterstrom** yes. We have indicated that we would help with maintenance and the lawyers
28 have indicated there are some legal things that would need to be worked out. So you would
29 maintain the right to the road and then you would then get a turnaround circle and then we would
30 step off the circle from that point and parallel the county road with a private road. That private
31 road would then be maintained by our HOA.

32
33 **Sands** that is frustrating to me, but at least that is a county road to your property.

34
35 **Mr. Otterstrom** yes and we are willing to give up the circle to the County. We figured it
36 wouldn't be a good idea for us to own and maintain the circle and then write an easement back to
37 the county. We thought that would also be problematic. The purpose of it is, is for the County to
38 turn their big pieces of equipment around.

39
40 **Sands** it seems it's not something that can work, to me.

41
42 **Christensen** was staff aware that it's going to have to be where it's drawn?

43
44 **Harrild** we are aware of what he has described. But let me state that staff does not review the
45 financial impacts of the development on the developer.

46

1 **Mr. Otterstrom** we did the engineering and we sent it in. We felt like this is a reasonable
2 solution. I would like to hearken back to why we are here in the first place is because we got
3 caught in the application process because of the road resolution. We were well into the
4 application process and a lot of expense when the road resolution came down from the Council.
5 We felt as a measure of justice and mercy we should be able to continue forward and you didn't
6 have a choice because of the resolution. That's why we are still trying to find a solution. We do
7 appreciate the council gave us that daylight and felt we could make that work but that isn't how
8 it has worked. The other landowner wants money and it was not a good situation. I understand
9 that your decision may just be the 200 feet but that would at least allow us to go back to the
10 Council and try again. We did meet with Craig Buttars and I think he was amenable to us.

11
12 **Sands** I have a feeling that most Commission and Council members don't have a problem with
13 this but it's a frustrating situation.

14
15 **Mr. Otterstrom** I did want to comment on the access but there are two other accesses to the
16 West. You can access from Sardine Canyon and then also from what I think is 900 West. It's
17 actually faster to go west a little bit and then go north to Logan rather than through Hyrum. We
18 would really like to move forward with this.

19
20 **Gunnell** how many landowners are south of you that would use this road for access?

21
22 **Mr. Otterstrom** it's all farm land to the south of us.

23
24 **Gunnell** and they are ok with this?

25
26 **Mr. Otterstrom** it's barley farms.

27
28 **Gunnell** the point being if they need to bring their equipment, they would need to travel that
29 road

30
31 **Mr. Otterstrom** I've talked to some of them and both the Olsens and Brent Parker seem to be
32 fine with this. Their big machines are down in hutches far to south and they don't bring those
33 across the county road. I've never seen the big equipment go that way just regular pickup trucks.
34 They would have no reason to drive it down off the hill that way. So they service and park them
35 further to the south.

36
37 **Gunnell** I know Troy, part of the Parker establishment, does bring big equipment up there for
38 planting and harvesting.

39
40 **Mr. Otterstrom** ok, I've never seen that. They've always been to the south where the equipment
41 hutches are.

42
43 **Commission** discussed the application. With the conditions before the Commission the
44 application isn't viable with the conditions presented. Some members felt that changing
45 condition #2 to include the 800 feet would be more feasible. Staff did point out that the
46 commission has approved things in the past that weren't necessarily feasible. The Commission
47 looks at county ordinances and policy and the process is the commission provides the conditions

1 that are forwarded to the Council, and the Council will do what they feel like they should.
2 Several Commission members felt better changing the 200 feet to the 800 feet. The Council has
3 said they will only accept 200 feet more for road for maintenance and that already sets
4 precedence where they said they would no longer accept no roads for maintenance. Staff is
5 already working on cutting roads from the maintenance list because of budget. Many
6 commissioners felt that if the subdivision is going to be allowed to move forward then the
7 applicant should be granted the 800 feet to make it actually feasible to move forward. The
8 Commission felt that the Council could have approved this even though the Commission
9 previously denied it.

10
11 **Parker** motioned to recommend approval to the County Council for the Nautica Subdivision and
12 with the edits to the conclusions and condition #2; **Christensen** seconded; **Passed 5, 0.**

13
14 **07:21:00**

15
16 **#7 Darrel's Appliance Subdivision 1st Amendment (Darrell Ricks)**

17
18 **Adams** reviewed Mr. Darrell Rick's request for a recommendation of approval to the County
19 Council to create a new lot (lot 3) from the existing lot 1 of the Darrell's Appliance Subdivision
20 to approximately 3390 South and 2400 west in the Agricultural (A10) Zone. The subdivision was
21 originally recorded on 2 October 2001 with two lots. The proposed amendment divides Lot 1 of
22 the existing subdivision to create a third lot. That would exhaust the developable potential of this
23 subdivision. Subsequent division of the lots within the subdivision would not be permitted under
24 the current A10 Zone. Any future development on these properties must meet the requirements
25 of the County Land Use code at the time of development. The owners of Lot 2 have expressed
26 written opposition to the amendment in order to preserve their right to divide their lot in the
27 future. Based on lot size and the density-based requirements of the A10 Zone, the majority of the
28 development potential within the subdivision is within the approximately 29-acre Lot 2. Staff is
29 currently recommending a continuance of the item so they may discuss the issues with legal
30 counsel.

31
32 **Jeff Ricks** I represent Darrell Ricks. There is a couple of things; according to the summary on
33 here, there is a minor correction that says there was a lot purchased on 2 October 2001 of 5.81
34 acres and the deed we have shows that it was October 23, 2000 and it was 3.91 acres. And then
35 two years later there was a second parcel of 1.27 purchased. It is a triangular lot that was
36 purchased with the intent of squaring up the land. Right south of the border there is a pump that
37 isn't relevant to this discussion.

38
39 **Watterson** have you looked at the possibility of changing zones?

40
41 **Mr. Ricks** that was an option that I was not aware of.

42
43 **Christensen** does that parcel currently entail everything except what is in the red?

44
45 **Mr. Ricks** yes, there is that line that goes east to west.

46
47 **Christensen** was this the original parcel?

1
2 **Mr. Ricks** we added 48 feet to the southern boundary.

3
4 **Christensen** so 48 feet on the southern boundary?

5
6 **Mr. Ricks** yes.

7
8 **Christensen** there was three property owners?

9
10 **Mr. Ricks** both parcels were purchased from the same land owner.

11
12 **Watterson** is the intended use for commercial or a home?

13
14 **Mr. Ricks** commercial.

15
16 **Brad Rees** I am speaking on behalf of the Rees family and we sold the property to Darrell's. We
17 just don't want to lose our right to subdivide the property and loose the water rights.

18
19 **Staff** and **Commission** discussed the application. The property owned by Mr. Rees is 29 acres.
20 If the Darrell's lot were to rezone to commercial it doesn't change the number of subdivisions
21 that have happened. The rezone would change the density for the commercial zone and the
22 density and rezone changes is something that Staff would like to discuss with legal counsel
23 before a decision is made.

24
25 *Sands motioned to continued item #7 up to 90 days; Parker seconded; Passed 5, 0.*

26
27 **07:34:00**

28
29 **#8 Discussion – Agri-Tourism**

30
31 **Harrild** updated the Commission on Agri-Tourism. Some examples are Gibbon's Greengate
32 Farm and the Little Bear Bottoms; Chris is in the process of reviewing and updated the ordinance
33 for Agri-Tourism. Agri-Tourism is not clearly defined right now and needs to be. Greengate
34 Farm has a restaurant currently and that is a commercial enterprise and doesn't fall under the
35 current code.

36
37 **#9 Discussion – Telecommunication**

38
39 **Harrild** telecommunications has been revised and will come before the commission. The FCC
40 changes their requirements on occasion so the ordinance needs to reflect those changes.

41
42 **Runhaar** updated the commission on the drafted storm water plan and staff is working on the
43 ordinance that will also be put in place. Staff thought the County was under the phase 2 permit
44 which would mean the permit to be submitted in August, however, everything needs to be
45 submitted to the State by July 1st. The ordinance will need to be adopted by the County Council
46 by September 1st, 2016. Portions of the ordinance will come before the Commission in July and
47 August.

1
2 **Staff and Commission** discussed noticing of adjacent landowners. There are some concerns with
3 adjacent landowners being noticed in time to respond. At the last meeting the Forest Service and
4 the Department of Wildlife and Resources (DWR) didn't received the notice until the day before
5 the meeting making it prohibitive for them to respond in writing. Staff has decided that entities
6 like the Forest Service and the DWR will be noticed the same way as municipalities, other
7 county departments, etc. so they will receive the information as it becomes available to staff.
8 Staff will consider noticing adjacent landowners earlier.

9
10 **Staff and Commission** discussed their frustrations with the subdivision remanded back to the
11 Planning Commission from the County Council.

12
13 **Adjourned**

14
15 **07:55:00 pm**