



Item

Page

Consent Agenda Items

- 1. Richmond Valley Subdivision 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment ..... 2

Regular Action Items

- 2. Hills of Home Subdivision ..... 2
- 3. Specific Criteria for Rural 2 & Rural 5 Zone Rezone Requests ..... 3

**Present:** Angie Zetterquist, Josh Runhaar, Lane Parker, Brady Christensen, Nolan Gunnell, Chris Sands

**Start Time: 05:30:00**

**Christensen** welcomed and **Parker** gave opening remarks.

**05:31:00**

### Agenda

Approved with no changes.

**05:36:00**

### Minutes

*Gunnell* motioned to approve the minutes from March 7, 2019; **Parker** seconded; **Passed 4, 0.**

**05:33:00**

### Consent Items

#### #1 Richmond Valley Subdivision 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment

*Sands* motioned to approve the Richmond Valley Subdivision 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment with the stated findings of fact, seven conditions, and two conclusions as written; **Parker** seconded; **Passed 4, 0.**

**05:34:00**

### Regular Action Items

#### #2 Hills of Home Subdivision

**Zetterquist** reviewed the staff report for the Hills of Home Subdivision.

**Staff** and **Commissioners** discussed the Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and needed road improvements.

**Lee Nelson** commented on the contract with Johnson's and the existing gravel pit, the bridge and signage for weight limits, and the need for grading on the road.

**Gunnell** and **Parker** asked about reclamation for the gravel pit.

**Mr. Nelson** responded about the plans for reclamation of the gravel pit.

**Staff** and **Commission** discussed the reclamation and how much of the gravel pit will be left open for personal use.

**Christensen** asked about the contract on the gravel pit.

**Mr. Nelson** responded they are working on ending the contract.

**Staff** and **Commission** discussed the contract and CUP for the gravel pit, and when reclamation would start.

***Gunnell** motioned to approve the Hills of Home Subdivision with the stated findings of fact, six conditions, and one conclusion as written; **Sands** seconded; **Passed 4, 0.***

**05:50:00**

### **#3 Specific Criteria for Rural 2 and Rural 5 Zone Rezone Requests**

**Zetterquist** reviewed the information for the Rural 2 (RU 2) and Rural 5 (RU5) Zone rezone requests.

**Staff** and **Commission** discussed the specific criteria for RU 2 and RU 5 zone rezone requests. Staff reports will contain more information to help answer the questions regarding criteria. Density, size of rezones, and noticing were also discussed.

**06:15:00**

***Gunnell** motioned to recommend the Rural 2 and Rural 5 Zone Rezone options to the County Council; **Sands** seconded; **Passed 4, 0.***

**Cheryl Burgess** asked what defines a small rezone?

**Runhaar** responded a small rezone is fewer than 3 lots created.

**Sands** stated that is not a set-in-stone definition.

**Christensen** commented that this is a concession.

**Ms. Burgess** commented against not having stricter criteria for rezones and that developers should be held to a higher standard.

**Runhaar** commented that the issues with private and public roads are being addressed currently.

**Christensen** stated some of the concerns Ms. Burgess has raised regarding developers and how they develop is out of the control of the Planning Commission.

**Ms. Burgess** asked if the Planning Commission could set standards for a single home owner and a set of standards for a developer.

**Runhaar** responded that there cannot be one set of standards for a single home owner and one set of standards for a developer. The standards legally have to be the same.

**Ms. Burgess** commented that developers are causing problems by hanging onto land that would be developed once the initial development is annexed into a city.

**Runhaar** responded to Ms. Burgess about annexation and a subdivision amendment.

**Ms. Burgess** asked about the exception 960 West on Hwy 218 for a fourth home.

**Zetterquist** stated the developer had obtained a design exception for four homes on a private road instead of the maximum three; it was not an exception for a fourth lot.

**Ms. Burgess** commented on the needed infrastructure for development, specifically water.

**Christensen** commented that water is the developer or property owner's risk.

**Sands** stated that the Planning Commission has no jurisdiction over water.

**Runhaar** stated the only thing the Planning Commission and Planning and Zoning can confirm is that they have a water right. Water rights and wells are overseen by the state.

**Christensen** responded that it would be beneficial for Ms. Burgess to discuss water concerns with the state water engineer.

**Ms. Burgess** responded she had. There are problems with developers who develop on the edge of the city.

**Mr. Burgess** asked about the master plan that is being developed and if that will have public comment.

**Runhaar** responded that there would be a series of public hearing.

**Mr. Burgess** stated he wants to remain agricultural and with the changes to the RU2 and RU5, agriculture is going to disappear, as well as water.

**6:03:00**

**Adjourned**