

Jefferson County Planning & Zoning Oskaloosa, Kansas

UNOFFICIAL

UNOFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

**Minutes of the Planning Commission
Meeting of March 28th, 2022**

Item 1. Call to Order

Item 2. Approval of the Agenda

Secretary Scherer moved to accept the agenda as presented and Vice Chair Rudolph seconded.

Votes were taken by Ayes and Nays as follows:

Paul Johnson Chairman	Gale Rudolph Vice Chair	Matt Scherer Secretary	Stephen Phillips	Tim Benyshek	Tiffany Asher	Vacant
DNV	Aye	Aye	Aye	--	Aye	--

Motion Passed 4-0

Item 3. Roll Call

Paul Johnson Chairman	Gale Rudolph Vice Chair	Matt Scherer Secretary	Stephen Phillips	Tim Benyshek	Tiffany Asher	Vacant
PRESENT	PRESENT	PRESENT	PRESENT	PRESENT	PRESENT	--

Item 4. Approval of the January 24th, 2022, meeting minutes.

Chairman Johnson asked if there were any corrections for the minutes. There were no corrections to the minutes. He then asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Secretary Scherer moved to approve the minutes and Commissioner Asher seconded.

Votes were taken by Ayes and Nays as follows:

Paul Johnson Chairman	Gale Rudolph Vice Chair	Matt Scherer Secretary	Stephen Phillips	Tim Benyshek	Tiffany Asher	Vacant
DNV	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	--

Motion Passed 5-0

Item 5. Public Hearing

Chairman Johnson explained the commission meeting procedures to the public and opened the public hearing.

PR2022-01 & Z2022-02: A request to consider a re-plot of the Lakeland Estates Subdivision. This proposal is to reduce the number of lots from nine down to five, with the smallest lot proposed being 5.33 acres. Also, a request to rezone lot 4 to Rural Residential, and Lots 1, 2, 3, and 5 to Suburban Residential. Both of these

requests are being brought by the owner of record; Fitzgerald Park Condos, LLC of P.O. Box 1684 – Elizabeth, Colorado, 80107.

During this time, staff asked who was here for the first case. The applicants, Steve Knull and Jan Fitzgerald were present via Zoom. Those opponents that signed in as present for the case were Julie Durand, William Kramer, Cindy Steffey, Mahlon Steffey, James Durand, Cody Steffey, David Steffey, Shelly Steffey, Rhonda Lindsey, Edward Lindsey, John Schonfeldt, Richard Ellis, Mandy Bostwick, and Roger Bostwick.

Chairman Johnson asked if anyone had ex parte communications with someone involved in the case or if a member has a potential conflict of interest regarding this case. Vice Chair Rudolph stated that she was approached by a concerned party, but she let them know she could not discuss the case with them, and they understood and moved on.

Chairman Johnson asked staff to give their report. Staff gave their report. After their report, Chairman Johnson asked the board if they had any questions for staff.

Vice Chair Rudolph: I do have one please Mr. Commissioner. In the letter that was added to the packet, one of their concerns was allowing the replatting? Their concern about this being the possibility of setting a precedence. So, has replatting happened before in this manner?

Dustin Parks (Staff): All the time. I won't say all the time, but replatting occurs frequently. Replatting is an adjustment of property lines to an existing subdivision. We have had, I don't know how many have been in the intervening year that I was gone, but I know we had four or five in the three or four years. In the four years I was here, we had at least four or five of them. We do our best to try to make sure that once it's platted, it's kind of platted with the intention of long-term viability and the existing subdivision as it is, being those nine lots with smaller entrance, you know, smaller road frontage on a road, which would be a private road. It doesn't adhere to our current subdivision regulations, but since it was approved in 1978, it fit the 1978 regulations just fine. So, with a replat like this, it fits our regulations more, and so replats like this are something that we encourage replats like this that help alleviate what I'll call legal non-conforming lots. Does that answer your question?

Vice Chair Rudolph: Yes. It does. Thank you.

Secretary Scherer: Couple of questions, Dustin. I'm not familiar with the area. Is 118th paved?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Yes, it is up to paradise point, up to the Corp ground. And I believe it's paved up to the Corp ground. But its kind of, it's broken up. Last time I was up there. It was actually gated on the Corp ground, but yes, it is paved.

Secretary Scherer: And do we have any traffic count data for either Ferguson or 118th?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Not recent.

Vice Chair Rudolph: And then I have another question please, Dustin. Thank you. If they were to alleviate the inner road, then that would save the property owner from having to do the legalities with the drainage and so on and so forth. Whereas it would fall back to each road wherever the entrances are at? Is that correct?

Dustin Parks (Staff): If the replat were to be approved as presented, then yes, they wouldn't have to worry about doing actually that road as it's platted now would go away. It wouldn't exist anymore. So yeah, if this were approved as it is, then that road would go away, and all the entrances would be either along 118th and/or Ferguson Road. And the existing roadway would have to handle those culverts and that kind of thing.

Vice Chair Rudolph: Thank you.

Chairman Johnson: Other questions by Planning Commissioners at this point for staff?

Secretary Scherer: This may not be the right time to bring it up and if that's the case, let me know. Dustin, you seem to be opposed to internal roads.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Oh, no, I'm not. In this case, the only reason that I bring it up is because of the small amount of frontages don't meet our current Subdivision Regulations. I mean, as approved, if they you know, if this gets denied, and they decide, you know, next week that they want to start doing the road thing that's between the road department and the applicant. I don't personally have anything against internal roads, I actually think they're beneficial. But for this particular case, with it having the small access frontage requirements, the small access frontage as they exist, and that small cul-de-sac and it being a private road, those are my concerns. I have no problems at all with an interior road if it's up to current subdivision regulations.

Secretary Scherer: Thank you.

Chairman Johnson: Other questions by Commissioners at this point for staff? Dustin, I didn't want to build off what Matt was asking about for the internal road. So, we're talking about lot four will go on to 118th. Lot three, lot two, those are certainties. And then lot one, possibly an option between 118th and Ferguson?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Correct.

Chairman Johnson: And lot five would certainly come off Ferguson?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Correct.

Chairman Johnson: Could there be a developed internal road that would take out the number of entrances onto 118th?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Theoretically, yes. And if that's the case, I mean, realistically, if I were the applicant, I would just go with what's already been presented or what's already been approved and not go through the redesign process or the engineering process and fees. But, yes, I mean, theoretically, you could, you could plan a road into you know, off of Ferguson that would allow the 10 acre lot, which is lot four, two, three and four, one, two and three and then lot five to kind of, I guess it would be you know, kind of on the southern tips of the top ones in the northern on the bottom lot there. But, I mean, that would be an engineering thing, and they'd have to go back through and get that redesigned but theoretically it is possible

Chairman Johnson: So, this this was initially approved in 1978. Where was Jefferson County at that point with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan?

Dustin Parks (Staff): I don't know that we actually had a Comprehensive Land Use Plan at that point. I know we had regulations that had been one two we were on our second set of regulations by then, but I don't know that we necessarily had a Comprehensive Land Use Plan at that point.

Chairman Johnson: And so, at that point, this cul-de-sac and interior road met those regulations?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Correct.

Chairman Johnson: Okay. If Planning Commissioners don't have any other questions for staff at this point, then I will ask if the applicant has further information or comments about the staff report. Is there a representative for this application on Zoom?

Steve Knull (Applicant): Can you hear me? Yes.

Chairman Johnson: State your name and your address and your connection to this case please.

Steve Knull (Applicant): My name is Steve Knull and I'm the husband of Jan Fitzgerald and yes, we're the ones trying to change this to the five acres or the five parcels as you see it from the ten that are there now.

Chairman Johnson: What is your address?

Steve Knull (Applicant): Right now, we live in Colorado at 35414 Running Brook Lane, in Elizabeth.

Chairman Johnson: Are you in agreement with the substance of the staff report?

Steve Knull (Applicant): Yes.

Chairman Johnson: Any other final comments?

Steve Knull (Applicant): Not really. I think you're all doing really well with this, so I don't know. We have the surveyor I don't know if the surveyor is there or not. He was gonna, I thought he was gonna be there at the meeting tonight but might not.

Chairman Johnson: Is there anyone else on Zoom or in the room that who wish to speak in favor of the application? So, if there's no other person online or in the room to speak in favor of the application, then we'll start with those who are opposed to the application at this point. And we will start with the folks in this room and then we'll move to anybody else online at this point. Okay. So is there, do you folks have a plan here about somebody wants to speak generally for the group or state your name and your address and we'll move right along here.

John Schonfeldt (9820 118th St): My name is John Schoenfeld. My residence is at 9820 118th Street. I own a 120 acres on 118th St on the north side. We've put together the letter of protest and there was a group of us that got together. I think there's probably 50 some odd people that are opposed in the general area within 1000 feet requirement that was notified by mail that there's some further down the road up and down Ferguson. Our feeling is that we moved out here we bought that property and to 2020. It was my wife's uncles prior to that, many years. That property was with nine lots I hear him say 10 I don't quite understand what it shows nine.

Chairman Johnson: The acres that are kind of adjacent to it that they've incorporated into it.

John Schonfeldt (9820 118th St): That's just a two and a half acres tract? That was a nine-division subdivision when we purchased out here, we bought because we wanted to be in a rural farm community. Every track of ground there is at least forty acres or bigger. Every house that's in that area sits on at least forty acres or more. There's a lot of ag traffic up and down 118th St. Labor Day weekend and you were asking about a traffic count. There's hundreds and hundreds 1000s and 1000s of motorcycles up and down that road for three or four days. And other traffic.

Chairman Johnson: That's on 118th?

John Schonfeldt (9820 118th St): Abate does the big rally back there at Paradise Point. We're opposed to the fact that the county was thinking about even changing that plat. It was nine when the person bought it and we feel it should stay nine. And then they can come in off Ferguson. If they want five lots, they could probably make five lots and come off Ferguson and it looks like that would be possible. Our other opposition is four new driveways on 118th. Again, there's a lot of ag traffic. One of my neighbors does a lot of baling up and down the road. A lot of traffic then. There are cattle, hogs, chickens, everything you can imagine. Some of the neighbors are avid hunters and shooters, I think just south of this property, and maybe where I think it actually connects on the southwest corner. There's a guy that must have a shooting range back there because I hear a lot of guns going off and they're not just twenty-twos. One of the things that in the staff's comments that I picked up on, he's referred to two other subdivisions within a mile and be as kind of new to the area. Peaceful Scenic, Acres was one he mentioned to the west, and another subdivision to the south within a mile. And I'm thinking I don't know of any other subdivisions, and I have lived out there long enough, I know most of my neighbors and I don't know of any other subdivisions, well come to find out what one of them is down at Steffey's property which is a little further down the road and it's a boat storage building. It's not a subdivision at all. Now maybe it shows that way on a map. It's it's a boat storage. It was I mean that's what it was originally for and when the lake come in they capitalized on some boat right right now it's a basically a barn they park tractors and equipment, and the other one is Boone subdivision. And some of the others here can probably expand on this. But I guess it was a bait shop on Bergersen down by the old Grange Road. And it's a

house it's not even, I mean, there's one building there. So anyway, and then he makes reference to Lake Shore Estates, which I was kind of offended by that because that's exactly what we don't want in our neighborhood. The front part of that now the back part of that's a different story but the front part of that I understand that the police don't even want to respond to calls in that area. It's not a good area. So anyway, that's my thoughts. I think there's probably others that want a turn here. He mentioned that they do replats all the time. But I wonder if that happens when there's not much opposition to the replat? Or is there no opposition? Thank you.

Cody Steffey (12126 Harper Rd): My name is Cody Steffey. I live at 12126 Harper Rd. Ozawkie, Kansas, it's just down 118th a little ways. I grew up at 9541 118th, the farm down the road there. My boys will be the eighth generation on our farm. We raise cattle, and we're, I'm proud of that. I'm proud of the area that we came from. There's a couple things that concern me. And I would like to the committee to consider when you talked about natural features, and cultural attributes and sensitive habitats, living there my whole life, that valley that borders lot four, and I believe the adjacent landowner to the west can also speak to this. That is a high travel corridor for wildlife. Lots of deer cross through there. Lots of raccoons, coyotes, I've seen bobcat, through there. Turkeys, Quail. It's definitely going to directly affect the travel through that area. And I'm concerned and consider myself an avid outdoorsman and a conservationist. And that's important to me. And the other thing, I'll keep it pretty, pretty simple to touch on what John said, and to expand on the drives coming off 118th. When you go up to Ferguson, off of 118th, that's a really pretty steep hill there, and it's really rocky bluffs. It's going to create for some blind entrances or drives. And I can see that potentially being dangerous. And also, I think, we need to take into consideration complaints of agrarian practice, from suburban residential people and those, the lots that you guys are suggesting, those type of lots attracts people that come from the city and move out there. And if we get a bunch of complaints about fertilizer, manure spreading, traffic, maybe a little bit of mud on the roads, you know, there's also concern for increased pedestrian traffic on 118th. I got cattle that run along 118th, my uncle's got cattle that run on 118th. So, there's, I think those are valid concerns. And I would like the committee to take those into consideration if they would please do so. And I agree with John and everything that John said that I think this can be accomplished and they can get their five lots and still come off of Ferguson Road, like the existing plot was. I'm not objecting to houses being built there. But I mean, just objecting to the proposed replat. Thank you very much for your time.

Chairman Johnson: Next person.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Hello, my name is Bill Kramer.

Chairman Johnson: Your address?

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): My address is 12055 Ferguson Rd. I moved on to that location on the first day of April 1972. That means I've been on that hill before any of these people. I like it up on that farm. I lived in Oskaloosa. Oskaloosa is fine. I don't want to live in town. And now town is trying to encroach on me. Regarding these subdivisions that are being talked about. Boone came in here in the early 70s. He's going to make money selling fish bait, fishermen going to Lake Perry. Perry was big deal. I really don't understand why that is a subdivision. I don't understand why is that he built a garage on that property. He's got about ten feet of it on Jefferson County today. I guess he did that without a survey. But that don't have anything to do with this. I understand. Okay. Cody already talked about it. But it says down here whether they approves this amendment is made necessary because of changing or changing conditions to the area affected? Well, in my view it darn sure does change the conditions around the area. It really does. Then it goes on to say from the staff comment that this amendment is necessary to achieve the applicant's goals for the property. I would like to hear the applicant's goals for the property. Has the staff heard the applicant's goals for the property? Have they?

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Nobody's answering me. What are the goals from the applicant? Other than selling lots that we don't even know how they're going to be zoned? You can't put a single wide trailer house on them, I know that. But what are we going to have barns, doublewides, modular homes? People coming in here from every which direction to buy these lots and build on them. I live 1320 feet away from this intersection that's a quarter of a mile north. They will bother me, I guarantee it.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Now on the other side of this paper called staff analysis. It refers to something called Comprehensive Plan. And we saw a little sentence or two up there a minute ago that said Comprehensive Plan. What is a Comprehensive Plan? Is that just is that just a plan for whoever's in Planning and Zoning to fix something up so people

can move in here from every which direction and start building the houses? Are you more interested in the county than you are then those of us who live here? Want to answer that, please? I've been on that hill for 50 years. I like it right the way it is.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Mr. Chairman, would you like me to respond to these questions?

Chairman Johnson: Yeah Dustin, let's start with that.

Dustin Parks (Staff): So, to answer some folk's questions about the subdivisions, this is actually kind of an ideal case to describe the difference. So, a subdivision is a legally defined piece of property that is smaller than forty acres and has been divided. So, the Steffey subdivision we mentioned, is a legally defined subdivision. The idea of subdivision or the word subdivision tends to trigger in people's heads exactly what the original plan of this property is, right? You look at it and you say, okay, I'm picturing a cul-de-sac and a bunch of houses. And that's what a subdivision brings to mind. But in terms of zoning, all a subdivision legally is, is a platted piece of property that is less than 40 acres, and that's in Jefferson County. It's a platted piece of property of less than 40 acres. So, the Boone subdivision is a single lot subdivision, and it was created because of an incorrect boundary adjustment. And they had to go through the public hearing process to create it. The same thing with the Steffey subdivision to the west of this one. So that's what a subdivision is. Now with this one in particular, we're dealing with both in my description of where subdivisions are locally, we have the smaller lot subdivisions, but we also are dealing with the cul-de-sac idea like what people think of in their head as a subdivision. So, I just wanted to clarify what that was. As far as if the staff has heard the applicant's plan we have and their plan was to reduce the number of lots there, increase their size, to adhere to a more rural feel. And then to sell the lots. They want to I know that the applicant can speak to this, but I know they mentioned building their own home on the 10-acre lot because they'd like to move out to this area. But I will let the applicant expand more on their plan for that. And that comment in the staff report is referring to the rezoning those that list of criteria is the rezoning changing it from Rural Residential to Suburban Residential. It's not necessarily just the plat. So that's more of a record keeping thing that we do that we call the golden factors, it's a case Kansas State case precedent set. As far as what a Comprehensive Plan is, in this particular case, it's a publicly guided document that for us was approved in 2001. We've had a few different renditions of a Comprehensive Plan in Jefferson County. But all Plans take into account public comment over the course of many months. And then it's a document that is joined to guide land use, as to the overarching feel of the public at the time it was approved. And so, in this case, we're actually working on redoing the Comprehensive Plan, since ours is almost old enough to drink. And it doesn't meet what our current what the current economy looks like, it doesn't meet what current demographics look like, it doesn't meet any of those things. And we need it to be more in line with what's happening in Jefferson County. And so that's why we're looking at redoing it. But to answer your questions, specifically, no, it is not a document created for the planning or for the Planning and Zoning office, it's actually a document created for the public, for the public to be able to help guide Planning and Zoning decisions, and land use applications through public hearing process, which is why we're having this process now.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): So, planning and zoning, therefore, in your opinion, is something that is put together to benefit people who want to come in here and buy land?

Dustin Parks (Staff): To be honest, I'm not entirely sure where you got that from what I said. But no, that's not what planning and zoning is for. Planning and zoning is specifically for.....*Kramer interrupts Dustin's answer....*

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): I have another question I'd like to ask you.

Dustin Parks (Staff): May I answer your first question?

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Have at it.

Dustin Parks (Staff): So, planning and zoning is actually, the way I treat this Planning and Zoning office. And some of the folks in the audience can attest to this because we've helped them through this process is the Planning and Zoning office is a liaison between how the regulations that were approved by the County Commission with public input, and how the public needs to adhere to those regulations. So, when we deal with the public in terms of their application, we help guide them through how we see what they look what they're looking to do. And we say, okay, here's how you do that. Within the

regulations, the Planning and Zoning office doesn't decide these things. The Planning and Zoning office provides input based on our experience, our profession, according to the regulations, the decision, the final decision is always up to the elected officials. So, the Planning and Zoning office isn't designed to help people sell their land. Matter of fact, we can't take who owns the land into account at all. There are some folks in the audience whose subdivision was simply for family, and we have to treat it like they're going to sell it in the future. Because we can't take things like that into account, we have to look at what's going to happen to that land once it's divided. Family ties or not. So no, the Planning and Zoning office is not designated as a let's get you to pass this thing office. It's a tool for the public to be able to utilize the regulations and to present cases to the Planning and Zoning board. And then further to the County Commission for them to make a decision.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Like I said, so when planning and zoning says jump, I'm supposed to stand and salute.

Chairman Johnson: Sir, sir, no, we are not the boss. Your elected County Commissioners made the decision to have a Comprehensive Plan.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Tell your man to not act like he's the boss then and maybe I'll believe him.

Chairman Johnson: Do you have anything further to say sir?

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Yes, I do have something further to say. I want to know why planning and zoning spent so much time on this condition of surrounding neighborhood to use two Suburban Residential and one Suburban Residential and Cody's barn that they talked about, as an example of what is good to rezone this property the way he wants it rezoned. You're using something to justify this. It isn't justified itself in my opinion. So why is that there? Why is it? Why is it? I remember Bruce Boone. I remember the one room schoolhouse that set on that property, and there's people in this room that went to school in that schoolhouse. It had to be rezoned a lot of times. Okay, this property that he's calling Paradise Simmentals, was at one time zoned Rural Residential, either that or Suburban Residential. The boat storage thing collapsed. And then it was rezoned back to ag which it is zoned as ag right now, according to the assessor's office down here it is. I don't know.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): But why are you using those locations as something grandiose? Okay, to keep this zoning you're planning on doing? Make it look good so that the County Commissioners, Richard, and Lynn will approve it.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Mr. Chairman, would you like me to respond?

Chairman Johnson: Yes, Dustin.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Okay. I'm going to share my screen right quick. Maybe, there we go. Okay. So let me get to that slide right quick. To answer your question.....*Kramer interrupts Dustin's answer....*

Dustin Parks (Staff): And I can see. Yep, I'm working on getting it shared right now. There we go. Okay. So, to answer your question about the Steffey subdivision.*Kramer interrupts Dustin's answer....*

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): I know where it is, better than you.

Dustin Parks (Staff): This right here is that subdivision. If you can see that mouse moving. This is their Suburban Residential. That's what it is zoned. That's what they got it zoned because of its size. This is the Rural Residential. And that's what they got its zoned because of its size. The reason I mentioned it, is because it's within the distance of other subdivisions for this. Now, when I mentioned earlier, the LESA score, where I said we take the land evaluation, that actually in this particular case, the existence of Suburban Residential nearby doesn't actually factor into the scoring for this property, because we didn't score it, since it's not in an Ag Enhancement zone. So, the Steffey's having this Suburban Residential lot over here? While it is within a certain distance is not actually affecting the land use over here in terms of that zoning.

Cody Steffey (12126 Harper Rd): So why is it referenced? But why is it referenced?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Because I have to show if there are subdivisions nearby. That's all. When we go through another subdivision hearing in a month or so, we'll have another map that shows subdivisions nearby. It's an informational reference. That's it.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Well, you know, you guys when you put a map on the screen where I can see it. This blue area on your map that you're calling Paradise Point, that location is Steffey's house? I'm pretty sure it's not Suburban.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Yeah, that's what it's zoned. That's what its zoned. It may not be taxed, but that's what it's zoned.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Well, whatever it's worth I'm opposed to this. You talked about the roads coming off of lot number two and number three on 118th street. You better go out and take a look at that ditch you are thinking about about putting a driveway in because it looks a whole lot different than it does on that map. Thank you.

Chairman Johnson: Anybody else new that wants to speak?

Ed Lindsey (10485 Hardin Dr): My name is Ed Lindsay. I live at 10485 Hardin Dr. My main issue here is I knew when I bought my property 42 years ago, that that subdivision that is there was laid out. And my main interest here is if they rezone this, the people that own the property, have no investment. And if you make them put that road in there, they have to make some investment and it makes the lots sell. And if you have investment in something, you're going to spend more time taking care of it and getting it right. I'm not against housing, I'm not against them. If they own those lots, they can build anywhere on that forty they want. They don't have to subdivide it, but what they're doing is they're in Colorado, subdivide these, doesn't cost them anything. And they have to put no interest in it, and they sit back and make the money and I don't like that. I like somebody to some investment in the land.

Dave Steffey (11895 Ferguson Rd): I'm Dave Steffey. 11895 Ferguson Rd. I live right north of that. I know you don't want this, but I want to reiterate the same thing that these folks have said here myself. I bought my land. I knew it was a subdivision. I knew it was there. I knew where the road was going to come in. I think it should stay that way. I don't think you can build driveways on that rock ledge that rock ledge is nine foot tall. Good luck, hope you got an excavator because you are going to need it. Anyway, that's my opinion. I'm totally opposed to it. I don't care if they wanna build nine houses over there, but it needs to come off Ferguson Rd. Thank you.

Roger Bostwick (9578 110th St): Roger Bostwick. I'm at 9578 110th St. Just a mile south of this and it really doesn't affect me per se, but I am the trustee for the Ozawkie Township and Fire Board. The issue that I have is if they put the lots or the drives coming off 118th instead of Ferguson Road, it would be very difficult to get any firefighting equipment up that steep hill, that sharp turn on 118th isn't really that wide in that area. If they if they decide to read rezone as five lots, just combining some of the existing nine and still using the cul-de-sac would be much more efficient for firefighting equipment. As Cody mentioned earlier, the blind alley coming off blind drive coming down there off 118th St especially when the bikes are there there's there's accidents across 118 during during the rally, you know four or five different ones over the weekend just on the 118th so that would make that much more difficult but if they did leave the cul-de-sac they can rezone it with five lots with a cul-de-sac instead of nine but it would be a lot easier to get firefighting equipment in there. Only truck we could probably get up there would be the small brush truck and that wouldn't be very, very good for a structure fire.

Chairman Johnson: Thank you sir.

Mahlon Steffey (9541 118th St): Yeah, my name is Mahlon Steffey. I live down at 9541 118th street. I live down there where this boat storage is that that they're talking about? It ain't no boat storage anymore sir. I keep tractors and everything else in there. I do hay all summer long. I've got cattle all the way up and down the side of that road. I do not want to be living in the city sir. I just can't. This is ridiculous when I run it up and down that road with big trailers full of hay and stuff. I don't need those driveways to have to watch out for when I'm going up and down there with balers and rakes that take up a little more than 119th Street. I can't watch out for all these people coming from the city. I got the bikers dumped on me. Please don't dump this on me. I was never asked about that. And that that is a nightmare every year. Thank you very much.

Chairman Johnson: Any other new people before second comments are?

Cody Steffey (12126 Harper Rd): Thank you sir. One thing I forgot when I was talking. This is Cody Steffey again. One thing I forgot about to bring up was the NRCS office and if you look at lot four on that map, where that creek comes through there and we'd even put it in our letter the NRCS office has denied access across that creek and been told not to disturb that creek bed because of the sediment going into the lake and if you can't put a tube in and you can't destroy the earth around the creek that would make lot four virtually landlocked too, that's the other thing that concerns me. It cuts the corner of Lot 3 as well. Yeah, it gets quite a bit of drainage, and it does run pretty good. So that was what I had forgotten my apologies.

Chairman Johnson: Anybody else at this point? So, there's nobody online except the applicant? Is there anybody in the room who would like to speak neutrally to, or just to offer basic information on this case? Just thought I'd provide that opportunity. At this point, I want to give the applicant an opportunity for rebuttal.

Steve Knull (Applicant): Yeah, hello, can you hear me? Yes, I'm not on the greatest of computers. Anyway, I didn't know there were so many problems with this. It's why we have these meetings. And that's why we do things this way. So, we understand the problems with the people. And then we can work these things out. If it becomes a problem, and people would rather have the road off of Ferguson Road, maybe I can get with my surveyor, and we could do something like that. That wouldn't be, I wouldn't be opposed to that I'm not opposed to the road as the one gentleman said, for the nine lots, I just was more planning on building a house or a lot in the back, which would be property number four, and daughter, and my daughter or daughter would be on property number five. So, we didn't need the others, you know, their property. And I don't want nine lots around us, I really didn't think that was a good idea to have all those people living in that forty acres. So, it's trying to alleviate some of the pain and pressure of that. And then there's also the 10th lot, which would be done on Road 118 and leave it like it is best still could end up getting a driveway on it. I know the one young man was opposed to having because of the wildlife, I can understand that too. Because I've walked all that I know how beautiful it is down there. And I can understand what the while I've seen the deer and I've seen the wildlife in there. So, I surely don't want to tear that up. But change this from ten to nine would definitely alleviate some pressure. As far as driving pressure goes and people a lot of people, I'm sorry to five lots. I thought that was a good idea. I still like to do something like that. But let's see about what your requirements are. I can make it so one property goes off of Ferguson Road and alleviate a driveway on 118. That would be lot number one, make the other driveway lot number five come off Ferguson Road, then there still be three driveways coming off of 118 instead of four. We don't know yet where we're going to put the house, I'd like to put the house on top of lot number four, I know that it would be hard to put a driveway up that I looked at that canyon down there and that drainage. It can be built there there can be a bridge or culverts put in there. And it can be engineered to flow, the way the land flows and the water that goes through there could be it could be that the culverts would have to be engineered, and all that. I understand how all that works. So that the water flow doesn't change, and it doesn't do any damage. We put a nice road in there instead of tearing the place up. Not in the business of tearing places up. And I've built houses for 35 years, so I'm not going to come in there and make something really ugly. There won't be any motorhomes. There might be an RV in there during the building process. There won't be any, what did the one guy or the one fellow was concerned about, mobile homes and stuff like that. I'm not if I sell the other three lots, but we keep the two. I don't have control over those three. And what they put in there and I don't know what the county zoning is for mobile homes is. I'm not sure if they are allowed to put those in there or not anyway. That's up to that landowner. Those three landowners that would be their decision on what they want to put in there. And they have to get approval from the county for, they have to do their road approved there have their driveways have to be applied. approved by the county, that drainage and their driveways has to be approved by the road department. All that I'm sure would be taken care of legally. There's not going to just come in, nobody's going to come in and just build stuff and throw stuff up there. It's against the law. We like the country feeling too. I definitely don't want to offend anybody, as it looks like we have. But I thought the place looked sort of offensive to myself in the first place, but nine lots and then there's ten. If you really look at the other two acres below, there's still going to be a driveway on that two acres below. No matter how we do this. If we keep the nine lots build the road with the call the sack, then we still don't have that acreage below in that plot plan. So that's a separate acreage, goodness, still going to be a road down there no matter what. So, I don't know, that's probably the best way I can address that. I can't think. If anyone has any questions that they'd want to ask, I'd be glad to try and answer as best I can.

Chairman Johnson: I'll open up to Planning Commissioners at this point, if they have questions for any of the presenters, for the applicant, or other people who have offered testimony tonight?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Mr. Chairman, to reference the mobile homes, somebody from the public had mentioned this earlier. We don't allow singlewides. But there is actually, you could do restrictive covenants on the subdivision, so that you know only homes of x square footage or more can be built that kind of thing. So, if you wanted to protect the other lots, that is a way to do that. If that's something that interests, you in the future. Just as a general knowledge for anyone who wants to do that there's you know, you can put restrictive covenants on subdivision rules, so that you can kind of control what's built there as a developer.

Secretary Scherer: I believe Cody, maybe was the first one who brought it up, do you have any idea how many drives there are on 118th Street in that mile?

Cody Steffey (12126 Harper Rd): In that mile? There's three. There's only three drives there and it's probably a mile and a half.

Commissioner Phillips: Question for Dustin if I could? If the zoning, if this didn't go through and the nine lots remained, is there anything that would require the applicant to use the road? Or could the applicants still go ahead and get driveways out onto 118th Street?

Dustin Parks (Staff): So actually, yes, on that plat, this is one of those restrictive covenants I was talking about. On the plat itself. There is actually a note and requirement on the plat that says no other entrances to county roads except off of the road from Ferguson. So, as it's presently platted, everything except that two-acre piece, the piece that's not actually a part of the original subdivision, the one in the northwest corner by the plat must use that cul-de-sac road to get to Ferguson Road.

Chairman Johnson: Does that answer your questions, Steve?

Commissioner Phillips: Yes. And that's unusual.

Dustin Parks (Staff): It is. But it's on the plat. So, it's a covenant on the plat.

Chairman Johnson: Are there other Commissioners that have questions of participants at this point?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Mr. Chairman, actually, I wanted to if I could, could I show that slide right quick? Okay, alright so it's kind of hard to see, but right up here is part of it. I had to cut some of it off to be able to show the plots, but no access is to be allowed onto County Road except by road marked. And then this over here says off of private road so those lots can only use this road as it's currently platted.

Cody Steffey (12126 Harper Rd): I have a question pertaining to that plat. Is there anything that prevents somebody from building a house on say there's nine lots there now, but if they want wanted lot one and lot two, is there, is there anything rule against somebody buying lot one and lot two and put a house on it? They still, I mean, they, to me that way that looks, they can still get five?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Um, yeah, technically, as long as they're not going across utility easements. We've done that in the past where, you know, especially in like the village districts where they've got the smaller lots. We've let people you know, if you own two contiguous lots like that, and there's no utility easement splitting them, people can build over those property lines, and we just note it on the building permit and kind of, you know, signify that it's one zoning lot. So that is possible as long as for like, for instance, in this particular case, lots one and two, lots three and four, five, six, seven, eight and nine. There are no utility easements in between those lots. So, yeah, that that is entirely feasible with this.

Chairman Johnson: I'm about ready to close the public hearing portion at this point. I'm got one other question. Dustin, can you explain the process of a protest petition?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Yeah, we usually do that at the end of the at the hearing. You want me to do that now?

Chairman Johnson: Yeah.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Okay. So, a protest petition works as such. If there's anyone in the public who disagrees with the Planning Commission's decision, they can contact the County Clerk's Office. We have the file on our website as well, for a protest petition. And you follow the instructions on the protest petition, it requires a copy of your deed and a signature protest petitions are only accepted for people who live within 1000 feet, not live, people who own land within 1000 feet, but only 20% of the land ownership in that area is needed to activate a protest petition. And what that means is, once a protest petition has been accepted, and once 20% of the landowners in that 1000 foot have signed on to a protest petition, then what that does is triggers a majority requirement vote. Technically, by state law, it's a three fifths vote. But since we only have three County Commissioners, it triggers a majority vote in our situation. So, for example, I'm going to just kind of make up a few numbers here just for this sake of argument. If within 1000 feet of this property, there are 500, I know it's too much, but if there are 500 acres within 1000 feet on all sides of this property, landownership wise, then once 20% of the ownership of that 500 acres, even if one person owns 20% of the land within that 1000-foot radius signs a protest petition, then the protest petition is valid and triggers that majority vote.

Chairman Johnson: Matt.

Secretary Scherer: He means unanimous vote.

Cody Steffey (12126 Harper Rd): So, can we get a list of people within 1000ft, of the landowners Dustin?

Dustin Parks (Staff): We usually put that in the County Clerk's Office, they've got a list. We usually like the day after a case, we'll give the County Clerk a list of who we mailed the letter to initially, that's the people that are within that 1000-foot radius. And then that way they can get that form. And there's usually a map and an ownership list down in the Clerk's office. If you or if anyone wants to sign a protest petition, we usually ask that they get the protest petition off the website or contact the Clerk's office to see how they would prefer to get it from there. And then they have within 14 days of the close of the case, to turn in the protest petition.

Chairman Johnson: Okay, I'm gonna close the public hearing portion at this point and see if Planning Commissioners have further questions at this point for staff on this particular case. Seeing none at this point than the chairpersons in position to ask if there's a recommendation on this particular case at this point.

Chairman Johnson: Matt.

Secretary Scherer: If I understood the applicant correctly, he's willing to consider revising the proposed plat to address some of the concerns that have been raised. If I'm correct in that understanding, I would suggest we consider postponing for a month or two, I guess. In our current schedule, I have two months, but I want to make sure that I understand the applicant's position correctly before I make that motion.

Steve Knull (Applicant): Yes. Can you hear me, okay? Yeah, I think one of the biggest concerns was the road, 118th getting hit with a lot of traffic and digging up all that ditch down there and making driveways. So, I wouldn't be opposed to putting a driveway in between lots one, two, three and lot five, access to all five, it would be a straight line instead of a cul-de-sac with a curve in it like the way it was. If that would be acceptable to everybody. I still would like to keep the lot sizes bigger. I just as soon have less lots there, then what was there before? Because the ten there is there now sort of too much.

Jan Fitzgerald (Applicant): My concern was if he did that, did the straight road. I don't know if you see me, I'm in here in the corner. Anyway, if you did that straight road, I'm looking at the final plat here. If you did that straight road, then you're going to have more traffic coming off Ferguson Road, which is a main road, and I would think a lot more safety concerns than it would be on 118th Street.
greater visibility off first.

Cody Steffey (12126 Harper Rd): There is greater visibility off of Ferguson.

Secretary Scherer: Mam, I certainly understand your position, but I think it's probably safer to have one outlet, then to have three or four on a road that's more used by agricultural implements and traffic....inaudible...motorcycles. But under that condition, Mr. Chairman, I would move that we postpone consideration of this application pending the applicant's revision of the plat until the next meeting, whenever that happens to be.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Johnson: Do I have a second from a Planning Commissioner?

Commissioner Rudolph: I would like to second that, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Johnson: Further discussion on Matt's motion to move this to the May meeting?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Mr. Chairman? I would recommend, while not a board member, I would recommend not putting a time limitation on to it to allow the applicant the time to get that. And I would say they would have to reapply with a new proposed plat since this is a preliminary and final replat in the same hearing, we are technically denying the final plat with this. And so, I would recommend that you consider not giving a date or setting it within a certain timeframe like, you know, to come back within six months or something like that. But it is entirely up to you. Since we are doing a preliminary and final plat hearing at the same time.

Secretary Scherer: I guess I'm looking at it as the fourth alternative presented by staff to continue the application for further analysis. Perhaps that's not what Dustin intended by that option.

Dustin Parks (Staff): No, entirely it is, just not with a deadline. A forcing a May hearing on it. But like I said, not the board, not the board member that is entirely up to you.

Secretary Scherer: Mr. Chairman, I move to striking the deadline on my motion.

Chairman Johnson: Does the second agree with that?

Commissioner Rudolph: Yes, I do. Thank you.

Chairman Johnson: Further discussion on the motion before us?

Commissioner Phillips: I'd say I'm gonna vote for it but only because the applicant is willing to do this. And I hope that the opponents of this appreciate the goodwill that the applicant has demonstrated in doing this. I think that's significant.

Secretary Scherer: I'd like to add, that's the only reason I made the motion.

Chairman Johnson: Further discussion on the motion by Planning Commissioners. Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion race their hands. Seeing an unanimous agreement, then this case will be in abeyance until and hopefully a worked out agreement between the applicant and those opposed.

Votes were taken by Ayes and Nays as follows:

Paul Johnson Chairman	Gale Rudolph Vice Chair	Matt Scherer Secretary	Stephen Phillips	Tim Benyshek	Tiffany Asher	Vacant
DNV	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	--

Motion passed 5-0

Chairman Johnson: Two or three comments about this process. One, we're in the process of updating our Comprehensive Land Use Plan, adopted 2001, we had some problems in the sense that we didn't, the Comp Plan is kind of a theoretical,

it's a conceptual idea from the from the community about, you know, development and Jefferson County and what you know, the rural and what people want, you know, to hold on to, you know, the values this county, but to put them into force, we have to adopt Zoning and Subdivision regulations to do that. And in this case, we didn't do that until 2009. And there's been some incongruities between the general philosophical flavor of what the Comp Plan said, and how we came up with Zoning and Subdivision regs. So now we're in the process of kind of redoing this, updating that Comprehensive Plan. We will go out to the community and get, you know, full public input. And, you know, get a sense of how can we handle development if it's, you know, some of its inevitable in Jefferson County, and given the community nature and suburban nature, you know, the metropolitan areas around Jefferson County, so it's it's not an easy task, and it's something that we're going to invite, you know, involvement. The second comment I would make is that, it and I guess, this is the 18th year, I've been on the Planning Commission, and there is kind of an insidious nature about the fact that if there is a suburban development close by, or a rural residential, you know, close by to agricultural land, and then the thinking is that's already already been breached. And so, and that was brought up a bit in some of the testimony tonight, about you know, what sets the stage for further development in areas. When we adopted the Comprehensive Plan, our hope was to really encourage development around our nine little cities within three miles of that, and really try and hold on to kind of a rural, the rural nature and agricultural landscape of Jefferson County. And I think all of us are going to have to be involved in how we come up with a next stage of holding on to that flavor that many of us moved to this county for, and how that there will be development, and how best to accommodate that in the least, intrusive nation. So that's a bit long winded, but you know, I think, the next year or two, writing a new Comprehensive Plan. The last thing I'll say is, the Planning Commission is only a recommending body. It is your elected County Commissioners that make the final decisions. And that's why I asked about the protest petition, if there's enough people who are close enough to this development, that sign a petition, that you have to have the full three zero vote out of the County Commission to make that, you know, we're just a recommending body is a play it is the County Commissioners that make the final decision. Go ahead, sir.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): Has the County Commission ever not approved what you recommend?

Chairman Johnson: Yes, there have been cases. Yes, indeed.

Bill Kramer (12055 Ferguson Rd): How long ago?

Dave Steffey (11895 Ferguson Rd): I know you're trying to wrap up. I think one thing that would make us feel a lot better about changes and development, is if there was more restrictions on what can be done. You know, the last thing we want is a bunch of double wide trailers going on these five lots. And I know they can't do a single line, but they can put up in doublewides and it's gonna affect the valuation.

Cody Steffey (12126 Harper Rd): I have a question regarding the protest petition. Since it was tabled for a later date not to be determined, do we still need to file the protest petition within 14 days? And my follow up question would be, how will we be notified of the next meeting when this comes back up again? Will it be posted on the street?

Chairman Johnson: Absolutely. It will be. Well, I guess this question would go to Dustin, will that when this does come back up? Will there or won't be a second round of letters sent?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Yes. It'll, since it was continued. It's, we treat it essentially like a new application. So yes, we'll send letters back out to the people within 1000 feet again, to let them know, and it'll have the updated map and all that stuff. What we don't do is we don't send letters for the County Commission hearings; we notify when that is like if this had been approved or denied. We would say okay, the County Commission hearing is on this date. We don't send out public notification for the County Commission hearing because they meet every single, you know, every Monday, and it's on their published agendas. But for when cases come back up like this, if they're on the agenda, we'll resend out public comment unless it was if the motion had been for tabling, we table that to a specific date, and then we don't send out public notification. But since this doesn't have a date, we'll resend out public notification.

Chairman Johnson: Yes.

Public speaking (not sure who) I want to say I appreciate the owners willing to work with us.

Chairman Johnson: And that's, we're trying to facilitate some of that dialogue.

Public speaking (not sure who) We're not against somebody building there and living there and taking care of it, we are against somebody just using it as a springboard to make money.

Chairman Johnson: Well, there, there's limits to what this Planning Commission could do about that. And we've run into that all the time. You know, I mean, people come in and say, well, I'm going to divide, I'm going to sell it to my daughter in law or you know, like, I'm gonna move my parents in on this thing, or whatever. And the planning laws don't work that way. I meant if it's subdivided for particular use, then it's open for sale. So, there's a limit to what you know, that's not how the laws are written. So, we'll move on to the next item on tonight's agenda. You're welcome to stay if you want to watch sausage being made.

Steve Knull (Applicant): Can you hear me now? I guess we're done? We'll get back with you all?

Dustin Parks (Staff): Once you formulate a plan just have your surveyor contact our office so we can discuss the plan and we can go from there.

Steve Knull (Applicant): Okay, yes, I'll get with the surveyor, and we'll work these things out. Okay.

Chairman Johnson: Thank you, sir.

Steve Knull (Applicant): Thanks for hearing our case.

Chairman Johnson: Oh, well. So do we have anything on the general staff report outside of the deferrals.

Dustin Parks (Staff): There you go. No, you were muted. I accidentally clicked mute. I'm sorry. If I knew I could do that, I'd have done it a long time ago Paul.

Chairman Johnson: So, anything else for general staff report?

Dustin Parks (Staff): We don't have an April meeting. Matt had made a pretty good recommendation that we probably should move to postpone the reorganization of the board until May. I thought the bylaws said April, he said they said March so that's obviously something we probably need to clean up to.

Secretary Scherer: Yeah, I thought that said April as well. When I looked and it says March.

Dustin Parks (Staff): So yes, we probably should, at some point, have a motion to move the reorganization from March to May.

Chairman Johnson: And are we going to get into this issue about if you abstain then your vote is counted as an affirmative vote.

Dustin Parks (Staff): That's between you all. The beauty of this is I don't decide on bylaws. Literally I cannot decide the bylaws for the board because it shows bias.

Chairman Johnson: Well, how about flagging that issue without a recommendation.

Dustin Parks (Staff): I can do that. I can flag the issue. But yeah, we don't have anything for the April hearing. I'm pretty sure we're gonna have something in May, we might even have this one again in May. It kind of depends on what they can get done in the meantime and I would like to discuss some of the stuff with the Comprehensive Plan but like I said, I'd like to be a little bit more informed as to what's happened over the last year with that so I'm doing the research there. The other thing, like I said, the bylaws, but I think that's it. Text amendment. Yeah. So, we'll have gone over that in May as well I guess because I'll be caught up to that by them. That's the 2021-01 Right?

Chairman Johnson: And we're, I know I read the minutes but where, does that deal with the right of way?

Secretary Scherer: It is in the minutes because I asked last time but I don't remember what the answer was.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Yeah, the right of way one was sent to the County Commission, but they postponed it until we got a little caught up in our office so that I could discuss it with them and they could make a decision. The other one involved the agricultural lot splits. The requiring the forty acres to be shown on platting and that kind of thing.

Chairman Johnson: But didn't, didn't we? We agreed on option two. And that was the one that that was tied to incorporating it into the Comprehensive Plan, in the sense of looking at and right of way needs across the county in different developments. So that's in advance.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Yes, by far, I've, I have had at least four people per day, and I'm not being hyperbolic talk about land division since I started. We have been absolutely slammed in this office. The fact that we don't have an April meeting is something I'd like to capitalize on, which is why I suggested we have a May meeting instead.

Chairman Johnson: Well, do you think that then in the May meeting, and we can count on a recommendation from you for an RFP for the Comp Plan?

Dustin Parks (Staff): I doubt we'll be that far. But I'm hoping to be very close because I don't know enough about what she has done so far to give you an honest answer right now.

Chairman Johnson: I think Kelly did a lot.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Kelly has done a lot.

Chairman Johnson: And you look at the memo about the incongruities between the Comp Plan and Zoning and Subdivision regs. And then she had a memo on kind of thoughts about how to lay out an RFP. So, you know, there's a lot of groundwork done by her before she left.

Dustin Parks (Staff): But I'd like to be familiar with it before I affirm, especially with you, that I will present you with something you can vote on.

Chairman Johnson: All right. Well, at least I want to keep the discussion going. You know, I'm not sure that I absolutely needed a definite timeline, you know, a final date. But, you know, this, this is something that could drag on a while, and, and preferably. You know, we we set some timelines, goals to, you know, to move on this. That's, that's only my comment. Go ahead Matt.

Secretary Scherer: Before we leave old business, I would like to make a motion to postpone the reorganization of the Planning Commission until the May meeting just because the bylaws do say we do it tonight.

Chairman Johnson: Do I have a second on that motion from a Commission member?

Commissioner Benyshek: Sure. I'll second that.

Chairman Johnson: Thanks, Tim. Any other thoughts about that? Is it a certainty then that this will be dealt with in May?

Secretary Scherer: Sure, hope so. We will only be two months late then.

Chairman Johnson: But your motion is to move it off March period?

Secretary Scherer: No to May.

Chairman Johnson: Thank you. Further discussions on that? Seeing none, all those in favor? Raise your hand. Okay. That passes unanimously.

Votes were taken by Ayes and Nays as follows:

Paul Johnson Chairman	Gale Rudolph Vice Chair	Matt Scherer Secretary	Stephen Phillips	Tim Benyshek	Tiffany Asher	Vacant
DNV	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	--

Motion passed 5-0

Chairman Johnson: Dustin, do you have any new business for us.

Dustin Parks (Staff): Not that I haven't already covered. Well, that is not true. I apologize. We are when I was here before we were looking at kind of adjusting our guesthouse regulations to allow for more things like mother in law's quarters, that kind of thing to make it easier for folks to build an accessory dwelling on their property, but also to keep it within you know, to stop people from having multiple houses on their property there. And we're probably going to be bringing something like that this year, I'm researching some of the changes. And I think that would make things easier for some of the citizens in Jefferson County. We're getting a lot of those requests right now. And I only see that increasing as the baby boomer generation continues to age, I only see that that increasing in terms of requiring places for family and friends to live. So, I'd like to kind of head that off at the pass.

Chairman Johnson: So, we're going to reengage in the tiny house.

Dustin Parks (Staff): No, I did not say that word. The thing is, is we settled that when we when we had our meeting. So, this is specifically about accessory dwellings.

Chairman Johnson: And does that apply to specialty crop interns?

Dustin Parks (Staff): It does actually. Yeah, that's one of the things that we want to lump in there.

Chairman Johnson: I know there's some interest in Jeff County for that.

Dustin Parks (Staff): I mean it wouldn't be multiples, it'd be one, you know, an additional accessory dwelling unit for that purpose. But right now, the guest house is pretty much just you know, if I wanted to come stay at Paul's house for a couple months, and he had a guest house, I could do that. But that's about it. So, we want to kind of expand on that a little bit.

Chairman Johnson: So, are you gonna bring us the draft on that in May?

Dustin Parks (Staff): I might. But it's uh, it just kind of depends on the on the public hearing load we have for May. If we're going to be talking about the Comp Plan, and we're going to be talking about the bylaws and we've got the organization that's going to be a big conversation because there's a lot to it. So, if we have a light caseload in May, I might but if not, I'll wait till a little bit later.

Chairman Johnson: Sounds great. Anything else on your new business list?

Dustin Parks (Staff): That is all I can remember at this point. I'll remember something as soon as we're done

Chairman Johnson: Well, the Chairperson would accept a motion for adjournment at this point.

Commissioner Phillips moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Asher seconded. All said aye.

Item 9. Adjournment – 8:46 PM

Minutes taken by: _____
Erin George

Approved: _____
Date

Chairman: _____
Paul Johnson

Secretary: _____
Matt Scherer III

DRAFT