

December 3, 2013

Chair Steve Heick called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm.

Those present were Tony Johnson, Sid Eder, Kenny Cada and guest Murray Stanton.

Michelle discussed the code. The previous attorney wanted very specific language so that there are no misinterpretations. We may want to modify similar uses which gives us some flexibility. There may be some errors in the current code.

Michelle had many ideas that their department had discussed. A few of the ideas were:

- Add museum in all the zones as permitted (or conditionally permitted)
- Clarify accessory uses in the zones
- Allow water treatment plants in every zone
- Accessory cottage house - loosen up with duplexes which are currently CUP to become administrative zoning permits (AZP)
- Considering where waste treatment plants should be allowed
- Utility structures to be allowed with AZP
- Allow unlit towers as accessory uses within AZP
- Rural residential to allow agronomy i.e. farming
- Rural residential currently allows 1,600 sq ft/building for processing to increase to 3,500 sq ft/building
- Suburban residential to include parks and residential
- Commercial zoning to get rid of outdoor storage restrictions
- RV Parks to be allowed in commercial zoning
- Add mini storage to commercial zoning
- Allow residential when attached to a structure (ie restaurant with apartment on top)
- Manufacturing - should it be allowed outside a building if it was appropriate?
- Should service yards and stations be allowed as CUP in Industrial?
- Should retail be allowed in an industrial zone if the business wants to sell their wares?
- Put caretaker housing in industrial zone with conditions
- Add public buildings and utility structures in industrial
- Don't allow solid waste in industrial - maybe allow with CUP?
- Under mineral resources - get rid of the annual registration
- Section 4.05 on Towers - would like to get rid of the automatic lien
- Put yurts on as CUP. They are not permanent residential as they don't meet any of the building codes (currently treated as tents)

Public comment:

Murray Stanton was in support of the changes suggested as less regulation may be better. Maintain necessary regulations only.

In Ag Forest, loggers are upset that buildings are not considered ag for taxing purposes. It was suggested that they talk to the legislators as the state only exempts ag buildings, not buildings for logging purposes.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 with the next meeting on January 21, 2014.

