

1
2
3 **PLANNING & ZONING**
4 **COMMISSION MEETING**
5 **Special Joint Work meeting w/ Jefferson County P & Z.**
6 August 30th, 2017
7 7:00 p.m.
8 **Meeting Minutes**

9
10 **Call to order:** Jefferson County P & Z Chairman Michael Clark, at 7:06 p.m.

11 **Present at the meeting: Jefferson County P & Z Staff:** Naysha Foster, Ione Hansen,
12 Brittany Simmons, and Ian Zollinger. **Jefferson County P & Z Commission Members-**
13 **Chairman** Michael Clark, Bill Stoddart, Susanne Woods, Byron Evans, and Ed
14 **Mortenson. City of Rigby Staff:** Kevin Hathaway. **City of Rigby P & Z Commission**
15 **Members-** Chairman Char Finlayson, Mike Wilder, Brett Ellsworth, Connie Moore, and
16 Dan Stowell.

17 The work meeting began with the purpose of discussing the issues to be addressed for the
18 update of the “Area of Impact” zone, at approximately 7:02 p.m.

19
20 **City of Rigby Adm. Hathaway** briefly summarized the issues related to the current size
21 and requirements of the “area of Impact.” Discussed was the importance and urgency
22 with which to move forward and get a new map and joint ordinances in place so that the
23 City of Rigby would not continue struggling with development issues taking place in the
24 county. The development on the fringe area of the city is especially difficult to manage
25 because the residents of the high-density subdivisions adjacent to the city, use and benefit
26 from the city infrastructure and services, at the expense of the city residents.

27
28 Proactive planning to minimize the current problems, and implement good planning
29 practices for future growth, has never been more necessary. The county needs the tools to
30 support the city’s development codes of new developments in the area of impact.

31
32 There was general discussion related to whether there would have to be an additional
33 “area of impact” commission to administer the area of impact. After some discussion, it
34 was generally agreed that that would not be necessary.

35
36 **Chairman Clark** felt any agreement should be based on the City comprehensive plan,
37 with reference to the county comprehensive plan.

38
39 More discussion about what the city’s vision for development in the future was. Other
40 general discussion about how long the area of impact plan should be in effect for.
41 Discussed some of the obstacles in the past, that have contributed to the current problems.
42 Talked about the unused capacity of the city water and sewer infrastructure, and plans for
43 upgrades and developments.

44
45 The consensus through the discussions was that there was a need to update the area of
46 impact map and ordinances, but that it would require more review of the city

47 infrastructure, and comprehensive plan before any plan could be advanced and
48 implemented. It was discussed that the benefit of growth and eventual annexation into the
49 city would not just be water and sewer connections. The higher density growth also
50 required wider, safer road corridors to accommodate the higher density. Storm drainage
51 and other emergency services benefitting county residents was also discussed.

52
53 Basically, the area of impact is a tool for the growth of the city in the future. All were
54 generally pleased that the city and county were willing to work together and solve this
55 issue. That has not always been the case in the past.

56
57 We as planning groups, need to be directing the placement of developments such as
58 schools, subdivisions, commercial growth, etc., in areas that are best suited for that
59 growth. We should not be trying to “reactively” respond to try and catch up to the
60 development after it takes place. Also discussed if the city wanted to grow residentially,
61 commercially, or industrially. Consensus was that the city wants to be prepared for
62 growth in all those areas in the future, since all those types of growth will probably
63 happen.

64
65 People are upset about the additional challenges for growth, once the property is annexed
66 into the city, or if they want to build in the current city limits. There are concerns of
67 higher taxes and costs. The response was that the development costs are competitive
68 when you consider that the higher density allowed in the city as opposed to the county,
69 was an advantage for developers. For example, in the county you can build one home per
70 acre. In the city, you could build up to three homes on one acre, building lots that cost
71 \$30,000 in the county that would require an additional cost to drill a well and install a
72 sewer system, compare with a city lot that can likely be sold for twice that amount or
73 more, and be connected to city utilities for \$6,000.

74
75 The group discussed when another meeting could be scheduled for. It was decided that
76 the best date for **the next meeting of the group would be October 18th, 2017 at 7 p.m.,**
77 **at the Jefferson County Courthouse.** A list of information requested for discussion for
78 the next meeting is listed below.

79
80 **City:**

- 81 1) Show current water and sewer services on a map.
- 82 2) Show other current utilities, (infrastructure?), that can be offered by the city.
- 83 3) Show any future plans, on a separate map for these utilities.
- 84 4) Show desired growth and plans for this growth. (?)
- 85 5) Bring in sort of a comprehensive plan with a new vision for the city. (?)
- 86 6) Figure out incentives for developers to come to the city.
- 87 7) Figure out what may be driving away developers and businesses.

88
89 **County:**

- 90 1) Show where developments in the county are going.
- 91 2) Show current growth.

92 3) What are the county's plans to accommodate these higher areas of growth?
93 Roads, EMS, potential street upgrades and connecting "backbone" utilities in new
94 subdivisions? (Subdivisions within one mile of the city boundaries.)
95

96 The meeting concluded at about 9:30 p.m.
97

98 Attest: Connie Moore
99

100 Dated: 3/18/2017
101

102 Signed: [Signature]
103 City of Rigby Planning and Zoning
104

105 Dated: 3/18/2017