Planning & Zoning Committee

Planning Meeting

February 29<sup>th</sup>, 2015

7:45 A.M.

PRESENT: Supervisors Egan, Kriescher, Keller, Thompson, Gabert. Jerry Bougie – Planning Director, Brian O'Rourke – Associate Planner, Cary Rowe – Zoning Administrator, Dean Kaderabek – G.I.S. Systems Analyst, Candace Bauer – Code Enforcement Officer.

1. <u>Minute Approval – December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2015, January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup>, February 1<sup>st</sup>, and February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016.</u>

Motion to only approve the minutes by L. Kriescher. Seconded by M. Gabert. Motion carried 5-0.

2. <u>Staff report on Farmland Preservation Plan update and Committee review and action on Public Participation Plan.</u>

B. O'Rourke stated that State Statutes require the County to adopt a Public Participation Plan prior to conducting any meetings with regard to updating the Farmland Preservation Plan. Once County Board adopts the plan a Steering Committee will be formed to assist with the project.

Motion to forward the Public Participation Plan for the Farmland Preservation Plan update project by M. Gabert. Seconded by C. Thompson. Motion carried 5-0.

There was no further discussion of this item.

## 3. <u>Committee review and action on proposed 3 year County Land Information Plan</u>.

J. Bougie provided a background of the plan, indicating that the State changed the Plan from five years to three years.

D. Kaderabek provided an amended page of the plan detailing the five projects and budget estimates within the plan.

J. Bougie stated that due to the large number and various professions of the Land Records Council that the group could not meet prior to the Committee reviewing the proposed Plan, therefore the Committee's motion to approve should be contingent on the Land Records Council approval at their March 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Motion to approve the proposed 3 year County Land Information Plan contingent on approval by the Land Records Council by C. Thompson. Seconded by R. Keller. Motion carried 5-0.

There was no further discussion of this item.

## 4. Discussion on procedure for removal of property from floodplain.

C. Bauer explained the procedures required for removal of property from the 100 year floodplain. This can be done prior to construction or post construction.

The Committee questioned whether or not the County required an unnecessary zoning change for removal of a home from floodplain of a property owner which was during the January public hearing, and whether or not staff should inform owners of the potential of banks requiring flood insurance when building in the floodplain.

B. O'Rourke stated that the zoning change in January the Committee was inquiring about was required in order for the owner to be officially removed from floodplain, and that it was done post construction, which is allowed. County staff is also not responsible for informing property owners of whether or not they will be required to pay flood insurance, as that is a matter between the owner and their bank.

There was no further discussion of this item.

## 5. <u>Discussion on landscaping requirements of Chapter 23, County Zoning</u> <u>Ordinance</u>.

C. Rowe stated that staff has been enforcing the landscaping requirements of Chapter 23 for approximately four years and it has been determined that some amendments are needed. Staff will be developing the necessary amendments in the next few months and will bring this item back before the Committee at a future Planning meeting for any required action.

There was no further discussion of this item.

6. <u>Discussion on process for introducing town zoning change applications at County</u> <u>Board meetings</u>. T. Egan stated that after the January County Board meeting, during which he brought various town zoning changes to the floor for a vote, a fellow County Board member reminded him that per Chapter 8 of the County's General Code the County Board member for which the proposed town zoning change is located is required to bring that item to the floor for a vote. Therefore he is asking staff if there is a method of making this process and requirement simpler for the County Board.

B. O'Rourke stated that staff has discussed this issue and in the future can determine which County Board member is responsible for the town zoning change and place their name on the paperwork that is forwarded to the County Clerk. Further, a memo can be sent to the entire County Board regarding this matter so that they are made aware in advance of the procedural change, and a memo can also be sent each month to any County Board member that has a proposed town zoning change taking place in their district so that they are aware of it prior to the County Board meeting. Staff will also discuss this issue with the County Clerk in an effort to also have the name of the responsible Board member listed next to the agenda item detailing the proposal that her office sends out each month to the Board.

There was no further discussion of this item.

Motion to adjourn by M. Gabert. Seconded by L. Kriescher. Motion carried 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 A.M.

Brian O'Rourke – Recording Secretary