

STEERING COMMITTEE

Meeting #5 Summary



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A Plan For Our Future, Rooted In Our Past

MEETING INFORMATION

Date: April 14, 2022

Time: 6:00-7:30 PM

Location: Commissioners Chambers (415 East Main Street, Emmett) and Zoom

ATTENDEES

Steering Committee Members

- ✓ Nita Barnard
- ✓ James England
- ✓ Steven Ethington
- ✓ Glenn Flaherty
- Palla Garringer
- Walker Harrison
- ✓ Jon Robertson
- ✓ Dan Spanfelner
- Teena Turner
- ✓ Brad Turpen
- ✓ Justin Vickery
- ✓ Stephanie Weldon

County Planning Team

- ✓ Jennifer Kharrl, Planning Director
- ✓ Michelle Barron, Associate Planner
- ✓ Neal Capps, Director of Roads & Bridges

Consultant

- ✓ Olivia Cvetko, Logan Simpson
- ✓ Kelly Naumann, Logan Simpson

This meeting was open to the public to listen; however no public comment was taken.

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome and Information

- Olivia Cvetko (Logan Simpson) started the meeting and walked through the Public Outreach Results from the in-person meeting and online survey results.
- See attached presentation for details.

Discussion

Possible revisions to the Vision

- Maybe specify something about water
- Can't get much more detailed than what it is
- Address issues with more actionable steps, not add to the vision

How should we address/incorporate Priority Growth Areas into the new future land use map?

- Currently there are three priority growth areas taking a tiered development approach
- Growth area #1 Area of City Impact – 1 acre (desire to be 80% built out before the 2nd but it cannot be enforced so that percentage may have to go away)
- County still needs room to grow, tied to infrastructure but there can be a change in the priority growth areas or future land use categories to achieve that.
- Cannot do case by case review
- Incentivizing growth (expedited development reviews, less fees, support) can be a way to direct growth
- Growth based on a combination of ground water levels, how many septic systems can it handle and roads
- There is no law that requires infrastructure with new development – something they want to look at
- Current rezoning process: they look at the map and see if it's appropriate. The fear is that if there is no guide (priority areas) then they will see more and more applications and have to review on a case by case basis
- Irrigation districts: over 30 with different requirements and sizes – each has different development requirements -should be a policy/goal of the comp plan to address drought and what that means for Gem
- Future Land Use Map: people wanting a rezoning would have to make a case– makes rezoning more difficult
 - only for larger projects, they don't want individuals to have to go through the harder process

What are the appropriate measures for the County to take to address affordable housing and new subdivisions?

- Community said there is a need but it's not the County's place to make it happen
- That seems like a city priority not a county priority
- Most places don't have any infrastructure to support dense housing; County priorities can address housing but don't know if they can do anything about affordable housing specifically
- Approve secondary dwellings (has helped a lot of families already), RV parks?
 - No, afraid that they will turn into trailer parks
 - RV parks are always double parked – but they don't want expanded because they are worried about trailer parks
- Improvement districts with special taxes or business housing support (workforce housing)
 - Tough to tie something as important as housing to a company
 - It can go wrong fast

- Can we make existing housing more affordable by making taxes the same for everyone (longer residents have lower taxes and maybe the higher taxes from new development can go lower)
- Limited supply and outrageous demand for regular housing
- Community is concerned about their kids having housing; how do we manage growth but also have our kids enter the ownership market
- Higher density doesn't mean that it makes anything more affordable
- Behind on permit fees but impact fees are new

What is the best way for the County to support continued agricultural operations?

- North and northeast part of the county corridors – slow down growth and push higher density towards the south
- Towards Dewey Road going west and south there is 5 acres of farmland that
- Higher quality soils should be preserved along the corridor
- End of March – October they do water monitoring
- Irrigation districts – over 30 with different requirements and sizes

Natural Resources - 5 acre lots or larger are preferred

Future Land Use Categories and Map

- If you follow the corridor going directly west (Dewey Road where it turns south), the agricultural areas are prime and should be preserved
- Is 40 acres right for the prime ag land?
 - Yes, although some lots are different because of grandfathered in
 - If there is a property that is prime ag without the soil types or irrigation then maybe it could be lowered in density.
 - We want to use the Existing land uses map (may have wrong categories on the bench, irrigated crop ground not pastureland, based on SC comments)
 - Extends prime ag – only actual prime ag should be 40 acres
 - Categories – there should be a few ag types for future land use based on soil types (SC doesn't know today but wants them)
 - If soil types are important to note then it should be noted on the map, but if community doesn't think it's important then it can be an appendix.
 - Create a community ag area, not a continuation of everything around it
 - Planned Community should go away
 - County residential should be updated with whatever replaces priority growth areas

Next Steps

1. Next Steering Committee: scheduled for May 12th but there is a conflict and may need to be rescheduled.
2. Possible joint meeting with the Elevate Emmett Steering Committee to discuss alignment between the plans specific to the Area of City Impact.
 - a. Consultant will send out quick poll to find times that work for most of the group
 - b. Meet twice in May, once joint, the other individual