Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting

January 17, 2024

Salmon, ID

The Commission opened the regular Planning and Zoning meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Those in attendance: County: James Malcolm, Vinn Strupp, Cody Settles and Jeff Nofsinger

County Planning & Zoning Staff: Polly Anderson and Lisa Olson

Members of the commission introduced themselves.

**Consent Agenda**

Approval of minutes from November 15, 2023

A motion was made to approve the minutes of November 15, 2023. All voted aye, motion carried.

**Sixty Foot Road Easement Study Session**

**James:** All of the stuff in yellow we’re taking that out? (Appendix B- Roads Detailed Performance Standards for the Design and Construction of Roads)

**Polly:** Not necessarily it’s entirely up to you guys. I think you need to go through everything and determine what you want to keep. I visited with Curt and he does seem to understand that his standards are up to him if there are access issues and those type of things. We just want to make sure whatever you guys decide it’s easy for us to handle in the office.

**James:** A lot of it I can see that there’s no need. Somewhere we need some written protocol on what roads should be. **Polly** Suggests going through it paragraph by paragraph. States she reached out to some planners and no one has anything as extensive as we do. Most of them let Road and Bridge handle their road standards. Most of them also have the 24-26 feet for their standards

**James**: For public roads I understand but I don’t think you need that for private roads. Asks panel for thoughts.

**Jeff** brings up the fact that if you’re doing a subdivision that’s a whole different scenario. I see this as someone just doing a lot split where there’s a couple pieces of ground and they want to put a road in is what we’re dealing with. If it’s a public road then the County Road Department handles it.

**James** asks if Road and Bridge has standards. **Polly** didn’t know if there was a book of standards but it is in the Transportation Plan. A few years back they decided to incorporate what was in the Transportation Plan into the Development Code.

Discussion on what Road and Bridge mostly deals with is access issues not what a road needs to look like. Mentioned subdivision across from Shoup bridge and **Cody** stated road through it was private but built to county specs. **Polly** states that in Planning & Zoning the office only really deals with two pages out of all of it in some way, shape or form. A subdivision will come before the P&Z board. Discussion of roads that the county may eventually take over needs to meet certain standards. Roads that are taken over are usually existing roads like Williams Creek Road that just happened recently. They signed over their section of the road that went through their lot to the county.

**Jeff** brings up the 24-26 foot road standard and that this meets County. Understands why people are upset when they have to do a 60 foot wide road when they are just splitting a lot. If they start with the 26 feet then at a later time they could put more towards the back of the lot.

More discussion on the 60 feet being too much and how some of the roads here are only 20 feet wide. In a larger county it makes sense but not here. What the discussion seems to be about is roads for lot splits, subdivisions would fall on the Board to make a decision. **Polly** asks if some of the Standards should be kept, all be taken out, summarize… **James** saw some things that were beneficial but a vast majority of it was not. **Cody** thought that Curt should have more input on what should stay or go, he knows the most about it. **Polly** said she would take it down to Curt and go over it with him then bringing it back before the Board for their opinion. Everyone agrees it could be cleaned up. Certain things such as culverts should be Road and Bridge’s responsibility, each situation is different. This is addressed with the applicant’s access permit. **Cody** brings up that all of their culverts are approved by Road and Bridge.

**Polly** wants standards for the surveyors for their lot split platting requirements, whether it be ours or Curt’s. **Cody** asked if it was just the 60 foot wide easement that was of concern and if there were people asking us to get rid of the rest of the standards. **Polly** said no she just thought it could be cleaned up. We just want a set of standards for the people coming into the Building Department for a permit. The fact was brought up that a lot split could include 5 lots and would the 26 feet be enough for a road. Everyone seemed to think it was

**Polly** brought up utility easements. Custertel wanted an easement when they signed off on the lot split application. **Jeff** stated Idaho Power won’t set foot on a property unless they have an easement. This is separate from a road and has nothing to do with it. Easements should be separate. Surveyor would need to worry about easements for utilities. **Cody** brought up working with the different entities that required different easements such as power and irrigation.

**James** brought up the 60 foot specification and (Lisa stated the standards were on page 99 of appendix of 24 feet) **James** suggests knocking it down to 30 feet and the road surface to 20**. Jeff** suggests 26 for fences, ditches, etc… **Polly** said **Chris** researched it and the Fire Code says 26 feet. **Cody** was on the website for Road and Bridge and said all he could find was the Access Permit application which gives the standards for what you need to do. **Jeff** questions are there two sets of road standards and are they the same? If in two different places reduce to one. **Polly**- We need some sort of direction for the public and she will check with Road and Bridge to clarify standards. **Jeff**-After checking with them the information needs to be looked at again to see what needs to be addressed as far as standards for public, private and subdivisions.

**Polly** brought up the Comp plan and the last time that it was amended was 11 years ago and if the board was interested in updating it. **Cody**-Every ten years is just a review? **Polly**-State Law says you should revisit your Comp Plan every ten years. You don’t have to, but it is suggested. If we decide to update it then it would be something to budget for next year. Mentioned Terry Otten that helped with the Development Code, she is a planner. **Jeff** was asking if anything had changed enough to warrant an update. **Polly** said there were some changes as far as mining, businesses, and the number of people that live here. The Board could go through it or someone could be hired to do it. She asked the Board to think about it.

**James** mentions adjourning the meeting, Cody motions to adjourn the meeting, Jeff seconds. James motions and seconds to adjourn, all agree by saying aye.

Meeting adjourns at 8:02 pm

Respectfully, Lisa Olson