

MEMBERS PRESENT

Todd Hildebrand, Chairman
Bob Jordan, Vice Chair
Harry Averett, Member
Kurt Siebenaler, Member
Ann Land, Member

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Sam Proffer, Planner and Zoning Administrator
Clark Melinkovich, Senior Engineer & County Recorder
Matt Olsen, Public Works Director

The meeting was brought to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Hildebrand.

Approval of Minutes:

Commissioner Hildebrand asked if the Commissioners had reviewed the minutes from the August 19th, 2021 meeting. All members affirmed that they had done so. Commissioner Hildebrand asked if any members had any changes. There were none.

Commissioner Siebenaler motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Averett.

Chairman Hildebrand called for a voice vote.

All voted aye. Motion carried.

Public Hearings:

Case No. 21.06 CRSD Marchbank Simple Subdivision

Commissioner Hildebrand introduced the case and asked staff to present. Planner and Zoning Administrator Sam Proffer presented the case.

Mr. Proffer went over the application packet for the Commissioners citing the appropriate sections of Chapter 6 Subdivision Regulations verifying that the submittal meets minimum Chapter 6 requirements. Mr. Proffer explained that the minor subdivision was a single 41.27-acre tract of land located in an un-platted development and sold by the Walker Family Trust off Bishop Road. The applicant proposed to subdivide the property into a 10.32-acre tract and a 30.95-acre tract.

Mr. Proffer noted that the area is un-zoned and because it is outside of the Joint Review Area of the City of Gillette, no zoning is required, and none is being requested. It was also noted that the surrounding properties are rural residential and agricultural in nature.

The area has no central water or sewer and will be subject to individual wells and septic systems.

Mr. Proffer did note that the applicant failed to file a public notice of intent to subdivide as required by law prior to the Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Proffer stated that he sought legal advice from the County Attorney's office, and it was decided that with the Commissioner's permission the applicant could file the public notice for the Board of Commissioners meeting.

Chairman Hildebrand asked Mr. Proffer if staff had received any comments on this case. There were none. Chairman Hildebrand then asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak. There were none.

Chairman Hildebrand stated that if there were no further discussion, he would entertain a motion. Commissioner Jordan made a motion to approve Case 21.06.CRSD Marchbank Simple Subdivision.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Averett.

Senior Engineer Melinkovich polled the commissioners.
Voting was as follows:

Commissioner Averett:	Yes
Commissioner Jordan:	Yes
Chairman Hildebrand:	Yes
Commissioner Land:	Yes
Commissioner Siebenaler:	Yes

Motion to approve carried. 5/0

Case No. 21.04 COZ Hess Rezoning Request

Commissioner Hildebrand introduced the case and asked staff to present. Planner and Zoning Administrator Sam Proffer presented the case.

Mr. Proffer explained that this request is directly linked to the next case on the agenda, the Hunter Hess Subdivision Plat. Mr. Proffer explained that the Hunter Hess Subdivision entails taking approximately .265-acres from a tract of land located at 6302 Tassel Avenue now zoned R-S and adding it to a tract of land located at 5201 Penny Lane

currently zoned R-1. The additional land acquired by the Penny Lane location must be rezoned to R-1 because a single parcel cannot have two zoning classifications.

Mr. Proffer went on to explain that the approval of the Hunter Hess Subdivision was linked to the approval of the rezoning request.

Commissioner Averett stated that he was one of the mail notice recipients and he had done some inquiries and said that he thought this was a good deal. Mr. Proffer noted that staff had one phone call from a neighboring property and that they expressed support of the rezoning.

Commissioner Siebenaler asked if anyone know what the purpose of the project. Commissioner Averett offered that he knew the applicant and that he was of the understanding that the applicants would like to build a shop. There was general discussion about accessory structures and zoning regulations as it pertains to shops and other residential uses.

Commissioner Siebenaler also noted that there was a discrepancy on the site plan and the plat where a utility easement was shown on one and not the other. Commissioner Siebenaler inquired if the easement had been vacated. Mr. Proffer explained that staff had noted the same thing and that the final plat that was resubmitted had the easement shown and that it was not vacated.

Chairman Hildebrand asked if there were anymore comments. There were none. Chairman Hildebrand asked if anyone in the audience wanted to address the Commission. No one came forward.

Chairman Hildebrand asked if there was a motion to approve. Commissioner Averett motioned to approve the zoning request Case Number 21.04.COZ contingent upon approval of the Final Subdivision Plat Case No. 21.08.COSP. Commissioner Jordan seconded the motion.

Senior Engineer Melinkovich polled the commissioners.
Voting was as follows:

Commissioner Averett:	Yes
Commissioner Jordan:	Yes
Chairman Hildebrand:	Yes
Commissioner Land:	Yes
Commissioner Siebenaler:	Yes

Motion Carried. 5/0

Case No. 21.08.COSP Hunter Hess Subdivision Final Plat

Commissioner Hildebrand introduced the case and asked staff to present. Planner and Zoning Administrator Sam Proffer presented the case.

Mr. Proffer noted that this presentation was a re-cap of the previous case as it pertained to the specifics of one parcel located at 5201 Penny Lane acquiring approximately .265-acres from the property located at 6302 Tassel Avenue to increase their lot size to a total .485-acres.

Mr. Proffer noted that no new infrastructure was required, and that the proposal met all zoning and subdivision regulations and no physical changes were being made to the properties.

Chairman Hildebrand asked if staff had received any comments on the project and again, Mr. Proffer noted that one neighbor had called in support of the request.

Mr. Proffer did bring to the attention of the Commissioners that the applicant failed to publish a public notice of intent to subdivide. Mr. Proffer noted that with the permission of the Commissioners, public notice could be published for the Board of Commissioners final public hearing.

Commissioner Siebenaler questioned how far north Katrina Avenue extended adjacent to the Penny Lane lot based on the final plat depiction of the right of way. After discussion, no definitive answers were obtained. Commissioner Siebenaler asked that staff clarify the extent of the Katrina Avenue and have it reflected accordingly on the final plat. Staff said that they would.

Chairman Hildebrand asked if there were any more questions or comments, and if none he would entertain a motion to approve. Commissioner Jordan motioned to approve the Hunter Hess Final Subdivision Plat Case No. 21.08.COSP pending completion of all Planning Considerations. Commissioner Siebenaler seconded the motion.

Senior Engineer Melinkovich polled the commissioners.
Voting was as follows:

Commissioner Averett:	Yes
Commissioner Jordan:	Yes
Chairman Hildebrand:	Yes
Commissioner Land:	Yes
Commissioner Siebenaler:	Yes

Motion to approve carried. 5/0

Old Business:

None

New Business:

Sketch Plat Submittal / Saddle Ridge Estates Major Subdivision

Mr. Proffer introduced the Pasek family and their agent Sheila Slocum with PCA Engineering. He then went on to explain that the purpose of a Sketch Plat review by the Commissioners is an opportunity for the Commissioners to give feedback to the applicant and if they see any problems or challenges with the proposal. It was also noted that this was not a Public Hearing and the feedback at this meeting was non-binding. Mr. Proffer then went on to describe how staff had previously met with the applicant and directed the Commissioners attention to the attached minutes of that internal meeting.

The applicants then came forward and began to present their case. There was lengthy discussion about the length of the road, whether the road was considered a cul-de-sac or dead-end road, the fact that they were proposing on-lot wells, on-lot septic systems, etc. There was also discussion about how the project would impact Shiplap Estates and Shiplap Spur Road. There was also discussion about WYDOT approval and any impacts on ingress/egress off Highway 50 onto Shiplap Spur and the additional traffic impacts.

There was also concern by the Commissioners about the ability of the project to fund the cost of maintenance of the roads, etc. by themselves. Commissioner Hildebrand expressed concern about potential costs that could be incurred by the County through grants, etc. There was general discussion about Improvements and Service Districts, responsibilities of Districts and homeowners, etc.

The applicants also discussed options for additional ingress/egress easements and whether they could obtain those easements from adjacent landowners.

Commissioner Siebenaler asked Mr. Proffer directly if staff had identified anything in the proposal that conflicted with current subdivision regulation. Mr. Proffer responded by directing the Commissioners attention to the minutes of the internal staff meeting with the applicants and noted the emphasis had been on the need of a second ingress/egress, traffic impacts, length of cul-de-sac problems, no centralized water system, etc.

Mr. Proffer reminded the Commission that they can recommend variances if requested by the applicants. Mr. Proffer summarized that staff felt that the applicant should include specific requests for variances along with proposed alternative solutions to the Commission rather than just saying that they can't or won't be able to meet the regulations.

After lengthy discussion regarding the topics surrounding subdivision standards etc., the applicants expressed a desire to receive a decision from the Commissioners if they would be in favor of the project as proposed. The Commission wanted more time and information from the applicant before they could give definitive feedback.

Chairman Hildebrand specifically noted that he would like to see proposals of an Improvement and Services District, Covenants, roadway service funding, etc. Commissioner Siebenaler specifically noted that he was having problems with the length of the dead-end road.

After additional discussion, the Commissioners decided that they needed more time and information before they could provide any definitive answers. It was agreed that Planning staff would research and provide more information for the Commissioners and that the applicant would do the same and that information could be presented to the Commissioners at the next meeting in October.

Adjournment

Chairman Hildebrand thanked those who attended for being there and asked if there was anyone who would like to make further comments. There were none.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Hildebrand adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

Chairman Hildebrand, Planning Commission Chairman

NOTE: Campbell County Planning Commission meeting minutes contain a summary of discussions and are not intended to be verbatim.