



<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Consent Agenda</u>	
1. Stratford Ranch Subdivision.....	2
2. Mendon Shadow 2 nd Subdivision Amendment	2
<u>Regular Action Items</u>	
3. Nautica Tower Conditional Use Permit	2
4. Pre-Application Meeting.....	2
5. Annual Disclosures/Conflict of Interest	3

1 **Present:** Stephen Nelson, Conner Smith, Kurt Bankhead, Brady Christensen, Nate Daus, Jay Rigby,
2 Jason Watterson, Chris Sands, Nolan Gunnell, Taylor Sorensen, Megan Izatt

3 **5:00:00 PM**

4 Light refreshments served in the Cache County Conference Room.

5 **Start Time: 05:30:00**

6 **Daus** called the meeting to order and **Bankhead** gave the opening remarks.

7 **05:31:00**

8 **Agenda and Minutes**

9 *Watterson* motioned to approve the agenda and minutes from February 1, 2024; *Sands* seconded;
10 *Passed 6, 0.*

11 **05:32:00**

12 **Consent Items**

13 **#1 Stratford Ranch Subdivision**

14 **#2 Mendon Shadow 2nd Subdivision Amendment**

15 *Watterson* motioned to approve the consent agenda; *Sands* seconded; *Passed 6, 0.*

16 **05:33:00**

17 **Regular Action Items**

18 **#3 Nautica Tower Conditional Use Permit**

19 **Nelson** reviewed the staff report for the Nautica Tower Conditional Use Permit.

20 **Staff** and **Commission** discussed the home on the property, and the needed permits for existing
21 structures.

22 **Jeremy Smith** the owner commented on taking over the tower and that they already have the FCC
23 permit.

24 **Daus** asked if there were any concerns with the conditions.

25 **Mr. Smith** commented on the all-weather 12 surface and a possible land swap with Cache County for the
26 road.

27 **Nelson** commented the concern could be worked out with public works.

28 **Watterson** asked if there would be additional building.

1 **Mr. Smith** responded no new buildings would be built but they have added the fence.

2 *Sands* motioned to approve the Nautica Tower Conditional Use Permit with the 8 conditions and 3
3 conclusions; **Rigby** seconded; **Passed 6, 0.**

4 **05:44:00**

5 **#4 Pre-Application Meeting**

6 **Nelson** explained that this is a pre-application meeting and no decision will be made tonight.

7 **Dallin Riggs** explained that he would like to build a single family home on a currently zoned RU5 parcel
8 and that he is looking at a one lot subdivision with an agricultural remainder. He explained his concerns
9 with the road improvement requirements and paving the road in front of the agricultural remainder.

10 **Daug**s asked about where the asphalt ends.

11 **Mr. Riggs** shared a picture of where the asphalt ends.

12 **Watterson** asked about the length of the frontage.

13 **Mr. Riggs** responded a little over 750 feet.

14 **Staff** and **Commission** discussed the requirement to pave the whole frontage to meet fire code.

15 **Mr. Riggs** explained his question is, is an agricultural remainder part of a development or not.

16 **Sands** asked who would be responsible to pave the rest of the road if a property owner to the north would
17 like to develop.

18 **Mr. Riggs** responded that currently, if the property to the north developed, the developer of the north
19 would pay for that.

20 **Staff** and **Commissioners** discussed the road improvement requirements from the updated road manual
21 and a possible fee in lieu for the agricultural remainder.

22 **Mr. Riggs** pointed out the term development in the ordinance.

23 **Nelson** reviewed the definition of development from the code.

24 **Staff** and **Commissioners** discussed the definition of development and expanded paving allowing for
25 more development.

26 **Mr. Riggs** explained the turnaround situation that is out there currently and that the construction of an
27 actual turnaround would be built.

28 **Commissioners** discussed building in the unincorporated area and the benefit all taxpayers receive from
29 roads built in the County.

1 **Mr. Riggs** asked about approval for a one lot subdivision.

2 **Nelson** reviewed the process of approval for a one lot subdivision.

3 **Christensen** asked if Mr. Riggs had any estimates in cost.

4 **Nelson** informed Mr. Rigg's there is an appeals process that Mr. Riggs' could use to appeal the road
5 improvements but the application has to have gone through the planning commission process first.

6 **Mr. Riggs** commented up to \$70,000 if the whole frontage were to be paved.

7 **06:23:00**

8 **#5 Annual Disclosures/Conflict of Interest**

9 **Nelson** explained the need for annual disclosures/conflict of interest.

10 **Sorenson** reviewed the law regarding the annual disclosures/conflict of interest.

11 **Staff** and **Commissioners** discussed different examples of situations that would need to be disclosed.

12 **Adjourned**