

**DRAFT TETON COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes from March 8, 2016**  
**County Commissioners Meeting Room, Driggs, ID**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Mr. Dave Hensel, Mr. Bruce Arnold, Mr. Chris Larson, Ms. Marlene Robson, Mr. Jack Haddox, Ms. Sarah Johnston, and Mr. David Breckenridge.

**COUNTY STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. Jason Boal, Planning Administrator, Ms. Kristin Rader, Planner.

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 PM.

**Administrative Business:**

Mr. Boal gave a brief introduction to a proposed ordinance before leaving the meeting. The proposed ordinance, which would create a process to provide building rights to previously created parcels that are not currently eligible to build on, will be reviewed by the Board on Monday, March 14, so the PZC could have a public hearing scheduled for the ordinance in the future.

**Approval of Minutes:**

**MOTION:** Mr. Larson moved to approve the minutes from February 9, 2016. Mr. Breckenridge seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** All in favor. Mr. Arnold abstained from voting because he was absent from the 2/9 meeting.

**Chairman Business:**

There was no Chair business.

**WORK SESSION: Draft Code Discussion,** Article 8: Building Types & Article 14: Administration

The Commission reviewed and discussed the proposed draft code presented by Ms. Rader.

*Article 8 Review:*

- Staff will add a description of the zoning districts to the table in Div. 8.1 as a reference for the abbreviated districts listed throughout the Article.
- The Accessory Building section will be added to the redline version.
- The “Heated Floor Area” will be adjusted to reference the correct section in Article 10 (for accessory dwellings), and the language will be changed to match the rest of the code related to accessory dwellings, such as total square footage or building area.
- The height of agricultural buildings versus accessory buildings was discussed. Agricultural buildings are still allowed to be 60’ in height, but accessory buildings would be limited to 30’ in height.
- Staff will look into changing the maximum length for a Recreation Residence. The current length and the maximum size would create a 5’ wide building.

- Carriage Court garage parking (Div. 8.19.1) was discussed, and it was not necessarily liked as an option.
- Consider rewriting Div. 8.19 Parking Location to be based on zoning district instead of building type. Generally, the PZC did not have a problem with parking being allowed on grass or off of a hard surface. It was suggested that rural zones or lots of a certain acreage could park in the grass, but residential, commercial, or industrial lots may need to have a hard surface for parking. Staff will look into changing the language in this section.

*Article 14 Review:*

- PZC agreed that the table in Div. 14.1 made sense.
- PZC felt that notice should be provided for the One Time Only. Site posting would be sufficient.
- References to other sections need to be verified and/or included (i.e. 14.3.5).
- It was asked if a time limit should be applied to how often the public could apply to amend the Land Use Code or the Comprehensive Plan. The PZC agreed that a time limit did not seem necessary as amendment applications are not a frequent occurrence. They also did not want to limit the ability of someone to propose an amendment if it was for a legitimate change.
  - PZC asked if there was a limit in the existing code. 8-11-1-C includes the following limit:
 

SIMILAR APPLICATIONS: Any application substantially similar to one filed and denied within one year from the date of such denial may be summarily denied by the commission.
- Examples and density values need to be updated based on the new density values in Article 3.
- Design Review for the Scenic Corridor was discussed. PZC agreed that the Design Review could be approved administratively, but they would like to remain updated on the applications to see how the new standards are working (staff would provide a written determination for the Design Review, which could be compiled as part of a staff updated to PZC at their regular meetings). If PZC feels the standards need changed or it is not working, they may ask to have PZC approve the review again or just change the standards. If the standards are working, then staff could stop providing updates to PZC about the reviews. The fee for the Design Review can also be reviewed to possibly reduce the fee since PZC will not hold a meeting for the approval.
  - After discussing the design review and building types, PZC pointed out that language should be added to Article 9 for the Agricultural Option that states only Agricultural Buildings qualify.
- PZC felt a rezone to PRS: Preservation should be an expedited process compared to other rezone applications. Staff will work on writing this.

*Moving Forward:*

- The remaining articles (1, 2, 4-7, and 15) will be discussed at the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- IDFG will be contacted again, and a date will be provided of when staff feels Article 13 can be finished and given to the PZC.

- Staff will have all redline versions to PZC by March 22, with the exception of Article 13 (unless IDFG comments and changes can be made by then).
- The joint meeting with the BoCC is currently scheduled for April 12. Depending on the timeframe for Article 13, this may be rescheduled to the second meeting in April or in May.
- If the joint meeting remains scheduled for April 12<sup>th</sup>, the complete redline version of the code will be provided to the BoCC and the PZC by April 1<sup>st</sup> (the “markup” version showing the changes and a “clean” version showing all changes accepted).

**MOTION:** Mr. Booker moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Larson seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kristin Rader, Scribe

---

Dave Hensel, Chairman

---

Kristin Rader, Scribe

Attachments:

1. PZC March 8, 2016 Meeting Packet