

**STORY COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

STORY COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

900 6<sup>TH</sup> STREET

NEVADA, IOWA 50201-2087

**515-382-7245**

*“Commitment, Vision, Balance”*

**Minutes**

**STORY COUNTY**

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**AN AUDIO RECORDING OF THE FULL MEETING MAY BE FOUND IN THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, OR BY VISITING [WWW.STORYCOUNTYIOWA.GOV](http://WWW.STORYCOUNTYIOWA.GOV)**

<b>DATE:</b> August 3, 2022	Cheryl Moss, Chair	2022
	Debbie Younkin	2026
<b>CALL TO ORDER: 4:00 pm</b>	Kathy Mens	2022
	*Wendie Schneider	2023
<b>PLACE:</b> Public Meeting Room	Ben Jensen, Vice Chair	2025
In the Administration Building	*Ray Lee	2023
	Dalton Johnston	2024
	*Absent	

**Special Note:** Members of the public could also participate via Zoom.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Amelia Schoeneman, Director; Andrea Wagner, Planner; Alanna Patterson, Recording Secretary, Marcus Amman, Planner.

**PUBLIC PRESENT:** Leonard Larsen, Phil Iasevoli, Sandra King, Alex Christiansen, Christine Hausner, Becky Christiansen, Liesel Danielson, Kim Christiansen, Matthew Christiansen, Brad Perkins, Gina Perkins, Patrick Anderson, Julia Anderson, Kent Vickre, Jerry Peterson, Joyce Peterson, Latifah Faisal, Linda Murken, Lisa Heddens.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA: (MCU)**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (MCU)**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Phil Iasevoli: made comments on public comment procedure, as well as questions in regard to the draft plan amendment and approval process.

Alex Christiansen: noted question in regards to the public having outside contact with the Commission.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Discussion and Consideration of Public Comments on the Draft Ames Urban Fringe Plan (AUFPP) and Changes to Consider in the Final Draft**

Amelia Schoeneman started her presentation on the review of the AUFPP public comments.

Moss asked Schoeneman to discuss the process moving forward to make changes to the Plan.

Schoeneman noted that there will be public hearings as part of the approval process.

The first comment topic was inclusion of the area southwest of Ames, including Iowa State-owned land, and the area between 190<sup>th</sup> and 190<sup>th</sup> Streets as Urban Reserve. Debbie Younkin asked if LESA and/or CSR is considered in determining what areas to designate as Urban Reserve.

Schoeneman stated they aren't at the moment.

Kathy Mens asked that the CSR levels be a required factor to consider in mapping the Urban Reserve.

Schoeneman said the commission can make this recommendation through option A. or option E. presented.

Ben Jensen asked Schoeneman if she could explain the County's role in annexation vs. the state's role or individual land owners.

Schoeneman stated under state code an annexation is routed to the County for review and comment, followed by the city.

Jensen asked if this process is started by landowners.

Schoeneman confirmed they would be requesting to be annexed.

Jensen asked what the purpose is to map annexable areas and to restrict it in certain areas. Schoeneman said it's to ensure conformity with the Plan.

Younkin asked what amount of land is currently annexed and not yet built on, not wanting to continue "sprawl" into rural areas.

Schoeneman stated there are policies in place to decide when annexation is appropriate.

Younkin asked about the process of instances when the city requests annexation, and the County wants to deny the request. Schoeneman noted the fringe plan helps with these instances.

Mens asked if most cities have fringe plans.

Schoeneman stated the County only has one with Ames.

Moss asked if these plans provide the County more power in reviewing annexations. Schoeneman confirmed.

Jensen asked if there are any ramifications over option F. which is removal of the Urban Reserve Overlay designation from the Plan and maintaining the areas mapped as such as Agriculture and Farm Service.

Schoeneman presented a comparison table of Urban Reserve Overlay vs. Ag and Farm Service. Under Urban Reserve Overlay, annexations are allowed if policies are met, and they are not permitted under Ag and Farm Service.

Cheryl Moss asked about the reduction in lot sizes for dwellings.

Schoeneman stated the main difference between Urban Reserve and Ag Farm Service is there are more restrictions on rural subdivisions.

Younkin asked how to reduce land in the Overlay East of I-35.

Schoeneman restated option B. "Remove the ability to annex any of the Urban Reserve unless an Ames Urban Fringe Plan Land Use Framework Map amendment to the Urban Growth designation is first approved"

Younkin also asked about the renewal timeline of the plan.

Schoeneman stated the Plan proposed to be in place for 10 years, and can be renewed every 5 years.

Moss asked if those renewal processes are quick.

Schoeneman confirmed, but amendments could be lengthy.

Schoeneman presented staff's recommendation to map Gilbert's Urban Growth area north of 170th to match their Comprehensive Plan. She proceeded to discuss Champlain Farms and the Meadow Glen properties in the Urban Growth areas.

Younkin asked if these areas can hook up to city sewer.

Schoeneman confirmed and noted the plan recognizes these areas to be more serviceable than the rest of the southwest.

Schoeneman proceeded to go through the options for Champlain Farms and Meadow Glen.

Jensen asked if option A. would support annexation of the area. (Option A.: Staff recommends: Map Meadow as Rural Residential - Existing. Staff also recommends creating a separate section in the Plan with an annexable lands map to discuss annexation and to show the properties along State Avenue and Meadow Glen Road as annexable).

Schoeneman stated she wouldn't recommend a policy impeding state law, but if they want to prevent annexation, they would choose option D. presented.

Jensen asked what would happen if Meadow Glen was mapped as Urban Growth.

Schoeneman stated there would be restrictions on divisions and it would give Ames review authority.

Younkin asked if the County would have review authority if both Meadow Glen and Champlain Farms were Urban Reserve.

Schoeneman responded if Meadow Glen was designated Urban Reserve, there would be allowances for creating additional buildable lots. She also stated the commission will need to decide if they would require Champlain Farms to be annexed prior to development.

Younkin asked if Schoeneman had heard any comments from the owners of Champlain Farms.

Marcus Amman and Schoeneman stated the property owner's only intention with the property is to build a single-family home on each parcel, and they have not provided public comment on the draft update.

Moss asked if the concern for the Champlain Farms remaining Ag Farm Service or changing to Urban Growth is about whether the property is annexed before or after any potential future housing developments.

Schoeneman stated it would be limited to one house per parcel if it remained as Ag Farm Service. They would otherwise need to seek an amendment to be mapped as Rural Residential - Expansion and develop with the County.

Schoeneman proceeded to the next topic - proposed limitations on certain conditional uses in the Urban Growth and Urban Reserve Overlay designations.

Schoeneman stated if there is a non-conforming use created and they'd like to expand or rebuild, there could be a process for them to go through for that request.

Moss asked if there are other jurisdictions that have this rule, Schoeneman confirmed.

Moss asked Schoeneman to explain the text amendment process.

Schoeneman explained this is a part of implementing the Ames Urban Fringe Plan, but this list in the Plan doesn't automatically take out pre-existing CUPs when the Plan is adopted. The County would need to review each use to determine what really is/isn't compatible with the commission and Board of Supervisors and have public hearings.

Dalton Johnson stated he doesn't agree with limiting some of the uses on the proposed list, however, noted that some uses don't belong in some areas. He noted there is a safety aspect such as shooting ranges and where those can go, but would like to save this for further discussion.

Mens stated some uses have time limits already such as campgrounds/RV parks, they aren't permanent, and questioned why they're on the list.

Schoeneman stated when the list was created, they looked at what uses would make city growth less desirable, that are large and take up a lot of land area and in turn make infrastructure deployment more difficult.

Moss mentioned from previous meetings a bed and breakfast type was to be changed to event venues. Moss asked if that would instead be a change to the code.

Schoeneman clarified it would be a change to the draft plan and later the code.

Schoeneman proceeded to the next topic - divisions in the Urban Reserve Overlay and Agriculture and Farm Service designation to create additional buildable lots.

Schoeneman explained what the process for current divisions looks like in the current fringe plan vs. the recommended changes that would allow for more flexibility.

Schoeneman also further noted staff's recommendations.

Moss asked Schoeneman to touch on the alternative that staff is not recommending that would allow further divisions for additional lots in the Ag and Farm service designation and Urban Reserve Overlay.

Schoeneman stated staff's concern is that most permit requests come from the fringe area, and by allowing new lots to be created, there would be a large number of these divisions and a large impact on what that area's character looks like.

Moss clarified, it would have a large impact and not have to meet standards for other types of subdivisions. Schoeneman confirmed.

Jensen asked if there would be a way to allow the subdivisions with the safeguards.

Schoeneman answered yes, it would be through an amendment for Rural Residential - Expansion.

Mens asked if these are required to be on paved roads, Schoeneman said no, but they would look at the traffic it brings and if it makes sense to pave the road.

Jensen asked if the plan would allow these subdivisions in the Urban Reserve Overlay.

Schoeneman stated no, only in Ag Farm Service unless an amendment was done to remap an area from Urban Reserve.

Mens asked if the 35 acre requirement would go away.

Schoeneman followed up with no, that standard would still exist, you'd need to meet an exception to reduce your lot size.

Schoeneman proceeded to the next topic of discussion - Rural Residential - Expansion.

Schoeneman explained the staff's recommendation.

Jensen asked what the math was to get the 60 lot target number.

Schoeneman explained it was based on the housing study's projections and permitting and subdivision trends in the fringe versus other parts of the County.

Schoeneman noted the comments received in regards to Martin Marietta and that these would be something reviewed outside of the Plan.

Moss then called for the time for public comment.

Christine Hausner at 3505 245th St. spoke against the AAFP.

Brad Perkins at 5506 240th St. spoke against the AAFP.

Alex Christiansen at 2984 South Dakota spoke against the AAFP.

Patrick Anderson at 2410 State Ave spoke against the AAFP.

Kent Vickre at 2625 Meadow Glen spoke against the AAFP.

Leonard Larsen at 3158 South Dakota spoke against the AAFP.

Matthew Christiansen spoke against the AAFP.

Joyce Peterson at 55040 265th St. spoke against the AAFP.

Liesel Danielson at 2981 South Dakota spoke against the AAFP.

Becky Christiansen at 2985 South Dakota spoke against the AAFP.

Kim Christiansen at 2985 South Dakota spoke against the AAFP.

Gina Perkins at 5506 240th St. spoke against the AAFP.

Phil Iasevoli at 3108 South Dakota spoke against the AAFP.

Public comment ended, Moss opened the floor to commissioners for further questions before proceeding to discussion.

Younkin asked Schoeneman to touch on the advantages of having the fringe plan vs. not having the plan for the residents, the city and the County.

Schoeneman proceeded to explain the benefits of having a fringe plan, and what would happen if a plan wasn't in place.

Younkin asked Schoeneman for clarification that without the plan the property owners aren't protected.

Schoeneman confirmed without the plan there would be less transparency, the city would have review authority over subdivisions, and the County and city may not be on the same page.

Mens asked if it's a bad thing to not be on the same page, to then work through things.

Schoeneman confirmed that's what the proposed changes based on public comment is doing.

Mens asked Schoeneman who came up with the Urban Reserve Overlay - the County or Ames.

Schoeneman explained this is from the Ames 2040 plan, and County staff worked on the policies with city staff.

Jensen asked for clarification between a development vs. an acreage.

Schoeneman explained developments are referencing a rezoning or development that's creating additional lots for a new house. An acreage references a single parcel of land for one home.

Jensen asked for clarification on the process moving forward with the draft getting to the finalized version.

Schoeneman explained the next steps for the commission to make motions and vote to get their recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Moss asked for clarification if the meeting is recorded and the public has access to the recording, they can confirm the correct recommendations will be made to BOS.

Schoeneman confirmed.

Mens asked if they requested an updated draft to review with their recommendations, it would take a few months.

Schoeneman confirmed and stated she is recommending a draft letter outlining the changes.

Younkin asked for clarification if the current plan is still in place.

Schoeneman stated the plan has been renewed until November while this update is worked on, and can be renewed again if needed.

Johnston asked for clarification on the process moving forward after this meeting going to the Board and the cooperators.

Schoeneman talked through various outcomes and solutions that could happen between the Commission, Board and the cooperators.

Moss asked Schoeneman about the opportunities for public input that occurred.

Schoeneman noted three meetings were held to collect public comment, a GIS map and form were on the website that collected comments, and additional public hearings will be held.

Moss then explained the commission will need to make a motion prior to discussion on each change/recommendation.

**MOTION: Jensen moved to remove the Urban Reserve Overlay designation from the Plan and maintain the areas mapped as such as Ag and Farm Service. Mens seconded.**

**Discussion:**

Moss asked about the ISU owned land, and why the concern of that land being annexed or not.

Schoeneman clarified that the motion made by Jensen was to completely remove the Urban Reserve Overlay, not just from ISU land.

Jensen stated having the Urban Reserve Overlay would be too restrictive, and most public comments received were against this designation.

Johnson relayed his uncertainty in completely removing the Urban Reserve Overlay, rather leaning towards option A. (staff's recommendation) to still allow for city growth, but reserving others.

Younkin asked if removing the Urban Reserve Overlay would affect the buffer between Ames and Gilbert.

Moss asked if removing the Urban Reserve Overlay would remove any annexation ability.

Schoeneman responded it would mean those areas would not be annexable.

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Mens**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Mens**

**Voting Nay: Younkin, Johnson, Moss**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

Motion failed.

**MOTION: Johnson moved to pass option A. Work with the other cooperators to reduce the amount of annexable Urban Reserve Overlay. Reducing the amount of annexable land in the Urban Reserve could include the Iowa State University-owned land. Staff would recommend limiting the annexable area of the Urban Reserve area between 190<sup>th</sup> and 180<sup>th</sup> Streets to the area between the railroad tracks and Highway 69. Younkin seconded.**

**Discussion:**

Younkin would like to remove the area between 180th and 190th from the Urban Reserve Overlay to protect the farmland.

Johnson commented that Gilbert has asked for the land between 180th and 190th to be annexable.

Jensen asked for clarification if property is un-annexable in the Urban Reserve Overlay, what can that property do.

Schoeneman responded that lot sizes could be made smaller, uses allowed in the A-1 Agricultural District would be allowed.

Schoeneman reminded the Commission they could amend their motion.

Younkin asked the commissioners if they could all agree to work with the other cooperators to reduce the amount of annexable land within the Urban Reserve Overlay.

**Motion: Johnston**

**Second: Younkin**

**Voting Aye: Johnston, Moss**

**Voting Nay: Younkin, Jensen, Mens**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

Motion failed.

**MOTION: Jensen moved to remove Urban Reserve Overlay from the areas south of Highway 30 and East of I-35.**

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Younkin**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Younkin, Mens, Johnston**

**Voting Nay: Moss**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

Motion passed.

**MOTION: Jensen moved to follow staff's recommendation as follows: mapping Gilbert's Urban Growth area north of 170<sup>th</sup> to match their Comprehensive Plan. The draft Plan cuts off at 170<sup>th</sup>. Gilbert's Comprehensive Plan extends their growth area a half-mile north of 170<sup>th</sup>. Adding a policy, where the annexation of properties in the Urban Reserve Overlay should be weighed against the Urban Growth areas' development, planned infrastructure investments in the areas, and their viability. And: Adding a policy that the County is not agreeing to the annexation of the Urban Reserve Overlay or Urban Growth areas through the adoption of the Plan and shall review all annexation requests at the time of a request and determine to support, or not support, an annexation at that time.**

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Johnston**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Johnston, Younkin, Mens, Moss**

**Voting Nay:**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**MOTION: Johnson moved to recommend option B.: Designating Meadow Glen as Rural Residential – Existing and, in lieu of a secondary annexable lands map, add a policy to the annexations section of the Plan that recognizes that certain properties, while not designated as Urban Growth or Urban Reserve nor intended for redevelopment and city growth, may need to be annexed to create more uniform city boundaries, efficient service delivery, and meet state law requirements for the configuration of annexations.**

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Younkin**

Jensen noted if the Champlin Farms property remains Urban Growth or Urban Reserve, Meadow Glen may end up being annexed. The Champlin property's designation will be discussed later.

Jensen moved to amend the motion to clarify the recommendation is only if Champlin Farms remains designated as Urban Growth.

**MOTION: Amend the motion to “If Champlin Farms remains Urban Growth, then designate Meadow Glen as Rural Residential – Existing and, in lieu of a secondary annexable lands map, add a policy to the annexations section of the Plan that recognizes that certain properties, while not designated as Urban Growth or Urban Reserve nor intended for redevelopment and city growth, may need to be annexed to create more uniform city boundaries, efficient service delivery, and meet state law requirements for the configuration of annexations.”**

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Younkin**

**Voting Aye on Amendment: Jensen, Younkin, Johnston, Mens, Moss**

**Voting Nay on Amendment:**

**Not Voting on Amendment:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**Amendment passed.**

Moss called for a roll call vote on the amended motion (If Champlin Farms remains Urban Growth, then designate Meadow Glen as Rural Residential – Existing and, in lieu of a secondary annexable lands map, add a policy to the annexations section of the Plan that recognizes that certain properties, while not designated as Urban Growth or Urban Reserve nor intended for redevelopment and city growth, may need to be annexed to create more uniform city boundaries, efficient service delivery, and meet state law requirements for the configuration of annexations.”)

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Younkin, Johnston, Mens, Moss**

**Voting Nay:**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**Amendment passed.**

**MOTION: Jensen moved to designate the property to the west of Meadow Glen (Champlin Farms) as Ag and Farm service, and designate Meadow Glen as Rural Residential - Existing.**

Jensen noted that the Champlin Farm's property owner could request an amendment to allow the property's annexation in the future.

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Younkin**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Younkin, Johnston, Mens**

**Voting Nay: Moss**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

Schoeneman asked for clarification on the previous motion regarding the areas south of Highway 30 and east of I-35 being removed from the Urban Reserve.

Jensen responded the motion was to remove everything south of Highway 30 and also everything east of I-35. The Commission remade the motion.

**MOTION: Jensen moved to remove Urban Reserve Overlay from the areas south of Highway 30 and, in addition, areas East of I-35.**

Younkin asked where the development would go if this motion passed. Jensen responded mainly north of Ames.

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Mens**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Younkin, Mens, Johnston**

**Voting Nay: Moss**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

Schoeneman continued to the next topic in which staff is recommending re-reviewing policies in the AUFPP for Environmentally Sensitive area protections and how they may apply to development in the city limits.

Moss asked for clarification if those policies would involve County Conservation's input.

Schoeneman confirmed that could be something that's added.

**MOTION: Johnston moved to vote for staff's recommendation: re-reviewing policies in the Ames Urban Fringe Plan for Environmentally Sensitive area protections and how they may apply to development in city limits.**

Moss asked about current policies in place protecting environmentally sensitive areas.

Schoeneman confirmed there are protections in place for the County to suggest against annexation of these areas.

**Motion: Johnston**

**Second: Younkin**

**Voting Aye: Johnston, Younkin, Jensen, Mens, Moss**

**Voting Nay:**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**Motion passed.**

Schoeneman proceeded to the next topic: Proposed Limitations on Certain Conditional Uses in the Urban Growth and Urban Reserve Overlay Designations.

**MOTION: Jensen moved to remove this strategy from the Plan.**

**Discussion:**

Moss asked about pre-existing conditional uses and how those would be affected once the Plan update goes into effect.

Jensen noted if a conditional use is annexed into the City, the conditional use would be considered non-conforming.

Jensen asked if the PZC would still receive CUP requests.

Schoeneman confirmed they would continue to make recommendations to the Board of Adjustment who would then approve/deny.

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Johnston**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Younkin, Johnston, Mens**

**Voting Nay: Moss**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**Motion passed.**

Schoeneman proceeded to the next topic: divisions in the Agriculture and Farm Service designation to create additional, buildable lots.

Moss asked if option C. is completed as part of the Fringe plan or after. (Option C.: adding an implementation strategy to allow ADUs, or second dwellings).

Schoeneman confirmed it would be an amendment to the code after the Plan's adoption.

- a) **MOTION: Johnston moved to pass staff's recommendations A. & C. - Simplifying the policy for divisions reducing lot sizes in the Agriculture and Farm Service designation and adopting the same policy in the Urban Reserve Overlay as follows:**

*Divisions for the creation of new development lots are not permitted. Parcels with existing dwellings or parcels on which a dwelling may be constructed ~~35 net acres or greater in size~~ may be divided once for the purpose of reducing their size ~~constructing a dwelling on a parcel between~~ to a minimum of one and maximum five net acres, if permitted by County zoning requirements (e.g., through farmstead, LESA, or residential parcel subdivision exceptions). The remaining land shall not be considered buildable for a dwelling and preserved as an outlot, through a deed, or by other restriction.*

**And adding an additional implementation strategy for the County to consider allowing Accessory Dwelling Units, or second dwellings, on parcels with an existing dwelling.**

**Motion: Johnston**

**Second: Younkin**

**Voting Aye: Johnston, Younkin, Jensen, Moss**

**Voting Nay: Mens**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**Motion passed.**

Schoeneman proceeded to the next topic of discussion, Rural Residential - Expansion.

Jensen asked about the numbered of new lots referenced as a target of the Plan.

Schoeneman referred back to the housing study done by the County, and the policy outlined in the C2C Plan.

Mens asked if the rule that requires a minimum of 35 acres to build a house on a parcel is changing.

Schoeneman stated no, this is for more than one house.

**MOTION: Jensen moved to follow staff's recommendation: Removing the limitation on the amount of land (40 acres) that can be requested to be amended to Rural Residential - Expansion through an individual Land Use Framework Map Amendment request. And: An additional option could be removing the restriction on the number of times per year the cooperators hear amendment requests and clarifying the process to request an amendment to the Rural Residential—Expansion designation for properties in the Urban Reserve Overlay.**

**Discussion:**

Younkin noted her support, saying this would be good for any congestion that is already existing in rural subdivisions. Also noted her concern of continued rural subdivisions and their spreading.

Schoeneman touched on option A., clarifying it allows for further flexibility on the amount of land that can be requested to be amended to Rural Residential - Expansion.

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Johnston**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Johnston, Mens, Moss**

**Voting Nay: Younkin**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**Motion passed.**

**MOTION: Jensen moved to remove the reference to the number of new lots in the Rural Residential - Expansion designation needed during the life of the plan (60 over the next 20 years).**

**Discussion:**

Jensen noted with the Rural Residential - Expansion any kind of target number will be forgotten and is atypical.

Schoeneman responded that most comprehensive plans do have a target number for growth.

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Johnston**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Younkin, Mens**

**Voting Nay: Johnston, Moss**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**Motion passed.**

Schoeneman moved on to other items to address.

**MOTION: Jensen moved to acknowledge options A. - It was noted that some parcels were outside of Ames' two-mile review area. This was an error and it is recommended that these parcels be removed from the Plan. And option B. - Staff would recommend allowing the reconfiguration or division of land in the Agriculture and Farm Service Designation and Urban Reserve Overlay for commercial or conditional uses. No new development lots could be created for additional commercial or conditional uses. However, allowing divisions to reduce the size of a parcel could result in a better site design as staff would have additional review over the proposal. In the Urban Reserve Overlay, the applicable city would have joint review authority over these divisions to ensure compatibility with future city growth.**

**Motion: Jensen**

**Second: Johnston**

**Voting Aye: Jensen, Johnston, Younkin, Mens, Moss**

**Voting Nay:**

**Not Voting:**

**Absent: Schneider, Lee**

**Motion passed.**

## **COMMENTS**

**Staff:**

Schoeneman anticipates a new case for the next meeting on September 7th, and training on procedure, etc.

**Commission: Moss thanked staff for their work and the public for their comments.**

**Jensen agreed and asked staff if adding an option to expand a nonconforming use through a conditional use permit could be a future work program item.**

**Younkin noted she attended the Story County Economic Development meeting. She also noted she and Moss had attended a planning and zoning training workshop back in May.**

**ADJOURNMENT: 7:55 PM**

---

**Approval of Minutes**

---

**Title and Date**