

Commissioner Minutes

October 1, 2024 – 10:31 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

DSD GENERAL BUSINESS

Commissioners Leslie Van Beek and Brad Holton

DSD Director Sabrina Minshall

Assistant DSD Director Jay Gibbons

Associate Planner Amber Lewter

Principal Planner Dan Lister

Director of Constituent Services Aaron Williams

COO Greg Rast

Deputy Clerk Jenen Ross_____

DSD GENERAL BUSINESS

The Board met today at 10:31 a.m. for a DSD general business meeting. Present were: Commissioners Leslie Van Beek and Brad Holton, DSD Director Sabrina Minshall, Assistant DSD Director Jay Gibbons, Associate Planner Amber Lewter, Principal Planner Dan Lister, Director of Constituent Services Aaron Williams, COO Greg Rast and Deputy Clerk Jenen Ross.

Director Minshall updated the Board on a couple of personnel items stating that Amber Lewter will be promoting into an Associate Planner position and Matt Espey recently passed his certified residential inspector exam.

For today's meeting Director Minshall and Assistant Director Gibbons want to discuss the current code and how it's been interpreted over time with administrative land divisions. Typical administrative land divisions, nonviable land divisions and at some point, relocation of building permits.

Director Minshall explained there are a lot of ways to get to the end goal going but she wants to walk thru what the code says now in order for DSD to get a little more perspective on what is trying to be achieved. DSD can then come back to the Board with different recommendations. Director Minshall believes this is the section of the code that is the most troublesome and has resulted in some challenges. A major contributor to the patterns of development have been thru how administrative land use and non-viable have been done over time.

Mr. Lister reviewed codes with the Board and spoke to some of the challenges staff has experienced. The end goal is to determine what is to be achieved and what are some other options. Code sections reviewed and discussed with examples included:

- Land division requirements, section 7-17-03 under the subdivision code
- 7-18-05: General requirement to submit for a land division
- 7-18-07: Administrative division in agricultural zones

- 7-18-09: Administrative division of nonviable parcels in an agricultural zone
- 7-18-11: Administrative division and relocation of building permits between contiguous parcels in an agricultural zone

Commissioner Holton thinks that any original lot after September 1979 should have been given a new, longer number when anything had been done to the original parcel and is frustrated with the plat room for not doing that consistently. He recently priced out a parcel inquiry, he found at least 4 different products where a title company can be hired to research your ground; most of them started at \$500 plus \$100 a year to go backwards; that is the market rate which tells him the \$70 is insufficient. His opinion is that from 1979 to 2024, there is a significant portion of ag ground that is owned by people who will never drive a tractor and don't care about agriculture. They have bought this ag land for future development and will do land lot divisions; it's about money and they don't care about the viability of their neighbor's farm ground because they have a future to develop every piece of ground in Canyon County. He feels the problem is espousing the preservation of farm ground but no mechanism to do that. His guess is that more than half the land is owned by non-farmers now. It's a farce to say that the land divisions have gone from a piece of ground and is ag ground; its ag ground until somebody puts in a subdivision or a change of zoning on that parcel. To preserve that ground from the original parcel to be farm ground is a farce, it's dividable if a person can get thru the application process. An email was received today from a resident which included a picture from their back deck of a 20-acre field that is their immediate viewshed; they recently saw a sign indicating a future public hearing to change the land and seem to be upset about it. But when they bought the ground to build their house neglected to buy the 20 acres in their immediate viewshed but still want to control it. They don't want anybody to have the right to build a house like they're sitting in; somewhere there is a disconnect in the rationale. He agrees that he'd really like to preserve farm ground but can't agree that he's going to push that on somebody else, that they don't get to do what they want to try to do with their land. Somehow in the preservation of farm ground, somebody is going to have to make some concessions and they are going to end up selling it for farm ground when they could have sold it for development ground which has a significant multiplier in profitability of the sale of that piece of ground. His suggestion/request to DSD is to do a jaunt and a deep-dive into the public hearings and meetings up to September 6th. The September 6th decision of the Board was a finality, it came after months of discussion to get to that decision. He feels there is some research to do about what the goals are.

Director Minshall said they'd bring information back for Thursday's meeting regarding when something was divided by deed and how it's handled after the fact. She will also have Assistant Director Gibbons talk about farm rights and how that's handled in Ada County and to go back into a bit more history of the original intent of the last change in the administrative division.

The meeting concluded at 11:30 a.m. and an audio recording is on file in the Commissioners' Office.