MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
SHAWNEE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Monday, April 30, 2018 – 5:30 PM
Shawnee County Annex

Roll Call and Announcement of Hearing Procedure: Judy Moler, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m., reviewed the hearing procedure and asked for roll call to be taken.

Members Present: Judy Moler, Jerry Desch, Chad Depperschmidt, Jake Fisher and Christi McKenzie. With five members present, a quorum was established and the meeting was called to order. Matthew McCurry arrived shortly after roll call.

Members Absent: Brian Aubert.

Staff Present: Barry T. Beagle, Planning Director; Joelee Charles, Administrative Assistant; Joni Thadani, Assistant County Counselor.

Communications: None were indicated.

Ex Parte Communication by Members of the Commission: None were indicated.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest by Members of the Commission or Staff: None were indicated.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Planning and Zoning Items: None were indicated.

Discussion of Planning Related Issues:

Discussion of County Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Moler indicated a date needed to be selected for the public hearing at the end of June. Through discussion, the date selected was Wednesday, June 20th, and it would be held in the Appraiser’s conference room. Mr. Beagle indicated a legal notice would be published. It was also noted that a Word version of the plan would be submitted to the County Commission. The Planning Commission’s recommendation must be submitted to the County Commission before July 4th.

Mr. Fisher reviewed the revisions on the Forward and Introduction. The following changes were discussed and consensus was achieved:

- Page 1—The second sentence in the first paragraph was changed to: We The citizens of Shawnee County are committed to working together to forge a shared future, aware of our connections to each other and respectful of our differences.
- Page 1—In the Vision Statement, the first bullet point was deleted.
- Page 1—In the Vision Statement, move the fourth bullet point to the beginning of the list.
- Page 4—The second sentence in the third paragraph was changed to: For context, the total population living outside of Shawnee County’s five cities would be comparable to the tenth largest city in Kansas, Salina, has a population of 47,707.
- Page 4—In the third sentence of the third paragraph, changed “conflicts” to conflict.
- Page 4—In the first sentence of the fourth paragraph, change “excercises” to exercises and “permiting” to permitting.
- Page 4—In the first sentence of the sixth paragraph, changed the comma at the end of the sentence to a period.
- Page 4—Item 1. In the box titled “Comprehensive Plans Perform Three Critical Functions” was changed to: Practical: Establishes a legal basis recommendation for regulating land subdivision & use.
- Page 6—In the first paragraph, changed “an” to and.
- Page 6—The first paragraph was deleted entirely.
- Page 6—In the second sentence of the second paragraph under Practical, changed “estaboish” to establish.
- Page 7—In the second sentence of the second paragraph under Planning and Private Property Rights, changed “impose” to imposes.
- Page 7—In the right column, the bullet point “Responsible Development”, the first sentence was replaced with: Growth continues to occur in the undeveloped area.
- Page 7—In the right column, add a bullet point and language for Economic Development.
There was discussion regarding the County Commission’s questions. Mr. Beagle indicated he had prepared issue papers for the Planning Commission as resource material to answer the questions. There was a consensus to utilize Mr. Beagle’s issue papers as the answers and submit them as a separate document. Mr. Beagle suggested they review them and provide any revisions to him by the next meeting.

Ms. Moler indicated there were no corrections for Chapter 1. She also reviewed the County’s Commission’s questions for that chapter and provided her answers.

Mr. Depperschmidt reviewed the revisions on Chapter 2. The following changes were discussed and consensus was achieved:

- Page 28--The second and third sentence in the first paragraph under Soil and Agriculture was changed to: Approximately 55 percent of Shawnee County is designated by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) as prime farmland, and farmland with the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce economically sustained high yields of crops and an adequate and a favorable temperature and growing season, are not excessively erodible or saturated with water for a long period of time. Another 23 percent is designated as farmland of statewide importance.
- Page 32--In the fourth sentence in the first paragraph under Wetlands, Waterbodies, and Flooding, changed “having” to “have.”
- Page 41—The first sentence in the first paragraph was changed to: These considerations are important can be beneficial to help Shawnee County thrive while ensuring and help ensure that the county respects the land’s capacity to be developed.
- Page 41--The first sentence in item 1. under NR-1 was changed to: Ensure Evaluate the need for a level of review either by developers or planning department staff to prevent development from encroaching on steep slopes, wetlands, or floodplains.
- Page 41--The first sentence in item 1. under NR-1 was changed to: Evaluate the need for a level of review either by developers or planning department staff to prevent development from encroaching on steep slopes, wetlands, or floodplains.
- Page 41--Under NR-2, item 5. was added as follows: Utilize the Environmental Constraints map (Fig. 2.12) that was developed as part of the comprehensive plan.
- Page 41--Under NR-3, item 3. was added as follows: Evaluate the need for the county to update its zoning and subdivision regulations and other requirements.
- Page 41--Under NR-4, item 1. was changed to read as follows: Require Evaluate the need for coordination of water retention and drainage where multiple dwelling units are within a certain distance of each other.

Mr. Depperschmidt concluded his review and recommended they send Mr. Beagle’s issue papers in response to the County Commission’s questions.

Mr. Desch asked how the issue papers would be presented to the County Commission as the answers to Exhibit A and separate from their revisions of the comprehensive plan. Mr. Beagle indicated if the Planning Commission approved the issue papers, they would be sent as a separate group of documents in response to the County Commission’s Exhibit A.

Ms. Thadani suggested they compare the answers in the issue papers to the chapters and incorporate their answers to the questions if it was something they edited since the issue papers were prepared before they discussed the chapters. Ms. Moler suggested sending a letter to the County Commission explaining they took the questions very seriously and discussed them. Ms. Thadani agreed and also suggested they review the questions as they went through their chapter. Also, they would need to indicate the issue papers prepared were discussed and accepted as the specific answers to each question.
Ms. Thadani asked if issue papers were completed for each question. Mr. Beagle said the majority had been prepared.

Mr. Desch reviewed the revisions for Chapter 3. The following changes were discussed and consensus was achieved:

- On page 44—The last sentence in the third column was changed to: On the consumer side, educating new rural residents on what services they could expect was also mentioned as important to create expectation for services, development, and costs.
- On page 50—In the third sentence of the first paragraph in the third column, delete bicycling and.

There was some discussion regarding the Half Day Creek Sewer Interceptor. It was created because the subdivisions in the area had failing septic systems that became an issue for public health, safety and welfare; however, it opened up that area for urban scale development. The city has defined the extent of what they would allow for urban density development. The city didn’t want to see urban density development in that area. From the county’s perspective, there was a substantial investment in that sewer system and the capacity would be lost if the area was developed in three acre lots without any requirement to connect to sewer. It wasn’t a benefit district where everyone in the district shared the cost. There was some question if the county had recouped its investment for it.

- On page 67—In the map title, changed “cellphone” to Cell Phone.
- On page 68—In the second bullet under Education, changed the two references of “Wabunsee” to Wabaunsee.
- On page 68—The second sentence in the second paragraph in the middle column was changed to: According to the Kansas State Department of Education K-12 Statistics page, the County also has several private accredited schools including Kennedy Academy, Lutheran Schools, the Southard School Menningers, and TARC.
- On page 74—In the first paragraph under Expansion, Maintenance, and Replacement Costs Discussion in the middle column, deleted the third and fourth sentence.
- On pages 74—in the last sentence of the last paragraph of the right column, changed “fees” to fee.
- On page 74—The last paragraph in the right column was deleted and moved to the beginning of the first paragraph on page 76. It was split on two different pages with a map in between.
- On page 74—In the third sentence in the second paragraph of the left column, changed “have” to has.

Mr. Desch stated the second paragraph in the middle column on page 76 provided the answer to the first question about the county growth areas that was asked by the County Commission for this chapter.

- On page 77—in the first sentence of the first paragraph in the middle column, changed “are” to is.
- On page 78—Under TI-3, Item 4. was deleted.

Mr. Desch reviewed the remainder of the County Commission’s questions for Chapter 3. He indicated Mr. Beagle had prepared issue papers for those.

Ms. Moler indicated Ms. McKenzie would be reviewing Chapter 4. There was discussion regarding the legal notice for the June 20th public hearing and it was determined they would review Chapters 5, 6 and 7 at their next meeting.

Adjournment:

Mr. Desch moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Moler, a unanimous voice vote declared the public hearing be adjourned, which was at 7:39 p.m.