

**JEROME COUNTY RECREATION ZONE COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
**April 13, 2022**  
**THE JACK NELSEN CONFERENCE ROOM, JEROME COUNTY COURT HOUSE**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Facilitator: Art Brown

Present: Becky Dean, Bill Baker, Brett Thompson, John Reed, and Oscar Carranza

Staff Attendees: Nancy Marshall, Administrator; and Kacie Buhler, Assistant Administrator

**OPEN DISCUSSION**

Art Brown called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. The Committee discussed the Minutes from the November 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting.

**M/S/C Becky Dean motioned to accept the Minutes from the November 3, 2021, as written. Bill Baker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Review Chapter 9 per changes suggested by Mike Seib and Staff**

Ms. Marshall explained that Staff and Legal Counsel encountered some issues while writing the housing density for Chapter 9 for the Rec Zone. She explained that Staff and Legal Counsel proposed to remove the housing density section and only allow those actions through the subdivision process. Bill Baker suggested the Committee review Chapter 9 with the changes page by page. Ms. Marshall stated on page 2 under Definitions, Destination Development and Destination Services was added. She explained the difference between the two types of commercial development. Mr. Baker suggested using the first sentence from Mike Seib's definition and combining it with Ms. Marshall's definition. Mr. Seib explained what his role in writing in the chapter was and stated he does not intend to help determine what can go where. He said he is there to help write what the Committee wants.

Mr. Thompson asked where Destination Development was in the chapter to understand why it needed defined. The Committee discussed the Commercial section that was added as 9-5.02. Ms. Marshall explained what was intended by only allowing Destination Development on a parcel bordering or fronting a Special Site. Mr. Brown gave an example of a helipad. Ms. Marshall stated that the helipad would most likely be considered a Destination Service. Mr. Seib clarified the reason for preventing certain uses to take up property along a Special Site. Mr. Baker stated the same would happen with the residential uses. Residences could be located along the Special Site and the remainder could stay as farm ground. Ms. Marshall explained the process of obtaining a zoning permit in the Rec Zone. Mr. Thompson asked if a Destination Development could be built on a property that does not front the Special Site but could obtain an access easement to the Special Site. He asked if the verbiage may be a little too inclusive and would not allow development that may be able to take advantage of a Special Site without being adjacent to the site. Mr. Seib asked what the difference would be in the Recreation Zone versus a Commercial Zone. Ms. Marshall clarified that hotels, restaurants, etc. would have to front the Special Site and the services, like kayak rentals, could not front the Special Site. Mr. Thompson stated he thought the point of the charts was to determine what should be allowed and in what zone but that they would not have to be located immediately fronting the Special Site. He said the proximity to the Special Site would be why a use was allowed in the Recreation Zone. Mr. Reed stated that a lot of it is common sense. Mr. Thompson stated he did not want to determine the exact proximity to the Special Site. The Committee decided to keep Destination Development and Destination Services section and terms out of the Rec Zone Chapter.

**JEROME COUNTY RECREATION ZONE COMMITTEE MINUTES APRIL 13, 2022 3:00 PM**

Mr. Seib explained that Staff and Legal Counsel added the Destination Development and Destination Services to match what was added for residential uses. He stated they should review housing density. Ms. Marshall recapped the Committees original density. Mr. Thompson stated that their intention was to allow more housing density than allowed in A-1 but to retain as much farm ground as possible. Ms. Marshall stated they have to maintain the one residence to one acre ratio but lots could be less than one acre. Ms. Marshall asked the Committee to review 9-5.01 and explained why it was added. John Reed asked if a property owner had eighty acres and wanted to divide ten, one-acre parcels, with the remaining 70 acres as farm ground, would they have to complete a subdivision. Ms. Marshall stated that if five or more parcels are created, state code states it must be considered a subdivision. Ms. Marshall stated that Staff's intentions would be all divisions would have to be a subdivision in the Recreation Zone. She said Land Divisions are basically developing for free as there are no infrastructure requirements. She said the lack of infrastructure causes issues for future property owners as well as the lack of maintenance agreements and/or CC&R's. The Committee discussed the difference between a Land Division and a Subdivision. Mr. Thompson stated that he doesn't think a division of one parcel into two should be required to go through the subdivision process. Mr. Brown stated the canal company handles the water shares for Land Divisions and Subdivisions. Mr. Thompson stated that he does not think the Committee should determine when a Land Division or a Subdivision is required and should use the definition as defined in state code. Ms. Marshall explained "Land Divisions" are only allowed in Jerome County, other counties have other regulations. Ms. Buhler explained the issues Staff encountered with the Housing Densities previously created by the Committee. Ms. Marshall stated they were possibly creating tracking issues. Ms. Buhler said determining how many housing rights a parcel may have left could create future issues as they would not be able to require an "unbuildable for residential purposes" statement be recorded on the property deed or survey.

Mr. Seib explained the wording should describe the boundaries that says where the Recreation Zone should go. Mr. Thompson asked if they should have a specific distance from a Special Site. Mr. Seib stated he doesn't think a specific distance is a good idea but the words in the chapter should draw the boundaries. Mr. Seib stated he thinks it is better to rezone the entire Rec Zone at once instead of piece by piece. He said they need to create boundaries with their words that will not allow a rezone to a different zone based on the uses allowed in the Rec Zone. Mr. Seib stated he thinks the Committee should make a map to help determine the wording and verbiage in the chapter. Ms. Marshall explained that in reviewing the chapter, Mr. Seib could not visualize where the Rec Zone should be located based on the words in the chapter. Ms. Marshall summed up by stating the chapter should better verbalize if development should be in the area of or specifically at the site.

The Committee asked Staff to create maps for the next meeting. The Committee agreed to meet on April 27, 2022 at 10:00 a.m.

**M/S/C John Reed motioned to adjourn. Bill Baker seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Kacie Buhler, Assistant Administrator