DATE: 4/18/05

COMMISIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Perry Huston, Vice Chairman David Bowen, Commissioner Alan Crankovich

CDS STAFF PRESENT: Director Darryl Piercy, Assistant Director Allison Kimball, Administrative Assistant Mandy Motes

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Hurson, Arthur Solbakken, Steve Lathrop

TOPIC:
1. Suncadia Development Agreement discussion/process
2. Outline of Comprehensive Plan Update schedule and process in advance of full discussion April 25, 2005

DISCUSSION:
1. Hurson started off the discussion explaining how in 1995 the county change the way that it did planning and how we have gotten to where we are today and because of the process that took place Suncadia fits into the process we are in today. Development agreements are outside of the normal realm of planning and even though they are not always perfect they are workable due to be able to amend them. You have to be careful when it comes to development agreements as far as what the law limits and they have to comply with both the Growth Management Act (GMA) and the Master Planned Resort (MPR). Houston commented that the MPR grants us the authority to allow development outside of urban growth and with that is how we were able to have an MPR. Both the zoning and designation within is MPR. Hurson commented it is a resort because it has a variety of activities not just a golf course. Recreational opportunities have to exist for it to be called a MPR. Kimball commented that the applications before the BOCC have met both the MPR and SEPA guidelines. Piercy said that SEPA went through the EIS process and final document have to stay within these parameters and then everything is ok. When the planned action SEPA came in, the site development was looked at in comparison and everything fit within the box such as density, open space etc. therefore requiring no further SEPA. We are just certifying that the review is still valid. Crankovich asked who was going to keep track of the part time vs. full time residents. Pierce stated that a lot of things to be built are for part time such as hotels, condos, townhouses, golf cottages the overall plan will be more part time or time share. It is the first in the state to use the MPR and by being able to pull it off shows how well the county and the applicant were able to work together. Hurson stated that it has a 30 year built out but is unsure how fast it will get done. We just need to look at the
isolated conditions and then the BOCC will work from there. Houston said that staff will have to monitor time lines and make sure to keep them in compliance, at this point go ahead but if the last plat is brought in for approval and none of the recreational amenities are in place then why will start to question. Pierce said that as it moves forward, he expects to see these taking place especially for them as marketing tools. Analysis to date, future. Anticipated all fit within these guidelines. The ones before the BOCC reflects the development agreement, SEPA review and are also in compliance with what was originally intended. The monitoring however will continue to be ongoing. Hurson said it has a lot of things you have to look at and a lot of constraints as well. Pierce said we can make modifications as appropriate and bring before the BOCC. Lathrop said the number is higher already then was anticipated and we are going to be seeing lodges this year.

**Drawing on Board by Lathrop:**

The approval process has to stay within the Development Agreement and the Counties Conditions of Approvals or it will need to go back to the top of the diagram. Even though the general sit plan was optional, it made sense to do a little more refining. In the application stage they have to tell us if there is a deviation and then we have to make the decision if we fell it is a significant change and we can make them do things to get it back in the box or drop it. If we are accepting everything that is in the table it has met all of the conditions listed above. Neighbors and county are getting some of the MPR with the rezone. The rezone has to happen
first for the rest of the conditions to go in proper chain of command. Also, will have three pre-plats and one final plan the first week in May. Staff review will give all the specifics and the monitoring of changes are still ongoing, but we still need to sit down and have a review on the development agreement and the counties conditions of approvals components with the staff. Hurson stated if the change is not significant then the director doesn't need to bring it up, just concerns need brought before the board and then on to the Planning Commission and then back to the BOCC. Lathrop commented that any deviations no matter how small will be brought forth. Crankovich questions what if it just doesn't work as far as traffic. Lathrop said it is a county project but Surecadia is paying for it. They had wanted a traffic circle because they didn't want to end up with a light. He wants the BOCC to be comfortable and be able to say that they met all of the requirements. Bowen commented that if they have all of the documents ahead of time to review then it should be ok. Piercy said that we will also be fast tracking the minutes for the May date. Hurson said that the only problem may be with the Planning Commission not understanding the outline/diagram for the platting process. Solbakken is working on a plat process and wants it to be very clean and better than before. Marketing and sales are based on the May 3rd approval process signature. They have been solving things as they want on a collaborative way/method.

2. Piercy discussed the comp plan update for the meeting next week so today he would like to present the basis of it. One being the overall goal statement and two being to identify and make recommendations for it. As far as the update he is looking at a variety of updates and including the public. A lot we can fix administratively and others will be a more formal process. Will provide a checklist to make determinations if we want to open up certain elements and what is going to be the overall scope of the update. As far as budget, we can reasonable assume anywhere from $75,000 to $100,000 from CTED. We also need to decide if we want to do in house or look for an outside source. Critical areas could be the most controversial and we could benefit from a facilitator. One thing coming out of this process would be a series of sub-area planning. Would suggest after comp plan update we should prioritize in which areas would be addressed and create a plan. Houston said everyone needs to understand what they can accomplish with a sub area plan. If we open the door too wide we will have a bunch of unhappy citizens.
| ACTION: | 1. All agreed on process.  
2. None |
Amendment to minutes: Community Development Services Study Session – April 18
Suncadia Development Agreement discussion/process

This is to provide clarification to questions and comments by Commissioner Crankovich and Suncadia Representatives regarding the SR903/Bullfrog Rd. roundabout and the roundabout at the Suncadia entrance from Bullfrog Rd.

As the study session progressed, the SR903/Bullfrog Rd. roundabout was brought up. Commissioner Crankovich asked what if it just doesn’t work handling traffic, what happens then? Steve Lathrop said it is a County project but Suncadia is paying for it. He also said the original idea was for a new intersection with a traffic light but other options were presented for consideration and through process, the roundabout design was chosen. Comment then turned to the roundabout at the Suncadia entrance from Bullfrog Rd. and that Suncadia did request that design because they did not want a traffic light at that location.