

**MINUTES OF THE
MIAMI COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
March 26, 2024**

**MIAMI COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
COMMISSION CHAMBERS
201 SOUTH PEARL STREET
PAOLA, KANSAS 66071**

ATTENDANCE

CHAIR: Kelli Broers

VICE-CHAIR: Topher Philgreen

PLANNING COMMISSION John Menefee, Joshua Brown, Randy Kitchen, Bret Manchester, Joe Flake, Phil Elliott, and Mark Raney

ABSENT MEMBERS:

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS: None present

PLANNING DIRECTOR: Kenneth Cook

ASST. PLANNING DIRECTOR: Jennifer Koehn

PLANNER: absent

PC SECRETARY: Casey d'Augereau

COUNTY COUNSELOR: Not present

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT Janet McRae

COUNTY COMMISSION: None Present

COUNTY CLERK: None Present

PRESS: None Present

**MINUTES OF THE
MIAMI COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
March 26, 2024**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kelli Broers called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Roll Call was taken with all (9) members present, making a quorum.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Kenneth Cook asked if the Planning Commission would like to continue having Study Sessions for the next few months while working through the draft of the Next Comprehensive Plan. Cook stated the third Tuesday of a month would work better for Staff due to the turn around needed to work up a discussion packet.

Broers suggested sending out an email with a survey for everyone to respond to.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DISCUSSION

Cook stated Staff has combined the current Comprehensive Plan, the draft of the Next Comprehensive Plan, and everyone's comments over the past year to put together the presentation and discussion. The focus was on the first part of Section 3 of the Comprehensive Plan draft. Staff would like feedback from the Planning Commission which will add in the expansion some of the information in the Next Comprehensive Plan based on the feedback received.

Jenny Koehn stated the presentation regarding Section 3 "Our Future Land Use and Economic Development Framework" utilizing the rough draft from Olsson's April 14, 2022, of the Miami County Comprehensive Plan. Koehn asked where the Planning Commission would like to begin with the discussion.

Mark Raney noted there were two (2) primary packets, one being a list of goals and the other being Section 3 Comprehensive Plan packet. Raney asked if there is an easy way to correlate the contents of the goals document with specific paragraphs/sections.

Koehn stated she ran out of time and did not get a correlation document created.

Koehn stated the main concern from the public comments and Planning Commission is that the draft of the Next Comprehensive Plan doesn't represent Miami County. It does not speak about "Rural Character" and seemed to lean away from "Agriculture" it was more centered around a city rather than our county. Section 3 of the Next Comprehensive Plan had the most obvious issues with not representing our county. Koehn noted that she was able to fix a couple of words here and there on parts of Section 3, where other parts just did not fit, and she found herself rewriting large amounts of Section 3.

Elliott asked to work through each page starting with page 1 to prevent missing something.

Koehn began on page 1 with the Vision Statement asking for feedback.

Elliott referred to Future Growth and Development Principles, number 1 Preservation of Rural Character, bullet "Preserve County floodplains as non-buildable, protected waterways" stating "protected waterways" is a sensitive phrase in the agricultural community. Elliott believes the "intent" is that the rural character involves streams, rivers, and those kinds of things.

Raney stated he doesn't know the intent and asked if there are specific defined things that this points to or is it arbitrary.

Koehn stated it's not arbitrary defined by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and is part of the FEMA Maps that is part of the layers looked at when reviewing building permits.

Kitchen noted the map shows the 100-year Floodplain and asked if that's what the county uses to determine buildable areas.

Koehn agreed.

Elliott stated he isn't concerned with the Floodplain component it's the protective waterways and there's been a variety of Federal court cases over who defines what a protective waterway is. Elliott would like to make sure it is understandable as to what "protective waterways" means and where that extent stops. Elliott doesn't believe a ditch on a property should not be considered a navigable or protective waterway.

Cook asked if there should be a statement at the beginning of Section 2 in regard to the difference of agricultural uses and the intent of a lot of these policies or goals are for when things are being developed. Cook believes the concern on the streamway protection was if someone is developing a residential subdivision then those areas need to be protected, if it is being used as a pasture then there is no need to protect those areas.

Elliott agreed with Cook's statement. Elliott believes that our process right now is a victim of things that we are seeing happen elsewhere and we just need to be cautious.

Broers asked Elliott if his concern is not that he doesn't want to protect the Floodplain but that he doesn't want to use the term "protective waterways".

Elliott agreed and noted without a clear definition of what "protective waterways" means.

Menefee believes if it is reworded it could be left in the Comprehensive Plan but with all water to the United States and the various court cases Elliott referenced it needs to be clearly defined what's intended.

Elliott stated he believes the 100-year Floodplain needs to remain in the Next Comprehensive Plan it's the "protective waterways" that needs defined.

Koehn moved to "Managed Growth Approach".

Broers asked if there is a definition for "urban-level services".

Koehn stated the word urban might need to be changed. Koehn was thinking more in line with "village expansion areas", more density and smaller lots.

Menefee asked for the definition of "urban-level services". Menefee believes "urban-level services" is different than infrastructure.

Elliott asked if the intent was to consider it “infrastructure”.

Koehn stated “infrastructure” was more like what she was going for.

Brown asked what is “unincorporated”.

Cook stated Beagle, Hillsdale, and Somerset are all unincorporated areas, they used to be town-size but never were developed. It is all areas Miami County has zoning jurisdiction over that are not zoned by a city such as Louisburg, Spring Hill, Paola, and Osawatimie.

Elliott noted the first and fourth bullet are very similar.

Cook noted regarding the first and fourth bullet it is preferred the growth is in the cities because they have the ability to provide the services and believes there should be a statement in this section regarding the majority of development should be within the municipalities.

Koehn moved to Rural Residential and Agricultural Preservation: *Miami County's origins are rooted in agriculture, shaping its rural character, but as cities expand, our landscape is gradually becoming more suburban. Despite this change, our plan prioritizes preserving our rural and agricultural character. We aim to maintain this identity even as we transition towards more residential areas. In areas outside city limits, residential development is planned at a density of one house per 10 to 20 acres. We encourage clustered development in these areas to protect farmland and open space. This approach groups homes on smaller lots to conserve land.*

Broers asked if this language is borrowed from the existing Comprehensive Plan.

Koehn stated yes. Koehn stated there is a combination of wording from the current Comprehensive Plan and the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Broers stated there have been conversations in the past about AG Preservations and hate the clusters of development away from infrastructure. The intent is to conserve large parcels, but the result is houses with no roads that are fire accessible. That seems to be the way it's been done and wonders if there is a better way of doing it.

Kitchen stated not allowing subdivisions would be the best way to protect and preserve agricultural.

Broers agreed.

Kitchen stated the County is struggling to keep up with the infrastructure of the County and subdivisions just adds to the infrastructure struggles.

Broers stated the time to call it out is when it is stated as a goal in the Next Comprehensive Plan.

Cook agreed now is a good time to address the concern.

Kitchen stated what's being allowed is a different type of landowner. Smaller tracts allow more people to purchase land and it makes for a completely different scenery. Kitchen believes there are enough small tracts in the county currently.

Cook stated when subdivisions are done the County looks at the density perspective of it and are generally ok with a 15-acre density in Countryside (CS) and 20-acre density in Agriculture.

Elliott stated currently working on “Goals” that can later be utilized to make regulations. Elliott referred to Goal 3.1 and asked if there is anything wrong with the goals themselves. Elliott stated the regulations need to match the goal.

Broers stated the cluster development is code for the AG Preservation the County currently has, there are counties that are serious about preserving agricultural land and they are doing it.

Menefee asked how many property owners with 40 plus acres are actually farming it and using it for agriculture production. If there is 40-acres fenced and cross fenced no one wants to lease it. Menefee’s opinion is this is the best option over taking a quarter section and chopping it into four (4) pieces.

Elliott suggested using Goal 3.1.1. (*Utilize clustered development to conserve large parcels of agricultural land and wildlife habitat.*), the regulation can define what that cluster density will be. Elliott’s concern is if this or similar statement isn’t in the Comprehensive Plan then 3-acre lots in the corner of an 80-acre lot won’t be allowed.

Menefee stated or if someone brings an application for a subdivision on property that is not good for farming purposes.

Elliott stated he likes the flexibility the statement gives the Planning Commission.

Koehn moved to Goal 3.2 Promote Agricultural Sustainability.

Raney asked for clarification to the meaning of Goal 3.2.2: *Encourage cities to integrate agricultural land uses in their growth areas.*

Koehn stated as the cities have growth and grow outside of their boundaries the County would require them to have larger acres and still be able to continue the services provided by the city.

Raney stated if a city decides to annex property the city can do whatever it wants with that property and asked if that is correct.

Koehn stated that is correct.

Elliott stated he had also marked Goal 3.2 Objective 3.2.2 for a couple of reasons: what agricultural land uses a city would integrate and somehow the words “growth area” was snuck in. Elliott suggested doing a keyword search for the words “growth area”.

It was agreed to use the term “city expansion” instead of “growth area”.

Elliott suggested striking “agricultural land uses”.

Raney agreed with striking it.

Menefee believes it’s not a bad idea but doesn’t see how it is applicable to the County and agrees that it should be strike.

Koehn’s opinion is that it would allow larger lots to be used for agricultural uses allowing farming on a smaller scale.

Kitchen asked if the City of Osawatomie limits makes it to the Victory Chevrolet dealership (Old KC Rd and W. 327th St).

Staff replied yes.

Broers stated she is looking 20-years down the road when people might feel differently than they do today.

Elliott stated if the intent is to encourage to integrate large lot development to allow for small agricultural uses, if everyone thinks it is an important component, what regulations will the County develop from that particular objective.

Koehn stated she can reword the objective and bring back to the Planning Commission.

Brown stated he agrees with Elliott but isn't sure how to apply it.

Koehn stated she hopes to have better communication with the County's cities in the future.

Koehn moved to Objective 3.2.3 stating Kitchen has a problem with that objective and asked for additional feedback from the Planning Commissioners.

Elliott stated he would like to strike through everything after "prime farmland".

Broers' concern is by calling out "farmland" the County is neglecting "ranches".

Koehn moved to Goal 3.3 Environmental Stewardship.

Elliott stated "residents" needs to be added to Objective 3.3.1's statement.

No comments or changes suggested for Goal 3.3 Objective 3.3.2.

Raney asked what Objective 3.3.3 *"Partner with conservation organizations and government agencies to provide technical assistance and financial incentives for the implementation of conservation practices on rural residential and agricultural lands."* Means.

Kitchen stated the County has a goal to preserve agricultural but doesn't believe the County will be able to do so.

Raney stated what might seem expensive for people from Kansas City is cheap for people from Los Angeles and a lot of the decisions made for the Comprehensive Plan can drive the market to be non-local.

Koehn moved to Goal 3.4 Preserve Rural Character: *Preservation of rural character entails safeguarding the distinctiveness, tranquility, and heritage of rural areas, maintaining their natural landscapes, agricultural traditions, and community values.*

Elliott stated he appreciates the "natural landscape" and "natural habitats" worded throughout this instead of tree-lined roads.

Koehn moved to Objective 3.4.2. *Implement zoning regulations and land use policies that safeguard against excessive urbanization and maintain the rural character of the landscape.*

Broers suggested getting rid of the word "excessive".

Koehn moved to Objective 3.4.3. *Develop and enforce zoning regulations and land use policies that prioritize the preservation of rural character, including restrictions on parcel subdivision and development density.*

No comments from the Planning Commission.

Koehn moved to Objective 3.4.4. *Support the maintenance and enhancement of scenic landscapes, such as farmland vistas, pastoral views, and natural habitats, through conservation easements and landscape preservation initiatives.*

Raney asked if there have been specific targeted areas that Objectives 3.4.4 and 3.4.5 would apply to currently.

Cook stated the State of Kansas designated 69 Highway as a scenic byway. Cook noted the only thing in the current regulations that mention “scenic byway” is the sign regulation.

Raney asked if a person has a piece of property will a great view the County won’t randomly designate it as “Scenic byway”.

Koehn stated that is not the intent with these Objectives.

Elliott gave an example of “scenic byway” using Hillsdale Lake. Elliott stated if a “Scenic byway” were to be implemented around the Hillsdale Lake there would be a boarder not allowing development within the boarder of Hillsdale Lake preventing development right new to the lake.

Koehn moved to Objective 3.4.6. *Support agritourism and small-scale entrepreneurship opportunities that celebrate rural traditions such as farm stays, farmers' markets, and local festivals, to bolster economic vitality while preserving rural character.* Koehn noted she deleted “farm stays”.

Broers confirmed “farm stays” was removed.

Koehn stated “farm stays” can stay in if the Planning Commission would like. Koehn stated she relates “farm stays” to Air BNBs and the County doesn’t have regulations for Air BNBs at this time.

Menefee believes if “farm stays” is removed it can be tied back in later under the “support agritourism piece.

Broers agreed with Menefee stating by removing “farm stays” it leaves “agritourism” open for the Planning Commission to decide what is agritourism and what’s not.

Kitchen asked why “farm stays” needs to be part of agritourism.

Koehn stated she can remove “farm stays” from Objective 3.4.6 and when they get to agritourism decide if it fits there or not.

Cook noted when talking about “farm stays” he considers it to be a short-term rental and doesn’t know how it can be enforced.

Elliott stated the 2011-2012 Legislative Session defines agritourism activity as “*any activity which allows members of the general public, for recreational, entertainment or educational purposes, to view or enjoy rural activities, including, but not limited to, farming activities or historic, cultural or natural attractions.*” Elliott stated using the State of Kansas’ agritourism component a person can do almost anything they want as long as it applies to that definition. Elliott stated by putting “farm stays” in the Comprehensive Plan it shows that the County has identified that type of activity versus a rental of a place in the rural area.

Brown stated there should be some identifiable features between a place you stay for one (1) night and one (1) that is a working farm.

Menefee gave the following example: a five (5) bedroom home with three (3) kids, when the kids are grown and gone the three (3) rooms become an Air BNB, it is on a working farm.

Cook stated the broad definition Elliott read leaves it to pretty much anything.

Philgreen stated it is called experiential short-term rentals and it happens all the time and can be rented through several different Air BNB options. If there is a chicken in the yard, then is it a farm stay or something else it can never be regulated. Philgreen stated this is a more in-depth conversation.

Koehn stated she did a section on agritourism and believes it is defined.

Koehn moved to Objective 3.4.7. *Advocate for policies and funding initiatives that recognize the intrinsic value of rural character and prioritize investments in its preservation through targeted conservation efforts and community-led initiatives.*

No comments from the Planning Commission.

Koehn moved to Goal 3.5 Affordable Housing Support. Koehn stated Miami County isn't able to provide affordable housing but as an alternative allows for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and believes that was an important move for Miami County to make.

Raney asked what an ADU is.

Koehn stated only one (1) residence is permitted per property. An ADU is an additional residence allowed on the property, but it must be subordinate to the primary resident by 50%. There are other guidelines that must be met as well.

Objective 3.5.2. Cook stated some of that comes down to the sanitation code in the Environmental Health Department and the soil profile from the property to determine what kind of systems are available.

Broers asked should it be cost effective or should it be right.

Cook stated Zoning Regulations and Subdivision Regulations will not get into sanitation specifically. The Environmental Health Department will have to be involved in any updates to the sanitation code. If Miami County does any updates to the sanitation code the updates will have to be approved by the State of Kansas.

Elliott asked if 3.5.2 was added just to have a second bullet and questioned if it is really necessary.

Koehn stated it did not seem right to have one (1) bullet.

Elliott asked if anyone else felt it necessary to have Objective 3.5.2.

Brown stated he doesn't believe it is very important but sees the importance of the wastewater management solutions be there to assure cost effectiveness.

Cook stated if talking about cost effectiveness of wastewater systems there are a lot of other costs associated with dwelling site/development that would need to be taken into consideration.

Menefee left the meeting at 7:34 p.m.

Broers agreed with Elliott and would like to have it strike.

Koehn moved to Residential Development: *Suburban density residential development, typically 1 unit per 3 to 10 acres, is prevalent in unincorporated Miami County. However, due to infrastructure*

limitations, particularly regarding water, sewer, and paved roads, most development occurs within the 10-20-acre rural density range. This section emphasizes the need for orderly, efficient development that aligns with the County's growth goals.

No comments from the Planning Commission.

Koehn moved to Goal 3.6 Planned Residential Growth.

Philgreen suggested rewording Objective 3.6.1 (.) to say something like: *Restrict higher density residential development to designated areas with adequate infrastructure, ensuring orderly growth...* Philgreen stated the County already has restrictions and asked if this means certain areas will have a higher density.

Koehn stated not at this time other than a Subdivision Application allowing people to do higher density lots.

Cook stated he brought a map down to a meeting to show the areas with a significant amount of residential development with a few larger tracts that were interspersed in those areas where residential development was already occurring.

Elliott stated one of his concerns is, using the Old KC corridor between Hillsdale and Spring Hill, there are multiple driveways one after another in some areas. Elliott believes some of the regulations encourages internal roads. Elliott stated what makes him uncomfortable about this is the ambiguity, services, and paved roads. Elliott noted just because there is a paved road and water available to a property doesn't mean the County wants to allow 5-acre lots along every paved road with water. Elliott stated he struggles with this entire section due to the conversations on larger lots then higher density and he believes it will set the County up for some challenges in the future.

Cook stated there have been some of these areas implemented they have defined some areas where there has already been a lot of residential development. Cook has thought about taking a map and drawing circles on it attempting to identify appropriate areas for this.

Elliott stated the residential development versus large lot subdivision is just a general terminology to him. Elliott believes this residential development allows 5-acre lots all the way down the road. Elliott stated he doesn't like this section at all because it seems to him that it is about 5-acre lots on paved road with water.

Cook asked Elliott if it were more defined like Timber Trace Ranch and Pearson if he would be ok with it if it is in an area that has been defined for this.

Elliott stated yes. The infrastructure still needs to be there, it's a planned area and different than an individual person.

Koehn moved to Objective 3.6.3 *Encourage future development to align with available services and infrastructure expansion plans.*

Elliott stated he is good with the general concept as long as the focus is more aligned with Subdivision Standards and is tie it to the Future Land Use Map.

Cook stated the current Subdivision Regulations has an Exempt Split down to 40-acres so anyone with a quarter section of land can split it to four (4) 40-acre lots without going through Planning & Zoning. Each

of the 40-acres can be split into two (2) 20-acre lots, now instead of a quarter section there are eight (8) parcels averaging 20-acres. Cook asked how to prevent all the individual splits from occurring and suggested increasing the exempt size to 80-acres. Cook noted this would require the individual to go through the platting process and Planning & Zoning can make sure there are road dedications and minimum infrastructure requirements.

Elliott stated he believes Objectives 3.6.1, 3.6.2, and 3.6.3 are opening the book for small lot infrastructure and believes it needs to be more orderly than that.

Raney stated if he understood Elliott's concerns correctly Elliott isn't opposed to the smaller lots like 5-acres depending on road access and services provided to them.

Elliott agreed.

Raney stated and likewise Elliott doesn't support going through and identifying areas within the County where these things will be allowed.

Elliott agreed.

Raney stated he agrees with Elliott and believes they are valid and reasonable points.

Koehn moved to Goal 3.7 Preservation of Rural Character.

Raney asked if the interest is to discourage developers from developing 1–3-acre sized lots.

Kitchen stated if it is out in the middle of nowhere, he believes so.

Cook stated some of it is through the Rezoning process and some of it is determined by the infrastructure in the area. If a developer has land down a gravel road 3-miles and no access to water, it is handled in-house by Planning & Zoning and doesn't make it to the Planning Commissioners.

Flake stated he wouldn't mind seeing it cities but doesn't want to see it in the middle of the county. Flake stated he would like to see the development closer to the four (4) cities of Miami County.

Broers stated to Cook's point, each application is to be considered on its own merits and applying the applicable criteria. Broers noted its good planning to put things where there is an infrastructure to support it.

Cook noted there was a question asking if the citizens were asked if they would want a 20-lot subdivision of 5-acre lots developed across the street from where they live. Cook believes it was 74% of them said no. Cook stated there was another question that asked, "what type of development do you think is appropriate" and more than 50% responded suburban residential development would be appropriate which is within the 1–3-acre range.

Koehn recalls them saying they were ok with it being closer to cities.

Elliott asked what the minimum size of acreage allowed for a septic system.

Cook stated 2-acres is currently the smallest allowed.

Elliott believes that is a component that needs to be addressed. If 1-3 acre lots is in the Comprehensive Plan, but a septic system isn't allowed on 1-acre lots then 1-acre lots shouldn't be part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Cook believes it is 1-unit per 3-acres.

Elliott read Objective 3.8.2 *"Mandate developers to provide necessary amenities and infrastructure to support planned developments."*

- a) *Ensure the construction of essential infrastructure, including roads, sewer systems, and water supplies, to support planned residential or mixed-use ventures spanning 1 to 3 acres."*

Cook stated this section was pulled from the current Comprehensive Plan and was only specific to the village expansion areas.

Elliott stated it needs to be identified that 1-acre is for sewer while 2-plus acres will be septic if it is left as 1-3 acre lots. Elliott referred to Goal 3.2 (Promote Agricultural Sustainability), Goal 3.1 (Preserve Agricultural Heritage), and Goal 3.4 (Preserve Rural Character) and stated those need to be addressed in Goal 3.8 (Planned Developments for Suburban Densities). Elliott stated he isn't sure it can be but 1-3 acre lots don't fit in with Goals 3.2, 3.1, and 3.4. Elliott stated they need to figure out how this works together.

Cook stated there has been discussions on 1-3 acre lots next to cities and these lots will prevent the cities from growing.

Koehn believes if she had Goal 3.9 (Development in Village Expansion Areas) ahead of Goal 3.8 (Planned Development for Suburban Densities) then Goal 3.8 would make more sense.

Elliott used Bucyrus as an example stating village expansion makes sense if future sewer development happens across that corridor. Elliott noted there is also a large portion of that is really good AG ground.

Cook referred to West of Paola and asked if the City of Paola will ever grow to the West because of the Floodplain. Cook stated closed to town on paved roads would be...

Elliott stated a rock quarry isn't great AG ground.

Raney stated when he worked on the city side of planning, he recalls annexation requests particularly the intermodal they had to bring in industrial property right next to residential properties. The county's zoning did nothing to preclude that use was a double-edge sword as the residential people didn't want it but there was no zoning to stop it. Raney asked if it would have been better for the county to have zoned small high-density residential as consistent with the adjacent city property.

Flake left the meeting at 8:09 p.m.

Cook stated one goal Staff has is to print the Future Land Use Maps that the cities have and coordinate that information with the county's Future Land Use. The cities will want high-density residential while the county doesn't do high-density residential.

Broers asked to jump to Economic Development due to Janet McRae being present.

Koehn moved to Economic Development *"Miami County aims to foster a thriving economy while preserving its rural and agricultural character, creating a balanced and sustainable community for*

current and future generations.” Koehn began the discussion with Goal 3.16 Economic Diversification and Strengthening: Objective 3.16.1: *Targeted Economic Development Programs:*

- a) *Focus economic development efforts on industries that align with Miami County's strengths and competitive advantages.*
- b) *Support the retention and growth of existing businesses while attracting new industries that contribute to the County's economic resilience.*

No comments from the Planning Commission.

Koehn moved to Objective 3.16.2: *Infrastructure Coordination and Enhancement:*

- a) *Regularly coordinate with local utility providers and industry to ensure efficient and reliable infrastructure provision in priority industrial and economic development areas.*

Broers asked if this would promote solar when that conversation hasn't happened yet.

Koehn stated it could as there are no regulations that stop large solar farms yet, but there is a moratorium on solar farms at this time.

Cook stated there have been discussions on updating that specific part of the regulations that deal with renewable energy which was worded as “renewable energy commitment”. Cook stated they are softening the language making note that the county isn't against it but wants to take into consideration the Rural Character and Agricultural Use of land as part of any discussions.

Raney asked Broers why the inquiry on solar on this section.

Broers stated there is a moratorium on solar farms right now and there had been many discussions prior to the moratorium about drafting solar farm regulations. At this time it is an unsettled topic. Broers stated she doesn't want to overcommit the county to something when the broader conversation hasn't taken place.

McRae suggested saying “encourage” instead of “ensure” and to remove “industrial” after priority.

Cook noted Economic Development areas can include both commercial and industrial.

Koehn moved to Goal 3.17 Economic Development Incentives. Objective 3.17.1 “*Continue using and exploring new county-level economic development incentives to foster industrial and employment growth within the county.*”

Cook suggested replacing “industrial” with “businesses”.

Koehn moved to Goal 3.17 Quality Development and Workforce Preparedness:

- a) *Coordinate vocational training programs with business development plans to ensure a skilled and qualified labor force.*
- b) *Encourage higher quality development activities while preserving the rural ambiance of the County.*

No comments from the Planning Commission.

Koehn moved to Goal 3.18 Collaboration and Regional Marketing:

- a) *Enhance cooperation among the County, cities, and community groups to improve economic development efforts.*
- b) *Coordinate marketing initiatives under the Miami County Economic Development Council, focusing on areas of regional significance and opportunities for development.*

Broers questioned if the first bullet (*Enhance cooperation among the County, cities, and community groups to improve economic development efforts.*) belongs in the Comprehensive Plan.

Elliott stated he struggles with it.

Cook stated part of the Comprehensive Plan is to include the Economic Development, Utilities, and Infrastructure per the Kansas State Statute. Cook stated McRae has an Economic Development Comprehensive Plan that is more detailed.

Elliott asked why not just reference the Economic Development Comprehensive Plan.

Cook stated we can but believes it will be beneficial to have some higher items listed in the Next Comprehensive Plan.

Elliott doesn't believe the wheel should be recreated rather than reference the wheel that is working.

Koehn stated she will work with McRae to assure the higher noted items align with the Economic Development Comprehensive Plan.

Broers believes the Economic Development Comprehensive Plan is more robust than the page being presented at the meeting. Broers stated a summary of those topics makes sense here.

Koehn will work with McRae and bring back to the next Planning Commission Study Session.

Koehn referred to the highlighted sections of the report and stated they are highlighted as she is questioning if those things really belong in the Next Comprehensive Plan or not.

Cook stated there has been some discussion on streamway trails, allowing for some trails and improvements allowing for biking or other activities along existing County infrastructure.

Kitchen stated if it is in the Comprehensive Plan it will make it easier for the County to get grants.

Elliott stated there is still 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, and 3.13 to discuss and just finished discussing 3.14. Elliott stated he doesn't feel it necessary to stay much longer, but doesn't believe Transportation needs much.

Koehn stated there hasn't been an updated Transportation Comprehensive Plan since 1994 and there might need to be some updates to verbiage.

Koehn asked if she is heading in the right direction with the discussions she has been presenting for the Next Comprehensive Plan.

Elliott believes this format for the Comprehensive Plan is a usable document.

Raney suggested to prioritize them according to higher priorities being listed first.

Elliott stated businesses and economic growth is necessary can't continue to add homes to the rural areas because then people expect a higher level of service.

Cook agreed with Elliott.

Elliott moved to adjourn the Study Session; Brown seconded. The vote was unanimous (7-0) via show of hands, the Study Session was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Approved this 17th day of May, 2024.

Casey d'Augereau
Casey d'Augereau, Secretary

Kelli M. Broers
Kelli Broers, Chair / Topher Philgreen, Vice-Chair

Minutes written by Casey d'Augereau