

Riley County Vision 2025 Committee Meeting

June 21, 2007

7:30 – 9:30 p.m. Manhattan Workforce Center
Meeting Summary

Welcome & Introductions

- The meeting was called to order at 7:30p by co-facilitator, Terrie McCants.
- The general public was acknowledged and asked to participate by writing comments/input on cards provided.
- Monty Wedel shared comments submitted by the public. Some members of the Committee expressed their concern about the overall attendance of the Committee meetings and asked if there was anything more that could be done to entice more participation. It was explained that due to various schedule conflicts that it was just a difficult time of year to expect large turn-outs.

Guiding Principles for Decision-Making

- Monty Wedel discussed the list of guiding principles for decision making for committee to consider. He briefly explained the source of the list and the content. The Committee was asked to review the document and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.

Continuation of Goals/Objectives/Policies Review

Residential – COMPLETED

Industrial - Completed objectives I-1 through I-2. Left off at Objective I-3.

Other Business

- Monty discussed the Regional Growth Plan, a document that EDAW (consultant) has been hired to complete as a result of the potential impact of Ft. Riley's population increase. He mentioned that EDAW has requested information regarding "future" land use designations. The Committee stated that they (or the Plan) were at the stages of providing such information. Although it may be necessary for the completion of the Regional Growth Plan, it's a bit premature for the Committee. Monty stated that he would contact the consultant to find out when they would be in town so that he might set up an information meeting for those Committee members that would like to attend.

The Way Forward

- Next Full Vision 2025 Committee to be July 19th 7:30-9:30pm @ the Manhattan Fire Station Headquarters.

Adjourned

AGRICULTURE SUBGROUP SUMMARY

April 26, 2007

Members Present: Diane Hoobler, Jon Howe, Nathan Larson, Jan Lyons, Joe Mertz, Linda Morse, Mark Scott, John Strickler, Vinton Visser, Ralph Wahl,

Staff Present: Monty Wedel

Major Themes/Observations/Suggestions

- Preservation of agricultural lands/areas is important
- The protection of existing agricultural operations from encroachment by incompatible uses is important
- It is also important to preserve some ability by agricultural land-owners to access the value in their lands for retirement, etc.
- Ideally, the ability to access the land value by the individual land-owner must be balanced in some way with the goal of preserving agricultural areas for present and future societal needs as well as to protect the rights of existing agricultural producers who desire to preserve their present and future investment in continuing the use of the land for agricultural production
- The implementation strategy we use to accomplish this should be simple and easy for the public and land-owners to understand
- Part of the implementation strategy should be to promote the use of conservation easement (purchase of development rights) opportunities where available, realizing there are limits based on funding and program eligibility
- Part of the implementation strategy should be to require that all non-agricultural uses in the agricultural areas sign an affidavit acknowledging the location as an agricultural area and a commitment not to make a nuisance claim against agricultural uses in the future.
- Part of the implementation strategy could be to allow homes on existing 20 acre tracts to be split off with a smaller lot (2-5 acres) and the remainder returned to agriculture or increased in residential density, if appropriate

- At some level of density, it is appropriate that the Riley County Planning Board and the Board of County Commissioners review a development proposal to ensure compatible use and adequate infrastructure for public health, safety and welfare
- One suggestion was that one non-agricultural residence per one-quarter section (160 acres) is an appropriate density level at which to initiate review (i.e. 1 non-ag residence per 160 would be the level of unplanned and unregulated growth)
- At the very least, our zoning strategy should be changed from a minimum 20-acre lot size requirement, to a one-lot per 20 acre requirement, with the lot minimum being dictated by sanitary code

AGRICULTURE SUBGROUP SUMMARY

May 3, 2007

Members Present: Diane Hoobler, Jon Howe, Tom Link, Jan Lyons, Joe Mertz, Linda Morse, Mark Scott, Vinton Visser, Ralph Wahl,
Staff Present: Bob Isaac, Monty Wedel

Points of Agreement

- **Preservation of agricultural lands/areas is important**
- **The protection of existing agricultural operations from encroachment by incompatible uses is important
(Subject to definition of incompatible uses)**
- **The implementation strategy used should be simple and easy for the public and land-owners to understand**
- **Part of the implementation strategy should be to promote the use of conservation easement (purchase of development rights) opportunities where available, realizing there are limits based on funding and program eligibility**
- **Part of the implementation strategy should be to require that all non-agricultural uses in the agricultural areas sign an affidavit acknowledging the location as an agricultural area and a commitment not to make a nuisance claim against agricultural uses in the future (It was agreed that an affidavit similar to one developed for the moratorium, a draft of which is attached for reference, could be used but would need re-wording)**
- **Part of the implementation strategy could be to allow homes on existing 20 acre tracts to be split off with a smaller lot (2-5 acres) and the remainder returned to agriculture or increased in residential density, if appropriate (This was agreed upon in principle, realizing many details are yet to be worked out)**
- **At some level of density, it is appropriate that the Riley County Planning Board and the Board of County Commissioners review a development proposal to ensure compatible use and adequate infrastructure for public health, safety and welfare**

Points Not Yet Agreed Upon

- At the very least, our zoning strategy should be changed from a minimum 20-acre lot size requirement, to a one-lot per 20 acre requirement, with the lot minimum being dictated by sanitary code **(no consensus, confusion as to the ramifications of such a change)**
- It is also important to preserve some ability by agricultural land-owners to access the value in their lands for retirement, etc. **(no consensus)**
- Ideally, the ability to access the land value by the individual land-owner must be balanced in some way with the goal of preserving agricultural areas for present and future societal needs as well as to protect the rights of existing agricultural producers who desire to preserve their present and future investment in continuing the use of the land for agricultural production **(needs work)**
- What density level should required review begin?
- What criteria should be used to decide upon requests presented to the Boards?