

Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners
August 7th, 2007
Custer County Courthouse
Westcliffe, Colorado

Present:

Planning Commission Chairman: Lynn Attebery
Planning Commission Members: Sherry Rorick, Pat Bailey, Vic Barnes, John Campbell, Rod Coker, Keith Hood
Associate Members (PC): Christy Veltrie, Sarah Senderhauf
Custer County Commissioners: Carole Custer; Dick Downey; Kit Shy
Planning & Zoning Staff: Jackie Hobby; Brian P. Cline
Custer County Attorney: John Naylor

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 P.M. by LYNN ATTEBERY, Planning Commission Chair.

ATTEBERY: Called for approval of the July 2nd, 2007 minutes of the Joint meeting of the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners

BARNES: *MOVED* to accept the July 2nd, 2007 minutes.

COKER: *SECONDED* the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

ZONING OFFICE REPORT

- Zoning Permits are on a slight increase in July of 2007, compared to July of 2006.
- Septic Permits issued in July of 2007 have decreased by almost a third of permits issued in July of 2006.
- Issues on the agenda for next month will a hearing for David Roever & Eagle Summit Ranch application for a Special Use Permit and The Wet Mountain Fire District Special Use Permit Modification.
- The next site tour is scheduled for August 30th, 2007.

Horn Creek Conference Grounds Special Use Permit Application Public Hearing

Property Address: 6758 County Road 130. Westcliffe, CO. 81252

Schedule Number: 102-26-902

ATTEBERY: *RECUSES*, Sherry Rorick & Rod Coker for the Hearing of the Horn Creek Conference Grounds, Special Use Permit Application. Associate Members, Sarah Senderhauf and Christy Veltrie fill vacated seats.

ATTEBERY: Read the applicant's statement, "*Horn Creek requests permission to operate a six-pad Recreational Vehicle (RV) park as part of its on going program. The proposed RV Park would be constructed between our existing water slide facility and our Mountain Meadows camp. It includes 6 individual gravel pads. The plan for this site would be to blend with existing topography and would endeavor to minimize the removal of trees. Potable water will be provided from the adjacent water system (PWSID#214326). The RV Park would be designed for summer time use so that the water system would require minimal trenching and would be winterized seasonally. Electricity will be provided by a site specific meter drop and then an underground bury to each of the pads. Wastewater disposal will be accomplished via a "RV DUMP STATION" to reside on site. The system may be stand alone, 1, 500 gallon sealed holding tank or tie into our existing wastewater treatment system (yet to be determined). Work to construct and/or maintain these systems shall be performed under the guidance of licensed professionals. It should be noted that this site will not be open to the "public", but used only to support the Horn Creek programs.*"

ATTEBERY: A petition has also been submitted.

CLINCE: A petition with 84 signatures from citizens living in the county.

ATTEBERY: Reads petition, "We the undersigned, oppose the proposal of Horn Creek to establish an R.V. facility on their properties for the following reasons. It would not benefit the Custer County, Co. community. An R.V. park is already established on Highway 69 that does benefit the community and could accommodate several RV's. Runoff from additional sewage adds to the contamination of those below. Their application for special use permit clearly stipulates that this is for the Horn Creek Conference Center only and not the community. From information that we have received, we have no idea as to the location of the proposed site."

NAYLOR: Presents a certified letter to Rod Coker from the County Planning & Zoning Office.

ATTEBERY: Reads letter from Planning & Zoning office to Horn Creek Conference Grounds, "It has come to the attention of this Office that you applied for a Special Use Permit on June 1st, 2007. Your presentation was held in the Custer County Courthouse on July 3rd, 2007 and a Site Tour was held on your property where the proposed RV site would be located. As of August 6th, 2007 your Special Use Permit has not been approved and the Septic application for a holding tank permit number (S070701004) has not been approved for use. Custer County Zoning Resolution requires that permits be approved prior to the use of the site. It appears that the RV site is being used by multiple RV's without proper permits being approved.

Enclosed are pertinent copies of the Custer County Zoning Resolution (SEC 8.6 pg. 40-42, SEC 10.1-10.7 pg. 51-54)".

COKER: Just to give everyone a brief history of Horn Creek and when all structures were built. The Mountain Meadows buildings were erected in 1970 with the Lodge being built also in 1970, with the original Ranch house being built in 1950. The proposed location for the RV Site would be just left of the Water Slide (West). This shouldn't be referred to as a RV Park; we think that they are better referred to as RV sites. We were notified in May of this year, that a number of volunteers wanted to come out in their own RVs and volunteer for Horn Creek. That was the purpose for these RV sites, for these

volunteers only. The traffic will be very minimal because people will be coming up to stay. There will be no coming and going on a daily basis. Water will be supplied our commercial water system. All sewage will be held in the installed vault system and then pumped for disposal. Access to the site specifically will come from a Horn Creek Road; there will be no extra access needs off of county roads. All construction will be done by licensed contractors. When we started in May, our licensed contractor put all sites in one area. We installed temporary electricity and created a temporary area and we occupied the area on a temporary basis only. There are several factors to this site specifically the topography, which created the need to occupy it on a trial basis. The electric is temporary as well as the septic, are both temporary facilities. We still want permanent facilities, but currently all we could do to facilitate incoming volunteers is to make these temporary facilities ready. Originally we thought we could meet these deadlines, but schedules changed and we did occupy the site a few days before the approval was given.

ATTEBERY: Asks for questions from the floor.

WILLIAM BORGES: I started the petition, and I just wonder if Horn Creek realizes it is illegal to operate a facility before approval?

SCOTT GEARY: Are there no charges applied to the volunteers while staying at Horn Creek?

DORTHY NEPA: Is it true or not true that they are currently not in compliance?

CINDY HOWARD: What is their tax status? Since they hold business conferences, how can they have non-profit tax status?

ATTEBERY: Rod lets first address the topic of operating illegally.

COKER: We started planning this in May. All current facilities are there on a temporary basis only and will be made permanent in the future. In the past the Board has approved three Special Use Permits that I know of that were being used before their approval. The focus should be on usage, and how this project meets the objectives and direction of Custer County. As for the volunteers, they are all volunteers. They do not get charged, and there is no business venture associated with the RV sites. Dorothy had a question about compliance and we are currently in compliance. Our tax status is tax exempt, and we would be more than welcome to sit down with anyone here and talk to them about our tax status and financial situation.

CINDY HOWARD: Horn Creek has been really reluctant to answer any questions about these facilities.

CAMPBELL: Did you talk to Planning & Zoning?

COKER: There is no instrument for dealing with temporary facilities.

We met in May with the Planning & Zoning Office and the Planning Commission Chair, and a Special Use Permit is the only instrument to be used.

CAMPBELL: Was the Planning & Zoning Office aware that you would use this site temporarily?

COKER: We met in May and discussed several options.

BARNES: We all thought that this was a good idea, and here was an opportunity to do things right. When we arrived for the site tour, we were told blatantly that Horn Creek would use the site that Saturday. That alone was unacceptable; it was just disrespectful to the County.

COKER: We made a good faith effort to do it right. We either had to refuse volunteers or put them in undesirable locations. Based on all factors we thought that this was the least conflicting.

BARNES: So, the needs of the people staying in the RVs supersede the County regulation.

COKER: Back in June, we realized we won't be able to meet the Counties needs. It was then we switched from permanent facilities to temporary because of the ground structure and plus to work out the ergonomics of the site.

HOOD: You have been doing construction in July.

VELTRIE: Did you do this for a particular group?

COKER: Yes, for this specific group that we made arrangements with in May.

VELTRIE: Would it have been possible to use other sites already in the county.

COKER: We have in the past, but they won't come without a place to stay. Any group greater than 6 will be in the county at any time.

JIM HESS: We have had volunteers stay in Grape Creek RV Park all summer. We also worked with the owner to inform him that we will not be taking any of his business. These volunteers come in and support Westcliffe business at least 3 days a week. They are not just here for Horn Creek.

CLINCE: Has the vault been used?

COKER: No.

SCOTT GEARY: Will the RVs be another form of housing?

COKER: Most groups travel & minister, they are not permanent. Volunteers will also stay in them for medical reasons, but they will not be permanent.

ATTEBERY: Read the Plan Operation portion of the Substitute Water Supply Plan for Horn Creek, "The five wells at Horn Creek Conference Center in this plan are identified as permit numbers 53571-F WELL ID 1305062), 53572-F (WELL ID 1305065), 53573-F (WELL ID 1305066), 53574-F-R (WELL ID 1305064), and 53575-F (WELL ID 1305063). The wells supply domestic, recreation, stock watering and irrigation water for a Christian family resort and conference center. The Horn Creek Conference Center (HCCC) has three separate housing areas (The Lodge, The Ranch, and Mountain Meadows). The Lodge has a lodge and cabin accommodations for up to 135 individuals, The Ranch has cabins for up to 130 individuals, and Mountain Meadows has cabin facilities for up to 140 individuals. Each are has centralized laundry and kitchen facilities. Recreation facilities include two swimming pools, an ice rink and recreation center. Outdoor landscaping is irrigated and comprises approximately one acre. HCCC also has a fishpond that can store 1.64 acre-feet of water.

The two wells at Sangre de Christo Seminary are identified by permit numbers 53569-F (WELL ID 1305060) and 53570-F (WELL ID 13005061). The two wells have been used to supply domestic and institutional water for the director's house, a cabin, a two apartment building, two student cabins, a student lodge, a classroom, bookroom, library and a chapel.

ATTEBERY: No where in this document do I see water provisions for 6 RV sites.

COKER: Water will be served from one of our current systems.

ATTEBERY: Reading from the Plan Operation portion of the Substitute Water Supply Plan, "The wells supply the domestic, recreation, stock watering and irrigation water for a Christian family resort and Conference center."

COKER: It allows us to operate as HCCC needs, and it is renewable annually.

NAYLOR: It doesn't sound like an RV facility is included.

ATTEBERY: Since we have no water experts here, we have to go by what this document states.

HOOD: If it doesn't say RV facilities then it needs to; to assure us that your water supply is meant for what you will be using it for.

ROCKWELL CANDA: They state they have water, and their water augmentation plan hasn't even been approved. RVs are not included in the water supply plan, and I support VIC BARNES over the arrogance of HCCC. They could have done things properly. They didn't have commercial water well rights in the past and operated that way for years. It was arrogance on their part 40 years ago with the well permits and septic issues, and it is arrogance on their part today.

LOCKETT PITTMAN: Are you going to make revenue from temporary sites?

COKER: This is our temporary resolution our long range plan is to let the ground settle, try out the site, but we will not get additional income from this RV site.

BAILEY: Asked the office if there had been approval problems in the past with HCCC.

CLINCE, HOBBY: We have not been in office long enough to comment on past issues of Horn Creek,

CAMPBELL: The best thing to do would have been to put people in other places until this SUP had been approved.

ATTEBERY: I will entertain a motion at this time.

BARNES: *MOVED* to deny the Special Use Permit for HCCC.

CAMPBELL: *SECONDED* the motion on the floor.

ATTEBERY: What about the existing temporary use?

NAYLOR: IT is currently in use before the SUP has been approved. A cease and desist order must be issued from the Planning & Zoning Office.

PLANNING COMMISSION: Voted unanimously to **DENY** a Special Use Permit for HCCC.

HOOD: To vote for the SUP, would require a substantial penalty for preconstruction a use.

CAMPBELL: Same as Keith, it was a wrong assumption that they could use the site before approval.

BARNES: I have previously stated my reasons for disapproval of this SUP.

VELTRIE: I would like to see any water issues resolved before I could vote for a project like this.

SENDERHAUF: The water situation mainly, and policy was not followed.

BAILEY: I agree with Keith. They were not legal by using the site before it had been approved.

ATTEBERY: I voted to DENY mainly because of public opposition, and the petition, plus the disregard for policy, and the impact to the county roads. An average RV of Fifth Wheel weighs upwards of 5 to 7 thousand pounds. The water supply plan doesn't include RV sites, and an application for a Special Use Permit isn't a temporary permit.

DOWNEY: I will entertain a motion.

SHY: I affirm the motion to the Planning Commission. The permit may not be used until after approval.

SHY: *MOVED* to **DENY** the Special Use Permit for HCCC, and called for an immediate stop to use.

CUSTER: *SECONDED* the motion on the floor.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS: The motion to **DENY** the Special Use Permit for HCCC unanimously passes.

RORICK & COKER: Returned to their seats in the Planning Commission.

VELTRIE & SENDERHAUF: Returned to their seats as Associate Members of the Planning Commission.

Humboldt Peak Partners

Extension to the Preliminary Plan Phase of PUD Process

Property Address: 5295 County Road 129 Westcliffe, CO. 81252

Schedule Number: 102-89-851

ATTEBERY: The next item on the Agenda will be an Application for an Extension to the Preliminary Plan Phase of the PUD process, by Humboldt Peak Partners with Attorney Paul Snyder representing.

ATTEBERY: Read statement for an extension, “The purpose of this letter is to request an extension to the time limitations for submittal of our preliminary plan for Humboldt Peak Ranch. As per the zoning code, submittal of a preliminary plan must be made within three months of sketch plan approval. We would request an extension for another three months.

Since the sketch plan approval Buck Blessing and his partners have evaluated the suggestions made by the county as a part of the sketch plan approval and after some deliberation we are now moving forward with the preparation of a preliminary plan submittal. While we anticipate submitting these plans in July, the three month extension will give us a bit of breathing room in order to do so.

SNYDER: This is a request for an extension for which Section 11.4 of the County Zoning Resolution provides for. On May 29th of this year Tom Braun applied for this extension before the three month time frame from the approval of the sketch plan had expired. We were well within the 90 day period. Was the request for an extension in compliance in accordance with County Resolution? It was applied for before the extension was up. The time frame from sketch plan to preliminary plan is short. Is there any downside for approval of the extension? We request the extension be granted.

SCOTT GEARY: I recommend that he use the meets and bounds for the property that are already in place.

ROCKWELL CANDA: I have no problem with the extension.

CAMPBELL: I have no problem with the extension.

BARNES: Are there any concerns with 11.4 of the resolution.

SNYDER: The language is silent whether to grant an extension before or after the 90 day time frame has expired.

GEARY: My opinion is that this is a very deceptive use of the PUD.

ATTEBERY: Reads Section 11.4 of the Custer County Zoning Resolution, “The procedure to obtain a permit for a PUD is split into three phases: 1. Sketch Plan 2. Preliminary Plan 3. Final Plan

The Sketch Plan phase will consist of a pre-application conference; appearance at a regularly scheduled public meeting and hearing; presentation of plan with appropriate

documentation to enable the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners to review the plan for general scope and compliance. The concept may be rejected at this point; however, approval does not guarantee final approval. Upon completion of the Sketch Plan process, the applicant will have 90 days to submit all data for the Preliminary Plan, unless an extension is granted by the Planning Commission. If the application is allowed to lay dormant, by the applicant, for more than 90 days, it will be considered withdrawn by the applicant. (See Appendix C.1)

RORICK: Since they have had to do so much already three months is probably feasible.

CAMPBELL: *MOVES* to **APPROVE** the request for an extension.

HOOD: *SECONDS* the motion on the floor.

PLANNING COMMISSION: Voted to **APPROVE** the request unanimously.

HOOD: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, there is no problem with an extension.

COKER: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, because we are just approving an extension.

BARNES: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, this is a complex proposal and this gives them time to complete the process.

CAMPBELL: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, agreed with BARNES, the time constraint is an issue and they are complying by the rules.

RORICK: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, three months is not sufficient time to complete the process.

BAILEY: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, some projects need more time than others and this is such a project.

ATTEBERY: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, the extension was applied for within the Zoning Resolution rules and it is the goal of the Planning Commission and Zoning Office to give individuals a chance to present their case.

ATTEBERY: Called for a 10 minute recess at 1:20 p.m.

ATTEBERY: Resumed meeting at 1:31 p.m.

**Dave & Brenda Roever of Eagle Summit Ranch
Special Use Permit Application**

Property Address: 8333 County Road 271 Westcliffe, CO. 81252

Schedule Number: 101-49-904

ATTEBERY: Read the applicant's statement, "Dave and Brenda Roever request a Special Use Permit to operate the Roever Learning and Resource Center within their parsonage home on David Roever_ Parcel B located on Eagle Summit Ranch. As I approach age 60, my entire career has been in public service, Ministry and Military. At retirement my services in both areas is strongly sought after and my old body cannot travel as before. Hence, my dearest associates and friends still seek my advice and desire to visit my home here in Westcliffe, CO. Additionally, the wounded young warriors returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan desire mentoring in the field of my expertise. They will visit my residence and I will advise them and direct them in quite council, to give them a future after their devastating injury.

ROEVER: It is a great privilege to be here. My scars are from defense of my country. I have several medals in two years of service. My vision is to help people, and I would not change a thing. For the last three years I have worked to create a place, for vets from overseas who seek my advice. Everything we are doing will be in respect for Custer

County, the environment, and my neighbors. I want to add to what the counties already doing. I want to give young vets more tools to speak to people. They will be at my house for 2 week periods, then we'll take a break and have some more young vets come visit for two weeks. In my life of service, the best years lay ahead of me. We will be in total and complete compliance with our place in the present and future.

CAMPBELL: What is your plan for the ranch?

ROEVER: Eight vets total. There will not be any expansion in the future because the vets will be staying in my house.

SENDERHAUF: How will the vets be getting there?

ROEVER: They will fly into Colorado Springs and shuttles will bring them out to the ranch from there.

ATTEBERY: If there are no more questions, Dave Roever is excused.

**Dave & Rebecca Richardson of the Richardson Ranch
Waiver of Subdivision Regulations**

Property Address: 2288 County Road 323 Westcliffe, CO. 81252

Schedule Number: 101-90-851

SHY: Recuses himself from issue.

ATTEBERY: Read applicant's statement, "Application for a waiver of Senate Bill 35-Subdivision regulations- to create an eight acre parcel out of a 223 acre parcel that will include existing home and improvements and well. The 223 acre parcel exists within an area already zoned for 5 acres. We wish to maintain the balance of the acreage so that it will be possible in the future to have six, thirty-five acre parcels to be able to give to each of our six children.

REBECCA RICHARDSON: Our property is in an area of 5 acre parcels. We want to create a nice 8 acre parcel for someone to own. The house and barn requires a great deal of upkeep. We have 6 children that we want to leave the remained of our property to. We just want to sell the house.

IRENE FRANCIS: We are in 5 acre zone. If you break the land into 35 acre; can that be broken into 5 acre lots?

CLINCE: In order to break the 35 acre parcel into 5 acre lots, they would have to obtain the same subdivision waiver that the Richardson's are. There would be a public notice given and adjoining landowners would be notified, then a public hearing would be given.

CANDA: Essentially, anyone could have the same opportunity.

STAN FRANCIS: Are there any deed restrictions?

RICHARDSON: No.

BAILEY: Is the well tied to the house?

RICHARDSON: Yes. Originally, it was a hand dug well. We had it bored down to 20 or 30 feet, and it was licensed for Residential and livestock watering.

HOOD: The well then is most likely tied to at least a 35 acre parcel already.

CANDA: I am not sure of that.

BAILEY: Then the well is tied to the 223 acres.

BARNES: There are major concerns here for a total 5 acre build out. The long term ramifications of this decision can be controlled with deed restrictions. Why can't you have one, forty three acre parcel with 5 thirty five?

RICHARDSON: That would change the value of the whole parcel, and I don't want to do that. This meets the subdivision regulations for the county currently. I have no desire to further subdivide.

BARNES: We also have impacts of septic to consider.

BAILEY: Density is a major issue. We are currently looking at 7 lots opposed to 6. Our County Master Plan wants a decrease in density.

VELTRIE: Though we have to consider 7 parcels opposed to a total 5 acre lot build out, and what the Richardson's are asking for is a lot less.

What is being asked for right now isn't out of line.

BAILEY: Are there any other wells on the property?

RICHARDSON: Yes, there are two springs that will stay on the larger parcel. They both have adjudicated rights to springs not streams.

BAILEY: Can you have restrictions on plats?

NAYLOR: Yes, on further subdivision.

ATTEBERY: Do you have the whole plat?

RICHARDSON: Just the eight acre parcel.

RORICK: I would like to see a plat or a deed restriction to prevent anything less than 35 acre parcels for the remainder of the land.

ATTEBERY: Can the Planning Commission put a deed restriction on a person?

NAYLOR: What we are looking at here is the eight acres.

CAMPBELL: Can we make a new plat mandatory, with a 35 acre plus, stipulation of the waiver?

NAYLOR: Sure.

VELTRIE: What was well used for?

RICHARDSON: For the house, livestock and to water the yard.

VELTRIE: Not for any irrigation on the rest of the 223 acre parcel?

RICHARDSON: Nothing outside the area of the house.

CANDA: There are no signs of ditches, or other irrigation. It was used strictly for the house area.

CAMPBELL: *MOVED* to **APPROVE** the request of a Subdivision Waiver, with a Replat of the remaining land and a Plat restriction stating that it cannot be subdivided to less than thirty five acre parcels.

BAILEY: *SECONDED* the motion on the floor.

PLANNING COMMISSION: Voted to **APPROVE** the Subdivision Waiver by a vote of six in favor of the request and one against.

BAILEY: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, because of the Plat restriction.

BARNES: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, because the Plat restriction prevented creation of five acre density.

HOOD: Voted *AGAINST* the motion, because in the past we voted against such requests that had geographical or road issues, and they had to create 35 acre parcels.

COKER: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, due to the overall reduction of parcel density.

CAMPBELL: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, due to the thirty five acre plat restriction and the creation of an eight acre parcel in a five acre zoned area.

RORICK: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, because eight acres is larger than five acre zoning.

ATTEBERY: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, because of the thirty five acre Plat restriction and the eight acre lot is larger than five acre zone.

CUSTER: *MOVED* the Board of County Commissioners **APPROVE** the recommendation of the Planning Commission to approve the Subdivision Waiver requested by Dave & Rebecca Richardson.

NAYLOR: The approval could have conditions.

CUSTER: *WITHDREW MOTION ON THE FLOOR*

DOWNEY: Commissioner Downey made a motion to approve the recommendation by the Planning Commission for the Subdivision Waiver for Dave & Rebecca Richardson for the division of the eight acre parcel from the total 223 acre parcel, with the conditions that approval is not final until a replat of the 223 acre parcel with the subdivided eight acre parcel is recorded, and a plat restriction and deed restriction stating that the remaining larger parcel cannot be broken down to less than thirty five acre parcels is recorded also.

CUSTER: *SECONDED* the motion.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS: Voted to **APPROVE** the motion.

Dave & Shirley Harmon

Lot Line Adjustment

Property Address: Lake Street San Isabel, CO.81069

Schedule Number: 100-86-800

ATTEBERY: Read the applicants statement, "I would like to vacate the lot lines between lot 14 & 15 and adjust the lot lines between lot 15 & 16, 13 feet to remove an encroachment of an existing cabin two feet over the lot 16 west side. The thirteen feet would clear up the encroachment and would also provide the ten foot setback for the cabin. That would make lot 14 and lot 15 plus thirteen feet of the west side of lot 16 become 112 feet wide to vacate the lot line between lot 16 and lot 17 to make them one parcel. That lot size would make them 87 feet wide by 100 feet deep."

ATTEBERY: Skip Northcross represented the Planning Commission on the site tour of Dave Harmon's property, and he will make his observations public at this time.

NORTHCROSS: The lots in question are located to the south of San Isabel Lake Lodge and cabins. Lake Street, where the lots in question are located, runs perpendicular to the street where the cabins and lodge are located. This area was originally platted for eight lots each containing one small cabin, the same behind the lodge. One lot of the eight, #18, has been sold and now has a park model home on it. Lot 17 is the site of an engineered septic system for seven dwellings. Lot #15 presently has two structures on it. By adjusting the lot line between lots 15 and 16 by thirteen feet, clears up an encroachment and provides a ten foot setback for the cabin. Mr. Harmon intends to sell this lot with the cabin on it under the provisions the two structures are incorporated into one dwelling. The cabins are very close together. Today, the BZA has vacated the lot lines between lot 14 & 15 and 16 & 17. The result of this is two lots instead of four. Two dwellings instead of four dwellings in an already dense neighborhood. Lot 17 with the engineered septic system will be large enough for one dwelling while meeting necessary set backs for lot lines and septic. Lots 12 & 13 contain the well from which all eight lots are served. These could be sold in the future. Still only a total of five dwellings are on the septic system engineered for seven dwellings. Harmon would provide septic service and water to the dwellings instead of potentially seven. His well is adequate for these additions. The

Zoning office received copies of monitor reports from the state annually for both the septic and water. History has shown them to be always satisfactory.

HARMON: Our water is reported to the state, so that situation is being constantly monitored. We are taking non-conforming lots and bringing them into compliance with the current Zoning Resolution.

HOOD: *MOVED* to **APPROVE** the request for a Lot Line Adjustment.

BARNES: *SECONDED* the motion on the floor.

PLANNING COMMISSION: Voted unanimously to **APPROVE** the request for a Lot Line Adjustment.

BAILEY: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, creation of larger less dense lots.

CAMPBELL: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, decreasing density.

RORICK: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, less density.

COKER: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, less density.

HOOD: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, cleaning up a dense area.

BARNES: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, less density.

ATTEBERRY: Voted *IN FAVOR* of the motion, less density, creating conforming lots, and cleaning up a dense area.

SHY: *MOVED* the Board of County Commissioners **APPROVE** the recommendation made by the Planning Commission on the request for a Lot Line Adjustment for Dave Harmon.

DOWNEY: *SECONDED* the motion on the floor.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS: Voted to **APPROVE** the motion.

ATTEBERRY: *MOVED* to adjourn at 3:55 p.m.

CAMPBELL: *SECONDED* the motion on the floor.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:56 p.m.
