



Valley County Planning & Zoning Commission

PO Box 1350
219 North Main Street
Cascade, ID 83611-1350

Phone: 208.382.7115
Fax: 208.382.7119
Email: cherrick@co.valley.id.us
Website: www.co.valley.id.us

Todd Hatfield, Chairman
Harry Stathis, Vice-Chairman

Ed Allen, Commissioner
Gerald Patterson, Commissioner
Robert L. Garrison, Commissioner

VALLEY COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

DATE: July 10, 2008

TIME: 6:00 p.m. to 8:10 p.m.

LOCATION: Valley County Courthouse

ATTENDANCE: Commissioners present: Chairman Todd Hatfield, Gerald Patterson, Ed Allen and Rob Garrison. Harry Stathis was excused. Staff members present: Cynda Herrick, AICP, Planning and Zoning Administrator and Paula Amundson, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant.

Chairman Hatfield introduced Rob Garrison as the new Planning and Zoning Commissioner and stated this would be his first meeting.

MINUTES: Chairman Hatfield asked if there were any changes or corrections to the June 19, 2008 minutes. There were none. Commissioner Patterson moved to approve minutes for June 19, 2008. Chairman Hatfield seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

A. OLD BUSINESS:

1. PUD 04-01 The Meadows at West Mountain, Phases 4-6 -- Extension Request: The applicant is Jack Charters of Timberline Developments, LLC. He is requesting approval of a one-year extension request of the Conditional Use Permit which states that a phase will be developed at least every two years. Phase 4 expires on July 12, 2008. The site is located in Section 17, T.16N, R.3E, B.M., Valley County, Idaho. [Not a public hearing.]

Chairman Hatfield announced the item and stated it was not a public hearing.

Staff stated a one year extension request was received on May 21, 2008 for the final three phases in the Meadows at West Mountain. The reasons for the extension are:

- DEQ must review the Phase 4 Construction Plan
- NLR&WD must review the Phase 4 Construction Plans
- The Valley County Engineer must review the Phase 4-6 Drainage Report
- The Valley County Surveyor must review the Phase 4-6 Final Plat

Phases 1, 2 and 3 have been recorded and the applicant was still in their timeline and recommended that the extension be approved.

Commissioner Allen moved to approve a one year extension for P.U.D. 04-01 The Meadows at West Mountain and that they continue to follow the phasing plan with a phase being recorded at least every two years. The next phase needs to be recorded by July 14, 2009. Commissioner Patterson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2. PUD 04-01 The Meadows at West Mountain, Phases 4-6 – Final Plat: The applicant is Jack Charters of Timberline Developments, LLC. He is requesting final plat approval for Phases 4-5 on approximately 58.97 acres. The Commission will review the final plat and Conditional Use Permit to determine conformance with the preliminary plat. Phase I was recorded November 23, 2004; Phase 2-3 on March 2, 2006. The site is located in NE ¼ Sec. 17, T.16N, R.3E, B.M., Valley County, Idaho. [Not a public hearing.] *Postponed to August 14, 2008.*

3. C.U.P. 08-07 Lakeport Storage II: The applicant is Lakeport Storage, LLC. They are requesting approval to establish four storage structures. The purpose of the buildings will be to store seasonal vehicles/boats from Mile High Marina and Hinson Power Sports. The proposed building sizes are: 3,360 sq. ft., 9,000 sq. ft, and two each at 10,200 sq. ft. There are two existing 10,200 sq. ft. storage buildings that were allowed by C.U.P. 06-29. Access would be from the existing Hinson Power Sports driveway on Hwy 55. The 10-acre site is RP00555000020A, Hinson Acres Subdivision Lot 2, in the NWNW Section 3, T.17N, R.3 E, B.M., Valley County, Idaho. [Tabled from June 19, 2008].

Chairman Hatfield announced the item and stated it was tabled from their last meeting on June 19, 2008. He asked if there were any exparte contact or conflict of interest. Commissioner Allen recused himself.

Staff stated at their last meeting the Planning and Zoning Commission directed the applicant to prepare a new site plan showing phasing, requiring that the landscaping be done in the first phase and conception of the buildings being done in the second phase. It was also requested that the new structures be reduced to two buildings. Mrs. Flemmer did submit seven pictures of the site (Exhibit 1).

Sam Worley, P.O. Box 4010, McCall, representing Lakeport Storage came forward. He stated he had the architect draw up the new site plan showing the landscaping plan and phasing plan (Exhibit 2). He stated they have reduced the structures to two buildings as requested. The phasing plan showed that landscaping will begin first before construction is started on the first building.

Staff took a copy of the revised site plan and gave it to members of the audience for them to look at. Staff asked for clarification on when they anticipated the building permit being issued. Mr. Worley stated after Phase One's landscaping plan was completed, then they would begin building Phase One's structure.

Commissioner Patterson asked if they had considered the neighbors comments and the direction they were looking. Mr. Worley said yes they had and it appeared the direction was coming from the east. That was the reason for landscaping the east property line first.

Staff suggested because there was new information the public hearing should be reopened.

Mr. Worley stated they have knocked down all the dirt piles and bermed it to the northern slope in preparation for landscaping. They pulled out all the boats from behind so that there are no visible boats. The trailers are in and out and are in a constant state of movement. The big pontoon boats and all the things that were staged on the back of the property have all been moved.

Chairman Hatfield stated at this time they would reopen the public hearing.
Chairman Hatfield asked for proponents. There were none.
Chairman Hatfield asked for undecided.

Ed Allen, 13950 Easy Street, stated he lived east of this project. He stated his primary concerns are with the layout of the buildings and that the landscaping is done in a manner that works. He said that six foot trees will not work. They need to follow the conditions of their conditional use permit and if they are going to change something, come back in front of the Commission and request a change of use.

Chairman Hatfield asked for opponents. There were none.

Sam Worley came forward and stated the comments presented were fair and reasonable.

Chairman Hatfield closed the public hearing. Deliberations ensued amongst the Commission. They looked over the revised landscaping and site plan and thought that it was in line with the requirements set forth. There was more open space created by scaling the application down to two buildings. It was clarified that Phase One's landscaping will be completed first in the summer/fall of 2008, before a building permit will be issued. Phase Two is set to start with the landscaping in the summer/fall of 2010 and the structure would begin in the fall of 2010.

Staff stated if approved additional conditions of approval would be added:

- A building permit will not be issued until Phase One's landscaping was completed.
- If the landscaping dies it must be replaced within two months if it is not in the winter.
- The landscaping must be irrigated.

Commissioner Patterson moved to approve C.U.P. 08-07 Lakeport Storage II as amended with new phasing and landscaping plan submitted, and additional conditions of approval.
Commissioner Garrison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Hatfield stated there was a ten day appeal period.

4. Amendments to the Valley County Subdivision Regulations Ordinance: The Valley County Subdivision Regulations was originally adopted April 29, 1970 and has been amended previously. The Ordinance provides definitions, rules, and regulations for the approval of plats, subdivisions, dedications, and vacations of public right-of-way and easements; prescribes standards for the design, layout, and development thereof; requires improvements; provides

standards for the approval or disapproval thereof; provides for the granting of variations and exceptions thereto; provides for a penalty of violations; and provides for appeal. The current amendment provides for administrative plats, short plats, and pathways, and increases the 20-acre exemption to 40 acres. The complete document may be viewed at:

http://www.co.valley.id.us/docs/PZ/Proposed_AmendmentsToSubReg.pdf

Staff stated at their last meeting they postponed scheduling a work session until they had a full commission to do so.

It was decided that a work session be scheduled for September 11, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. Commissioner Allen moved to schedule work session for September 11, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. Commissioner Patterson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

B. NEW BUSINESS:

1. C.U.P. 08-10 Morell Meadows Subdivision – Preliminary Plat: The applicants are Myron & Susan McCumber. They are requesting approval of a two-lot residential subdivision on 7.23 acres. The subdivision would be served by individual wells and sewer. The lots would be accessed via a private road onto Morell Road. The property is currently addressed as 14096 Morell Road. The parcel (RP18N03E252255 & RP18N04E303925) is located in the SENE Sec. 25, T.18N, R.3E, and SWNW Sec. 30, T.18N, R.4.E, B.M., Valley County, Idaho.

Chairman Hatfield announced the item and asked if there was any exparte contact or conflict of interest. There were none. He then asked for the Staff Report.

Staff presented the Staff Report. Since the staff report has been completed additional comments have been received marked as Exhibit 1.

Mr. & Mrs. Richard Scott, 6249 Melville Drive, Oakland, CA responded by letter received July 3, 2008:

- Property owners since the early 1970's
- Major concern is for the water table with the increase of more wells
- Hope that no more subdivisions or wells are approved for the Morell Road area

Jeff & Mary Lantz, 9316 N. Pebble Falls Ln., Boise, responded by letter received July 7, 2008:

- Own a home at 14076 ½ Morell Road and are against the proposed subdivision
- The noise level would be increased to their property
- The current layout of the parcels on Morell Road provides an environment that is peaceful and open. If this subdivision is allowed it would set a precedent for other lot owners to start subdividing their parcels.

David and Janet Vlasach, 14098 Morell Road, responded by letter received July 10, 2008:

- When they purchased their property it was with the understanding that the properties in the subdivision were to remain as surveyed.
- The nature of the neighborhood would be changed.
- Increase density and traffic would diminish the value of adjacent properties and spoil the unique character.

- The McCumber's are our friends but they do object to this application.

Richard Bland, Boulder Lake Road, McCall, responded by letter received July 10, 2008:

- Bland Family Trust opposed increased density of this residential community.

Greg & Kaye Cutler, 12420 SE 252nd Place, Kent, WA, responded by e-mail received July 10, 2008:

- We purchased our property in 1999 and attached to our Deed and Title Policy was an exhibit "C". The first item states that the buyers shall not subdivide the land.
- It is our understanding that all the property owners in the immediate area also received this same exhibit with their purchase documents
- Opposed to this application for subdividing and ask that the covenants detailed in Exhibit "C" be honored.

Staff stated she received additional correspondence this evening:

John Seevers, 14094 Morell Road, responded by letter dated July 10, 2008 (Exhibit 2). Some of the objections stated in his letter are:

- It will change the character of the neighborhood.
- There are 8 residents living on Morell Road.
- If this is approved it will set a precedent.
- There will be increased traffic, noise, lights, people, dust, animals and pollution.
- The McCumbers operate a business which impacts the neighborhood with equipment, trailers and supplies.
- This will change the area from rural to city environment.
- There are access problems.

Larry and Dede Bender, 14076 Morell Road, responded by letter (Exhibit 3) and said they chose to live rurally and keep the following:

- Visual serenity and freedom from impact of over development.
- A quiet place with low density and natural settings.
- Object to further property division and asked this proposal be denied.

Ted and Lisa Arnold, 14089 Morell Road, responded by letter (Exhibit 4). They stated they purchased their property with the understanding that the number of lots in existence at that time would not change. They purchased specifically on Morell Road because they like the density and that the lot is not suitable for a split.

Lowell and Bobbie Meader, 14118 Morell Road, responded by letter (Exhibit 5). They stated they purchased the property because of the location, the covenants that were in place and the deed restrictions placed on their warranty deed. It is a concern to the Morell Road community that the McCumbers listed their C.U.P. property before it was actually split.

Staff stated she has a copy of the McCumber's warranty deed and it does not reference any attachments except for the property description (Exhibit 6). However one of the lines states "Subject to current year's taxes, irrigation district assessments, public utility easements, subdivision restrictions and U.S. Patent reservations."

Staff stated she also included a letter that she had written to the McCumber's in 2005 concerning their business (Exhibit 7). Staff believed they were still in compliance with that letter from 2005. All the business activity takes place off site and they have no employees parking on site.

Commissioner Patterson asked about the deeds, and covenants, conditions and restrictions (CCR's) that were given to them for review and wondered if any of the CCR's conditions had been recorded with the deed.

Staff stated in October, 1991 the parcels were created. It was originally proposed as Wapiti Ridge Subdivision and that plat was never recorded. Apparently there were CCR's recorded when the rural parcels created. CCR's can be recorded and do not have to be associated with a subdivision. It is not our issue to enforce CCR's.

Chairman Hatfield stated at this time they would hear from the applicant.

Myron McCumber, 14096 Morell Road, handed out maps and aerial photo and distributed them to the Commission (Exhibit 8). He stated he and his family have lived in this neighborhood for eleven years. He understood the concerns of his neighbors, who are good friends and neighbors. In subdividing the property they want to create two lots, one was the lower part of the property where their existing residence is, which is the parcel they want to sell. After that they would move into the barn and shop on the upper parcel, with some additional remodeling. Their intention was to stay in the neighborhood and they were also concerned with keeping the rural atmosphere and peaceful environment.

Mr. McCumber said their goal was to downsize because their children have gone off to college and it was a large piece of property to maintain. They are not trying to develop anything. Both properties are built on, both properties have existing septic systems, the upper property would need a well, and there is power, gas and telephone to both buildings. Regarding impacting the density of the neighborhood, it would add one more family down that paved driveway. It will increase additional use on Morell Road, but so do a lot of the existing properties with guest houses that are rented out or have caretakers in them. Those particular residents do not participate in their road association. He is creating a use that will participate in the road association and pay for maintenance and upkeep.

He said to address another concern by the parcels being created is that they don't have road frontage. They are willing to create a 70 foot easement down the north boundary of their property for the lower lot and they would keep their right-of-way to go down to their pump house for irrigation purposes.

He understood that a lot of people seem to think that there is a subdivision there with CCR's. He has done research with AmeriTitle to find some recorded document that shows they have CCR's or that there is a subdivision in existence on their property. They could not find any.

As far as existing use, their property is adjacent to a number of lots that are smaller than the two lots they are proposing to create. They don't think they are creating a substandard lot for the neighborhood. This subdivision was not going to create, dust, erosion or construction noise because the buildings already exist. Also, the landscaping was in and irrigated.

Commissioner Patterson asked if Mr. McCumber had seen the ccr's that he was given for review

from their neighbors. Mr. McCumber stated he had not, could not find any ccr's that had been recorded, and could not find any attached to his property. He had not been given any ccr's at the time he purchased his property.

Commissioner Allen asked staff how did this happen? How do we deal with the issue of determining whether there were actually CCR's or not.

Staff stated this is not a recorded subdivision. The ccr's reference Wapiti Ridge Estates and there is no such subdivision. Whatever subdivision was created was never recorded. Staff was under the impression that other homeowners' had received these ccr's but Staff has not seen a signed copy. This is not a planning and zoning issue that needs to be determined.

Commissioner Allen asked Mr. McCumber if he felt he was in compliance with the operation of his business at his residence. Mr. McCumber said he felt he was in compliance and that he is a general contractor and has an insulation business. On site he has an insulation trailer in front of shop and he has a fork lift that is used for construction business. He only has part time employees, which none of them work or park at that location. They have done berming along the south boundary of their property line where the barn is to provide a little softening with their neighbors.

Chairman Hatfield asked to hear from proponents. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield asked to hear from undecided. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield asked to hear from opponents.

Larry Binder, 1406 Morell Road, came forward and stated he owned three separate parcels in the subdivision. He made reference to the Valley County Land Use and Development Ordinance (LUDO) and submitted a copy of the first four pages (Exhibit 9). He is concerned with the overcrowding of their land in a rural area. He stated he is concerned about their property rights and the Commission's effort to minimize adverse affects to them.

He then referenced the "Neighbor Notification" and took exception to the wording that "if you do not submit a comment it will be assumed you have no objections...." (Exhibit 10). As a neighborhood they object to this, even though most of them are friendly with the McCumber's. But there are people that are so friendly with the McCumber's they feel they cannot come forward, even though I believe they object to this also.

He then submitted the McCumber's C.U.P. Application (Exhibit 11) which he said were full of errors and misstatements. Lastly he submitted a record of survey for the parcels in the area to show impact (Exhibit 12). It showed the McCumber's parcel and all the surrounding parcels almost in a complete circle who object to the application.

Commissioner Garrison asked Staff that looking at the plat it is stating the area to be 4.654 acres. Staff stated that parcel is the westerly half of their lot. The easterly half is split by a tax code line and that is why it appears they have two parcels. The McCumber's originally thought they had two parcels with their property, because they had two separate parcel numbers.

John Seevers, 14094 Morell Road, stated he lived south of the proposed property being split. He was opposed for all the reasons that have been heard and written tonight. It will change the

character of the neighborhood. When the rest of the neighbors bought those properties, they understood the size of the properties, both large and small, but it was their understanding the size of the properties would not be allowed to be split again. He submitted the warranty deed from the Morell's to the Brown's (Exhibit 13). This deed has a list of restrictions in relation to this property from here on out. Mr. Seever's said he also had a letter from Ruth Kretschmer, previous owner of the McCumber property, and she stated it was her understanding that the property could not be divided any further either. (Not left as an exhibit)

He further stated regarding the CCR's, the key word here is the word recorded. Nobody can find anything recorded, but there is a clear intent that there were CCR's. He submitted another copy of the "Restrictive Covenants" signed by different names, but it shows that there were multiple people at multiple times trying to put covenants on the property which were then given to all buyers indicating what they can do (Exhibit 14).

Mr. Seevers submitted the Declaration of Private Roads for Wapiti Ridge Estates which addresses CCR's and road agreement but was never signed or recorded (Exhibit 15). He then submitted a picture taken today from his property of the back of their barn with equipment lying around (Exhibit 16). He wanted to show the impact their businesses has on everybody else, which is visible from the road.

Mr. Seever's then displayed a record of survey done for Maurice Brown (Exhibit 17). He had drawn blue circles to show areas of influence of existing homes surrounding the McCumber property. As can be seen this is the densest area of the Morell Road development. The noise level from motorcycles and the radio is pretty loud coming from the McCumber property. They claim that there is nothing else going on out there. But if you read the real estates ads for the lower property it says they can have another house and a barn down there. He thought regarding the upper property that down the road another house will be going on that property because somebody will not want to live in a barn. He believed their property tax values would also be diminished.

Jim Crawford, 14075 Morell Road, stated they have known the McCumber's for quite a few years and consider them good friends and neighbors. He said all the property along Morell Road was owned by Jay and Maurice Morell and as they sold parcels they passed along their deeds and restrictions. He said their warranty deed signed in 1987 by the Morell's has restrictions in there that they agreed to. Somehow the subdivision itself got lost but the original set of covenants has been the idea all along. He stated he was president of the Morell Road Association for the last twelve years. He believed that all the people who bought their lots on Morell Road understood that those lots could not be divided. He said if this proposed subdivision is permitted it would allow all the other property owners to start subdividing their land which would change the character of their special place. Submitted his letter marked as Exhibit 18.

Chairman Hatfield asked to hear from the applicant for rebuttal.

Myron McCumber stated he appreciated all of his neighbor's comments and respected their feelings. He said the closest neighbor he has and the one that has the most issues with his residence is John Seevers. With regard to the picture submitted by John Seevers of his barn area the red trailer is used for motorcycles and the stack of bricks are going to be used for a patio in the back. Their intent is to remodel their barn and to live in it. There is roofing material out

there which is headed to Boise. He agreed the forklift is not attractive, but he has also looked out at John Seevers property which has also been filled with his different types of machinery in the last ten years. So this isn't a one way street. They have had two teenagers living in their home for the last few years and the things that go with teenagers did go on at their home. Like he said before he does not have any copy of the ccr's attached to his deed, he doesn't believe there is a recorded subdivision, and it is not his intent to skirt anything or obscure the facts. He stated he respectfully submits his plan and hoped the Commission will find it in compliance.

Commissioner Garrison asked about the roads that are actually easements across his property. Commissioner Garrison wanted to clarify that when they are talking about developing the road that it would go all the way back to the lower lot. Mr. McCumber answered that was correct.

Chairman Hatfield said at this time they would close the public hearing.

Discussion ensued amongst the Commission. Commissioner Allen said the big issue here was this area a subdivision or are they private parcels of land. It sounds like it is not a subdivision since one was never recorded. These deed restrictions must have been recorded with the property.

Staff stated that the McCumber's did not have any restrictions recorded with their deed. Staff stated her understanding is that there was a twenty acre piece of property that went from the Morell's to the Brown's which had deed restrictions, which was later split into four parcels. Maybe those deed restrictions didn't get passed on even though it was stated that they were to be successive with the other property owners.

Commissioner Allen said it seemed like they started out by wanting to put deed restrictions on this, but didn't believe there was the backing in the ordinances for them to deny this based on that premise. Staff stated again that we do not enforce CCR's. Commissioner Allen said exactly, and so not being a subdivision, not finding any encompassing CCR's and no homeowner's association, that is the real issue here. If there was a homeowner's association then they would take up this proposal with them. Staff stated typically that is how it usually works, because when there are CCR's there is a homeowners association to enforce them.

Chairman Hatfield asked when this property was divided up. Staff thought the 80's or 90's. Chairman Hatfield disagreed and he believed that it was a subdivision. The reason he asked earlier if the Bowlden's were here was because they were the ones that submitted the "Restrictive Covenants" that were given to them by the real estate company back in 1999. He felt they must have been recorded because they would not have come up with the property when it changed hands in 1999 with regards to the Bowlden's.

Commissioner Allen said he could be right but how can they react either way since they do not enforce CCR's. Chairman Hatfield thought they could because CCR's are there for a reason. We make people put CCR's on their subdivisions. Staff stated that was not correct, because we do not enforce CCR's, so they do not require CCR's for subdivisions.

Chairman Hatfield said he understands wanting to split your parcel. He also understands that when you buy in area with small lots or large lots, you are buying into a certain type of living that you desire. If there are these restrictive covenants attached with your property out there,

then people are buying into that.

Commissioner Patterson said there was a lot of testimony written and heard about how they would be affected visually and by noise. He wasn't so sure that would be true. There seems to be both larger lots and smaller lots surrounding the two proposed lots. He did ask Mr. McCumber if he had restrictions on his lot, and he said he was unaware of any restrictions when he bought his lot. So if this is correct does he have the right to separate his property because of this? Technically the deed restrictions don't apply to him, since he never received any at the time of his purchase. He further said everybody has their perspective and everybody has their rights.

Commissioner Allen commented the problem with this was that it was one of those issues that are outside of our ordinances for resolving.

Commissioner Garrison agreed that he was also looking at Mr. McCumber's warranty deed and there is nothing there that tells him what his subdivision restrictions are specifically. Granted there are other homeowners that have copies of them, but they were provided with them.

Staff stated there are also the frontage and road issues. They will have to rearrange their plat if you approve this, so that each lot has 30 feet of frontage onto Morell Road, which is a private road. The subdivision ordinance also requires that all subdivisions be connected to a county road or connected to a county road by a private road that is built to county standards. So you are going to have to decide what to do with that portion of the subdivision ordinance. Staff referenced Ordinance No.05-76.

It was discussed on how they would go about this. They would have to replat with a flag lot for the back lot to have access to 30 feet of frontage off of Morell Road. Then, Morell Road would have to be brought up to county standards. This would be a condition of approval.

Staff stated it comes back to the issue of compatibility. If they comply with the specifics of their drawing and meet all of the standards, ultimately your decision would be is it compatible with the surrounding land uses.

Commissioner Allen moved to approve preliminary plat for C.U.P. 08-10 Morell Meadows Subdivision with the additional condition of approval of meeting frontage standards and had to comply with Ordinance No. 05-76 in the subdivision regulations. Commissioner Garrison seconded the motion. All in favor were Commissioner's Allen, Patterson, and Garrison. Chairman Hatfield voted against motion. The motion carried.

Chairman Hatfield stated there was a ten day appeal period.

C. OTHER ITEMS:

1. Facts and Conclusions: Approved as presented.

- C.U.P. 08-08 Gold Fork River Ranch Gravel & Sand Sales
- C.U.P. 08-09 Aloha Point Subdivision

2. Correspondence:

- City of McCall sponsored Land Use Law Workshop on July 28, 2008 at 5:30 p.m. – They have invited the Planning and Zoning Commission to attend.
- C.U.P. 06-02 Settler's Mill Subdivision #1 (2 Phases) – Copper Canyon Development is in the final stages of determining well sites. They are requesting an additional 90 day final plat extension to November 13, 2008. The current extension expires on August 13, 2008. Approved as presented.
- P.U.D. 07-02 East Lake Meadows – Letter regarding approval for constructing model units - They are requesting to construct model units before they put in the infrastructure to generate interest in the project. Typically Valley County does not allow this, so I will let them know that they can come and talk to you about it at your next scheduled meeting August 14, 2008. Chairman Hatfield said at this time they would have to say no, but they are more than welcome to come to the next meeting and present their request.

3. Appendix A Amendment – It was agreed to postpone to August 14, 2008

4. Discussion is concerning Industrial/Commercial Uses – Commissioner Patterson stated he was working on maps. Chairman Hatfield stated he wants to get a hold of North Lake Sewer and Water District and see where there lines go to. It would be good to find an area that could tie into that. It would be nice to have a couple of areas in the county for industrial businesses to go.

Meeting adjourned.