

**Fremont County Planning  
& Zoning Commission  
Minutes  
April 7, 2008  
County Annex Building**

The Fremont County Planning & Zoning Commission met in a regular session on April 7, 2008. They met in the County Annex Building. **Members in attendance were:** Kirk Mackert (Chairman), John Nedrow (Vice-Chairman), Larry Singleton, Joette Lookabaugh, Cindy Miller, Steve Pinther, Ron Kynaston, Vance Derricott, and Glen Pond.

**Staff and others present:** Joshua Chase (Planner I), Molly Knox (P&Z Administrative Assistant), Marla Vik (Public Works Director), and Letta Laux (P&Z Secretary).

**1. Welcome**

Mr. Mackert welcomed everyone to the meeting at 5:59pm.

**2. Presentation by Nelson Engineering on the Review of Schiess & Associates Large Scale Development Study (LSDS) of Golden Sands Resort.**

Jeff Snyder-Nelson Engineering stated he handed out a final report of the review for the LSDS of Golden Sands Resort and a letter that explains the differences between the draft and the final report. He went over the changes with the P&Z commission. He asked Diane Temple to explain the changes in the Emergency Service Section.

Diane Temple-Nelson Engineering explained the emergency services section and stated that emergency services were decided to be included into the review of the LSDS and the review was added into the final report.

Mr. Snyder referred to the Steven's Ranch LSDS and stated he felt it set the precedence for how LSDS are done in Fremont County. He discussed item 3 from the report. He listed the different facilities and services that need to be covered in the LSDS. For runoff and erosion control, there was nothing to discuss. For firefighting services, there is an existing well, and they have received a "will serve" letter from the fire department. There is one issue with the well and there was no information that proves that the 16" well will produce enough water for fire protection. He also questioned the irrigation flow requirements, and he thought one inch per week might not be sufficient to irrigate. The fire protection and the irrigation need to be added together and the well needs to be able to

produce 1,000 gallons per minute even if they are irrigating at the same time they are fighting a fire.

Mrs. Miller stated that one inch per week of irrigation is not going to be adequate.

Mr. Pinther stated that this study seems to have a few inadequacies. He asked if this could be because the developer chose their own engineer.

Mr. Snyder stated it is his opinion that there are a few inadequacies, but he can not say that it is because the developer hired his own engineer or if it is just the way the engineer interpreted the code.

Mr. Pinther stated he just wants to be sure that the P&Z can receive the best information. There are holes in the study, and they should discuss that issue. He asked if the runoff and erosion control study was not done because it did not need to be addressed.

Mr. Snyder stated in the report they have indicated that the erosion control study does need to be done. Stated he is going to go through the analysis and then the revisions or recommendations for the study.

Mr. Pinther stated he wanted to point out that the fire department was concerned with having two points of egress.

Mr. Snyder discussed the Water Section and that there was not a lot of information provided for the community water system. Discussed the current sewer proposal and that they are planning on using the St. Anthony treatment center via the Parker lift station. He discussed the transportation study and that it was dealt with adequately. He discussed the solid waste section and they got a letter from PSI that they will pick up the waste but they have not talked with the land fill and he feels that is a big issue and needs to be addressed. They also need to indicate what the sheriff response is for the emergency services. He discussed the recommendations for the LSDS: they need to provide more information on irrigation, address the erosion control and run-off, address the solid waste and how they can mitigate impacts to the landfill or find some way to help the County out with that. They did not discuss the proposed cost analysis for the proposed upgrades for the water and sewer systems, and it is clear in the code that they are required to provide the cost and then discuss with the County who is to pay for those costs.

Mr. Mackert questioned the water source. He would like to have clarification if they are proposing to drill another well out there. Can they tie the new well in with the other one? They need to clarify what the intent is with that.

Mr. Snyder stated that he thought it is not likely that they can tie those together.

Mr. Pinther questioned what the next step is to get this finished.

Mr. Snyder stated they will have multiple discussions until Nelson Engineering is satisfied with Scheiss and Associates' report and have met the intent of the code.

Mr. Pinther stated he is glad that Nelson is following up with all the holes and keeping them on task.

Mr. Mackert stated he appreciated the review that Nelson Engineering is providing for Fremont County.

Mr. Derricott asked if they are doing this dual review procedure in other areas.

Mr. Snyder stated they do a lot of the reviews and LSDS for other developers.

Mr. Chase asked what kind of interaction they have had with the developer.

Mr. Snyder stated that the communication has been funneled through the County. It would be more efficient to communicate directly with the consulting firm and they can send all the correspondence via email to the County until the review is done. Then the final report can be given.

Mr. Grant Thorson-Schiess & Associates stated that he has addressed the concerns from the review made by Nelson Engineering. He went through a letter to the County that lists their response to the recommendations of Nelson Engineering. He also gave their reason for not providing a cost analysis which is because the County will not be responsible for those costs.

Mr. Derricott questioned the two-points of access issue.

Mr. Thorson stated they addressed that in the transportation services section. The current plan does have another access.

Mr. Pinther stated they did not do the cost analysis because the developer was going to be paying for the additional costs, and questioned if what they are designing or proposing is adequate.

Mr. Thorson stated the DEQ governs the standards and they can not build anything that is not approved by DEQ. It will be adequate and appropriate to the site.

Mr. Pinther questioned the pump systems and the lift stations and they would want to know that they have a good design.

Mr. Mackert stated it will be adequate because they will have to submit plans to the DEQ for approval.

Mike Jardin-Scheiss and Associates stated that the Mayors from Parker and St. Anthony are also looking into this.

Mr. Thorson discussed the sanitary services section and it will be constructed by the developer and maintained and owned by the County. He discussed solid waste disposal and they have talked to the County Public Works to determine the capacity available. He discussed Police Protection and they have made an effort to contact the Sheriff. They would like acceptance or acceptance with conditions.

Mrs. Lookabaugh questioned what is going on with the Sheriff and why he has not responded.

Mr. Thorson stated he visited the Sheriff's office as well as made several phone calls and left messages and has not been able to get a response. He would be willing to keep pursuing the issue to be able to get one.

Mr. Mackert asked if Mr. Chase would be willing to send a letter asking the Sheriff to respond.

Mrs. Miller asked for justification on why the one inch per week irrigation would be adequate.

Mr. Thorson stated they do have the water rights to be able to irrigate that property. They can redo the flow requirements, and they did not know what the irrigation needs were.

Mr. Mackert stated there has got to be information out there that tells how much irrigation would be required.

Mr. Thorson stated they will do that.

Mr. Mackert asked who looks at the flow rates on the wells for fire fighting.

Mr. Thorson stated it is the DEQ that gives the requirements for that.

Mr. Mackert asked if DEQ will check the flows on the pumps.

Mr. Thorson stated there will be a flow test and a pump test done and review the design for them to match it up.

Mrs. Miller asked if they should make a final recommendation on what they need to address.

Mr. Pinther stated that Nelson had recommended what needs to be done and they should not deviate from that.

Mr. Mackert questioned if there is anything in the code that will require someone to be on the site taking care of it.

Mr. Chase stated there are some maintenance requirements.

Mr. Mackert stated there could be some potential issues as the area grows.

Mr. Thorson stated the sewer systems they are proposing will have St. Anthony and Parker available to troubleshoot any problems that come up. The well is capable of making a call to the on-call worker if there is a problem.

Mrs. Vik stated the DEQ will require that a certified person will be available.

Mr. Pinther stated that he would like to see that Mr. Snyder is responsible to work with Scheiss & Ass.

**MR. PINTHER MOTIONED TO ACCEPT NELSON ENGINEERING AND MR. SNYDER'S RECOMMENDATION THAT SCHEISS & ASS. ARE TO WORK WITH MR. SNYDER AND DEAL WITH ALL THE ISSUES LISTED IN THE LSDS BEFORE SUBMITTING THE FINAL REVIEW. MRS. LOOKABAUGH SECONDED. VOTE TAKEN: ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED.**

Mr. Snyder stated that in dealing with the cost estimate issue, Schiess & Associates can provide an estimate and they would accept that. DEQ does not look at any systems dealing with fire fighting unless it is in a combined system. The fire department is strict on the requirements.

Mr. Pinther questioned if they can meet DEQ standards. Would he recommend that they have a different system, and if so they would want to see the cost estimate.

Mr. Snyder stated that is a possibility, and they would need to see the information to make an informed decision.

Mr. Mackert asked who would do the pump test to be sure this well meets the requirements.

Mr. Snyder stated it would be up to the developer to meet the requirements of the fire district and to prove that they have met the requirements.

Mr. Chase stated that the maintenance is addressed in Chapter XIII. He read from the code what the maintenance requirements are.

### **3. Sketch Plan-Williams Caretakers Cabin-Mike Williams**

Mr. Mackert asked for Mr. Chase to give his report on the Williams Caretakers Cabin.

Mr. Chase read from the report and read the three recommendations on page 2 of the staff report.

Mr. Robert Spence-intended purchaser of the split lot. Stated the reason for this is to be able to split a lot and to build a cabin for himself as he is the caretaker of Mr. Mike Williams's home. He explained the lot split on the map and questioned if he will have to go through this again for the city of Island Park.

Mr. Pond stated in order to annex this into the City of Island Park, they would have to go through public hearings and does not think he needs to worry about having to go through the process again.

Mr. Mackert stated it is already in the area of impact and Island Park has agreed to work with Fremont County building codes and that is the reason he is getting approval from the County. He discussed the lot with Mr. Spence as shown on the map.

Mrs. Miller asked if there has already been a lot split done on this property.

Mr. Spence referred to the map and stated that split was a 1&1/2 acre lot donated to the Fremont County Fire Department to build a shed to hold a fire truck. It was counted as a one-time lot split by Fremont County even though it was donated to them. This is not a subdivision.

Mr. Chase stated they could also look at using a lot line adjustment to make this parcel work.

Group discussed how to do a lot split or line adjustment.

Mr. Singleton stated since the land was given to the County for building a fire truck shed and if it hadn't been they would not even need to be in here asking for this, they should show some consideration to the landowner.

Mr. Spence stated they have been in contact with a County Commissioner and asked him to waive this and they were denied.

Mr. Mackert asked if the County had asked if they could buy that piece of land for building the fire shed.

Mr. Spence stated that it was difficult for the homeowners on the north end to get fire insurance and the Williams donated and subsidized the cost for the surveying in order to split off that parcel to donate to the County for the purposes of holding another fire truck.

Mr. Mackert stated if he is just looking for one parcel of the ground he could see the potential of dividing the larger parcel which could create problems with density.

Mr. Spence discussed the density of the land.

Mr. Pinther stated he is sympathetic with Mr. Spence because of the donation to the County and they should not be held to the one split requirement. He questioned if there is any intention for commercial use there and if the home would be visible from the highway. He is also concerned with the access to that lot.

Mr. Spence stated there is a huge burme in front of the property keeping it hidden from the highway. He would be asking for an easement from the adjoining land-owner's property for the access road.

Mr. Mackert questioned if the access off of Hwy. 20 is used right now.

Mr. Spence stated that he uses it for his rental property and Jerry also uses it for his driveway.

Mr. Kynaston stated that there is a well known snow mobile trail that goes through there.

Mr. Spence stated the trail is not there anymore and has been rerouted to the other side of the highway.

Group discussed the snow mobile trail situations in Island Park.

Mr. Spence stated he will have to install a well and a septic system and asked if he will need to get a building permit since he is only building on a 1&1/2 acre lot.

Mr. Chase stated he will have to have a building permit and they do not have a minimum lot size for needing one.

Mr. Nedrow stated he would have to go to the health department for septic permits.

Mr. Mackert asked if they are looking at a two lot subdivision here.

Mr. Chase stated the code looks at this as creating two lots.

Mr. Spence questioned the connection to the water system or central sewage requirements.

Mr. Chase stated there is an exemption that if you can not connect to that system then you will have to have one put in.

Mr. Mackert asked about the density requirements.

Mr. Chase stated there were no wetlands or stream corridors. He explained how they came up with the density for this, and that they could receive bonus points.

Mr. Nedrow questioned if the smaller parcel would still work with the line adjustment being less than 2 & ½ acres.

Mr. Chase stated they do not have that minimum density. Where there are two existing lots the density takes into account the big piece.

Mr. Spence questioned if he could get bonus points.

Mr. Chase explained how bonus points are awarded.

Mr. Mackert asked Mr. Chase if Mr. Spence could meet with him and try to work out the possibility of doing a lot split or line adjustment.

Mr. Pond asked what verification they have that the lot split was done when the parcel was given to the County.

Mr. Spence stated that Mr. Patlovich had done the research on that.

Mr. Pinther stated if it was not for the lot being given to the County, he would not even have to be here before the P&Z. The County Commissioners do have the right to waive the second lot split.

Mr. Chase stated the P&Z would have to deny this and they applicant would have to go to appeal.

Mr. Nedrow asked if they could also grant a variance.

Mr. Pinther questioned if Mr. Spence had contacted the Commissioners about this and that they had denied him? He asked who told him to go to the Commissioners.

Mr. Spence stated that Molly Knox had told him to talk to them because they are the only body that could be able to grant this.

Mr. Pinther stated they should send them a recommendation to reconsider this.

Mr. Chase stated that this would have to go through the procedural process.

Mr. Pinther stated the sketch plan can still proceed and at the same time, Mr. Spence can go to the Commissioners and ask them as well.

Mrs. Miller questioned if the main objective is to not have 3 tax id numbers.

Mr. Spence stated that he just wants to split the lot and build on it. The reason they want to do it this way is for the future possibility of the Williams wanting to sell more of their property.

Mr. Nedrow stated they can approve the sketch plan tonight and then approve a variance later, but this P&Z board does not have a history of granting variances.

Group discussed options for Mr. Spence to get this application approved. They discussed adding more property to his lot.

Mr. Chase stated the issue is not the lot size. He is recommending to Mr. Spence to do a lot line adjustment.

**MR. SINGLETON MOTIONED TO ALLOW THE SKETCH PLAN TO MOVE FORWARD. MR. PINTHER SECONDED. VOTE TAKEN: ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED.**

**4. Work Session- Gunbarrell at Shotgun Village- Gregg Williams, Developer- Rick Byrem, Surveyor**

Mr. Mackert stated that during the last public hearing on this issue Mr. Derricott read a letter into the record and the next day Mr. Mackert had asked him if he would be willing to step out of the rest of the deliberations pertaining to Gunbarrel due to conflict of issues. There can be no new information given tonight as the public hearing is closed.

Mr. TJ Budge-attorney for Mr. Williams stated they had been asked for new information in the motion at the public hearing.

Mr. Mackert read the motion made by Cindy Miller during the public hearing. Stated he is concerned with the procedure of this as he does not know if they will have to schedule another public hearing in order to hear this information.

Mr. Singleton stated they had given them the deadline of April 7 and that is tonight.

Mrs. Lookabaugh stated they are bound to allow them present the new information since it was in the motion.

Mr. Mackert stated he would ask the attorney to keep within the bounds of what was in the motion.

Mr. Chase stated he noticed a couple of errors in the score sheet and he calculated a cumulative score of 25 points rather than 10. He also found a fault in the score

sheet on page 6 and there is a total of 40 acres and would be 40.7 acres. The calculation of density comes out to 15.662.

Mrs. Miller asked how it changes things.

Mr. Chase stated it was just changes the overall score from 10 to 25.

Mr. Pinther stated in regard to the motion given at the public hearing, there was a letter from the Island Park fire department and he did ask them to comply with that letter. There were two dates on that letter.

Mr. Nedrow stated in the motion Mr. Pinther had asked them to comply with the letter dated 10-5-07.

Mr. Chase stated there is not a letter with that date.

Group discussed the letters from the fire district. Mr. Pinther requested maps to look at.

Mr. Mackert stated another possible reason for the motion to be stated was do to the comment by Mr. Patlovich where he told the P&Z they were obligated to tell the developer how they could comply.

Mr. Mackert asked Mrs. Miller to read from the code kk.1 and kk.3

Mr. Nedrow stated the Board of County Commissioners has changed kk.1 with the "gunbarrel rule" and that precedence has been set that they will approve the road so long as it is a road built to County standards.

Mr. Pinther stated they Commissioners have had a different interpretation of the code kk.1, but the P&Z is still bound to the code as read and is not changed until there is an amendment and a rewrite of kk.1.

Mrs. Lookabaugh stated that the code can not be interpreted one way for one subdivision and differently for another.

Mr. TJ Budge-attorney for Mr. Williams stated that since this was tabled at the public hearing this is a continuation of that public hearing. He addressed the motions made at the public hearing. He referred to the Island Park Fire Department letter and stated they qualify with the requirements in paragraph 1 and they are willing to change the location of the hydrants if they need to. They also meet the standards of paragraph 2, and will build the road to be able to hold 85,000 lbs and widen them to meet standards. P&Z can have that as a condition for approval. Marla Vik will do the inspections on that. The 200ft. fire break will be addressed. The height restrictions will be 30ft. and they have an improved set of covenants. The fire department requested an easement and they are not entirely

sure what the fire department is requesting as this is a public road, but they will comply. The cul-de-sac has a 120ft. diameter.

Mr. Pinther questioned if the drainage would be taken care of on Ponca road? He read appendix B.6 regarding drainage on the roads. He questioned if they will meet the requirements for drainage and snow storage.

Mr. Budge stated he is assuming that the 85,000 lbs capacity refers to the materials used.

Marla Vik stated standard road construction includes the drainage area. She does not know how they are going to do it.

Mr. Budge stated at this stage, the developer usually does not usually have the finances to do this now, but they can work with their engineer on the road construction and have the approval of the road by Marla Vik be a condition placed on them for final approval.

Mr. Pinther stated they will also have to have room for snow storage.

Mr. Mackert read from the minutes the statement from Mrs. Vik about the snow storage requirements of 10ft. to 15ft. for storage removal.

Mrs. Vik stated they require the wide right-of-way.

Mr. Williams stated they will blow the snow.

Mr. Budge stated the problem is that the standards for roads today are a lot different from the standards 10-20 years ago. The Commissioners had said if it is not possible to bring roads up to County standards or is physically impossible to bring them up to current standards it is not a reason for denial. He read from the minutes from the County Commissioner's meeting regarding the "gun-barrel" rule. The roads are not as wide as they wish they were, but they are dealing with them today. They are going to do the best with what they have and there are already 168 lots there, and they feel that if they improve the road, 16 more lots can easily move in there as well. If they are denied, the existing roads will remain poor.

Mr. Budge stated the other issue was to make the HOA keep their promise to maintain the roads. The only way to do that is through the restrictive covenants. They made a new version of the restrictive covenants and he passed them out. These covenants are over-kill as far as he is concerned. He discussed page 16 of the covenants and they have the right of enforcement. He discussed page 18 (maintenance and repair of roads) and they have the right to maintain and repair the roads in gunbarrel and the access roads that are not maintained by the County. He discussed page 21 and stated that they are enforcing the right to receive assessments or have a lien put against the home etc... He discussed page 24 and

the right to enforce the lien and how to enforce the lien. These are the most restrictive covenants possible. These are tough, but that is what the P&Z asked for.

Mr. Mackert asked what if the HOA want to dissolve the entire document.

Mr. Budge stated the government can not force people to take care of their property unless it is a nuisance.

Mr. Nedrow asked if this ever happens.

Mr. Budge stated HOA's are usually not dissolved when they have road maintenance issues, but the larger the development, the more likely they are to stay together. They could, however, dissolve.

Group discussed if the HOA would be willing to tax themselves.

Mr. Budge stated that every neighborhood in Island Park that is not maintained by the County is taken care of by the homeowners. This is not something new and is not destined to doom. The 168 lots are small ½ acre lots and the new 16 lots are on bigger lots and will probably be bigger homes. The land owners will be used to driving on maintained roads because they are going to improve them. These covenants work all the time and sometimes they do not but there is no guarantee unless the County wants to take care of these roads.

Mrs. Miller questioned the 200ft. fire break; what is it, and is there one?

Mr. Rick Byrem stated he is not sure what the fire district is asking for because Fremont County does not require it in the code. They are not in a wooded area.

Mrs. Miller stated there is a reason for fire breaks and not just in wooded areas.

Mr. Byrem stated they do not have any intention of providing the fire break as the County does not require it.

Mr. Mackert read from the code regarding what fire breaks are.

Mr. Budge stated they can remove any dead wood or other fuel sources, and recommended they add a condition that the fire department approves of their fire break.

Mr. Pinther stated a road through there would provide a fire break.

Mr. Budge stated they did that to maximize some of the open space.

Mr. Budge addressed the access issue from kk.1 and kk.3. He read the “gunbarrel rule” and stated and where they fit in under that is because they are well under the

1,000 average daily trips. Even if all the lots in gunbarrel and the adjacent subdivision were filled they were under 500 average daily trips. He discussed zoning and residential zoning and the Yale-Kilgore road and the loop-system. They have done everything that the Commissioners have asked for and more. With the points they have been given, they feel they have done a good job in complying with the preliminary plat requirements and would accept any conditions the P&Z might want to place on them.

Mr. Mackert asked if there is any new information given here tonight.

Mr. Budge stated they did turn in the new restrictive covenants. It is impossible to get a second point of access.

Mr. Pinther questioned if they have tried to purchase any other lots to be able to widen that road.

Mr. Budge stated there is a creek that runs to the north and the other property owners would not sell to them. Compared to the other subdivision, this is much friendlier to wildlife and open space and the public. This is a responsible development. They would appreciate their approval and any conditions the P&Z might have.

Mr. Pinther questioned if they have considered becoming a tax district. They are laying a lot of hope on the restrictive covenants and being a tax district would guarantee that there was funding in place.

Mr. Budge stated they have not considered being a tax district unless the government takes ownership and maintenance for these roads, it is up to the HOA. This is the best they have until the County wants to take over these roads.

Mr. Pinther stated there are always other options without having to drop the standards.

Mrs. Lookabaugh stated the covenants are the toughest ones that she has ever seen. She would not allow any client of hers to sign them.

Mr. Pond stated the Commissioners ruled some time ago on this and made the gunbarrel rule and he feels this that based on what they have proven they should move forward.

Mr. Pinther stated the Commissioners can make any ruling that they want, but until there are amendments, the P&Z are required to stick to the code. He is concerned that the road does not comply with the loop-system, the 85,000lbs weight, the two-points of access and that it does not meet the standards of appendix B. If they dumb-down the standards, they will be held to those standards for several years.

Mrs. Lookabaugh stated she does not disagree with Mr. Pinther for the standards, but this developer has met all the requirements that the Commissioners have asked them and at this point any further discussion is purely philosophical and they should either approve or deny them.

Mr. Mackert stated they have given approval with conditions added in the past. They can ask that the roads be approved by Marla and that the fire department requirements are met. He asked if these conditions would have to be met to meet approval. Everything is not always black and white. If they involve the agencies to help approve this, they could work together on this.

Mrs. Lookabaugh questioned if they are to make a motion with the condition of what is in this letter or beyond.

Mr. Mackert stated it would be for beyond. It would need to be known what standard would need to be met for the roads by Marla. There are the experts on staff for the County, and at some point, they need to rely on their expertise.

Group discussed what conditions they could add to this motion if they approve it.

Mr. Pinther stated that it was made clear to them at the last meeting that they are not to take the County Commissioner's interpretation into consideration as a rule.

**MR. PINTHER MOTIONED TO DENY BASED ON VIII.  
KK.1 AND KK.3 AND VIII.I.2 AND MR. KYNASTON  
SECONDED.**

Mr. Kynaston stated it is a good development, but the road to it does not seem to be able to make standards. They could be making a bad problem worse.

Mr. Nedrow asked if they were to deny this, are the Commissioner's allowed to add conditions.

Mr. Mackert questioned if they could also remove any of the recommendations?

**VOTE TAKEN: THOSE IN FAVOR: PITHER, NEDROW,  
AND KYNASTON. THOSE OPPOSED: MILLER,  
LOOKABAUGH, POND, AND SINGLETON. MOTION  
FAILED.**

**MRS. MILLER MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE  
GUNBARRELL AT SHOTGUN VILLAGE WITH THE  
FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE PUBLIC WORKS  
DIRECTOR GIVES INPUT AND APPROVAL TO THE  
ROAD CONSTRUCTION AND DRAINAGE. 2. THEY  
CHECK WITH THE ISLAND PARK FIRE DISTRICT FOR**

**APPROVAL CONCERNING THE LETTER THEY SENT TO THEM DATED 10-5-2006 LISTING THE REQUIREMENTS.**

Group discussed the score sheet being recalculated and if they should add that into the motion or not.

Mr. Mackert stated to let the record show that the score sheet had been changed.

Mr. Chase stated they received a score of 25 which gives them density bonuses, and they have designed their project to protect the open space and the wetlands.

Mr. Nedrow suggested that Mrs. Miller withdraw the motion

Mrs. Miller withdrew her motion.

Mr. Chase discussed with the group the scoring and how to change it.

**MR. NEDROW MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE SCORE SHEET FROM 10 TO 25 ON THE CUMULATIVE SCORE. THEY CHANGED THE ACREAGES ON THE SLOPES TO 1.5ACRES, THE STREAM CORRIDORS TO .02 ACRES, OTHER ACRES TO 39 AND THE TOTAL ACREAGE TO 40.7 GIVING THOSE BONUS POINTS TO BRING THE LOT TOTAL FROM 15.6 TO 16 LOTS. MRS. LOOKABAUGH SECONDED. VOTE TAKEN: ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED.**

**MRS. MILLER MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE GUNBARRELL AT SHOTGUN VILLAGE WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: 1. THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR GIVES HER INPUT AND APPROVAL ON THE ROAD TO KK.1 STANDARDS. 2. THEY CHECK WITH THE ISLAND PARK FIRE DISTRICT CONCERNING THE LETTER SENT TO THEM AND MEET THE REQUIREMENTS IN THAT LETTER DATED OCTOBER 5, 2006 OR MORE CURRENT REQUIREMENTS. MRS. LOOKABAUGH SECONDED. VOTE TAKEN: THOSE OPPOSED PINTHER, NEDROW, AND KYNASTON. THOSE IN FAVOR: LOOKABAUGH, MILLER, POND, AND SINGLETON. MOTION PASSED.**

**5. Marla Vik addressing the Planning & Zoning Commission on Section KK, IP-Section FF, SF-Section II, NF-Regarding Access**

Mrs. Vik stated she is here to see if they want to address and clarify the intent of these sections.

Mr. Mackert stated he would like to have Mrs. Vik rewrite that because she has the expertise to write it clearly so there is no concern with interpretation.

Mrs. Vik referred to the handout where the road standards have been changed and they will supersede appendix B.

Mrs. Vik discussed the issue of two points of access and the intent is to protect a way to get out in the case of something happening to one of the accesses and to have that other access far enough away from the other one so it is not affected by that incident.

Mr. Pinther stated this is not totally unique to the County, but it is difficult because we do not have the infrastructure.

Mr. Kynaston recommended they change the wording to “roads maintained on a year-round basis by the County”.

Mrs. Vik asked why they even say that it is maintained on a year-round basis.

Mr. Pinther stated they are guaranteed that the accesses will be opened and maintained on a year-round basis.

Group discussed the year-round maintenance requirements and two-points of access and the length of the access roads.

Mr. Mackert clarified that they want to say if the development has less than 6 homes and less than 660ft. they do not have to have two points of access.

Mr. Pinther stated if it is a small enough subdivision and has fewer than 1,000 average daily trips then they can use the loop system.

Mr. Nedrow stated he has a problem with the 1,000 Average Daily Trips (ADT) and it is probably a typo and should be 100 ADT.

Mrs. Vik agreed with Mr. Nedrow because relatively small developments should have much less than 1,000 ADT as that is a big loop-hole.

Mr. Pinther stated he thinks the 1,000ADT is accurate.

Group discussed the 1,000ADT requirement and the length of the road on the “lolly-pop stick” for a loop-system.

There was a recommendation from the fire district to make the road length to the loop a minimum of 150ft.

Mrs. Vik stated she got enough information from the P&Z to write this and that they should tell the Commissioners that they are working on a text re-write.

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm.