

PAGE #1

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman Wilkerson, David Poole, Jim Hutchins, J.B., and Fred Nussbaumer.

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH PRIOR NOTICE: Steve Ethington.

MEMBERS ABSENT WITHOUT PRIOR NOTICE: Brent Jensen.

OTHERS PRESENT: Brad Hawkins-Clark-Planning Director, Maureen Hill- Planning Analyst, Jennifer Kharrl –Development Services Coordinator; Dick Linville- Prosecuting Attorney.

Vice Chairman Wilkerson opened the public hearing at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone, then explained the public hearing process.

**Item One- A Temporary Hardship Permit request by Robert and Kathryn Sangster to allow the temporary placement of a manufactured home to help care for their mother. Located at 1336 Sunset Drive. T 06N, R 02W, Section 1.**

No ex parte or conflict of interest were reported.

Fred Nussbaumer has prior knowledge of the subject property.

**Robert Sangster-** 1336 Sunset Drive.

With your approval we would like to submit temporary cement skirting to ensure the structural integrity of the home once it is brought to the property. I have a notarized letter I would like to submit. We are asking for temporary cement skirting that will protect the home from ground or water erosion for the time the home is on the property. We request your approval in granting this we are asking that the home be safe and set for my mother. We want to be sure we keep the integrity of the home and make sure there is no shifting from weather or irrigation.

**David Poole-** When you say a cement skirting do you mean a curb then the skirting or do you mean pouring a cement footing and then put the skirting?

**Robert Sangster-** We are asking for a cement wall around the perimeter, that will be removed, we just want to make sure her home is safe and to keep the integrity. We are working with a licensed general contractor on this.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson -** Are you talking about putting a footing and then a wall?

**Robert Sangster-** Yes.

PAGE #2

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** That is considered a permanent foundation. Staff, what is your feeling on the foundation since the temporary hardship is required to be put on a temporary foundation?

**Brad Hawkins-Clark-** The temporary hardship permit has one standard and that is that it has to be on a temporary foundation. That is pretty specific, I think there may be some flexibility and the building official may be able to determine what will work.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** This wall, is it going to be poured and formed concrete wall?

**Robert Sangster-** Yes, it could be.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** David Poole had a thought about pouring a footing and put the house on a studded wall.

**David Poole-** You put a curb around the perimeter to keep water out 6 or 8 inches deep and run the studded wall on top of that. You are getting the same job done but you are avoiding a permanent foundation.

**Robert Sangster-** That sounds great. Thanks.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson opened the public portion of the hearing.**

None.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson closed the public portion of the hearing.**

**J.B. –** Personally I would prefer cinder blocks on curbing.

**Jim Hutchins-** I agree, I don't like the formed wall because that would be permanent. I would like to see a block or a curb or a studded wall. It has the appearance of a permanent foundation. I am opposed to pouring a foundation.

**David Poole-** Made a motion to approve the temporary hardship permit by Robert and Kathryn Sangster to allow the temporary placement of a manufactured home for their mother since the need is there with the following stipulations:

- ?? The permit is subject to an annual review by the Development Services Department Staff.
- ?? The permit is non-transferable to another property.
- ?? The manufactured home must be removed when the need no longer exists or if the property is transferred or sold.

PAGE #3

- ?? Applicant must obtain a manufactured home permit prior to the placement of the home. No permanent foundation is allowed. The discretion of the building official will decide if the foundation is adequate.
- ?? Applicant shall comply with all requirements of Southwest District Health Department for the approval of the septic system. The septic system must be approved before the issuance of the manufactured home permit.

**Motion received a second.**

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**Item Two- A Rezone request by Charles Crane to rezone 9.00 +/- acres from A-2 Rural Transitional Agriculture (a 5 acre minimum lot size) to R-3 Rural Residential (a 2-acre minimum lot size). Located at 2375 Airport Road. T 06N, R 02W, Section 14.**

No ex parte or conflicts of interest were reported.

Maureen Hill showed a power point presentation on the property.

**Maureen Hill-** The subject parcel is identified as tax 55. This request is actually requested so this property can be considered for a minor subdivision at a later date. It is important to note that in May of 2006 the property changed hands and became ownership of Mr. Crane. Tax number 55 (the subject parcel) used to be described as tax 17 prior to May of 2006. When the property was transferred a small piece of property was left out of the description. The small piece is still described as tax 17 in the ownership of Taylor. We have a small .74 acre parcel that was created.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** At the time that tax 55 was recorded, it wasn't an error? This was the plan?

**Maureen Hill-** That is the question, we don't have information why that occurred. But the concern is there was a variance approved on the subject parcel on the easement width requirement.

**J.B.-** How wide is that?

**Maureen Hill-** 34 feet. The requirement was 40 feet. It goes from 34 feet to 40 feet.

**J.B.-** What is the distance of the narrowest point?

**Maureen Hill-**I don't have that answer for you at this time. We feel under the circumstances that we need some more information to substantiate any type of zoning. It is important that we get these issues straightened out.

PAGE #4

**J.B.-** Is this parcel in the impact area of the Comprehensive Plan?

**Maureen Hill-** No, it is mixed planned development. It is outside of the impact area.

**J.B.-** Okay.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** Did you measure the traveled portion of the easement?

**Maureen Hill-**No, in my opinion there is not enough room for additional traffic.

**J.B.-** Was the variance approved for one single-family dwelling?

**Maureen Hill-** That was for a building permit for tax 17 and a building permit for the Taylors.

**J.B. -** Thank you.

**Jim Hutchins -** Is that ditch part of the easement?

**Maureen Hill-** It does run along the easement, what I understand is that it runs east/west and it takes a turn and runs north/south. Our recommendation is to continue this so we can get some more information from the applicant. There are a lot of concerns and considerations.

**Brad Hawkins -Clark-** In my opinion, tonight the only thing before you is the rezone and it has very little to do with the easement or the variance that was granted. The question of the width of the roadway would be subdivision questions. You need to determine if the request complies with the comprehensive plan.

**David Poole-** I beg to differ, the easement is an issue because it needs to be wide enough for more building permits to be issued.

**J.B.-** I don't know if I agree with continuing the request, if it doesn't comply with the comprehensive plan then we should deny it not continue it.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** I know we are not talking subdivisions, but I thought minor subdivisions were required to have county road frontage. Are we saying this private road may allow the applicant to come back for a minor subdivision?

**Brad Hawkins -Clark-** No application has been filed for a minor subdivision.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** Wouldn't we be leading the applicant down the wrong road if we approve the rezone and the subdivision won't allow a private road?

PAGE #5

**Brad Hawkins-Clark-** The new Subdivision Ordinance has a provision to apply for a private if the two standards are met. It may work. The first standard is there has to be no other property that could use the access and the second is if it already has an existing easement and is landlocked.

**Fred Nussbaumer-** There was a building permit issued on tax 17?

**Maureen Hill-** No, the building permit was issued on tax 55. Tax 17 is .74 acres and is bare ground.

**J.B.-** Tax 55 was part of 17 before the building permit was issued. According to the way we do things 55 was an illegal split. So a building permit should not have been issued. The variance would not apply to other houses because it was specific to two homes.

**Charles Crane -** 2375 Airport Road.

I would like to clarify that the Taylor's did a lot line adjustment and that little piece is not a separate parcel. It is part of the Taylor's parcel. The original survey made a mistake. The 9 acres that I own has a 34-foot road easement with a ditch along it. The road surface is 15-20 feet wide and is very solid and compacted. I am building a house currently for me. In the future I would like to sell my current house that I am building and subdivide and build a nicer house when I have some money.

**Fred Nussbaumer-** You are looking for three more lots?

**Charles Crane -** Yes. I would like the R-3 zone.

**Fred Nussbaumer-** What is your net acreage with the easements?

**Charles Crane-** There is probably almost an acre in easements and roads. This is an existing private road and the Taylor's didn't use it very often but there is a road agreement.

**J.B.-** You have heard our concerns, the private road has limitations and a specific use and you know it isn't big enough for your intended use.

**Charles Crane-**For three more houses.

**J.B.-**The ordinance says certain things that specify and we have to follow those guidelines.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** To follow up on the road, in that length of road you have to have turnouts every so many feet. You can't get a turnout without going onto someone else's property. It appears that there may be a ditch company that maintains that ditch and we haven't heard from them so I am a little concerned.

PAGE #6

**Maureen Hill-** I spoke to Edgar Youngstrom manager of the Sand Hollow Ditch Company he is the person who indicated that the ditch runs north/south on the east boundary and the Sand Hollow ditch delivers water to the head gate but the ditch company has no jurisdiction over that ditch.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson opened the public portion of the hearing.**

**Kelly Taylor-**2395 Airport Road.

That little piece of property, the intent was to take it out of tax 17 at the time and put it with tax 19. The intention was to square off our parcel. I am adjacent to the property to the west. We saw something that said there might be a building permit there and we were going to keep quiet. The intent was to put it with tax 19. I don't have a problem with this rezone. I do think there will be an issue with the road at the time of the subdivision. I think the two acre split is good for this area and a good density. I think this might help support our airport and golf course.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** Will you go through the process to correct this problem?

**Kelly Taylor-** We will make sure it is taken care of, I think we were told wrong by Mr. Bennie he told us just to break it off and keep it separate.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** Fuel trucks were mentioned on this road easement, could a car pass a fuel truck on this easement?

**Kelly Taylor-** Not for the first 600 feet. The variance was good for three building permits.

**John Evans-**3979 Wills Road.

What we did there, we did have a letter from Brad. We were cleaning up tax 17; we have a letter stating that tax 17 would not have a building permit. We got letters from planning and zoning so they knew what we were doing. We were trying to straighten this area up.

**Wayne Roller-**2323 Airport Road.

I have been associated with this property ever since it was subdivided in 1977. That ditch had been there since before I was there in 1977. If someone messes with that ditch someone is going to get hurt. That is only a 34' right of way.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** Is that ditch associated with any company?

**Wayne Roller-**It is more less a private ditch. It is not an incorporated ditch, everybody that uses it cleans it and maintains it.

**George Hayes-**2759 Airport Road.

I am east of the little piece in question. I have lived there for fourteen years. I was the sole home until about five years ago when the Taylor's built their homes. My concern is when it

PAGE #7

comes to subdividing the property. The reason I live out there is because it is in the country, it is a private atmosphere. My biggest objection is the subdividing of the property.

**Julie Hayes-2759 Airport Road.**

It is my understanding that the 2-acre lots he is wanting could be possible to make due with the ground. It concerns me that if this is approved then all of the parcels around here will also ask to be rezoned. I am very against it. I think Mr. Crane was well aware of the property being a five-acre zone.

**Fred Nussbaumer-** What is the size of your property?

**Julie Hayes-** 1.3 acres.

**Charles Crane - 2375 Airport Road.**

I have no intention to interrupt the flow of water to the downstream neighbors. My intention is to maintain the ditch and flow through my property and protect the ditch. As far as the neighbors to the south, I haven't been a good neighbor I have been busy. I can understand their concerns with development. The house that I am building I am trying to make it a nice place. The future house will be the same type of house with the same kind of landscaping. The road easement is a concern and I need to figure something out to make you people happy and make it appropriate for development. The Comprehensive Plan call for lots of this size, hobby farms to where you are not right on top of your neighbors. With these larger lots you stay farther away from neighbors. I think this would be an appropriate use for this property.

**J.B. -** The fact of the matter is the ditch will be affected. When you have to go to a 40-foot easement with a 24 foot driving surface the ditch will be affected. It cannot be maintained as it is. Today, I don't think it complies with the Comprehensive Plan. I think this is premature it may comply in a couple of years.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** How far is the property off of Highway 52?

**Charles Crane-** 1000 to 1200 feet. Here are some pictures that might help.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson closed the public portion of the hearing.**

**J.B.-** I don't think it complies with the Comprehensive Plan at this time. The easement will be an issue. I am not opposed to this when the time is appropriate.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** You are saying that the property doesn't comply with the Comprehensive Plan. It looks like all the properties surrounding this property is A-2.

**Jim Hutchins -** I agree with J.B. and I think it would be leap frogging if we approved the rezone. I am opposed to it.

PAGE #8

**David Poole-** Ditto.

**Brad Hawkins-Clark-** I just wanted to clarify that the Comprehensive Plan designation is mixed planned development and it doesn't set a minimum acreage.

**J.B.-** We have discussed with the new Comprehensive Plan that we don't want to have the leap frog affect.

**David Poole-** Knowing this, I am still opposed to the rezone. The property can be used as it is currently zoned and I think it would adversely affect the surrounding properties.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** Since this is within 1000 feet of the Highway, which is mixed use. Here we are really looking at putting more residential are in a mixed-use area.

**David Poole-**Made a motion to recommend denial to the Board of County Commissioners for the rezone request by Charles Crane to rezone 9.00 +/- acres from A-2 Rural Transitional Agriculture to R-3 Rural Residential because the property can be used as it is currently zoned and it can adversely affect the surrounding properties.

**Motion received a second.**

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**Item Three- A Special Use Permit request by Marci Rae to allow the use of a private family therapy building in the A-2 zone. Located at 4700 West South Slope Road. T 06N, R 02W, Section 20.**

No ex parte or conflicts of interest were reported.

Brad Hawkins-Clark showed a power point presentation on the property.

**Jim Rae-** 4700 West South Slope.

We are currently building a new home for our family. When we bought the property we thought the existing manufactured home would be perfect for a therapy building for our daughter who has a chronic progressive neurological disorder called alternating hemiplegia and is being treated for epilepsy. She is currently ten years old and she will need therapy for the rest of her life. This would be a wonderful opportunity for her to continue her home therapy. This would be fantastic and perfect for her to do this. There will be no changes to the property. We are requesting to keep it this way for this purpose.

**J.B.-** How old is your daughter?

**Jim Rae-** She is ten.

PAGE #9

**J.B.-** Is the manufactured home on a permanent foundation?

**Jim Rae-** Yes.

**J.B.-** Would you have any problem when the need no longer existed, to remove the manufacture home?

**Jim Rae-** No, its sole purpose is for therapy.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** On the application it shows you own 2.973 acres and the legal description says you own 5.370 acres, which is correct?

**Jim Rae-** The latter.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** You mentioned you would not use the manufactured home for a dwelling. Would you be willing to remove all plumbing and water and sewer?

**Jim Rae-** If it was necessary. It would be handy to have a restroom available.

**Brad Hawkins -Clark-** If you read my correspondence with the applicant the first time we met the thought was to apply for a temporary hardship permit. The special use permit option would allow for them to keep it.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** The staff report says here that the house will store therapy equipment and accommodate therapists. Are you thinking therapist will be accommodated over night?

**Jim Rae-** No.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** How many therapists are you anticipating at one time?

**Jim Rae-** As of right now, we don't anticipate more than one therapist at any given time.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** You can accomplish what you need if we stipulate that only one therapist at a time could be there at any given time?

**Jim Rae-** At this point that would work.

**Fred Nussbaumer-** This is just for the private use for therapy for your daughter, correct?

**Jim Rae-** Correct.

**Fred Nussbaumer-** So there is not going to be outside people coming in for therapy?

PAGE #10

**Jim Rae-** No, just for my daughter.

**Fred Nussbaumer-** I don't think taking the restroom out should be a stipulation, all offices have restroom facilities.

**J.B.-** I think this is a very unique case and requires a wider view. Having gone through therapy myself and knowing the specifics of what it takes, limiting one therapist bothers me because one therapist may need to talk to another. I do understand wanting to teach her to cook and to be self sufficient in being able to do things by herself. I think we need to be very strict in saying no overnight residence at all and if they did they could lose the building and the use of it. I think the bathroom and kitchen are very useful and would be needed. It is very functional and important. I think we can cover ourselves with some strict stipulations that this can never be a residence but not limit the therapy aspect of it.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** I would like to refer to page seven of the staff report, how do you track the selling of the property?

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson opened the public portion of the hearing.**

**Debbie Lasher-** 1322 South Watermark Avenue.

I am here to represent the Rae's, I was their realtor for the sale of this property and I am also Marci's mother. I did meet with Planning and Zoning before the purchase. The intent was always to use the manufactured home for a therapy office never as a residence. The intent is to build a new home because they now have five children and so there needs are to have a bigger home. I know they have no intentions to use this as an investment or rental property. She positively is one hundred percent handicapped and she will be for the rest of her life and needs therapy and the whole property will be the therapy that she requires.

**John Evans-** 3979 Wills Road.

I understand that they did not do the temporary permit, I agree with the special use permit. Don't you do a yearly review, so the need could be there for forty years. I think this is great for a special use permit.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson closed the public portion of the hearing.**

**J.B.-** I have a question, can we attach a condition to a deed that shows up on a title report that says this has to be removed when it is sold.

**Brad Hawkins-Clark-** From a planning standpoint the County could attach restriction for new land not existing land. We have no authority to enforce conditions on title reports or deeds.

PAGE #11

**J.B.-** Technically, couldn't they have applied for a temporary hardship to use it as a residence?

**Brad Hawkins-Clark-** The temporary hardship specifies that it cannot be a on a permanent foundation.

**David Poole-** When you have an annual review what do you do for the annual review? If under your review you find out that the name has been changed can't you require the home to be removed?

**Brad Hawkins-Clark-** Non-transferable means from property to property. You could specify from owner to owner. At the time of the annual review we could check that.

**David Poole-** Under this special circumstance it may a be a situation that through the course of the therapy the child may want to live on its own and the house would need to become a residence. If we can assure that these people cannot sell the property with that home still intact. I think we should allow the special use permit.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** Another side of the coin the applicant has to sign a removal form for a temporary hardship permit, maybe we could require the applicant to sign one for this special use permit.

**Brad Hawkins-Clark-** There is an active building permit for their current residence and at the time of the issuance of the building permit the applicant did sign a removal form. It would have to be removed fourteen days after the certificate of occupancy is issued. That form could be cleaned up and you could add some of your stipulations. We would want to make the document they already signed null and void and have the applicant sign a new one.

#### **Discussion.**

**J.B.-**Made a motion to approve the special use permit request by Marci Rae to allow the use of a private family therapy building in an existing manufactured home on the property with the following stipulations:

- ?? This permit is subject to an annual review by the Development Services Department.
- ?? The permit is non-transferable to another property or property owner and is only valid at 4700 West South Slope.
- ?? All vehicular access to the use shall be taken from existing driveways. No other new access points are permitted and no new address will be assigned to the property.
- ?? No signs or other non-residential advertising is allowed.
- ?? The building will have to be rendered non-livable by removing sewer and

PAGE #12

water at the time they no longer use it for therapy or when the property is sold.

**Motion received a second.**

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**Item Four- A Rezone request by Kyle Stratton to rezone 9.83 +/- acres from A-2 Rural Transitional Agriculture (a 5 acre minimum lot size) to R-3 Rural Residential a 2-acre minimum lot size). Located at 3979 Wills Road. T 06N, R 01W, Section 20.**

No exparte or conflicts of interest were reported.

Brad Hawkins-Clark showed a power point presentation and discussed the property.

**Angie Comish-** 1523 West Hayes.

Kyle has 9.83 acres. The zoning around that whole area is A-2 and R-2. R-2 is residential with a one-acre minimum; he is not asking for that, he is asking for R-3, which is two acre. There a variety of homes in that area, I counted around 46 homes and only 8 of them are over five acres. They range from half-acre lots on up. We do have 2.1-acre lot sizes that are large enough for individual well and septic, we went out with the Southwest District Health for the test holes and it is good soil. We concur with staff's conclusions, the requested zoning does fit with the surrounding areas. It is consistent with the area. Directly to the north the property is pasture and hay and to the east is just weeds and to the west is basically just pasture ground. Shared driveways do make sense.

**David Poole-** What about Southwest District Health's recommendation for central water?

**Angie Comish-** Discussing with the health department there doesn't seem to be any issues but we will do whatever is required. He will review whatever I propose and let me know if it will work.

**David Poole-**Are you going to propose central water?

**Angie Comish-** I don't know, I will have to look at the existing wells and their volumes in the surrounding area.

**David Poole-** We do have some water quality issues so that is why I am asking this question. It would make a big difference on whether I will be behind the rezone or not.

**Jim Hutchins -** Is there any water delivery to the lower parcels from irrigation or a ditch?

**Angie Comish-** I think there is water along Wills and South Slope, nothing goes through his property to get to some other property.

PAGE #13

**Jim Hutchins** - So then are you looking at pressurized irrigation?

**Angie Comish** - Yes.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson opened the public portion of the hearing.**

**Dennis Farlow** - 975 E. South Slope.

Mr. Stratton came by my place today and discussed what he wanted to do and addressed the questions from my letter. I can see more and understand more about what he wants to do. I am for this application at this point, we will take care of the rest when it comes up.

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson closed the public portion of the hearing.**

**J.B.** - Made a motion to recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners for the rezone request by Kyle Stratton to rezone 9.83 +/- acres from A-2 Rural Transitional Agriculture to R-3 Rural Residential because it complies with the comprehensive plan.

**The motion received a second.**

**In favor:** J.B., Fred Nussbaumer, Jim Hutchins.

**Opposed:** David Poole.

**Vote:** 3 to 1.

**Regular Meeting:**

**Item One- Approval of the minutes of July 27, 2006 and August 14, 2006.  
(Continued to the next meeting).**

**Item Two – Items from the public.**

**John Evans** - 3979 Wills Road.

I still have a concern with the special use permit. You guys are concerned about the annual review and when they sell and that goes back to any special use permit. It would be a lawsuit if someone bought some property and continued to use the special use permit because it is non transferable.

**Fran Yett** - 2670 Gem Avenue.

Read a letter into record stating that they run a dairy operation and they are surrounded by residential and it would make sense to allow their area to be residential instead of agriculture. The proposed CAFO Ordinance does not allow a dairy to be within a mile of a subdivision.

PAGE #14

**Vice Chairman Wilkerson-** What is proposition two?

**Fran Yett-** I printed out a page so you can see it, it talks about eminent domain and property rights and values. We have 400,000-dollar homes surrounding us so it doesn't make sense for us to remain agriculture.

**Jim Hutchins-** We proposed that no subdivisions be allowed within a mile buffer to help protect the dairy.

**Fran Yett-** Are one-acre homes not considered a subdivision?

**Jim Hutchins-** Not anymore.

**J.B.-** Because they are a CAFO and because they are right there, would they be eligible to apply for a rezone if the properties surrounding them didn't want a dairy there?

**Fran Yett-** This is the only state that I know of where we are a CAFO. A CAFO is 1000 animal units and a cow counts as 1.4 so that is generally 714 milk cows. We are a CAFO with under 500 cows because the proposed cafo says that five animals per acre is a CAFO.

### **Item Three – Items from the Planning Director/Administrator.**

#### **A. Recent Board of Commissioner meeting decisions.**

**Brad Hawkins - Clark-** The Board held three public hearings today. The Zoning Ordinance amendments and they support the changes. They approved the Casey Johnston rezone on Main Street. They also held the Shipley rezone on Highway 52 that you recommended denial, they heard the public comment and will make a decision in two weeks. We will be making you new books as soon as the Zoning Ordinance amendments are adopted. We are going to copy you with the codified version. The Board hearing is September 28<sup>th</sup> on the Comprehensive Plan, they will be meeting with the City Council. I would definitely encourage you to read the proposition two; it is the most substantive change that could happen to planning and zoning. This is attempting to say that you as a commission make a regulation that changes the potential development of the property, for example if you denied a rezone, you would have to pay them the difference for the value of the property or waive the regulation. They are trying to establish the highest and best value of property. There is an estimate of 4.6 billion dollars in lawsuits in Oregon right now.

### **Item Four– Items from the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney.**

None.

PAGE #15

**Item Five –Items from the Zoning Commission.**

**J.B.-** Brad, I recently received an e-mail from you and my e-mail was down. My request is if you e-mail us about a meeting or training that you copy the staff with those so they are on the same page. Have you asked the County if they can improve the microphones or get us a stand? It became obvious to me tonight that I would like to be able to write on a white board for the power points.

**Brad Hawkins -Clark-** The Clerk’s office is definitely aware they are the ones who are responsible for this room and equipment.

**Item Six –Adjourn.**

**J.B.-** Made a motion to adjourn.

**The motion received a second.**

**Vote:** Unanimous.

Vice Chairman Wilkerson closed the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

---

Chairman

---

Secretary