



Minutes of the Kane County Planning Commission
& Land Use Authority Meeting
76 North Main Street, Kanab
January 14, 2015

- CHAIRMAN: Tony Chelewski
- MEMBERS PRESENT: Tony Chelewski, Roger Chamberlain, Dale Clarkson, Wade Heaton, Robert Houston
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Harold Hamblin
- EX-OFFICIO MEMBER: Commissioner Douglas Heaton (absent)
- STAFF PRESENT: Shannon McBride, Land Use Administrator; Mary Reynolds, Administrative Asst.; Ryan Maddux, Building Official; Kent Burggraaf, Deputy County Attorney
- 5:30 PM Work Meeting
- 6:00 PM Meeting called to order by Tony Chelewski
Prayer Wade Heaton
Pledge of Allegiance Boy Scouts
Announcements Tony Chelewski

Tony Chelewski welcomed ladies from the school program; also Boy Scouts, who were there to earn their communication and citizenship badges.

Administrator Shannon McBride asked everyone in the audience to sign the red binder. They passed the binder around for the public to sign.

Motion was made by Roger Chamberlain to approve the December 10, 2014 minutes with changes made by County Attorney Kent Burggraaf. Motion was seconded by Wade Heaton. The Chair asked for any questions or comments and there were none. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion was made by Robert Houston to approve the minutes for the December 23, 2014 Special Meeting. Motion was seconded by Wade Heaton. The Chair asked for any questions or comments and there were none. Motion passed unanimously.

Announcements/Updates: Tony Chelewski said he called Mike Kempt today. He has only seen Rudy twice this month. Evidently Rudy is supposed to plow the roads [so] the people aren't complaining.

No Commissioner tonight.

Motion was made by Wade Heaton to go in and out of public hearing at the call of the Chair. Robert Houston seconded the motion. The Chair called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Chelewski called the commission into public hearing.

Administrative/6:00 pm
Administrative

Election of Officers, 2015
Chairman and Vice Chairman

The 2014 Chairman, Tony Chelewski, stated he didn't miss a meeting this year. Roger Chamberlain nominated him to be the 2015 Chairman for the Planning & Zoning Commission. The nomination was seconded by Dale Clarkson.

Chairman Chelewski called the commission out of public hearing.

Motion was made by Roger Chamberlain to approve Tony Chelewski as the chairman of the Planning & Zoning Commission for 2015. Dale Clarkson seconded. The Chair asked if there were comments or questions and there were none. The Chair called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Chelewski asked Roger Chamberlain if he was going to be present this year and he said he probably was not. [Going on an LDS mission.]

Motion was made by Robert Houston to nominate Wade Heaton as the vice-chairman for the Planning & Zoning Commission for 2015. Dale Clarkson seconded the motion. The Chair asked if there were comments or questions and there were none. The Chair called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Chelewski called the Commission into public hearing.

Administrative/6:01 pm
Public Hearing

Conditional Use Permit – Consider Revoking
(Ireta) Annie Miller, property owner, Vermillion
Cliffs Estates, 6-83 E. Boulder Bluff Rd., Kanab

Tony Chelewski: We are going to talk about the [possible] revocation of a conditional use permit for Annie. I'd like to have [Attorney] Burggraaf lead us off.

Annie Miller was asked to come up to the commissioner's table to address the issues regarding her conditional use permit.

Kent Burggraaf, Attorney: We are here pursuant to notice being provided to the permit holder. You should consider the conditions that were imposed on the conditional use permit (CUP) and any evidence provided of compliance or non-compliance. Ms. Miller should have the opportunity to present how she feels she's in compliance and have the opportunity to rebut where people believe she is not [in compliance]. The public comment should be strictly related to the conditions [of the permit] and not just complaints in general.

Atty. Burggraaf clarified what is considered a permitted use because of the way the ordinance was amended, and the manner in which it was interpreted; the technicality is that Ms. Miller has a permitted use currently, without the need of the conditional use permit. In a legal sense, Ms. Miller doesn't have to comply with the CUP in order to have the bunnies/small animals on her property. This revocation would be more of a formality; but Ms. Miller may want to defend it. Atty. Burggraaf reminded the audience to keep comments civil.

Tony Chelewski asked how many people in the room were there to make a comment. Four people raised their hands. He directed those who would comment to stand, state their name, and say what they had to say in three minutes.

Shannon McBride read the conditions of the permit so the audience was aware. She said Annie has signed a letter of compliance [for the nuisance she was red-tagged for previously]. Shannon read the conditions from [number] 9 through 13 of the conditional use permit. She reminded the commission that originally, Annie thought she could comply with [all] the conditions within six months.

Shannon took photos of the site [bunny farm] and showed before and after [clean-up] shots. Annie has not obtained a building permit, yet. Shannon showed a photo of the RV Annie was living in, which was red-tagged since her six months had expired. It has since been removed from the property. Tarps are down, stacked bunny cages, (under the nuisance ordinance it could not look junky, and she agreed). Annie's father has worked on the property for her and improved its conditions. While there has been some improvement, not all of the conditions imposed have been met; there is no fence, and she is [working on] the building permit. The pig is gone and no odor is apparent. Commission will have to make their call on whether the conditions have been met, but as far as the nuisance ordinance goes, Annie has complied with the agreement she signed. The violation she is dealing with tonight is on the CUP [not a nuisance].

Robert Houston asked if the only decision they were making tonight was on the violations of the CUP and its [possible] revocation. That answer was affirmative.

Annie Miller: I have done what I can with the financial condition I am currently in. With some help from very kind people in the neighborhood they have assisted me in [putting] up the new shelter we have now. I have done everything I can at this point; I understand some of the conditions on the permit were not 100% met, but I am still trying to work at what I can [accomplish].

Tony Chelewski: I have seen quite a change as I drive back and forth [to Kanab]; it's very evident there is a difference with the rabbit containment.

Wade Heaton asked how many rabbits Annie had; she said she was down to roughly 30. He asked if she still planned on building structures in the back and she said yes, she would build extra barns. There was an additional question on the worms [Annie had at one time] she said once they are up and going they mulch down the manure. [They don't do it in the winter]. It helps prevent the odor [and build up].

Robert Houston clarified that out of all the items stated on the permit, only #10 had been complied with and the others have not completely been complied with. Shannon McBride verified that. (That included no fencing or enclosures).

Annie Miller: The one enclosure there has double capacity and is very efficient. Because of finances, only one has been completed. I was given a year to do the fence (so it's a little lower on my priority list). In trying to meet the conditions I tried to do

what was most important. I am still in the process of working on a building permit. I have been in contact with the building department to get everything lined up there. I need to [work] within my means of finances and there are a few things I must do on the property before my permit [can be granted]. We have put in a septic, which is one of the requirements for the building permit. It's just slow financially.

Robert Houston asked Atty. Kent Burggraaf to explain the permitted uses of Annie's property.

Kent Burggraaf: Revoking her [Annie's] conditional use permit does not stop the bunny operation. When the CUP was issued, it was prior to this body addressing the interpretation of the number of small animals allowed. The conditional use permit was issued because of the number of animals possibly being limited by the ordinance. In the discussion that followed that very same meeting, this body interpreted the ordinance a little differently, which, in a very practical sense gave her a permitted use at that point regardless of whether we issued a CUP. The ordinance was even changed, making it more clear, that she had a permitted use because she can have so many small animals per 6,000-plus square feet. She is under the amount she is allowed currently so by revoking [the CUP] you aren't taking away her right to have the bunnies. But because we've had a nuisance issue, which has been addressed, there is some concern we may have a nuisance issue in the future that will need to be dealt with. It will just be cleaner if the CUP is not there. With that being said, in your motion – if you revoke and go that route, you'll still need to identify what terms she is in violation of [i.e., make findings].

Tony Chelewski: So those are only items 9 through 13?

Kent Burggraaf: Technically, you consider all the conditions, but those are the ones that Shannon has highlighted.

Roger Chamberlain: As I look at it, [as long as] the waste is disposed of properly, it's her property; so be it. The worms [are or will be] taking care of [the waste] so that is taking care of itself. If you put them in a building, that might be detrimental for the health of the animals; there's no circulation.

Annie agreed and said it is bad for the rabbit's health. Tony Chelewski commented if one has a small corral of horses you have to clean it. Roger Chamberlain added he

felt the cleaning up of the property [rabbit manure] takes care of itself. Shannon McBride reiterated Annie had cleaned [the property] up considerably.

Tony Chelewski: We are ready to go forward with public comment at this time. I would like to start with the back row, and move right to left. Please stand up and state your name [for the record]. When you stand up, please look at the clock [and note the time], and stop when your three minutes are up.

Maggie Dahl: I live down the street [from Annie's rabbit farm]. I don't quite understand where we stand with the CUP. I understood she was supposed to have three barns built in six months for the rabbits, none of which have been done. The CUP said she was not allowed to put in any other additional facilities and that three-sided structure with the tarp on it was not a self-enclosed facility like is required on the permit. I am concerned about the way the rabbits are being taken care of or if it's a health issue. Rabbits are stacked 3-4 high in wire cages and they urinate and defecate on each other. I thought the commission was really clear in the June 11th meeting [2014] about what was required within six months. So I don't understand why there would be any more time given. There are state and federal laws on how animals should be cared for and those animals are not being cared for. The tarp was put on after we complained about it; probably a week after the six months, so the bunnies were out there in that three-sided building during the snow and freezing temperatures. My personal opinion is that the commissioners were very clear on the requirements and we should be held accountable for what we do in the community.

Tony Chelewski asked Annie about the cages. Annie clarified the cages had catches for waste. They empty the trays [to remove the waste].

Tony Chelewski said as [people] made comments, he wanted to [address] or correct what was being stated. He said he used to raise rabbits himself and had gone through this, but he wasn't [living] in town. He commented about the temperature and Annie said they [rabbits] were wearing fur coats, which Tony agreed with. Tony said he had more of a problem considering coyotes that might gnaw at their feet if they are stuck in the cages.

Maggie Dahl responded that she understood bunnies are furry, but the [drinking] water was frozen and they needed access to that.

Annie responded she doesn't have a thermometer [in the structure] but they are watered twice a day. In the summer they have a swamp cooler and she will put more in the shed when finances permit. She said they lost very little to the heat; most of what they lost was due to trespassers on the property who put something in their feed that they shouldn't have.

Rick Miller: I am Annie's father. Annie has had a hard time trying to comply with all the stuff that she's had to. She has a house in Panguitch she's trying to sell; at the time [when she agreed to the six month condition of the CUP] she had a buyer but that fell through. That has put her in a financial bind. When she got the property, she was renting for \$800/month, so she thought she could stay in the RV to save money and have something to put equity into. She's had rabbits down here for a year before she moved out there. The rabbits are stacked, but they have containers underneath it. I have spent \$4,000 in new roofing and metal for cages, and the septic, (to help). People have their opinion on how animals should be raised but I see cows, sheep and horses out in the open all the time. I don't understand the difference between a cow, sheep or rabbits. I was raised on a farm, and use to raise animals as a kid. The animals had to be in pens. Annie has tried hard to do what she has to do to survive. She's a single mother and works, making about \$10 an hour. I'd like to see anyone in here to make it at \$10/hr; to pay for a house, buy property, and live, and put up with what she's had to. Every time someone makes a nuisance call it costs her more; she has to put money into [correcting] the nuisance rather than into the property. There are good people in the county, but others should keep their nose in their own business.

Charlie Saba: I wanted to say that the manure problem was my fault. I tore my rotator cup and I had promised her I would get some of that stuff out of there. But, I just started physical therapy yesterday.

Charlie Wright asked if the animals were for income. Annie answered they were her son's 4-H project. He shows them at the fair, and shows them at a national level throughout the country. He sells just enough to pay for the feed and he also sells the worms to people to fertilize their gardens. It's just enough to pay for the feed and put a little aside for his college savings.

The Chair called the Commission out of public hearing.

Wade Heaton: My personal feelings are that there was a CUP issued, there were conditions set, and they haven't been met. I don't see, as a commission, that we don't revoke the permit.

Robert Houston: I agree with that because if we let it slide one time, it opens the door to other violations. It's not compliant.

Dale Clarkson: Personally, I compliment you on your free enterprise system and what you're trying to do. I think that's commendable to you. I think with the rules and regulations that we have, that I would support the cancellation of the CUP, realizing what the future holds.

Roger Chamberlain: I would revoke the CUP because it's irrelevant to the operation. The current operation complies with the permitted use.

Tony Chelewski: I agree with what [was] said. So keep after it, and stay within the regulations.

Motion was made by Robert Houston to revoke the Conditional Use Permit for (Ieta) Annie Miller, property owner, Vermillion Cliffs Estates, 6-83 E. Boulder Bluff Rd., for non-compliance of conditions number 9, 11, 12 and 13. Motion was seconded by Wade Heaton. The Chair asked if there were comments or questions and there were none. The Chair called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Chelewski called the commission into public hearing.

Attorney Kent Burggraaf left 6:36 p.m.

Legislative/6:05 pm

Kane County Resource Mgmt. Plan
Edits only.

Shannon McBride: We don't need a motion on the [changes to] the Resource Management Plan. These are edits only. The only thing left are Sections 7 and 8. We have a lot of different counties calling in and asking for our Resource Management Plan and Grazing Plan.

[Said good bye to Eagle Scouts].

Wade Heaton asked how the [coordination] meetings were going in general. Shannon said they were going good. She said they were at an interesting point - almost at a standstill.

Shannon McBride: We are actually asking their solicitor [and regional manager] for an interpretation of the Proclamation. In that paper, it states, "...nothing in this Proclamation will affect grazing..." and it goes on. They have cancelled this month's meeting to give their solicitor more time [to interpret]. And they need to go back to Washington [D.C.] to check it out because of the comments brought up by Garfield and Kane Counties on the Proclamation. Their [BLM's] stance is that if grazing is protected, and that's exactly what President Clinton intended by putting that into the Proclamation, then this process should not go forward under the same circumstances, [it is moot]. It's exciting and I am not sure where it will go [from here]. It's been a great journey and it's been very educational.

Shannon cont.: The BLM and Glen Canyon Recreational Area people are very informative. But right now we have the Grazing Alternatives to comment on. I sent you all an email; if anyone else is interested in it please go in and make a comment. Look at all the Alternatives, [and pick one]. Alternatives "D" is the one we want; it is for maximum grazing and rangeland health. Where it will progress is unknown, until the interpretation comes back.

The question was asked about whether BLM believes the Proclamation changed anything. Shannon McBride explained that where the Proclamation was written in 1996, they [BLM] are saying the objects and values listed in the first segment of the Proclamation is what should be protected, [not grazing]. But everyone can see that the Proclamation says "...whereas nothing in this Proclamation should affect grazing..."

Shannon McBride: President Clinton specifically stated that grazing is a valid and existing right. They [BLM] are trying to say grazing has to protect the objects and values of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (GSENM). Our stance is President Clinton said grazing will stay at the level [it was]; we still have to apply applicable law which is what FLPMA mandates, along with the Antiquities Act and the Taylor Grazing Act. We have to regulate it through [those Acts], but not to protect the objects and values of the GSENM. The argument we keep bringing up is in Chapter 27 – that grazing is an existing right and needs to stay the same.

Tony Chelewski: It's not just the BLM, though; it's also the Forest Service, BLM and Park Service involved.

Shannon McBride: We will be going in with the Forest Service [this year] for Cedar Mountain. They are doing an EIS and that will be a totally different [experience].

Tony Chelewski asked of the two counties combined, how many AUMs they had. Shannon McBride told him it numbered 76,000 AUMs. They originally had 106,000. They keep questioning that at the meetings, saying we are at 76,000 AUMs, but they [permittees] actually are not [at that number]. Right now [ranchers] are utilizing 36,000. Elk and deer are not included in that number; only cows.

Shannon McBride: Our Chapter 27 states ranchers/grazers need to put their improvements in (fences, water, roads). That is [one of] the problems for the ranchers. That is one of the suggestions we've made to them [BLM] to help protect the ranchers from wildlife and protect some of the water placements. Ranchers need permission [to do improvements], and a lot of time they aren't given it. It is where a lot of the damage is done [to the fences, roads and water sources].

Roger Chamberlain stated the regulations forbidding them to use motorized equipment to repair pastures, fences and roads are essentially shutting the grazers down. If they can only use an axe, pick, or shovel a lot of the repairs cannot get done. It is causing [more] damage not being able to get in and make improvements. It was clear the [enforcement of] these regulations were causing more damage than the grazing.

Shannon McBride: I don't know if any of you know John Steiger; he was at our last cooperators meeting and we explained some of that [to him]. Commissioner Heaton was very thorough about our 2477 [roads] and access to these areas. We brought up the point about areas around Hole in the Rock, if there is no access to them, why are they protecting them? John Steiger's position was very interesting. He said at this point, he needed to go back to Washington [D.C.] to obtain an interpretation.

Tony Chelewski: A story I was told by Mr. Hamblin was out at the lake; they were asked by the Park Service to build a fence so the cows couldn't get to the lake. They [ranchers] said that's no problem, we'll get out there right away. When they got out there [with equipment] they were told no, you can't use any motorized vehicles. So

they towed old car hoods [turned upside down] behind horses to go do this job. A little while later, the [National Park Service (NPS)] station at Lone Rock road had a D-9 [caterpillar] brought from Green Haven, to put the water and electric in. That's what you're dealing with.

Tony Chelewski explained to the high school girls the significance of his statement; that the D-9 was the biggest caterpillar made and is usually used at coal mines. The NPS used [the D-9] to dig a trench to put the water line and cable in for the [ranger] station. The ranchers were not allowed any machinery to fix the fence. The [rhetorical] question is why the Park Service gets to go against regulations [with motorized equipment].

Motion not required.

Chairman Chelewski called the Commission into public hearing.

Legislative/6:10 pm
Public Hearing

Kane County Land Use Ordinance
Proposed revisions to Chapters 5 & 21.

Shannon McBride: I met with Kent Burggraaf ahead of time and took care of all the problems with Chapter 21 through the application process so we don't have to change the ordinance. We don't have to go through [Chapter] 21. The next is Chapter 5, and the attorneys asked me to research it. The example I will use is what brought the question up in the first place. As you know, Best Friends is in Agriculture [zone]; part of it was a PUD [planned unit development] but it was never recorded and we haven't figured out why. So they don't have a community; it is just an Ag piece. They keep coming in with some pretty large commercial buildings pertaining to the animals. My question was posed to the attorney about whether we had a density issue. I keep signing off on all these buildings and there is nothing in the ordinance that [addresses] density on the Ag chart. I looked through Washington and Iron County's ordinances and there again, it comes to a problem that keeps reoccurring; by eliminating so many of our zones (like the other county's have i.e. Ag-5, Ag-20), we just have Ag, therefore we don't [address] density issues. Kent said if you don't have any problems with that then it can stay the way it is. Does the density issue bother you?

Wade Heaton: Where do we come back with the number of dwellings per parcel? How does it factor into this?

Shannon McBride: In residential we allow a primary residence and a guest house in the back. Ag structures aren't [considered] dwellings; residential has a limit because they are residences/dwellings. We don't have a definition for density on Ag. According to the ordinance I have to keep signing off on BF's plans.

Roger Chamberlain: They have enough property for their cluster of buildings. Their buildings are close together but the open space is immense. Why should we care whether their cat house is close to their residences?

The discussion continued about the number of structures allowed on an Ag piece, which appeared unlimited. The ordinance did not state a number. The general consensus was not to mess with it. Most structures were clustered because they shared utilities. BF is more adept at how to deal with their animals than the commission.

Robert Houston: I don't think we can look just at Best Friends; we have to consider the whole county. We have to look at the bigger picture. If someone owns land and wants to cover it with buildings, let them.

Wade Heaton: We have to look at the rest of the county, but we need to protect the zone; and the purpose of the zone. If it's an Ag zone, what do we care? They can have a barn, a shop, a shed, back to back to back. That's the purpose of the zone; that's what we have to protect. Whether it's to raise hay or cats is irrelevant.

Discussion ensued on whether the commission needed a motion to leave the issue as it stands. The chairman asked the public if there were any comments and one person stood up.

Charlie Saba: Is Rural Unimproved [Subdivision] in Chapter 27 or 21? [He was told it was covered in Chapter 21 and Chapter 27 covered the GSENM]. Most of the things people do are Lot Joinders and you have notification. But you don't have that on Rural Unimproved [Subdivisions]. Rural Unimproved [Subdivisions] really impacts people a lot more than a Lot Joinder does. I think giving notification to people for Rural Unimproved is what we should do.

Shannon McBride: We could put it in Chapter 21 if you guys wanted to and do the notifications, publishing in the paper, etc.

Roger Chamberlain: If RUS is next to 900 people because its 200 acres and it joins 50 lots, what would it cost? (The answer was \$10 per notification. The notification requirement is for property owners within 500 feet in any direction).

Robert Houston: If someone brings in an RUS application, and meets requirements, we can't deny it, right? If they meet the requirements, we can't reject it.

Shannon McBride: That is correct. What Charlie is suggesting is that we add this [notification] to the process. Right now we don't have it in our RUS process; it's not on the application or in the ordinance. Charlie is actually suggesting that we add it to Chap. 21 under RUS.

Robert Houston: But it wouldn't matter if the [applicant] did everything right. We couldn't deny him. We could notify all the [neighbors] and they could get worked up, but there isn't anything we could do if it's done right.

Shannon McBride: We were going to try to keep the cost down, but that is the next item [on the agenda]. Due to engineering costs we need to increase our RUS fee.

Wade Heaton asked if the question about notification had to be dealt with at another time, since it wasn't on the agenda, but Shannon explained it could be addressed because [revisions] to Chapter 21 had been published in the paper. It is a public hearing, which is why Charlie brought it up.

Wade Heaton: I understand what Robert is saying, but it holds true for everything we do. Obviously we make policy, but we administer it when people come in within that policy. Part of the reason we give public notice is because it's the people's ordinance; it's the peoples and the citizen's county ordinance. They have the right to know if the ordinance is going to change and they have the right to know what's going to happen to the property next to them even though they can't do anything about it. That doesn't necessarily mean [we shouldn't] notify them of it.

Charlie Saba: What I said was about writing letters. That public notice was posted [on a bulletin board].

Shannon McBride explained the notification process, where property owners are sent a notice in the mail, it's published in the paper and posted in three different

places, including the county and state websites. Wade Heaton asked if it would make it any cheaper to eliminate the mailing requirement. Shannon McBride explained Charlie Saba's concern was about the adjacent property owners not being notified. Robert Houston stated he felt the public should always be kept informed.

A motion was not necessary if no changes were made.

The Chair asked if there were any comments or recommendations and there were none. The Chair called the Commission out of public hearing.

Dale Clarkson: If we make too many rules and regulations we'll have a hard time following through with them. What we have is enough. We are so against the federal government loading us down with rules and regulations and then we do it to ourselves. We don't need to impose restrictions on people. [We should only look at] the economics of the item; that's what should dictate our (decisions). I'd like to see us streamline more, and not burden anyone. Don't invite people to gripe. We aren't in a high density county (yet), where we should notify everyone.

Wade Heaton asked what the [current] requirements were. Shannon explained them. She asked Dale Clarkson about the Juniper Hills subdivision; he said there were ten. That would add \$100 more. Some circumstances exist where RUS butts up to subdivisions where there are a lot of people to notify.

Wade Heaton: Dale is right. We hate regulations and restrictions and turn around and do it ourselves. But this isn't restrictive; all this does is mandate communication. I like communication to let people know what's going on. It might cause a potential problem or two, but it makes sure everyone knows what's going on next door.

Dale Clarkson questioned the process on RUS. Robert Houston asked why [notification] was done on Lot Joinders and Shannon told him it was State Code and that RUS doesn't have that requirement. Ag requirements are not as restrictive. If requirements were added Kane County would be more restrictive than state code.

Dale Clarkson: We haven't denied a Lot Joinder in years. We have spent thousands of dollars and spent a lot of [Land Use Authority's] time and haven't rejected one. Can we stop that program? Why would I object to that? To lower density, it makes sense to remove over burdened [requirements of notification]

Wade Heaton: The [Lot Joinder] notification is mandated by state code.

Tony Chelewski: If we continued the \$10 fee, could it be split?

Shannon McBride: The applicant pays the entire fee. It is not a county burden.

No motion was made. The commission decided to leave it as is.

Chairman Chelewski called the Commission into public hearing.

Administrative/6:15 pm
Public Hearing

Fee Increase for Rural Unimproved Subdivision
Proposed change in fee to cover costs.

Shannon McBride: We need to increase the Rural Unimproved Subdivision fee to \$600. We lost money on one of the Jones & DeMille projects. The current fee is \$500 and we need to cover costs. The county chose TC Engineering [as the county engineer] because they are more affordable. But if it's Tom's project then that has to go to Jones & DeMille for review.

The Chair asked if there were any comments or recommendations and there were none. The Chair called the Commission out of public hearing.

MOTION was made by Robert Houston to approve the proposed fee increase from \$500 to \$600 to cover costs for the Rural Unimproved Subdivision application fee. Motion was seconded by Dale Clarkson. The Chair asked if there were comments or questions. The Chair called for the question; and the motion passed.

Chairman Chelewski called the Commission into public hearing.

The chairman thanked the girls from school for joining the meeting.

Adminsitrative/6:20 pm
Public Hearing

2015 LUA Meeting Schedule
Yearly calendar

Shannon McBride: Please notice the change in the Planning & Zoning meeting date in November because of Veteran's Day.

The Chair asked if there were any comments or recommendations and there were none. The Chair called the Commission out of public hearing.

MOTION was made by Wade Heaton to approve the 2015 meeting schedule for the Planning & Zoning Commission. Motion was seconded by Robert Houston. The Chair asked if there were comments or questions. The Chair called for the question; and the motion passed.

Chairman Chelewski called the Commission into public hearing.

Administrative/6:30 pm
Public Hearing

Lot Joinder
**Philip & Cinthani Crenshaw, property owners,
Meadow View Heights, Plat F, Lots 333 & 334,
New Lot 333A; submitted by Platt & Platt
Engineering**

Shannon McBride: This [application] had a lot of problems and it is not ready to come to the table. You'll have to postpone it.

The chairman called the meeting out of public hearing.

Motion was made by Wade Heaton to postpone the Lot Joinder for Philip & Cinthanie Crenshaw until the February 11, 2015 Planning & Zoning meeting. Motion was seconded by Dale Clarkson. The Chair asked if there were comments or questions. The Chair called for the question; and the motion passed.

Chairman Chelewski called the Commission into public hearing.

Public comment by Mary Craven; she suggested the minutes of the Planning & Zoning commission be published since no one is reporting on meetings. Shannon told the commission the minutes are available on the county and state websites in written and audio formats.

Chairman Chelewski called the Commission out of public hearing.

Motion was made by Robert Houston to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Wade Heaton. The Chair asked if there were comments or questions. The Chair called for the question; and the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Land Use Authority Chairman,
Tony Chelewski

Land Use Administrative Assistant,
Mary Reynolds