

COCHISE COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES

Wednesday, May 15, 2013

REGULAR MEETING at 4:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Cochise County Planning & Zoning Commission was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Chairman Lynch at the Cochise County Complex, 1415 Melody Lane, Building G, Bisbee, Arizona in the Board of Supervisors' Hearing Room.

Chairman Lynch admonished the public to turn off cell phones, use the speaker request forms provided, and to address the Commission from the podium using the microphone. He explained the time allotted to speakers when at the podium. He then explained the composition of the Commission, and indicated there were three Special Use requests on the Agenda in addition to the Work Session regarding the proposed changes to the Zoning Regulations. He explained the consequences of a potential tie vote and the process for approval and appeal.

ROLL CALL

Chairman Lynch noted the presence of a quorum and called the roll, asking the Commissioners to introduce themselves and indicate the respective District they represent; seven Commissioners (Tim Cervantes, Pat Edie, Jim Lynch, Jim Martzke, Liza Weissler, Ron Bemis, and Joe Garcia) indicated their presence. Staff members present included Beverly Wilson, Deputy Director; Dora Flores, Permit and Customer Service Coordinator; Keith Dennis, Planner II; Peter Gardner, Planner I; Britt Hanson, Civil Deputy County Attorney; Michael Turisk, Planning Manager; and Pat Hoefler, Planning Tech.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion: Approve the minutes of the April 10, 2013 meeting as presented.

Action: Approve **Moved by:** Mr. Martzke, **Seconded by:** Mr. Cervantes

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 7, No = 0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Mr. Martzke, Chairman Lynch, Ms. Edie, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Cervantes, , Mr. Bemis, Mr. Garcia

No: 0

Abstain: 0

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

PUBLIC HEARING - Docket SU-13-06 (Cavaliere): A Special Use request for a guest lodging facility in a Rural Zoning District located at 121 and 117 W. Portal Rd in Portal. The Applicants seek to rent two existing cabins on a short-term basis. The Applicants are Bill and Dorothy Cavaliere. He called for the Planning Director's report. Mr. Peter Gardner presented the docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Mr. Gardner explained that the request was to allow the use of several existing ranch cottages as guest lodging on the subject parcels.

Mr. Gardner explained that the docket was transmitted to various agencies for comment. He also explained the correspondence that Staff had received regarding the proposal. He closed by listing the factors in favor of and against approval, explaining several conditions and requested modifications, and invited questions from the Commission.

Mr. Lynch invited the Applicant to make a statement. Mr. Cavaliere opted to ask if the Commission had any questions. There being no questions from the Commission, Mr. Lynch opened the Public Hearing and asked if there were any members of the public wishing to speak in favor of the project. There being none, Mr. Lynch then asked for speakers in opposition. There being no speakers in opposition, Mr. Lynch closed the Public Hearing and invited discussion from Commissioners. Mr. Lynch then called for the Planning Director's summary and recommendation. Mr. Gardner recommended Conditional Approval and explained the Conditions requested by staff. He also explained the three requested Modifications. Mr. Lynch called for a motion. Mr. Martzke made a motion for recommending Conditional Approval. Ms. Edie seconded the motion and Mr. Lynch called for a vote. The motion passed 7-0.

Motion: Motioned to approve with Conditions and Modifications the Special Use authorization for Guest Lodging

Action: Approve **Moved by:** Mr. Martzke **Seconded by:** Ms. Edie

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 7, No = 0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Mr. Martzke, Chairman Lynch, Mr. Cervantes, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Bemis, and Mr. Garcia.

No: 0

Abstain: 0

Item 2

PUBLIC HEARING - Docket SU-13-07 (Van Wort): A Special Use request in a Rural Zoning District to legitimize an existing portable restroom and septic service business located at 144 S. Sundust Trail in St. David. The Applicants are Tom and Ashley Van Wort.

Chairman Lynch called for the Planning Director's report. Mr. Keith Dennis presented the docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Mr. Dennis noted the concerns of Highway Staff, and detailed the requested conditions and modifications. He also presented a map illustrating support and opposition. Mr. Dennis went on to explain the factors in favor and against approval, including a discussion of the Saint David area plan and off-site impacts. Mr. Dennis closed by inviting questions from the Commission. Mr. Lynch asked for clarification regarding the septic holding tank, which Mr. Dennis provided.

Mr. Lynch invited the Applicant to make a statement. A member of the public, Mr. Stuart Kershner interrupted to offer a correction to the Staff report. Mr. Lynch explained at which point he would be permitted to speak and directed him to hold his comments until then.

Mr. Tom Van Wort, Applicant, spoke regarding his project. He explained that he lived on the site, and went into detail about the evolution of the business and how it came to be on their property. Mr. Van Wort explained the scope of the business and of the storage that would occur on site. He also explained his business and demonstrated how he served the local community. Mr. Van Wort explained his efforts

at cleaning and maintaining his property. He also provided more information regarding day to day operations of the business including the rationale for the holding tank. He mentioned that he had received a great deal of positive feedback from the community for his services and demonstrated the care and maintenance he provides his property and equipment. Mr. Van Wart went on to speak regarding his knowledge of laws and regulations and how he felt his business fit within them and explained that his service was local and necessary. He then closed his statement by inviting questions from the Commission. Mr. Bemis asked about odors and insects associated with the holding facility. The Applicant explained the sealing system and how it prevented odors and insects. Mr. Bemis also asked about noise and times, and the Applicant explained that a pump is used for several minutes once or twice a day to empty the tank and stated that he felt the noise was not excessive. Mr. Cervantes asked about the process of cleaning the porta-pots and where this is done. Mr. Van Wart explained the process and that the cleaning is done off site prior to returning the units to his property. Ms. Weissler asked about why moving the business was moved without permits. Mr. Van Wort explained the history and rationale and professed ignorance regarding the permitting requirements and expressed his desire and willingness to comply with all regulations. Ms. Weissler also discussed the number of porta-pots owned and the potential for more to be stored on site. Mr. Van Wart explained that he would not want to store that many units for the sake of his own aesthetics, and also noted that if he had that many units in storage his business would likely be failing or would have outgrown his current location. Mr. Lynch asked when the Applicant had moved into the property. Mr. Van Wart stated about 5 years ago. Mr. Lynch also asked about permitting. Mr. Van Wart stated that he had been unaware and noted that he had not moved the business as is onto the site but rather that it had grown into its current state.

Mr. Lynch then opened the Public Hearing and asked for speakers in support. There being none present he asked for speakers in opposition.

Mr. Stuart Kershner, of Saint David, noted that Staff missed noting one letter of opposition on the support/protest map. He then noted he lived within 1500' of the subject property. He noted this was his third presentation against a special use and noted a philosophical disagreement with the process. He stated that he felt that Staff was ignoring regulations regarding this proposal. He addressed Chairman Lynch regarding a previous docket from several years ago, claiming that Staff did not mention the Saint David Plan in regard to that docket. He then claimed that proposal was in violation of the Saint David Plan. He then complimented Staff, stating that the reports were much better than in 2005. He then took issue with several conclusions in the Staff report. He disagreed with the assertion that the Saint David Plan supported the proposal and quoted the Plan. He disagreed with Staff's interpretation of the Plan and stated that he felt the business should be located in the Neighborhood Conservation area, which is 1.5 miles away from the proposed location. He suggested that the Applicant relocate the business and suggested that the Applicant lease or purchase another piece of property for the business. Mr. Lynch agreed to give Mr. Kershner more time to continue. Mr. Kershner noted that he believed there was no similar storage use within one mile of the Applicant's property. He also stated that the Applicant has "inadvertently or possibly intentionally" constructed a shelter for his trucks without a permit, and stated that the Zoning Enforcement Officer has not taken punitive action against the Applicant. Mr. Kershner also stated that the holding tank was installed without a permit from ADEQ. He also claimed that the Applicant had not taken any steps to correct the situation. He then stated he felt that a crew of several individuals with a backhoe could relocate the holding tank in the Neighborhood Conservation district and then be "good to go". He continued by noting that the Applicant possessed a small backhoe on the property and complained that Staff had not noted the backhoe in the report. Mr. Kershner closed by

stating that he felt that if the docket was approved the Applicant should be given a five year time limit for the business, should be limited in scope, should be required to install a concrete apron to wash the trucks, and should build an opaque fence concealing all porta-pots and equipment.

Mr. William Martinez of Saint David stated that he moved to the area 40-years ago and started paying property taxes shortly thereafter. He stated he owns 120-acres with Mr. White and explained that they have invested a great deal of money in the property. He stated he didn't want to see a porta-pot business located there because it was "convenient". He stated there were other areas in Saint David that were designated for business. Mr. Martinez stated that he didn't know why the Applicant had not gotten permits but claimed that if the Applicant had called ADEQ, that he would have been told that an underground storage tank could not be installed based on the zoning. He spoke regarding the tank and ADEQ referencing a memo in the report and ADEQ's designation of the tank and the permit required. Mr. Martinez claimed that Staff was "asking you guys [the Commission] to allow them [the Applicant] with a stroke of the pen to do whatever they [the Applicant] want". He stated that the proposal was not acceptable to them or the neighborhood. He noted their opposition to previous dockets and stated that they would appeal to the Board of Supervisors if the docket was approved. He stated that everyone in the rural area with a well was "terrified" of groundwater pollution and expressed concern regarding the holding tank. Mr. Martinez claimed that there had been no mention of the holding tank until the report was issued and the tank was shown on the concept plan. He stated that the Staff report did not mention the tank until several pages into the report. He noted that no one wanted septic systems to back up but "we shouldn't have to put up with this stuff, and this is an illegal tank that's in operation". He referenced Mr. Kershner and complained that the County had not "done anything to make them cease and desist" and noted that the Applicant was currently using the tank. Mr. Martinez wanted Staff to require the Applicant to cease and desist pending the Commission's approval. He claimed that it would be "nothing" for the Applicant to relocate the tank, and stated again that he didn't know why the Applicant had moved their business to the site. He claimed that the Applicant's only answer was "it was convenient" and protested that. He closed by asking the Commission to reject the proposal. He then made a comment regarding the Applicant's trucks claiming that the trucks were not correctly permitted by the State.

Mr. Joseph White of Saint David thanked the Commissioners for their service. He noted that he and Mr. Martinez own 110-acres in the area of the proposal and noted that they had a lot of money invested there. He stated it was "unbelievable that this could happen". He stated that he doesn't walk on a portion of his property anymore because he didn't like seeing the porta-pots and trucks. Mr. White stated he felt there was a place for the business, and it "was not in the middle of a residential neighborhood". He stated he felt the business was a major eyesore. He stated that he felt the Applicant was applying for the Special Use permit because they failed to take the time to go step by step through the proper permits or "take care of business in the proper fashion". Mr. White noted that the area was rural but this was "a Light Industrial Use they are trying to force down our throats" and that it was not acceptable. He made a comment about the weight of a full tanker truck and how it would impact the roads. He noted the site was four-acres and claimed it was "jammed up with equipment and buildings that didn't have a permit to be built". He stated he couldn't let that happen in the neighborhood. He then approached the Commission with a map and claimed that a number of neighbors hadn't heard about the proposal. He then claimed that the "planning people" came up later and added additional proposals that were not addressed in previous communications. He then aggressively questioned the Commission and Staff how they would feel if the proposal was next to their houses. Mr. Lynch admonished Mr.

White and asked him to return to the podium. Mr. White apologized for “getting a little carried away sometimes.”

Mr. John White of Saint David stated he represents his brother Joseph and Mr. Martinez in their real estate endeavors. He noted that having an “industrial use” in a “residential area” decreases property values when the property is sold. He referenced the proposed project as an eyesore and stated it would lower the “price they could potentially get” for their [the neighbors’] property.

Mr. Peter Moran of Saint David stated that he had been in front of the Commission before opposing other Special Use requests that had been denied. He stated that the property was RU-4 and “that meant you could build one house, not a business, not a riding stable, not a junkyard, whatever. One house.” Mr. Moran spoke regarding Special Uses and stated that “most people thought that was for an elderly parent”. He asked why we don’t “call it a business permit and forget about RU-4 and allow them to have business”. He spoke regarding Sybil Road and how trucks generate dust. He stated that this was a “neighborhood environment, not a business environment”. He identified himself as an author of the Saint David Plan and stated that the authors of the plan “really don’t want any businesses” and that they would allow the existing businesses and stated that he felt Saint David would agree when it came up for election and that it was RU-4 and “we don’t want a bunch of businesses”. He noted it was a Rural community and that he hoped that the Commission would deny the request. Mr. Moran also noted that he had been before the Commission seven times before opposing Special Use requests.

Mr. Cook asked to speak on another issue. Mr. Lynch asked him to hold his remarks until Call to the Public.

Mr. Lynch invited the Applicant to make a rebuttal. Mr. Van Wart went into detail regarding the septic holding tank. He explained how it was built, why it was built, and explained that no leaching occurred. He noted that aesthetics seemed to be an issue and noted that he had spoken with Mr. Kershner for over an hour via telephone regarding the project. Mr. Van Wart stated that Mr. Kershner had noted that screening the porta-pots would eliminate the eyesore. Mr. Van Wort emphasized that they would do “literally whatever it takes to make this right.” He stated that there was no intent to defraud or deface, or devalue anyone’s property. He stated that they were a small business trying to “make an honest living”. He stated that their growth and customer list was testament to the quality of their business. Mr. Van Wart admitted that he should have spoken with his neighbors and stated that if he had know that it would have caused an issue he would have done so. He spoke regarding the scope of the operation and the amount of material stored on site. He noted that he had communicated with several of the neighbors in opposition and had expressed a willingness to work with them. He stated he felt that they “simply do not like his presence there” and noted that he felt that there was nothing else he could do. Mr. Van Wart also noted that if the neighbor had “been sitting on property for 38-years, it didn’t look like he was trying to sell” and that property values were perhaps not the actual issue. He continued by claiming that his property was the best maintained and most attractive in the area. He stated that “just because it qualifies as agriculture doesn’t mean it’s aesthetically pleasing to other people”. He again expressed willingness to do whatever was necessary and apologized for any inconvenience.

Mr. Lynch closed the Public Hearing and invited discussion from Commissioners. Mr. Bemis asked Staff about ADEQ requirements, and what would happen if ADEQ denied a permit. Mr. Dennis explained that there was no reason that the Applicant would not be able to receive the ADEQ permit.

Mr. Garcia asked if everyone in Saint David has a septic system. Staff verified that there was no sewer system in Saint David, so every home would have a septic system. A member of the public interjected that they also has wells. It was noted that all the homes have septic systems and wells. Mr. Garcia noted that each of those septic systems with leach fields had at least as much chance of contaminating water as the Applicant's holding tank. Mr. Bemis asked about a condition regarding screening. Mr. Dennis noted that Staff had crafted a screening condition for use by the Commission, but had not recommended it. He also noted that any of the permitted as of right commercial uses in the RU district would not require screening in this area. He did note that Rural districts were not Residential, which is why screening was not required. Mr. Dennis did note that since this was a Special Use then conditions could be applied, and that while Staff was not recommending a screening condition, one had been prepared in the event that the Commission would like to add it. Mr. Lynch then called for the Planning Director's summary and recommendation. Mr. Dennis presented his summary, noting that Staff's position was to find a compromise. Mr. Dennis recommended Conditional Approval with several Modifications. Mr. Lynch called for a motion. Mr. Bemis made a motion for Approval with the Conditions and Modifications recommended by Staff. Ms. Edie seconded the motion and Mr. Lynch called for a discussion. Mr. Martzke asked for clarification regarding the holding tank and if it had a leach field. Mr. Dennis explained how varying agencies are using differing phrases for the same physical system, and noted that there was indeed no leach field. Ms. Edie noted that the tank was far enough from the property line that a modification was not required for the location of the tank. Mr. Dennis concurred. Mr. Garcia expressed support for the screening condition. Mr. Bemis made a motion to add the screening condition crafted by Staff to his previous motion and Mr. Garcia seconded. Mr. Hansen clarified procedure. Ms. Weissler asked to see the support/protest map, and expressed concern about odors. Mr. Lynch asked Staff about structures being built without permits and if the Commission was rectifying that. Mr. Dennis explained that the structures had been built without permits, and clarified that the structures would still need to have the structures permitted. Mr. Lynch then asked if the business could continue to operate before the permits were approved. Mr. Dennis explained that there was a deadline to apply for the permit, but that the Applicant would not have to cease and desist as long as they were working through the permitting process, similar to the time spent waiting for the Commission hearing. Mr. Bemis made a motion to Approve with Conditions recommended by Staff, the additional Condition 6 to include screening, and the requested modifications, and Ms. Edie seconded. Mr. Lynch asked for summations from the Commission. Mr. Martzke asked again about the storage tank and ADEQ's requirements and its setback. Mr. Lynch and Mr. Dennis reminded Mr. Martzke that the unit met zoning setbacks and would be moved if ADEQ required greater setbacks per condition 1. Mr. Bemis stated that he felt the Commission should consider the people that the Commission dealt with. He noted that he felt the Applicant was a "good citizen caught in the process" who was "trying to straighten things out" and expressed faith in ADEQ. Mr. Bemis also expressed a responsibility to the neighbors, and felt the screening requirement was a good compromise and expressed support. Ms. Weissler expressed concern for the neighbors' thoughts, and stated that she felt this was not the sort of business the neighbors might have expected. Mr. Martzke noted that the Use was permitted in a Rural district such as this. He noted that Staff had put in a great deal of effort, and that the Commission was in a position where someone was going to leave the meeting unhappy. He again expressed support for Staff's efforts and expressed support for the project and the Applicant's effort to correct the problem. Ms. Weissler countered that the Applicant had created the problem by moving the business without a permit. She also expressed concern that the Commission was often granting forgiveness rather than permission and felt that dockets shouldn't always be approved after the fact because things were not done correctly the first time. Mr. Bemis spoke regarding Ms. Weissler's

point, and spoke to the ease he felt that the public could run afoul of requirements and that the Commission should consider that as well. Mr. Cervantes countered that a business owner should be expected to ask many questions prior to starting a business and that the Applicants should be held accountable for not getting permits prior to beginning. Ms. Edie responded that the Applicant did not start the business and should perhaps not be held to that same standard as a new business. She stated that he may have been misinformed by the previous owner. Ms. Edie noted that even as a Commissioner she found the regulations confusing, and that it may not be reasonable to expect all citizens to know all of the regulations. Mr. Cervantes expressed a feeling that Staff was very helpful in that regard and reiterated that he felt that business owners should be expected to ask enough questions to meet all regulations upfront. Mr. Lynch concurred. Mr. Lynch summarized the motion and called for a vote. The motion passed (4-3). Mr. Lynch explained the appeal procedure.

Motion: Motion to Approve the Special Use Authorization with Conditions including condition 6 and Modifications.

Action: Approve **Moved by:** Mr. Bemis, **Seconded by:** Ms. Edie

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 4, No = 3, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Mr. Martzke, Mr. Bemis, Ms. Edie, and Mr. Garcia.

No: Chairman Lynch, Mr. Cervantes, Ms. Weissler

Item 3

PUBLIC HEARING - Docket SU-13-05 (Workman): A Special Use request for an Off-Site Advertising Sign in a Rural Zoning District in Hereford located at 10280 S. Wilderness Rd, at the west entrance of the Kings Ranch subdivision.

Chairman Lynch called for the Planning Director's report. Mr. Keith Dennis presented the docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Mr. Dennis noted that the sign was already in place, and clarified why the sign is regarded as Off Site and could not be considered as part of the Special Use for the same applicant several months prior. He also noted that the sign will be moved from its current location as it sits in one right of way and too close to another. Mr. Dennis closed by listing the factors in favor of and against approval and invited questions from the Commission.

Mr. Lynch invited the Applicant to make a statement.

Mr. Michael Cerepanya of Hereford spoke on behalf of RL Workman. He spoke to why the sign was not part of the previous Special Use to establish the Contract Construction Services, and explained the relocation and the height of the sign. Mr. Cerepanya also spoke to why the sign was installed without the correct permits and stated that the builder was unaware of the requirements.

Mr. Lynch also noted that there were no members of the public wishing to speak regarding this item and invited discussion from Commissioners. Ms. Edie asked about the location of the landscaping in the right of way, which Mr. Dennis explained was permitted. Mr. Lynch then called for the Planning Director's summary and recommendation. Mr. Dennis recommended Conditional Approval. Mr. Lynch called for a motion. Mr. Bemis made a motion for Approval with Conditions recommended by Staff.

Mr. Martzke seconded the motion and Mr. Lynch called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Motion: Motioned to approve the Special Use Authorization.

Action: Approve **Moved by:** Mr. Bemis, **Seconded by:** Mr. Martzke

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 7, No = 0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Mr. Martzke, Chairman Lynch, Mr. Cervantes, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Bemis, Ms. Edie, and Mr. Garcia.

No: 0

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Chairman Lynch opened the “Call to the Public.” Jack Cook spoke about various matters. Mr. Lynch noted that several speakers signed up to speak about water and explained that there would be a work session on the issue. He noted that while he was not required to permit it to be a topic for Call to the Public at this meeting he would permit it.

Mr. Winston Witwer thanked the Commission for bringing “the advisory board” to the attention of the Board of Supervisors and requested that the Commission take no action on the revised regulations, particularly water regulations until the advisory board was established and had an opportunity to “understand their role”. He also requested multiple public hearings after the advisory board review all the rules and regulations currently in effect from 2004 on. Mr. Witwer also requested the process be delayed until after summer to allow citizens a chance to review the changes. He stated there was no rush to establish new regulations by quoting a study that claims that there has been no water drawdown in the last ten years. He explained that he lived in the County to avoid regulations. Lastly Mr. Witwer questioned the need for the current Planning and Zoning Regulations. Chairman Lynch asked Mr. Witer to clarify what advisory board he was speaking about. Mr. Witwer responded “the advisory board that we’ve been talking about”. Mr. Lynch stated that when Mr. Witwer refers to an advisory board that is supposed to “review all the regulations” Mr. Lynch is unaware of any such Board. Mr. Witwer responded “the board that’s supposed to be in place since 2004 as I understand”. Mr. Lynch remarked that Mr. Witwer “must understand something I don’t”. Mr. Hansen interjected that Call to the Public should not involve a discussin, to which Mr. Lynch clarified that he was “just trying to understand what he’s telling me”.

Ms. Jere Fredenburgh had signed up to speak but was not present.

Mr. Mike Jackson of McNeal noted that he believed that the board Mr. Witwer was referring to was the Building Code Advisory Board. He expressed appreciation for the Commission’s discussion of SU-13-06. Mr. Jackson continued by discussing the Building Code Advisory Board, admitting he spoke incorrectly about the issue in January. He stated that at that meeting the County Attorney advised the Commission that the Building Code could not be discussed at the time since it was not on the agenda and is separate from the zoning ordinance. He went on to claim that the Attorney’s Office has stated that Zoning violations include Building Code violations and noted that the Board had approved a contract for a zoning hearing officer. He further claimed that the Attorney “improperly obstructed” the January meeting. Mr. Jackson then pivoted to an email discussion between himself, Supervisor Searle, and another member of the public. He further discussed the background of the advisory and appeals.

He stated that the Commission denied a previous proposal because “people shouldn’t judge appeals from rules they themselves wrote”. He stated that Staff was pushing the same idea to the Board despite the Commission’s reluctance. He reiterated his claim that the Supervisors have been continually and willfully breaking the law. He once again stated that the Commission’s work on the regulation would be wasted because of the lack of the advisory board. Lastly he thanked Chairman Lynch for setting up the several work sessions to review the proposed changes to the zoning regulations.

Chairman Lynch closed the “Call to the Public.”

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Chairman Lynch then called for the Planning Director’s report. Deputy Director Beverly Wilson reported that the wind farm approved by the Commission in April would be appealed. She also noted that there would be one Special Use at the June meeting. Ms. Wilson also explained that a self certification proposal for Registrants and the proposal for the Building Code Advisory and Appeal Board would be presented. She also explained that Staff planned to have the final work session on the zoning regulations in June and would bring them for a vote in July. She explained several Staff issues as well.

CALL TO COMMISSIONERS

Ms. Weissler asked for information on the wind farm appeal, which Ms. Wilson provided. Mr. Lynch made comments regarding the agenda and items the Commission wanted resolved in the zoning regulation changes.

WORK SESSION

The Commission held a Work Session to continue reviewing proposed changes to the Zoning Regulations. The proposed Water Conservation measures was covered. Chairman Lynch noted that the Work Session was open to the Public, but was not a Public Hearing. He reiterated that there would be no action taken at this time. Ms. Wilson presented and explained the proposed changes. There were numerous requests for clarification and suggestions for minor changes from the Commission. There was also a discussion regarding what “encourage” meant in the regulations, and if it was not truly a regulation if it should be included. Another Work Session was proposed to review the proposed zoning regulations with the requested changes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Martzke moved to adjourn, Mr. Bemis seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.