

TAYLORSVILLE-SPENCER COUNTY
JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING

The regular meeting of the Taylorsville-Spencer County Joint Planning and Zoning Commission was held November 18, 2021, in the Fiscal Court meeting room at 28 East Main St., Taylorsville, Kentucky.

Chairman Deapen: Called the meeting to order.

Administrator Sweazy: Called roll.

Present were Gordon Deapen, Valerie Hunt, Marsha Mudd, Diana Faue, Teddy Noel and Anthony Travis. Also present were Administrator Sweazy and Admin. Assistant Angie Helton. Dwight Clayton and Paula Wheatley were absent.

Commissioner Mudd made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Commissioner Noel.

Chairman Deapen: Any further discussion? Julie read the roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Roll called, motion carries.

Chairman Deapen: Committees.

Administrator Sweazy: I made a few phone calls to KEPTA in regard to mapping and things like that for regulations and their going to look into it, to see what they can do. In years past, with them being our Planning & Zoning Agency, they could do a lot of free services for us, but it not that way anymore. So, they will get back with me on what they can help us with and what they can't.

Chairman Deapen: To all attending, our by laws require that if you wish to speak tonight you be sworn in for testimony.

Attorney Dale: As a notary, administered the oath of testimony to all wishing to speak.

Chairman Deapen: Old business.

Administrator Sweazy: None.

Chairman Deapen: New business.

Administrator Sweazy: We have the application of **Glen Goebel** requesting Preliminary Plat Approval of Goebel Crossings Phase V consisting of 64.121 acres located on Hochstrasser Road and Nevin Lane. In your packets there are several dates of previous action. Phase I was done in July of 1999. In November of 1999, Mr. Goebel came in and rezoned 462 acres to R-1, single family residential. In 2003 we did Final Plat Approval on Phase II of 56.919 acres. In July of 2005, we did Final Plat Approval of Phase III of 77.672 acres and in January of 2018 we did Final Plat Approval on Phase IV of 49.87 acres. Today, what they are requesting is Preliminary Plat Approval with a few Variances Request. They are requesting front yard setback for 50' to 25' to stay consistent with the previous phases. Also requesting variance needed on the 3 to 1 ratio on Lots 202, 203, 204, 205,215,216, 220,

221, 225, 226, 227, 228, 234, 235, 236 and 237. (Lots that we feel average out are Lots 201, 206, 213, 214, 232 and 233.) The County Engineers have looked at it and had a few changes, that's why you got new drawings tonight. So, County Engineers have already viewed the Preliminary Plat. Per County Ordinance the Developer is aware they are responsible to widen Hochstrasser Road to 20' payment with a 2' shoulder and provide appropriate ditching on each side. Restrictions will be the same as Phase IV, recorded in Deed Book 282, Page 427.

Administrator Sweazy: I would like to note that Mr. Goebel is present.

Carl Lentz: I'm with LGB for the Engineers for this site for Mr. Goebel, GC Ford, Brian Wacker, and Steve Smith. My address is 12800 Town Park Way, Suite 201, Louisville, KY 40243. Julie pretty much covered a lot of it. The first section of Phase V, we're looking at 48 lots, the variance she talked about with the 3 to 1 ratio is 16 lots in the section that requires that variance. We are asking for a variance because we are trying to put the road in the most likely spot to keep site disturbance at a minimum. A majority of the trees are going to be saved by the way we laid the lots out. If you look at how we did the drain easement, there's quite a bit of the tree mass left. There's some co-existing ponds and a drain, it's actually a blue line stream. Actually the big lots back up to it and those are some pretty big setbacks. Just trying to keep the site disturbance to a minimum. We have a good looking development here.

Chairman Deapen: Julie can we write on these? I am going to take a minute to mark the lots you ask for a variance on.

Administrator Sweazy: Did I put the preliminary plat check list in your books? We did go through and made sure everything in our regulations as far as preliminary plat requirements are on these plats.

Chairman Deapen: yes and thank you.

Mr. Lentz: I will add that lots we are requesting the variance on, we have a one acre minimum for this zoning, about 80% of those lots are over 1.5 acres, we had a five acre lot, a couple of three acre and couple of two acres lots to offset that.

Chairman Deapen it looks like a few exceptions like 237 would be one of them. Any questions from the commission?

Commission Travis: Did you all make any concern about the streets being connecting to adjoining properties?

Mr. Lentz: We talk to Mrs. Sweazy about that, in section 4 where we are tying into Nevin Lane, it has connection to the East and West of the property of section 4.

Commissioner Travis: I'm talking about Phases 5 and 6.

Administrator Sweazy: Because of the way this lay, is why I didn't think it was something that would be necessary because you already got a straight shot, you have a road that stops at the Yates Farm if they ever wanted to go forward with that, you have a road that stops at the Tucker Farm if you ever wanted to go with that. Those lots on those roads back up to these set of lots here. So, is it necessary to

have multiple entry points to the adjoining properties? There's only about 400' distance, backyard to backyard between these two streets.

Chairman Deapen: Any other questions from the commission?

Commissioner Hunt: Is there anything on here that shows where Phases 5 & 6 will lay within the property?

Administrator Sweazy: Showed on the screen where they lay.

Commissioner Faue: So, this is going to take up from one side to the other?

Administrator Sweazy: Yes, with Phases 5 & 6 they will take up from one side to the other. Do you want to look at these separately for together?

Chairman Deapen: Let's keep them separate. Any other questions from the commission? Is there anyone signed up to speak?

Administrator Sweazy: Yes.

Vicky Yates Glesson:

Vicky Yates Glesson: I was born and raised here in Spencer County Kentucky. My father was Robert Yates, my mother was LeVone Herndon Yates and I was raised on the farm at 7018 Taylorsville Lake Road and our farm lies adjacent to the Goebel farm. My husband and I, as you may know my father and my mother had passed away my husband and I bought the farm, so we now own our family farm. So I am here this evening because I'm requesting four things that I would like to have addressed. First of all, I want to address greater setbacks. I want to ask for buffering and screening. I want to address the cost of fencing and I want to address access. There are at least seven tracts that are in phase five alone and I'm not sure about phase six. They contain at least, almost 13 acres, in those tracts run right along the edge of our farm. As you probably know our farm is likely the farm that has been most negatively impacted by the Goebel Crossing Development to date. We currently deal with almost one mile of development that runs along the boundary of our farm. Many of the homes that are there are no more than 15 feet from our property line at best. I can almost touch them. My family is owned and operated this active farm operation for almost 100 years at this 155 road site. We currently raise vegetables, row crops, cattle on the farm. We've operated a dairy there. We've raised sheep. We've raised chickens, turkeys, hogs on the farm. My grandmother raised turkeys so that she could have extra money to pay for groceries. Our farm was in existence long before the changes that were made by this massive dense residential development of Goebel Crossing. However Goebel Crossing as I said has had an enormous negative impact on our farming operation. I probably do not need to tell you that there are slim profit margins if any for a farming operation. We've had to deal with trespassers from surrounding housing developments. Insurance options are limited, we've actually had to talk to folks at Lloyds of London because insurers do not want to insure a farming operation that is surrounded by subdivisions. Insurers have required us to takedown barns and buildings where we were storing hay and straw or that was providing shelter for our cattle because they saw these as attractive nuisances to children that lived in the nearby subdivisions. The insurance options as I said are limited and they're extremely expensive because the location the farm is now surrounded by subdivisions. We also deal with rising property

taxes due to the location of the farm and sometimes worse of all are the stray animals. Animals that come from these subdivisions particularly dogs that run, chase, and kill our cattle and our calves. I'm here this evening to ask the Planning & Zoning Commission to put certain protections in place so that my family can continue to farm the land that we have farmed for almost 100 years. I request first greater setbacks particularly those side yard setbacks. At present we had numerous houses as I said there are no more than 15 feet at best from our property line. This would serve as a deterrent I think for trespassers and animal's, and it provides some protection to the rising insurance costs. When I talk to the insurers, they indicated that it could help us get our insurance costs down. I request that we have no less than 40 to 50 feet. I'm also requesting buffering or screening along the property line of at least two to three rows of acceptable trees including use of non-deciduous trees to discourage animals and children and others from trespassing on our farm property. This should occur when you have two very different land uses, one is a farming operation that is inherently one of the most dangerous operations that is out there and then on the other hand you have a dense subdivision made up of children and animals. We need to have a buffer that discourages those folks from coming, their animals and children coming on to the property. I also requested this Commission address fencing issues that he's been created by multiple property owners that now join our farm. The fences are in place, these are division fences, these are fences right along the property line and these were jointly maintained by my family and the property owners that were next to us including the Goebel's. In fact, Mr. Goebel pressed my father to agree that the existing property lines that would be the common property line that would be dividing our property and his property, and these would be division fences. The custom in this scenario is that for instance if a tree fell across the fence the two owners would share the cost of the repairs. Cause remember it costs a lot to be a farmer and your margins are almost nil and a post today, a fence post will cost you \$25 or more for one fence post. So today even though the fence line is a division fence, when a tree falls on a fence, it becomes now our sole responsibility for all of those repairs and remember we have a mile, we now have miles of this around our farm. We must fix the fence because we have animals, we've got to protect our animals and we worry about potential liability. There is no incentive for that adjacent property owner to assist in the cost even though that fence is on a division line for a property line. The cost of that fencing as I said is expensive and I request that this Commission make provision for fences that are division fences on the property line to be jointly maintained. I also request access to roads, and I think Mr. Travis mentioned this the way the subdivisions now have been approved that are around our farm we are now landlocked. Our property is landlocked with very limited ability for ingress and egress to operate our farm for instance the person that raises the row crops in the back of our farm also raises the row crops on Mr. Goebel's farm that's now going to be part of this phase. But he gains ingress and egress through the Goebel property to our property. This has been going on for decades and the current phase of development will not create a barrier that will make such ingress and egress impossible. I'm asking this Commission to provide us as an adjacent property owner access to side roads so that we can actually access our farmland to our farm so that we can farm our property. We have a problem around our farm about this issue and this access issue is become a huge problem. As you know the state passed right to farm legislation in 1982 to protect the farmland in Kentucky. The goal to keep residential development from having a negative impact on existing agriculture operations. Remember we were here 100 years long before anybody ever developed residential development next to us. This legislation was amended and it was expanded in 1996 and interestingly in 1995 this county passed a right to farm ordinance including establishment under the agriculture grievance committee and the requirement that the deed that transferred property and a new residential development that was within 5,280 feet of real property on which agricultural operations are conducted, they must contain very specific disclosure language to that person that is buying the property they must be

signed by the grantor and the grantee and they had to tell them about the realities of living near a farming operation in a county with a strong role character and active agriculture sector. This has not occurred, and I'll let you know that it does carry a penalty of \$500 per transference. This right to farm ordinance was passed to protect the counties farmers from nuisance suits from adjoining landowners. The Spencer County officials went even further and in an ordinance, they addressed the county specific concern about the loss of farms in the rural nature and culture of this county. They specifically noted that agricultural operations are sometimes forced to cease operations, or they're discouraged from making investments in farm operations due the encroachment of non-farm operations. Their goal was to conserve and to preserve Spencer Counties diminishing farmland and my family are still trying to hold on to conserve and to preserve that farmland. Their goal and their ordinance specifically states that it is the purpose of the ordinance to create a good neighbor policy. I wanna remind you about that, it's a good neighbor policy. By advising the citizens of Spencer County that agricultural operations and uses of property that are adjacent to or near properties that have been converted to residential developments will be protected in order to reduce the loss to Spencer County of its agricultural resources by limiting the circumstances under which AG operations may be lost. So tonight I am asking you to protect my family's farm by granting my request to increase the setback's to add buffering and screening around our properties to share in the cost of fence maintenance and to grant us access so that we can eliminate the subdivision land lock that we are suffering. Quite frankly these requests are little more than trying to do what the ordinance said was its goal in the first place, to establish a good neighbor policy. We never had these problems with our neighbors in the past so my family now can hopefully continue to try to farm the land that my Grandfather purchased in the 1920s and we continue to try to operate today. Thank you.

Chairman Deapen: let me ask a question, this is truly a naïve question on my part. You talk about the access I understand concept of what you're saying. Can you break down for me a little more what that means in practicality. I'm not asking the question well.

Mrs. Glesson: what has happened is that all of these subdivisions either the way they interpret it or their homeowners associations that they have put together they are very specific about you cannot cross over into our subdivision. So we had even...

Chairman Deapen: with farming equipment, is that we are talking...

Mrs. Glesson: nothing! We can't, we have no ingress or egress whatsoever and they...

Chairman Deapen: you are meaning Yates Farm?

Mrs. Glesson: so for instance if I wanted to go into Goebel Crossing. I have no way to get into Goebel Crossing, I have no way to even access one of the roads there. I have not, we are essentially land-locked. My only way in and out right now would be on 155.

Chairman Deapen: so we look back at the chart that we're looking at right there on phase 4.

Mrs. Glesson: so I'm assuming...

Chairman Deapen: that just shows the road abutting your property and that's put there for that purpose to be able to connect those two properties. Am I incorrect in that assumption?

Administrator Sweazy: no, I think that is the way that regulation lay it out, is it's there for the future, to be able to access.

Mrs. Glesson: so we could go out right up...

Administrator Sweazy: we would have to read that, study that. I don't know if it's meant to be used for farming purposes or not. That would be the only thing, with her property she's got road fronting on 155. So, I'm not saying anything, what you're saying though is, because the people that have ran the farming operation on the back half of Goebel's also run soybeans or whatever on yours, so they crossed over Goebel to get to the back of her property.

Mrs. Glesson: the way my father farmed it we could go through the back there and we could get to that property because it's very difficult to go just from the front property. We probably couldn't even get the equipment back there.

Administrator Sweazy: but all I'm saying though is you're not completely landlocked. It's just landlocked from the back portion.

Mrs. Glesson: the only thing we can do is go up that one drive that goes from 7018 Taylorsville Road. So what happened my father even bought a lot in Goebel Crossing, he bought a lot in Willowbrook. He at the time was trying to use those as ingress and egress. Particularly the one at Willowbrook to get to the back of the farm and so their homeowners association has taken a position, even though we have..they don't even want there to be a gate there. So they want to make sure that there is no ingress or egress. So, none of these subdivisions are allowing that and there it is. So, when you're trying to farm and you're trying to get equipment in or out because you may not even be able to get it over some of the branches and through the fields, they have taken a very different attitude than this Commission seems to be taking.

Chairman Deapen: to Mr. Travis's earlier point. What you're looking at there is one road into where all of the activity is. There is a dead end street that abuts to your property, we put that in there deliberately so that the two properties could be connected. You're saying that that's not the case.

Mrs. Glesson: we never understood that to be the case and in fact whenever we've gone to Mr. Goebel to even ask whether we could have ingress or egress he has said no. He would even let us put a gate between that lot that we own on Cynthia's Ridge that we bought to try to have sometime ingress and egress. We went to those links and we were told no.

Chairman Deapen: we would have to do some legal research on that but I think that's the intent of why we put that provision in there.

Mrs. Glesson: it would be helpful so that we know, we put a gate up there and we could get our equipment in and out. I'm not sure where this road even is. I'm glad I'm here tonight because I had no knowledge that anyone had put a road there that we could use because we kept being told no we could not have ingress or egress there.

Chairman Deapen: Commissioner Travis is correct in his earlier request. We have a provision at that strongly recommends and encourages connection other than our main thoroughfares.

Mrs. Glesson: it would be impossible to bring some of those big combines and things, I don't think they could even go through there.

Chairman Deapen: probably not, no that is why I was trying to ask if you were specifically talking about farm equipment.

Mrs. Glesson: Oh yes. We have soybean, we have row crops back there. That's what's...soybeans and corn that are back in there and so I would like to know where this road even is. I have no idea so I would like to know and I'd like to be able to have some input into where other future roads might be put if they're going to be put so that we don't get... just because we've chosen to farm. I don't want to be penalized for that. You never know what life is gonna deal you. We may have to sell the farm, it would break the heart but if we do we do. I need to know. I need to make sure I've got options.

Administrator Sweazy: could we find out if the county takes over roads and they become county roads, can a homeowners association stop them from traveling the County Road?

Chairman Deapen: I will defer to our council.

Administrator Sweazy: I think that would be something worth trying to find out as well.

Attorney Dale: we would have to take a look at public roads. Public road anybody can use it.

Mrs. Glesson: Willowbrook has taken the position that we...my dad bought this this lot in Willowbrook before it was ever really developed and now they have taken, the homeowners associations taken the position, you can't put a gate up there, we can't get in and out and we have to get in there to try to get to some... that's where most of our cattle are. Off of that's when you go in to take care of those cattle and you got wagons, you're trying to take hay into them, you've got fork for the big rounds of hay.

Attorney Dale: I can't answer your question right off hand but once it becomes a public road I don't know if you can stop them from using it.

Mrs. Glesson: I would like some...

Attorney Dale: and it might be a matter of legal opinion between your attorney and their attorneys to work all that out.

Mrs. Glesson: I don't wanna to get into all of that.

Chairman Deapen: so prior to 1998, how is your access affected differently today than it was in 1998?

Mrs. Glesson: that would have been when Mr. Goebel...

Chairman Deapen: the year before there was any subdivision there.

Attorney Dale: looks like there's a road that goes from there cultivated field going all the way back over.

Mrs. Glesson: there were other entrances into our property before the subdivisions. Off of Hochstrasser Lane...

Commissioner Noel: that is was I wondering, I always remember the 155 entrance. Was there another entrance into your farm?

Mrs. Glesson: not an entrance per say, but my father would take his equipment across there to get to the farm.

Administrator Sweazy: so he had to cross somebody else's property.

Mrs. Glesson: yeah across somebody else's property we did not touch Hochstrasser Lane.

Commissioner Noel: that's what I was...okay.

Mrs. Glesson: it would be helpful...the way that there's all these dense subdivisions that have gone up, it would be helpful if we could have a way to have access out of the farm.

Chairman Deapen: other questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Travis: this one straight, that we're seeing here. Is that not the end of the street on phase four? (Referring to the power point)

Commissioner Noel: yes.

Commissioner Travis: so that is opposite end from Hochstrasser?

Administrator Sweazy: where that red dot is her farm, that is where it joins the fence line right there. The other end is the Tucker Farm. (Using an arial view)

Attorney Dale: you can see that road where it goes back.

Commissioner Travis: but down here is where its showing the houses, is that not phase four?

Administrator Sweazy: right this area is phase four.

Mrs. Glesson: most of those houses, they have only a 15 foot set back they're right on our property line

Attorney Dale: has the county taken over the roads in phase four.

Administrator Sweazy: not completely for the most part, they have to do their final adoption.

Mrs. Glesson: so does that mean if there are any roads, I'm not aware of any. I will go back and look at this because I think this is back by our pumpkin patch. They have been building houses like crazy back there.

Chairman Deapen: that is the way it is platted.

Mrs. Glesson: I would like to be able to look and see where this is and would like to have some input into how any other streets can come so we can get to the back of the farm. Thank you.

Chairman Deapen: Is there anyone else to speak on this?

Administrator Sweazy: No.

Chairman Deapen: I don't think I feel comfortable on making a decision tonight on this. Do you have anything else you would like for us to consider?

Mrs. Glesson: I have a quick question; I want to make sure I know what the variance were. Because I do think several of the lots abut the farm.

Administrator Sweazy: We have a 3 to 1 ratio, so a lot can't be deeper than it is wide.

Jason Marshall: 1991 Hochstrasser Road. Just curious before the development occurs. Seventy-eight homes being added, couple more 100 or so drivers. Are there any plans to widen Hochstrasser and Washburn. Those roads are already dangerous trying to pass someone.

Chairman Deapen: Hochstrasser will be widened to 20' with a 2' shoulder on each side.

Mr. Marshall: So when people come down Washburn to get to Goebel Crossing. I believe that would increase traffic on Washburn and that road is extremely treacherous. Are there any plans with the county for Washburn?

Chairman Deapen: No.

Mr. Marshall: Then I would oppose this at this time until Washburn can handle this amount of traffic trying to get to this area.

Commissioner Travis: How much of Hochstrasser is going to be widened?

Mr. Lentz: Just the whole frontage of the development.

Commissioner Travis: So, the width of the front coming towards the water tower?

Mr. Goebel: It won't go near the water tower. You have the Crescent D farm, then the 10 acres was sold, but you didn't make him widen it and then we join where those 10 acres starts and runs down to Mr. Hochstrasser's house.

Commissioner Travis: What I was say is it's not going back towards Mudd Lane.

Mr. Goebel: It won't be near Mudd Lane.

Commissioner Travis: Yes, but the road still goes back there.

Mr. Goebel: Yes. I think Trevor did some of that.

Administrator Sweazy: Yes, just from Beacon Hills to the start of this property is where it's not widened.

Chairman Deapen: Is there anyone else signed up?

Administrator Sweazy: No.

Chairman Deapen: Any further discussion on this tonight? We have several issue, I think we need to look into and we're going to need some help following the legal aspect.

Mr. Goebel: May I come up and make a few comments?

Chairman Deapen: Can you come up to the podium?

Mr. Goebel: My dad bought the farm we are talking about in 1941. He joined Mr. Yates. He had an entrance from my farm with gates and they shared together for years and years. He went through there to get to his property. He came over and baled hay for us. We shared gates and fences and worked together to fix if needed. There has never been an entrance from the back of his farm. He used mine and uses mine today because they combine soy beans and go through my farm to get the theirs. Because the ground is so rough on the other side, they didn't want to drive over to their grain bends, and now they wanted to use me, well I let them do it. I have in the past, thing might be changing,

because we like to work together, we'll be glad to work with Vicki, I known her since she was a baby. But don't accuse us of not being able to get to her land.

Chairman Deapen: This is a common problem when we have significant change of how we are using our land. I didn't sense it was personal that anyone was pointing fingers at anyone else. As things change, situations change, people make different decisions with their land, there are unattended consequences and that certainly appears to be what we are having to deal with here.

Mr. Goebel: We did Phase 1, when we got to Phase 2, we had to fix the line, we put up a fence and there's a gate there. But it's the HOA that won't let her go through there.

Attorney Dale: Is there any way you all can work it out with some kind of accommodations?

Mr. Goebel: I don't know what she wants.

Attorney Dale: I think she just wants access that she had before to the farm.

Mr. Goebel: She never had any access back there in the back.

Commissioner Travis: If you all had never known each other. Then you go to develop this. The way the regulations are set up is that you try to leave a connection to the joining property, nothing concerning of what had been done in the past, we like to have as the county and the State level, that there's a positive side to have connection from one piece of property to another. What you all are talking about would not have anything to do with the regulations.

Attorney Dale: But you said there was a connection is Section 4 with a gate?

Mr. Goebel: Its Section 3, there was a gate there, not sure if its still there. They go through my land to get to their farm to put crops out. They tore the fence down to get through. I didn't tell them to, and I didn't tell them not to. They drive through my farm to get to their farm; I have no objection to that.

Attorney Dale: You've done that for years, right?

Mr. Goebel: I have no objection to that. But there's no exit there, her people just cut the fence to get through.

Attorney Dale: They probably did that to get the combine over there.

Mr. Goebel: They brought it through the front for a long, long time, but now they don't.

Attorney Dale: So, you don't think there is a way of working something out on that access?

Mr. Goebel: In that direction, I far as I'm going, I sold all that land and don't own it anymore. I think it's a possibly we could if they tell me what they want, just a drive-thru. I let them go through my front land just to get to the back of the farm, because I still own that.

Chairman Deapen: We're going to take this up again in two weeks. The idea solutions to these kind of problems is for all the neighbors to talk it through and say what would we have to do to a win, win here?

Mrs. Glesson: I don't care to set down and talk about it. This gentleman here said we will sell you land. We already went to the extra expense of buying a lot that adjoined our property and they bared us from being able to go through. They wouldn't even let us put a gate up, not to put a road but to even go through there to get to our property. My mother and father-in-law even considered building a house on that lot and said they would just like to be able to cross through there on a golf cart just to get to our farm and we were told no.

Attorney Dale: Was that by the developer or the HOA?

Mrs. Glesson: I understood it was by Mr. Goebel that said that.

Mr. Goebel: Yes, I said that. The people there said they didn't want it.

Steve Smith: The distance from her farm to Hochstrasser Road is acres of land. To tie a road into that, when she has one in Fisherville. The biggest issue I've heard of is about the dogs and the kids and you put a gate up that's going to let more on their property.

Chairman Deapen: But that's an argument you can't win.

Mr. Smith: Very true.

Chairman Deapen: But can you put that in there for safety reasons to get traffic off the main roads?

Mr. Smith: There's been farming equipment coming through there in both properties since I have lived there and I have been there 17-18 years. I don't know why that would change if she used that connectivity point there and worked it out with the HOA to maybe use that for a month.

Attorney Dale: Where are you talking about?

Mr. Smith: Phase 4, because Phase 5 the way it rounds the corner, there's nothing 15 feet from her property, its more like 300 feet. It solves those problems with her worrying about us being to close to the fence.

Attorney Dale: Aren't they accessing it now through the back road?

Mr. Smith: Through the old farm road that's through the property that we are buying.

Attorney Dale: That's been there 50-60 years that they have been accessing that.

Mr. Smith: But how do you create an agricultural road for farm equipment to go through the middle of our development?

Attorney Dale: That's something you would have to put your heads together and try to work something out that would accommodate your development and accommodates the adjoining landowner. It doesn't have to be exactly where it is.

Mr. Smith: That connectivity point right there in section 4 is the best spot, that's our high spot on our land too and it where their pumpkin patch is too.

Chairman Deapen: I would encourage you all to talk, you certainly don't have to. I can't demand that you do that. I think everybody is going to be happier if you all can work this out.

Mr. Smith: That's got to be 500 feet from Hochstrasser Road through Goebel Crossings to get to the Yates farm.

Commissioner Travis: That's not 500 feet where you got the proposed street back there.

Mr. Smith: Taking from where our land stops that were buying to the Yate's.

Commissioner Travis: No, we're talking about Phase 5.

Mr. Smith: Phase 5 will run right against their property. It's the same concept as the connecting road on Phase 4 if we give it on Phase 5. So, what's the difference of 400 foot, when the road exist now and the new road we're putting in?

Chairman Deapen: There may not be any, but clearly, it's her understanding that she been denied the use of the entrance in Phase 4. So that's a moot point wither there's a difference in Phase 5. She's land locked.

Mr. Smith: There's an easement there for connectivity.

Mr. Lentz: Actually Phase 4, it's a right-a-way all the way to Mrs. Yate's farm. As far as her not being able to use it, I believe in 2017 there might have been something said about farm equipment not being able to use the county road there.

Chairman Deapen: We didn't say that.

Mr. Lentz: There was something to that affect. The ROW was stubbed, the ROW is stubbed at her property line.

Mr. Smith: It's for residential development, for school buses...

Attorney Dale: it's a public road it'd be like trying to stop farming equipment on a state road.

Mr. Goebel Nevin Lane is a county road, and the farming equipment goes from one end of Nevin to the other...

Attorney Dale: it it's a county road, I don't think anyone has the right to stop them from using it.

Mrs. Glesson: Willowbrook HOA is creating a rucus.

Attorney Dale: if you could use that would it solve your problem?

Mrs. Glesson: not sure where that road is.

Mr. Lentz: Like Mr. Smith said, 400 feet to the north is access to her property. The general area of the old farm road. She has access, it is not land locked. So as far as who has rights and who's telling her no, that would be an Attorney's decision. The way we developed in Phase 4 is a county road right-a-way that goes to the Yate's farm.

Administrator Sweazy: On the Final Plat of Phase 4 it does say connection to the streets in Goebel Crossings, Phase 4 (Jacks Court and Alyssa Way) shall not be allowed unless the adjoining property is being developed as a residential subdivision. So, the street doesn't get to connect to use unless its used for a residential subdivision purposes.

Mrs. Glesson: So, they were going to force us to develop our farm before we could use it?

Administrator Sweazy: To use that entry point, that's what's on the Final Plat.

Mr. Smith: I think the reason it was put that way was because we didn't want someone to put a mobile home park there.

Mr. Lentz: I believe when we did that it was part of the zoning ordinance. That note particular, that property had to be residential use to extend that road to tie into Goebel Crossings.

Mrs. Glesson: I think Mr. Dale mentioned about meeting to try to work something out. I am glad to do that. I want to make sure I understand that there is an ordinance that says now we can't use this road that I learned about tonight. That we can't use that for farm purposes, it can only be if we develop our our farm if we make our farm into a residential subdivision.

Administrator Sweazy: that is what on the record plat that was put to record.

Mrs. Glesson: how does that work with the right to farm ordinance that says you're never supposed to negatively impact an agricultural...

Chairman Deapen: you need to come to the microphone.

Mrs. Glesson: I just wonder how that complies or comports with the right to farm ordinance that this county passed that says you're not supposed to negatively impact an existing agriculture operation with a residential operation.

Chairman Deapen: and I think it's a valid question and I'm not an attorney and I'm not going to...

Mrs. Glesson: so we've decided tonight I don't really have access and if it is I'm back to where I was.

Chairman Deapen: it sounds that way to me from what is on that plat.

Administrator Sweazy: at that point.

Mrs. Glesson: at that point. I'm asking that be changed. I'm requesting a change then.

Chairman Deapen: that's not something we would be able to do. That would have to be a legal challenge. Let me say this from a standpoint and then I'm going to repeat I'm not a lawyer. It sounds to me like you're making a very good argument, but that argument would have to be made of court of law saying that's not corporate based on this law. We can't unilaterally go back and change the plat we granted here five years ago. That's not gonna happen. A court of law can do that.

Mrs. Glesson: but you can change it on this five and six.

Chairman Deapen: we have not adjudicated five and six.

Mrs. Glesson: so I need to figure out or try to work with someone or I'm asking you to at least see that through five and six, that I can have some kind of ingress and egress because to my prior point where being landlocked.

Attorney Dale: hopefully you all can set down and work that out. Otherwise, I see litigation coming which is costly to everyone.

Commissioner Hunt: as far as the past phases like Cynthia's Ridge, is in which phase?

Mr. Goebel: three.

Commissioner Hunt: then Glen Way is in three, Thomas Trace three. OK

Steve Smith: there is a cul-de-sac at the end of it (Thomas Trace) several points of connectivity to the Yates farm by cul-de-sac in multiple locations.

Administrator Sweazy: but it depends if the cul-de-sac actually touches the fence line or if the lot wraps around the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Goebel: there is probably five to ten feet from the line to the cul-de-sac.

Attorney Dale: let me just throw something out. There is some law dealing with dominant concerning the states by description after 30 years and some other aspects that of course it would take a court of law to work all that out. Those litigations can be time consuming and expensive. Wither there are some rights with this since they've had that access as long as they have or not...something to think about. Just trying to motivate you to get something worked out.

Mr. Smith: We would like to but it's been zoned residential for 20 years.

Attorney Dale: I'm looking at Phase 5, that road that goes back there is obvious that's been used for years you can see that on the pictures.

Chairman Deapen: I think we made as many points as we can. We will certainly encourage you to talk and if we have to make our decisions, we will.

Chairman Deapen: New Business.

Administrator Sweazy: We have the application of **Glen Goebel** requesting Preliminary Plat Approval of Goebel Crossings Phase VI consisting of 46.270 acres located on Hochstrasser Road and Nevin Lane. The same goes as previous action dates for zoning change, plat approvals. There are variances needed on the 3 to 1 ratio on about 5-6 lots. Also asking for front yard setback from 50' to 25' to stay consistent with the previous phases. County Engineers have already reviewed this Phase as well and

given their approval. Per County Ordinance the Developer is aware they are responsible to widen Hochstrasser Road to 20' pavement with a 2' shoulder and provide appropriate ditching. Restrictions will remain the same as previous Phases.

Chairman Deapen: I will just not that on the ones their asking for a variance on for the 3 to 1 ratio that also all of them are at least 2 acres on this Phase and one almost 5 acres.

Mr. Lentz: Phase 6 is a little different then Phase 5. None of Phase 6 actually abuts Mrs. Yate's farm, it ties in right at the back corner of her property. Phase 6 has no mutual property line to adjoining Mrs. Yates's Farm, it's just a point, a corner. We developed the lots in the Cul-de-sac into large tracts because of the pictography and saving the trees and if you look at the lot layout the rear of the houses are going to be pointing towards the rear of the adjoining houses in the adjacent subdivision. Of the adjacent house that front on Hochstrasser. The rear of all the proposed lots will be facing the adjacent properties.

Chairman Deapen: Any questions from the commission? Anybody signed up on this one?

Commissioner Hunt: Just trying to figure out what I'm looking at in between lots 251 & 252.

Mr. Lentz: There is an existing drain easement that runs under Hochstrasser. We're going to extent that pipe or create a drainage ditch to take the water down to get it to the ponds on the lower end of the property.

Commissioner Hunt: So, it's going to be coming back into the lots.

Mr. Lentz: Right, then get in the pipe system going down the road into the creek that runs in the back corner of Mrs. Yate's property.

Commissioner Hunt: So, this pie shape area is a continuation of lot 252?

Mr. Lentz: That's right. The hashed lines are drainage easements. The water shoots across that property, it will have either a ditch or a pipe in that area.

Attorney Dale: Let me make another comment. I know how it is when parties get together and try to negotiate, when their doing it themselves, you might consider having a non-binding mediation to have somebody there that's going to be buffering you all because sometimes it gets like a tug-a-war and you don't accomplish anything. I see Vicki's side of this too, I have a farm. But I would like for you all to have a win, win situation. I understand about taking a combine through a subdivision you got dogs and kids, but maybe some could be worked out on the back side of the property with access. Hopefully you all can get something worked out.

Mrs. Glesson: I have not seen a plat for Phase 6, I ask that I get an opportunity to look at this, to make sure I feel comfortable with what impact it's going to have on the farm.

Chairman Deapen: You can take this Plat with you.

Mrs. Glesson: Can I get a copy of Phase 5 as well, for my husband to look at.

Chairman Deapen: Is there anyone else signed up on this on Julie?

Administrator Sweazy: No.

Chairman Deapen: New business.

Administrator Sweazy: We have the application of the proposed amendments to the **Taylorville – Spencer County Subdivision Regulations** pertaining to subdivision construction standards within Spencer County. This is just for the county, and this is a set of regulations put together by the County Road Foreman, County Engineers, there were two Magistrates on the Committee, myself and the County Attorney. What we did was for several years now subdivision regulations were from 1992 and so we have made amendment after amendment. So, we tried to combine that all into one document and put the new guidelines for how they want subdivision roads constructed. Now this is just for the county. The city has also put together some documents, we are going to work on do the same thing with the city information blending in with current regulations so everything makes since and I will bring them before you also. So, these are strictly county. The underlined is the proposed changes and the strikethrough is being taken out. You will also find some I changed the type setting to vitalized it because I had already emailed it with the document and at Monday nights meeting they threw a handful of changes at me last minute. So, anything you see that the type setting is a little different, that's what they added in on Monday.

Attorney Dale: I have a matter to throw at you all and it's up to you all. Something that you all and the developer should be aware of. There's a statue dealing with parking. Here is a memo and the Statue is with it. You're not supposed to park or stop on any portion of the roadway and there are some exceptions. The problem is developers don't like to make a wide road and parking on the sides because its muddy. But this legislation was passed to address the safety, health, and welfare of travel through there. An example is Highview, the roads up there are narrow and cause a problem for zoning. The regulations require two parking spaces.

Mr. Goebel: Are we done and just come back in two weeks?

Chairman Deapen: Yes.

Mr. Goebel: Do we need to talk to Mrs. Glesson before that two week?

Chairman Deapen: That's up to you. I would strongly encourage you to walk back in here in two weeks and say we got together and talked about this, and this is how we want to resolve this, and this is how its going to get changed. I strongly encourage you to do that. Of course, you don't have to.

Attorney Dale: If not, you could be looking at a lawsuit. I don't think you want that, and Vicki don't want that.

Commissioner Travis: Dudley have you looked this proposal over?

Attorney Dale: the issue is the subdivision roads are going to have to be wide enough to allow parking on the side. You have to have the travel portion and then the area to be able to park off that travel portion. Like a state route or increase the number of parking on the lot itself. Highview is an example people park up there. They don't have any place else. You have the school buses, garbage trucks, scraping

the roads in the winter time. You have cars parked partially on and off the road. I think that's the reason the statutes are enacted, to prevent that type of thing from happening. Our regulations would have to get changed and again this is up to y'all, just calling it to your attention what the state law is about not parking on thoroughfares and thoroughfares is assigned a statute. The present statute prevents parking on any portion of the roadway which is defined as the travel portion of the highway. There's a statute there that defines what that means, which is a defined as a public road, street, avenue, alley. The statute defines that. State law basically prevents people from parking on Highview or on any subdivision county or city. Unless the road is wide enough parking onside without out traveling on the 20 foot or 18 foot travel portion of the roadway or the regulations would have to require additional parking on lots. Again how you handle that I don't know. I don't know how other subdivisions or planning zonings deals with that even if they're aware.

Chairman Deapen: our regulations say that for single family residences they have to provide two spaces outside...

Attorney Dale: most houses have four to five cars.

Commissioner Travis: I know from history the development we've done. You make a two car garage, they put enough stuff in it to make it into one. But a two car garage and then you have another area that you can park two more vehicles. But some folks decide they're not going to do that even though they could pull in there. Its an issue I'm sure the City has had to deal with.

Attorney Dale: trying to deal with in Highview, state law prohibits it.

Commissioner Travis: most all could add additional ten feet on the side of their driveway, you can put an entrance closer than 15 foot correct?

Administrator Sweazy: yes the driveway. It's the structure that is 15 feet off.

Attorney Dale: the problem is our regulations don't require that or give that option. That's something you may want to consider either developers will have to make the road wide enough for parking on the sides or the regulations be amended to give the land owner the opportunity to have more than two parking places.

Chairman Deapen: I think he is saying we do have that.

Administrator Sweazy: more than anything what we run into is truly is the sewerred lots, the lots are very small lots they only have whatever garage parking there is and maybe the two spaces out front of the garage and that's all the parking they have. Generally, that's because the lots are smaller, so they don't provide for a long driveway or additional spaces and it seems like those are the developments that we see people are trying to park on the street. Most of your bigger lots, your subdivisions out in the county where you got acre lots it seems like they put the houses further back on the lot the driveway therefore is deeper and a lot of times wider that provides the parking. So we don't have as many I guess issues with the parking on the streets in the county developments as we do on the smaller lot developments.

Attorney Dale: we can take a look at it when we address the city's. That makes a good point.

Administrator Sweazy: in these new guidelines something that they're saying here is all development not just sewerred developments. All developments will have curbs, so they are doing away with doing

your 20 foot wide with gravel two foot shoulder and ditching they now want curb and gutter basically on all.

Attorney Dale: that is county. The city has that now.

Administrator Sweazy: but I just think sometimes when you get curbs, I don't know why people want to park on the side of the street. They get more of a city feel with that curb.

Attorney Dale: it is just convenient; you have visitors and usually the sidewalk comes down to the street. I can see that its not as much a problem for the county as it is the city.

Commissioner Travis: felt one issue he didn't see addressed, if you put a curb in like it should be you get nineteen feet to a yard of concrete. I saw someone that done curb and they probably got forty feet to a yard. What is going to happen if someone backs over it with a garbage truck or loaded truck, you aren't going to have any curb left. I haven't seen anywhere that made any recommendation as far as the height of the concrete and so forth.

Administrator Sweazy: there are some specs in there.

Commissioner Travis: that is something that might need to be looked at because if you put curb in you should have some conditions.

Chairman Deapen: I read through this three times is the curbing the main additional things that I would have missed.

Administrator Sweazy: no, I was just saying they (fiscal court) added the curbing requirement on Monday.

Chairman Deapen: my question is what else did they add on Monday.

Administrator Sweazy: they designated a fine amount. They added to some of the titles. Section 403.6 pertaining to the curbs.

Chairman Deapen: Section 413 they added to the title.

Administrator Sweazy: Public Improvements and that is because they are wanting to make it added to the title public improvements and that is because they want to make sure when these things are bonded it covers improvements it's not just the bed of that road, it's covering improvements as a whole.

Chairman Deapen: so, 416, 417 does the same thing.

Commissioner Travis: they want to put the utilities at the rear of all lots? Section 416.

Administrator Sweazy: I believe that is just for overhead.

Commissioner Travis: rear of all lots or underground. All transformer boxes, pretty hard to make them unsightly.

Administrator Sweazy: put them in the middle of a bush!

Commissioner Travis: if you have two lines of lots and the back comes together you could probably do that.

Administrator Sweazy: basically, the titles and they assessed that \$2000 a day if they have to do a stop work order. So, on Monday that's really about all they added.

Commissioner Travis: I have to say that 416 will be hard to pull off.

Chairman Deapen: did you have anybody sign up to testify on this one?

Administrator Sweazy: no, never had anyone come into the office to look at them or request a copy.

Chairman Deapen: this isn't my area of expertise; I have read it and understand it. I think I understand some higher standards of building all of which I think long term the county is going to benefit from. I didn't see anything that I couldn't endorse. I feel very comfortable with the people you told me that worked on it. Express to the commission the team that worked on this.

Administrator Sweazy: it was myself, the county road foreman, county engineers, two magistrates, county attorney.

Chairman Deapen: I thought that was a good group and gave me a lot of confidants.

Administrator Sweazy: our regulations are from 92 there have been some tweaking and amendments along the way but fiscal court came in and they added an ordinance and that's when their ordinance came into play that all roads be built, paved and everything before you could sell the first lot. In that ordinance, it also stated that it was an amendment to our regulations and so I have gotten it through to them that it couldn't be an amendment because we never held a public hearing and that was part of their thinking on this. They didn't want to do this without going through this process to make this our subdivision regulations as a whole instead of having three or four documents floating around that people are trying to get copies of and this way we've got it all in one.

Commissioner Travis: Section 419 they marked out the 18 inch entrance pipe, I don't agree with that. I think we should have an 18 or 20 inch pipe in that. I'll be honest and not trying to go against those fellows, but we need to keep that 18 or 20 inch pipe in there.

Administrator Sweazy: in the discussion for taking that out, it leaves the road foreman and engineer the authority to say its gotta be 20, its gotta be 22, 24 or they can jump down here and say 16 is good. We take out a set size that way it lets them fluctuate to where it needs to be.

Chairman Deapen: it gives them the discretion...

Commissioner Travis: I don't like because I've seen them use too small a pipe.

Chairman Deapen: If it said 18 before.

Commissioner Travis: Well we could say a minimum of 18 or as required. I'll be honest with you, the first development I done, I went with a small pipe and it lasted about 6 months. I had to dig it up and put in some good pipe. So, I got an education on that.

Chairman Deapen: Let use that as an example, what if the need really needs to be 24 and we don't have latitude to do that.

Commissioner Travis: I'm saying a minimum or as required.

Commissioner Hunt: Is the County Road Foreman going to look at each and every one of these?

Administrator Sweazy: Yes, they do, and this is at the point for a building permit. So, each house they go out and look at it to determine whether a pipe is needed at all. That's part of our building permit process, we don't issue a residential building permit or house until we've got the approval from the Road Forman on what type of pipes got to go in there.

Commissioner Travis: I bet some of the Engineers will disagree with me. They want to put in too small a pipe. In my opinion is a lack of experience. I had a conversation with a gentleman one day they were going to put in a 18" pipe, I told them it wouldn't work. He said we only have 6 acres here to drain. I said what about the other some odd 20 feet ditch.

Chairman Deapen: My concern with getting hung up on this is the process is practical, because this is what we advertised and I would encourage us to vote yes or no. Vote on this and then if we need to make some minor changes to it later, I won't oppose it. I hate to see us not act on the entire thing or vote the entire thing down on that one issue.

Attorney Dale: I think you have the right to make a recommendation that goes to the county in the motion.

Chairman Deapen: So, our motion would be that we recommend acceptance with the following change.

Attorney Dale: The county is the one adopting it, your just recommending statements.

Chairman Deapen: I'll withdraw my last statement.

Attorney Dale: Any other recommendations should you have, it might be something you want to study and pick it up next time.

Chairman Deapen: I hope everybody studied. That was the request from the commission.

Attorney Dale: If Anthony has a recommendation, then I think you could pass that on to the county.

Commissioner Travis: When I see something that a major issue might arise with what we're doing and I'm not here ruffle everyone's feathers, but I think that I'm going to be here that I know something that's not where I think it should be then I should say.

Chairman Deapen: Would you like to take a 15-minute recess and let you look at the changes.

Commissioner Travis: No, can we take this up at the next meeting?

Chairman Deapen: We been requested not to do that. We were requested to act on it at this meeting. That's the reason it was sent out and we were asked to study it.

Commissioner Travis: That's fine, I don't have a problem with it.

Commissioner Hunt: May I ask with the reason was for it to immediate action today?

Chairman Deapen: Getting it into place before other developments come through. There are some major things in here of how we're going to build roads in here. We have other's grandfathered into

lower standards. The magistrate court said we would like for you to take a look at it, study it and if your good with it, let's get it in place so we don't have to deal with any other major developments coming in and taking advantage of the lower standards.

Commissioner Faue: I will say I did read it and I think the section that Anthony has issues with, I think as long as it's going back to the county road engineer, even today, he would final say on that even if we said it was 18" in here. He could say no it has to be something else. I'm okay with the County Engineer determining that. The other section as far as the utilities being in the back of the lot, its says where practicable. So, it's not set in stone and we know in some development that isn't feasible and that will be and increased cost for the developer to get those boxes to the back of the lot. That's the only two sticky points that I saw.

Administrator Sweazy: That was the main goal to get it in there. So that as these new developments start coming through, we can hold them to these standards, over what we had before.

Chairman Deapen: It's the beginning of the year, let's get off to a good start.

Commissioner Faue: So, if we were to say okay on this, when will become effective?

Administrator Sweazy: It will go to Fiscal Court; you would be making a recommendation to Fiscal Court. They have to have two readings on it. So, its still pushing probably until January before it done.

Attorney Dale: You can make the motion to approve it with that recommendation and about the concrete curving, they can accept it and they may not.

Chairman Deapen: But there are standards in there.

Commissioner Travis: In section 405, does it say the maximum weight allowed? It says any road over an 8% grade must be reviewed and approved by the County Road Foreman. So, they're not really doing anything.

Chairman Deapen: Explain that to me.

Commissioner Travis: Any road over 8%. So, we got a street that's 12%, any road over an 8% grade must be reviewed and approved by the County Road Foreman and County Engineer prior to submitting a development plan. So, your saying we are going to have a maximum but we're going to let the County Road Foreman and Engineer make you go further.

Chairman Deapen: Yes, that's what that would say, and I don't know if that is wise or not.

Administrator Sweazy: I think what part of that is their going to just let us look at it on paper and just send it on through they're going to go out there on site and look at it and try to figure out what their asking for, the reason behind it, and if it will actually work or not.

Commissioner Travis: There's a lot of rules, 8% is not a lot of grade. You wouldn't be able to get up your driveway.

Chairman Deapen: But that's where the county would come in, isn't it?

Commissioner Travis: They're going to review the plat before it gets here.

Administrator Sweazy: If you want to take this and look at it because Anthony didn't get to look at it. He doesn't have email. If you want to hold it until the next meeting and you want me to have the County Road Forman and the County Engineer here to answer questions, I will try to do that for you.

Commissioner Travis: I don't have any problems working with Todd. Me and him had a discussion we agree on a lot of things and there's things we don't agree on. If you want to go ahead and pass it then that's a good choice.

Administrator Sweazy: The only thing I think is, it's been to the county already, they reviewed it, Fiscal Court reviewed it and they made changes twice. Monday was the last time they looked at it and they changed a couple of things. They're comfortable with it but they may not understand some of this other stuff.

Chairman Deapen: That little conversation that Anthony and I just had, and I say this very respectfully. I read that and I thought isn't that interesting they changed it to a desirable 8%, maximum 8%, but the county can change it. That doesn't mean anything to me, I've never built a subdivision and Anthony has so he picked up on it.

Commissioner Travis: I just know the issues we had over the years when I was a magistrate with percent of soil on the streets. If someone wants to make a motion to pass it, go ahead.

Chairman Deapen: I would like to who ever makes the motion, I would like to have them include the issue that Anthony brought up. That it should be 18" or greater.

Administrator Sweazy: But what if it doesn't need a pipe at all? In section 419 it says including placement of an entrance pipe, as directed by the County Road Forman, where applicable.

Chairman Deapen: So, instead we need to say including a placement of a minimum 18" entry pipe.

Commissioner Travis: I don't care to talk to Todd.

Chairman Deapen: I'll entertain a motion.

Commissioner Faue: Is the 18" the only thing?

Chairman Deapen: Anthony is saying let's let it slide as it is and we will handle it from there. Anthony is that what I'm hearing, you can live with it as it's written?

Commissioner Travis: Right if that's what the group wants to do.

Commissioner Faue: I make a recommendation that we recommend to Fiscal Court the adoption of the New Subdivision Regulations.

Commissioner Mudd: Second.

Chairman Deapen: Any further discussion? Julie call roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Roll called, Commissioner Travis did not vote.

Chairman Deapen: Motion carries. General questions or discussion? Next meeting December 2, 2021.

Administrator Sweazy: I do have one thing. I have a couple ladies here that still need training for the year and Anthony also. Wanted to see if could do on December 1, at 8am.

Commissioner Travis: Made motion to adjourn, second by Commissioner Faue.

Chairman Deapen: We have a motion to adjourn, all in favor please say aye, meeting adjourned.

Chairman

Attest:

Secretary