

From: John Simler
Sent: Wed, February 25, 2004 11:00AM via e-mail
Planning Commission minutes 2/3/4

Planning Commission 2/3/4. Present: John, Suvia, Kathleen, and Janet.

Minutes from the previous meeting (1/20/4) were not approved. Suvia wanted to make changes in one of her statements. She will bring the revised minutes for the next meeting.

Election of officers was not held. Rachel misplaced the paperwork for the BOCC regarding the reappointment of John Hunt. John's reappointment still needs to be determined by the BOCC. Do you have a copy of the paperwork for Rachel?

The planning Commission wants to review these three sections with an eye toward reconciling the time periods identified in each section:

Section 5.01.04 (1)
Section 5.02.03 (3)
Section 5.03.04 (1)

Section 6.01.06 Should the consequences be specified when a parcel is NOT compliant but created anyway?

Section 6.02.01 (5) Is it really necessary to that every lot have frontage to a public road? No private driveways to the public road?

6.03.02 (1) (C) The planning commission is unhappy with the inverse relationship between density and park size. Comment from Andy Grant on this?

6.03.02 (1) (D) Clarify what this means, then add to 6.03.02 (1) (B) instead of having it as its own line item.

6.03.02 (1) (C) Some concern over a maximum width , but not a minimum width. What are the county road standards?

6.03.02 (2)(H) Should this be deleted? Should it be moved? It doesn't go with the previous items.

6.03.03 (2) Break this into two numbered items instead of one?

6.03.03 (4) Does this belong with the appeals procedure in 6.03.05?

Review 6.03.03 altogether.