

AREA PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES
JULY 13TH, 2006

PUBLIC HEARING OF THE AREA PLAN COMMISSION OF GRANT COUNTY was held on Thursday, July 13th, 2006 at 6:00 P.M. in a specially scheduled meeting on the first floor of the Grant County Office Complex at 401 South Adams Street, Marion, Indiana. The following members were present: John Woodmansee, Karen Owen, Dennis Fox, John Bonham, Myron Brankle, Rana Vetor, Kim Windle, and Dick Treon, Vice-President. Absent were Bob Highley, Dick Trobridge, Keith Roorbach, Mark Bardsley and Tony Manry, President. Staff present was Tanya Ford, Executive Director, Bruce Elliot, Area Plan Attorney, and Brenda Harrison.

Board will wait until the August meeting to approve minutes.

Tanya Ford explained that there weren't any petitioners, only the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance brought before the board by the office. But, anyone wishing to speak for or against it will need to step up to the microphone; state their name and address for the record. There will be a total of twenty-five minutes for the remonstrance.

Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance; amend Section 14.6 of the Grant County Areawide Zoning Ordinance. Tanya Ford stated that this is the section that deals with the cessation of permits. The way it reads now is, if a cessation of permits is passed, then we can not issue any permits. This amendment modifies it so that if it is passed, then we couldn't even accept any applications; we still wouldn't be able to approve or issue any permits either.

Tanya Ford stated that this has to do with Senate Bill 35. When it was passed it changed a lot of things, and one of them has to deal with submitting an application, the rules that you can follow. You have three years to get started and in those three years you would follow the rules in place when you applied, not when it was approved. This could cause some issues, and undermine what Section 14.6 was put in the ordinance for. So we are simply looking forward to amendment that tonight. You would need to give it a recommendation, and then it would go to legislative bodies for their approvals. You have had this for about a week, and if you feel uncomfortable with it, Bruce Elliott is here to answer any questions and we can always push it forward to the August meeting. But, Bruce is on hand to answer any questions.

Dick Treon said I guess I'm one of these people who believe it's all a matter of timing. But, this just seems to come at a bad time, with what's happening in other situations right now.

Bruce Elliott responded by saying I think typically in these type of matters you see a lot of amendments, changes or clarifications in the Countywide Zoning when big issues come up. Timing to me is always a factor when these issues come up, this is not anything I'm overly concerned about concerning the time.

Dick Treon stated that he looked at it from a different side, too. I'm in the getting a permit business more so, than the rest of you, so this sort of affects me. Hypothetically, I could get a building permit; it pertains to any type of permit where it would be, first thing that comes out of mind, it was a home occupation permit. Maybe I'm taking it too serious, and maybe it's not affecting anything, if we just have to cover all the bases.

Tanya Ford stated that if you were to pass a cessation on permits you would specify which permits, just like they did before (for any confined feeding operations). This says there has to be an amendment in place, so we couldn't just randomly go through and start putting a hold on permits. There would have to be a proposed amendment on the table and they would have to specify what it was for. This has been in the ordinance since 2002, and this is the first time we've had to put it in place. So this isn't something we use all the time, but it is a good tool to have in place. Because of Senate Bill 35, we really do need to tighten up this section of the ordinance. I understand where you're coming from; did we come aware of this because of the issue we're dealing with? Yeah, probably. Does this need to be modified no matter what's happening? Yes, definitely.

Myron Brankle asked what essentially are we doing?

Tanya Ford responded that this is a proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance; the Plan Commission would have to give it a favorable or unfavorable recommendation. Then it would have to go to all the legislative bodies; Commissioners, Fairmount Town Council, Van Buren Town Council, etc., who would vote on it, they would either approve it or deny it. If they approved it, then it would have to be recorded and then it would become an effective amendment to the ordinance. If one of them denied it and wanted to see a change, then it would come back to you, for you to review, to see if you were "kosher" with those proposed changes.

Myron Brankle asked if there was a certain amount of time to complete this, and he also asked Mr. Treon if he felt like they needed more time to study this. Dick Treon answered no, that he was leaning more toward the CAFO issue, to him that is what's brought this to head. He also stated that he wasn't familiar with Senate Bill 35 until recently, and after becoming more familiar with it, then I see where you're coming from with this. But unfortunately, 99% of the people in the county don't know what SB35 means, so to us here its stay on top of it or understand it. I guess I'm looking at the broad perspective of why it's being done.

Myron Brankle asked Bruce Elliott, briefly what Senate Bill 35 was, and could he concisely summarize what.

Bruce Elliot said that he didn't think he could concisely speak on that. Basically, what Senate Bill 35 is saying is that at the time the applicant puts their application for the permit on file, and then we are, as the County, to follow the old rules, the rules at the time the application was applied for. This amendment will tighten our ordinance up and give some clarity as to what we can do under that Senate Bill.

Myron Brankle asked would it be, if we passed this amendment to the ordinance that we would not have to abide by the old rules after the applicant has filed.

Bruce Elliott stated that we're still going to be under Senate Bill 35, there's no doubt about that, that's the State of Indiana's legislation. But this will tighten up our ordinance for our interpretation and clarify what our duties and responsibilities are.

Myron Brankle stated that if he as a farmer came in and applied for a CFO, previously until this ordinance is voted on and accepted, I would be able to get my permit granted. Since I applied before we met.

Bruce Elliott asked if he was talking about this amendment.

Myron Brankle answered yeah.

Bruce Elliott stated that with this amendment, I would tell you no.

Myron Brankle asked even though we have not passed the amendment.

Bruce Elliott stated if the amendment passes.

Myron Brankle asked what essentially then would Area Plan be telling me as a farmer, if I come in and apply for that permit before this.

Tanya Ford stated it's what we have right now. You will still have to meet the requirements of the permit, but if you would come in and file, let's say you want to build an accessory building. You came in and applied for your permit for the accessory building and you filed your application and then after the time period that you filed the application, the Plan Commission amended the ordinance to say that you could not put up accessory buildings in AG. SB35 with the way were interpreting it, would require me to still, once you met the requirements of that permit, issue that permit, because, you filed under the old rules. There is some question about complete, I'm not sure, but that's how we were interpreting it.

Bruce Elliott stated that SB35 requires that there be submitted a completed application. You brought up the issue of CAFOs; with the case I'm aware of here in Grant County, I believe there is some question, if that CAFO/CFO has filed the appropriate documents or not.

Myron Brankle states so we meet this evening and pass this amendment, tomorrow Mr. Farmer comes in and applies.

Tanya Ford stated that it's still not effective. I still need to take this amendment to all of the legislative bodies, and they have to vote on it, then if that passes and all legislative bodies vote on it and it's recorded, then you would have to vote on a cessation of permits again under the new rules.

Myron Brankle asks if this will take several weeks.

Tanya Ford answers that it could take a couple of months.

Myron Brankle asks that right now we have stopped all applicants for six months. Tanya Ford corrected that approvals have been stopped. Myron Brankle restated that we have stopped approving applications for six months, two or three weeks ago, and beginning at that time. So there's a possibility that this goes through the system, cities, towns, Commissioners, if it's approved tonight, within or before six months is out. I'm lost in the lag time there.

Tanya Ford asked Mr. Brankle if he wanted to know why it takes so long to go through the amendment process.

Myron Brankle stated that if I, as Mr. Farmer, came in for *inaudible comment*, still it hasn't been approved. We vote on it and approve it and start the process in motion. Still I, as Mr. Farmer, want his permit, under the jurisdiction of the six months freeze. Will that carry any credibility after those six months?

Tanya Ford stated that after the six months, they've applied for the permit, and in that time period there are going to get all of their information together and it's going to be a complete application. But we can't approve it, because we've passed that cessation of permits. So,

you're asking at the end of the six months, would they fall under the new rules or the old rules. That would definitely be an attorney question.

Bruce Elliott stated that Mr. Farmer would want to follow the old rules, under Senate Bill 35. Trying to answer a hypothetical, I'm sure that's what the farmer would want to follow. Our position is that if it is passed by the legislative entities then we will have to look at the case, but the new rules should be in fact.

Myron asked the new rules for Area Plan? What happens to Senate Bill 35?

Tanya Ford and Bruce Elliott both answer that its still there.

Myron Brankle asked if it still has the teeth it did have or what?

Tanya Ford answered that mostly yes, but this truly needs to happen. I think pretty much what's going on now, we can not comment, it's very hypothetical, because SB35 is so new.

Bruce Elliott states that there haven't been any cases decided using SB35. It's a brand new law that happened July 1st of this year. Before there would ever be a case on it, there would have to be a trial and an appeal taken.

Myron Brankle asks what made Senate Bill 35 pass.

Bruce Elliott answered that anything when you get a politician involved. I think that perhaps a politician had a constituent that was treated poorly on a zoning case. They went to their politician/elected representative and complained. That's why I think Senate Bill 35 is on the books.

Dick Treon asked if whether SB35 slid in on other bills or how it actually come about.

Tanya Ford answered that she didn't think so.

Dick Treon asked if it stood on its own.

Tanya Ford stated that she was pretty sure.

Dick Treon stated that a lot of bills get slid in with other legislation and all of a sudden its, wow, I didn't know that.

Tanya Ford stated that there was a gentleman in the audience that's quite knowledgeable about this, too, and he was shaking his head yes, that it was on its own. And it was a bad court ruling, and it did have to do with billboards. What happened was, a sign company pulled a permit for billboards, and they didn't put the signs up right away. Once the permits were approved by Marion County, Marion County changed the zoning or amended the ordinance, which would not allow the billboard to be in that location. Then Marion County came back to the company and told them, no; you can't put the billboards there. The billboard company said you gave us our permits; you changed the rules after the fact. It went on to court, Marion County actually won, hence then SB35 emerged from that.

Dick Treon asked Bruce Elliott if a permit application has to be totally complete, to be considered under this, or if I come in and don't have all of my paperwork and start my process, does that start the clock ticking.

Bruce Elliott stated that it may not be a question, he could answer. The court may have to on a fact like that, based on Senate Bill 35. Basically, it states that it has to be an application in completed form.

Dick Treon stated that we could sit here and say what if. I would ask you Tanya, in your years here have you ever had this happen. Have you had cases where a person came in and got a permit and then somewhere down the line it got rejected or turned down?

Tanya Ford stated that it could be turned down if they don't have all their information or if they provide incorrect information. But, just to issue a permit and then we change the rules after the permit is issued, no. That goes against the fundamentals of what we do.

Dick Treon stated that he was trying to be objective here, and I see the reasoning for it, but it's kind of like the old fib, he broke my fix it. I see the other side of why you're trying to do this.

John Bonham stated that he would say it is broke, and I'm not talking about just the application on hand. I look at it as, the cases, you've had in the past, where a permit has been applied for, was granted, but because we had to go with what was on the rules, then the amendments were changed afterwards, because we saw we had a bad amendment. I would put that in this category, if we lived in a perfect world would have thought about this eighteen months ago or two years ago, but we are not in a perfect world. I look at this and say when we have issues that deal with water quality, issues we would have considered if someone would have brought them to us. If someone would have said we needed to look at whatever comes into our county, and we want to be sure were covering that correctly. We would have done that, I think, over a course of time. I see this, giving us this option, not only to our current situation, we have only suspended permits, and we have not suspended the application receiving or the completing of an application that has already begun.

Tanya Ford stated no we have not.

John Bonham stated that this does that, and I think there is a time to do that if you're caught in a situation where you haven't been in that perfect world looking ahead and that's why I would say our amendment is broke and needs to be fixed.

Rana Vetor stated she sees Senate Bill 35 as big brother kind of legislation; this amendment puts it back into Grant County, to grassroots making the decision. As opposed to having the State telling us what we are going to be doing.

Tanya Ford stated that it's going to be an administrative nightmare, forget everything else, just because you have three years to start and seven years to finish, with subdivisions, etc., it adds, besides what were looking at right now, a whole lot of other things involved with this. But, this came about because of what I feel was a bad court ruling.

Karen Owen stated that she was going back to Myron's Mr. Farmer. Mr. Farmer comes in next March, and we already have different things in place. So, he comes up to the desk with a permit, what do you do?

Tanya Ford stated that by next March, we ought to have the amendments in place, because we said six months. So, we would have the new amendments in place, he would have to submit his application and meet all the requirements. If he meets all of his requirements, we would issue a permit.

Karen Owen asked if there is something we missed in that time, and he comes in with a petition and you bring it to the Plan Commission, this says we can do an emergency, we are going to look at this, we are going to take some time to look at this, and we are not going to accept his permit right now.

Tanya Ford stated that she doesn't bring every permit to them. So we would just like now, until you pass the cessation, we are going to go with the rules that are in place. Then you would still get into, if he submitted a completed application and met all the requirements, we would issue the permit. And you could pass your emergency order all you wanted, but, it wouldn't work, because the permit would have already been issued.

Karen Owen stated that she didn't understand what good this is.

Tanya Ford stated that we know we are going to be working on an amendment to the ordinance, and usually we know ahead of time, that we think there's a problem with the ordinance and we need to be considering this. We mull around with it for awhile before we actually get serious and put something on the table, so to speak. What this would allow you to do is if there's an amendment being proposed you could pass the cessation of permits, if we adopted this amendment. That would mean they could not come in and even apply for a permit during that time period. Now if one is already approved, it's already approved. I'll be honest with you, if I already approved a permit because they submitted a completed application, and met all of the requirements, and did everything there suppose to, I'm not going to revoke the permit. That has happened one time before, and we did not revoke the permit, because there was a question on interpretation, and it went to the BZA, etc. If I've issued that permit and they've met all of the requirements, and had a completed application, I'm not going to take that permit back, because they've met everything they were suppose to. This came about we found, because we need to consider an ordinance amendment, then you could pass your cessation, that person would already be in place, but, we could then go forward with correcting what was a "flaw" in the ordinance. So, it would stop every Tom, Dick, and Harry from rushing in and getting a permit, knowing an ordinance amendment was coming and trying to get stuff taken care of. Like, pulling a bunch of accessory building permits, or something.

Karen Owens stated that right now, if we pass this tonight, I know we can't permanently keep anything from necessarily coming into the county. Could with this tonight, keep people off for like, four or five years?

Tanya Ford answered oh no. If we did that, we would probably be sued.

John Bonham asked if he were to apply this amendment, if it were in place, what it would mean today is no one else could apply for a CAFO, under this right now, for the six months.

Tanya Ford stated that you don't want to do it indefinitely, because that's not good for development in the county and that's not fair.

John Bonham stated that it also means that one that's on file could not be completed for six months. Which again, gives us time to complete changes that were looking at doing?

Tanya Ford stated that you have to look at, by the time, even if you give it a favorable recommendation and we try to precede forward and go through the whole process. Your literally talking a couple of months, and you are already well into that six months.

John Bonham said that he knows that, and trying to apply it to the existing one is hard. But I'm trying to say if we had another situation, where we had a brand new application that came in, and that we were uncomfortable with our ordinances, then this being in place could not only stop what were trying to do here, the issuing of a permit. And also, could stop any additional applications, and even the completion of an application. Is that correct?

Tanya Ford stated that unless they have already applied, then it could get sticky with SB35 again.

Bruce Elliott stated that was correct.

Tanya Ford then stated that there was no way to get around that.

John Bonham stated that at least we have teeth that no one else can apply.

Tanya Ford's answer was definitely. What the intention of what's in the ordinance right now is was for that. And then SB35 came along and changed the dynamics, so that now we have to modify our ordinance, because before just saying we couldn't approve them, was sufficient. With SB35 you really have to add in that we can't accept the applications, because when they start submitting the applications then they start getting locked into certain things.

Dick Treon stated that this is impossible to stay ahead of. I've been reading, and keeping up on some of this and just like the CAFOs, and ethanol plants and so forth. I'm starting to see them change their identification. Rather than being agribusiness, there calling it some other kind of business, because it's not just a cow standing out in the middle of a field. They've brought it in and made it a production line business deal, theoretically. As I read the Indianapolis paper and some of the other papers, you see other counties dealing with the same issues. These companies are just finding new names to basically circumvent the rules. How do you stay ahead of that game? We pass this, and next week a guy comes in, the very business you talk about trying to regulate, he's determined that it could be called something else that's not even in the manual.

Tanya Ford stated that we were the ones that defined a use, no matter what the petitioner calls it. And if someone disagrees with that, we can take it to the Board of Zoning Appeals for an interpretation. There is a section in the ordinance that talks about defining the classifications. So, they can try to change their name, but that doesn't usually work with the way our ordinance is written. Now, there could be some ordinances where that could be a problem.

John Woodmansee asked if this would be a permanent addition to the zoning ordinance, and is it meant for us to take a timeout and consider everything before we pass the new rules.

Tanya Ford stated that if you have an amendment, and we know we were going to do an amendment, then it allows us, if we feel that circumstances warrant, to pass this. The best example, I feel would be something like an accessory building, where it is very easy to get the permit and you could, by the time you got done, have everyone know it was coming, and could literally have a hundred people come in and pull a permit trying to usurp the size requirements or the setbacks requirements. So, yes it's in place, and it's a good thing. The way it's written you have to consider it on a case by case basis, there is a time limitation and the Board has to feel that the situation warrants it. It's not something, you want to use constantly, but we are not constantly amending the ordinance, either.

John Woodmansee asked that the cessation of permits that was passed three weeks ago, that it is not required to go through the legislative bodies.

Tanya Ford stated that was already in the ordinance, and it was written in place. When they adopted the amendments to the zoning ordinance in 2002, that was put in there, and so they accepted that and it gave the Plan Commission the authority to do that. What we are doing tonight is changing what that says so yes that is actually an amendment. The cessation before was not an amendment to the zoning ordinance.

John Woodmansee asked if this parallels all of the zones, or is this just for AG zone.

Tanya Ford stated that this is for all of the zoning classifications. But, it would only be for what you specified. Such as accessory building, single family dwelling units, customary home occupations.

Dick Treon stated that as he understands it that one entity, it takes a unanimous vote from the entities for this to pass.

Tanya Ford stated that she thought it was just a quorum.

Dick Treon stated not just this one, but any.

Tanya Ford said you're not talking about the cessation anymore.

Dick Treon said no. This particular amendment to the ordinance, in order for it to pass, and become rule it has to be unanimous, is that correct?

Tanya Ford asked with all of the legislative bodies passing it? Bruce and I are still working on that one.

Dick Treon stated that not only do we have this one, but it looks like the CAFO is going to be coming before the other entities.

Tanya Ford stated that was right and that there is a possibility that one legislative body won't pass it. So were working on what the ramifications would be.

Myron Brankle asked a question that was inaudible.

Dick Treon said let's take Fairmount for example. If their council says I don't agree with this and don't pass it, then does that kill this amendment?

Tanya Ford stated that was what they were working on.

John Bonham stated that we went through this in 2002, and we could have made suggestions on a change.

So it wasn't like we were disagreeing with one part, and it would keep the whole thing from happening.

It would have been worked out over a course of time.

Tanya Ford stated that was the key. An amendment to the ordinance usually takes a pretty good length of time, because we come up with drafts, we give you the drafts, before we even ask you guys to consider it officially. We give you draft after draft, we take the suggestions, we rewrite them. It's a lengthy process, and it's supposed to be, that's the way the code is written.

John Woodmansee stated that in the big picture of things, *(inaudible comment)* if we have to consider an amendment, is this going to be reasonable, or is this going to be a major obstruction to development or is this a reasonable time to stop things.

Tanya Ford stated that it all depends on how you use it, if your passing a cessation constantly, well, yeah its going to hinder development and its not meant to be used constantly. It's a tool that's in place so that if the situation warrants we can use it, but it's not something your gonna want to use all the time. We want it there in case we need it, because it does have a place, and it is a very good tool and definitely there are situations where its appropriate and its needed.

Myron Brankle asked a question that was inaudible.

John Woodmansee asked if it was meant basically to stop a legal loophole that might get us into some trouble.

Bruce Elliott stated that you have to look at it as a partial response to Senate Bill 35.

Rana Vetor asked if she was correct in assuming then that this resolution of suspension would just be for a specific classification. So, if we were to say that no, we don't want anymore accessory buildings, it would just be for that. It would not stop subdivisions. She also stated that it gives us the time to do what we need to do here at grassroots level.

Tanya Ford said yes once you actually start to get to serious drafts, *(inaudible comment)* it allows you to suspend that it. It's in response to SB35, but just when we bring it to you, to when it would actually be complete, that in its self can take quite a bit of time.

John Bonham asked would this also give a concerned citizen a real place where they can come locally to express a concern, bringing it to a governing body, and then they have an ability to then take that under advisement, and then apply this. There should be a forum at the local level that comes into play.

Tanya Ford stated that what this does is what you had before there was certain intent, and by amending it, it allows you to keep the same intent, it doesn't really change what we had before in the sense of the intentions not changed. It's just because of new rules we have to add something to ours just to keep it at the status quo of what in the first place.

John Woodmansee stated that because of the issue in Senate Bill 35 is the ideal vested interest. What that definition is, if they've got money invested, and an application started, they've got a vested interest.

Tanya Ford stated that is how everyone is interpreting it, and its not just you have to have a pole in the ground or the foundation. If you can show that you have engineering work and this and that, and then you have a vested interest.

John Bonham asked if this helped to keep that rush of people from establishing that vested interest.

Tanya Ford stated that it basically says it's not allowing you to file an application.

Dick Treon asked if a copy of SB35 could be forwarded to all of the entities. Because, none of his councilmen are going to know what it is.

Tanya Ford said she could do that.

Dick Treon stated that it would help for the councilmen to know what was being said when Tanya came to speak about the amendment and SB35.

Tanya Ford stated that there is someone in the audience.

Dick Treon stated that this is a public meeting and is there anyone that wants to speak for or against this petition.

Jon Bomberger, an attorney with Baker & Daniels in Fort Wayne, representing Weaver Popcorn. We support this amendment to the zoning ordinance. One of the interesting things about Senate Bill 35 and your zoning ordinance, your previous moratorium that you adopted under Section 16.17, there is an existing provision under Article 14, in your ordinance, regarding subdivision plats, which does today gives you the exact same power that this amendment would give you with regard to applications for building permits. Because, it does allow you to suspend applications for subdivision plats. That is one thing I think should be considered in terms that you already have that power, with regard to one category, if you will, of applications. This would just extend that from just subdivision plats to building permits, improvement location permits, and those types of things. All of the discussion you've had in regards to a "freeze", so that you don't have them rushing to Ms. Ford's office, with building permit applications is really sort of a long term issue for Grant County. Twenty years ago, the country side was rife with cell phone agents, as they ran around the country trying to build towers as quickly as possible. Of course most jurisdictions, municipalities, and counties didn't have any way to deal with those issues, and having this type of power to allow you a way to come up with a way to regulate them and make sure their not building next door to one another, is a very appropriate power. What you're doing here is addressing a concern, from a State Law that was passed at last session. I believe this is a very appropriate response, and we support it.

Myron Brankle stated that as he understood it, if we feel that it is broken, then we need to fix it, and time is of the essence to move tonight. Is that what it's about here?

Bruce Elliott told Myron that he couldn't tell what he's thinking, but as legal council, something needs to happen. There is a gaping hole in our ordinance that needs to be addressed. This amendment will address that. There are probably many Plan Commissions throughout Indiana addressing this very same issue with Senate Bill 35.

John Woodmansee asked with this amendment, is so much of it worded because of other counties.

Tanya Ford stated that she hadn't seen any other counties, but when she was at the Indiana Planning Association Conference, in the spring, they were talking about this. It was still new, and they said there was work you had to do on your ordinances, and since then just the correspondence we've had, has said basically this is what you've got to do, and it is more or less what were doing. Defining out what makes a complete application, when are you going to accept the application? Now, not everybody has run into the cessation of permits. For instance, Madison County does not, because they called us and asked for that section of our ordinance, to amend their ordinance. But everybody is examining the whole concept of a completed application and when you can file.

But, is everybody's worded just like ours, no. But is it pretty much along the same line as ours. Unless they don't have the whole cessation of permits, then they would have to add all that language.

Dick Treon stated that Madison County was mentioned, and did they state whether they were doing this because of SB35 or do they also have CAFO issues.

Tanya Ford answered both and that Tipton County did the same thing. They heard about the cessation of permits we had in the ordinance and wanted a copy of that as well.

Dick Treon stated that from reading Madison County is facing the same CAFO issue in the swine industry, rather than the cattle.

Tanya Ford stated that most of the counties around, even in southern Indiana, a lot of them are facing this issue. They are not only facing this, but SB35, because it's a state law and it's affecting us all. Everybody's sharing ordinances and running back and forth.

Dick Treon asked if there were any more comments or discussion.

John Bonham stated that he wanted to make one last comment; by making the change were not approving or disapproving any permits or application. We were just defining the process they have to abide by, thus giving us an opportunity to do some work if we feel we need to.

Myron Brankle asked what would this meeting entitle?

Tanya Ford stated just the amendments of section 14.6 of the Areawide Zoning Ordinance.

Dick Treon stated that if there isn't any further comment, they would entertain a motion at this time.

Rana Vctor made the motion to amend Section 14.6 of the Grant County Areawide Zoning Ordinance as presented. Myron Brankle seconded. All members present voted yes; motion carried.

John Bonham asked if we were giving a favorable recommendation. Tanya Ford stated yes. Tanya Ford stated that the motion passed, and that we will proceed to start the process and get all of the legislative bodies.

Dick Treon asked if there was any other business. Tanya Ford answered no.

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Richard Treon, APC Vice-President