

**FREMONT COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 1, 2011**

CHAIRMAN DEAN SANDOVAL BROUGHT THE MARCH 1, 2011 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO ORDER AT 4:05 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Joe Caruso
Byron Alsup
Dean Sandoval, Chairman
Mike Krauth, Jr.
Joe Lamanna

STAFF PRESENT

Bill Giordano, Planning Director
Don Moore, County Engineer
Vicki Alley, Planning Assistant

MEMBERS ABSENT

Daryl Robinson (*notice of absence was provided to the Chairman*)

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4. APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2010 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

5. REQUEST: SRU 11-001 8 MILE RANCH KENNEL

Request approval of a **Special Review Use Permit, Department file #SRU 11-001 8 Mile Ranch Kennel**, by Jeffrey Charles and Karen Buckner, to allow for a dog kennel which will house up to a total of twenty (20) dogs (no specific breeds) and ten (10) cats for the purposes of day time and overnight boarding and grooming, on property they own. The property contains a single-family dwelling, a metal barn and a 10 foot by 20 foot stall. The owner will add a 944 square foot kennel addition, which will provide 10 dog kennels with a portion being enclosed, a cat area with cages and a grooming area. A portion of the kennel will be used for an outside dog run which will be concrete floor and which will be enclosed by an 8 foot chain link fence. In addition, a garage is proposed at a later date. The property is located *approximately one (1) mile east of Fremont County Road #3A, on the south side of U. S. Highway 50, approximately 1,290 feet south of U. S. Highway 50, in the Eight Mile Area.* The property is zoned Agricultural Forestry and contains approximately 41.08 acres.

REPRESENTATIVE: Matt Koch, Cornerstone Land Surveying, LLC

6. REQUEST: SRU 10-008 AT&T CELL TOWER COTOPAXI

Request approval of a **Special Review Use Permit, Department file #SRU 10-008 AT & T Cell Tower - Cotopaxi**, by AT & T Wireless, for property which is owned by Cotopaxi Consolidated Schools, to allow for the installation of a one-hundred (100) foot monopole, which will contain six (6) antennas, an equipment shelter, an ice bridge, a meter rack, and a telco cabinet. Access to the site will be via a twenty (20) foot easement from County Road #12. The *property is generally located approximately 1/4 mile north of the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and County Road #12, on the west side of Fremont County Road #12, in*

the Cotopaxi Area. The tower and associated items will be located within a fifty (50) foot by fifty (50) foot, two-thousand-five-hundred (2,500) square foot lease area inside a 45.03 acre parcel. The property which will house the tower contains the Cotopaxi school and other accessory buildings and is located in the Agricultural Suburban Zone District.

REPRESENTATIVE: *Jeremy D. Mironas E.I., Tower Engineering Professionals, Inc.*

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Discussion of any items or concerns of the Planning Commission members.

8. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION CALENDAR

9. ELECTION OF FREMONT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS

10. ADJOURNMENT

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dean Sandoval called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Sandoval made the announcement that Planning Commission member Mr. Tom Doxey has resigned effective immediately, and a written resignation letter is forthcoming to the County Commissioners. Chairman Sandoval also noted that we have two new Planning Commission members and asked them to introduce themselves.

Mr. Joe Lamanna – I have worked at Holcim for about six years in the quarry. I am a geologist by training. I am very interested in land use and zoning issues. I moved to the area about six years ago and fell in love with the area. I grew up in Denver and went to school at Colorado State. I am really impressed with Fremont County. My family and I see a lot of potential in the area, and I hope I can help guide its path.

Mr. Mike Krauth, Jr. – I grew up in Cañon City and have lived in this area most of my life. I lived on the West end of the County for about ten years. I graduated high school here. I worked for the County several years ago. Since then I have been in the private sector. I have had a company with my brother for fifteen years. I recently went through the Conditional Use process last year. I was interested in the process and studied it to familiarize myself. I was scared of the process at first, but once I got through it I thought it wasn't so bad. Now I am on the other side of the fence. I am a business owner, familiar with the process, and I want to give back to the community.

Chairman Sandoval asked the remaining three members to introduce themselves for the new members' benefit.

Mr. Joe Caruso – I live in Florence and I serve as a member of the City Council. I have been in the valley since 1991.

Mr. Dean Sandoval – I am a local business person. I have a dental practice and I have been in town for about 29 years. I have been on the Planning Commission for about 13 years. This will probably be my last term.

Mr. Byron Alsup – I live up in Coaldale. My wife and I own the Mountain Home Veterinary Clinic there. I am a graduate of CSU. I have been in Colorado for most of the last 35 years and in Fremont County for the last 20 years.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Sandoval asked if there were any changes, additions or corrections to the agenda.

MOTION

Mr. Alsup made a motion to accept the March 1, 2011 Fremont County Planning Commission Meeting agenda.

SECOND

Mr. Caruso seconded the motion.

Chairman Sandoval called for a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously. (5 of 5)

4. APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2010 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Sandoval asked if there were any changes, additions or corrections to the December 7, 2010 Fremont County Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

MOTION

Mr. Caruso moved to accept the December 7, 2010 Fremont County Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as written.

SECOND

Mr. Alsup seconded the motion.

Chairman Sandoval called for a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously. (3 of 3 members who were present at the December 7, 2010 meeting)

5. REQUEST: SRU 11-001 8 MILE RANCH KENNEL

Mr. Matt Koch, Cornerstone Land Surveying, LLC, was present to request approval of a Special Review Use (SRU) Permit, Department file #SRU 11-001 8 Mile Ranch Kennel, by Jeffrey Charles and Kareen Buckner, to allow for a dog kennel which will house up to a total of twenty (20) dogs (no specific breeds) and ten (10) cats for the purposes of day time and overnight boarding and grooming, on property they own. The property contains a single-family dwelling, a metal barn and a ten foot by twenty foot stall. The owner will add a 944 square foot kennel addition, which will provide ten dog kennels with a portion being enclosed, a cat area with cages and a grooming area. A portion of the kennel will be used for an outside dog run which will be concrete floor and which will be enclosed by an eight foot chain link fence. In addition, a garage is proposed at a later date. The property is located approximately one (1) mile east of Fremont County Road #3A, on the south side of U. S. Highway 50, approximately 1,290 feet south of U. S. Highway 50, in the Eight Mile Area. The property is zoned Agricultural Forestry and contains approximately 41.08 acres.

Mr. Koch stated that the proposed kennel will be built on to an existing residence. The applicants plan to build ten dog kennels on to the rear of the garage. The cats will be housed inside. The dog kennels will have outside dog runs attached to them which will be totally fenced. We have reviewed all the proposed Conditions and are okay with them. Normally an

applicant is required to notify the property owners within 500 feet of the SRU boundary, but the recommendation on this application is 1,500 feet, and I was curious as to why the change.

Mr. Bill Giordano answered that it was increased in order to notify few more people in the area. The normal 500 foot radius will basically only notify the adjacent property owners. Because the sign is going to be off-site on the highway, we felt it would be better for more of the neighbors to get a notice in case they don't see the sign. The change from 500 to 1,500 feet is subject to the Planning Commission's approval.

Mr. Koch noted that the applicants are proposing ten dog kennels, but they are asking for twenty dog units, because some people travel with several animals, and they want to be able to keep two dogs in a kennel at a time. The grooming is just for the dogs that are boarded, so that the dogs will be cleaned up and smelling nice before they leave.

Mr. Giordano showed a video of the proposed site, giving a general idea of the site location and neighboring areas. He briefly discussed the conditions, contingencies, waivers and additional notifications as per the Department Review.

Mr. Giordano stated that although the applicant has a well permit, we want to make sure the Division of Water Resources considers the permit adequate for this use, which will include washing down the kennels and using additional water. If this permit is not adequate, the applicant may have to change the type of permit to commercial.

Mr. Giordano said a domestic well includes rights for agricultural uses, so the existing well permit may not be a problem. This item still needs to be clarified so a problem does not arise later. We need a letter from the Division of Water Resources documenting that the use is acceptable, or a new permit. Regarding the recommendation that property owners within 1,500 feet be notified, there is a drawing in the packet showing a 500, 1,000, and 1,500 foot notification distance. We chose 1,500 feet because that radius included a few more neighbors who might be impacted by noise. Regarding the waiver request for lighting of the parking area, the applicant is proposing to install a light on the exterior of the residence, close to the parking area. Because of the nature of the area, the Department does not recommend hard surfacing of the parking area. It would not be practical because the rest of the property is gravel and pretty open.

Mr. Caruso asked what type of documentation is required from the Fremont County Environmental Health Services regarding the septic system.

Mr. Giordano responded that wastewater disposal will be required for the boarding kennel, and a restroom facility in the kennel area may be required. Either the kennel facility will require a separate septic system, or the existing septic system will have to be increased in size.

Chairman Sandoval asked which option the applicants plan to pursue.

Mr. Koch said they are not sure yet. They are evaluating whether the existing system is adequate, or what they would have to do to it. There is also the question of cost: is it more cost-effective to build a new septic system or to add to the existing system? They will decide when they get the information back from the engineer.

Chairman Sandoval asked if it makes any difference to the County which option they choose.

Mr. Giordano answered that documentation will be required from Environmental Health as to acceptability of the system. That concern is well covered.

Mr. Alsup asked how close the nearest neighbors are, in terms of noise buffering.

Mr. Koch answered the neighbor to the northeast is the nearest, at just over one quarter mile. There shouldn't be a problem with noise, and that neighbor has dogs running around up there.

Mr. Giordano stated that he posed the question that if noise became a problem, could the dogs be housed inside at night, and the answer was yes.

Mr. Koch said the dog runs will be outside, but the dogs can be brought inside and kept in if noise becomes a problem. He added that since the kennel will be attached to the residence, the applicants will be right there to take care of noise issues. They won't have to exit the building. Someone will be there twenty-four hours to take care of whatever issues arise.

Mr. Krauth asked if there have been any objections from the neighbors.

Mr. Koch answered that the neighbors have not been notified yet. That will be part of the County Commissioners' Public Hearing process.

Mr. Krauth asked if any of the neighbors know about the proposed kennel.

Mr. Jeff Buckner answered that most of the neighbors know and seem okay with it. He noted that when you propose something, at first there are no objections, but later when people see it in writing, things may change. The loudest thing out there is gun shots and no one is bothered by that.

Mr. Caruso noted that the 1,500 foot radius in reality adds only three additional property owners, including Zimmerman across Highway 50, which is a moot point. I think 1,500 feet is excessive. The Zimmerman's are going to get more noise and traffic from Highway 50 than they are from this use. I think 1,000 feet is more than generous.

Mr. Alsup asked what type of signage is anticipated. There are a lot of signs in that area already.

Mr. Koch answered there will be a small sign off the highway, containing the address; nothing gaudy, and not lighted. The maximum size is four foot by two foot.

Mr. Alsup questioned the choice of Planning District. The Department Review says District 5, but isn't this actually District 4, the Royal Gorge District?

Mr. Koch stated the proposed site is right on the border. The Royal Gorge District (*District 4*) is to the west, and this property falls in the Arkansas Valley District (*District 5*).

Mr. Alsup clarified that although the Roadway Impact Analysis lists ten dogs and ten cats, the application specifies ten kennels, but doubled up.

Mr. Koch noted that it won't affect the traffic volume.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there really is no fire control plan.

Mr. Koch answered not for that area. We got a letter from the Fire Department that says they respond to those areas.

Mr. Lamanna noted the site is about twenty-five minutes out. In the event of a fire, is there anything that needs to be done with ground cover or removing trees?

Mr. Koch responded that the applicants have already cleared out the area for building the residence. The trees are fifty to sixty feet to the north, so there is quite a bit of room there. The natural grasses in the field would be the only thing, and the owners keep those down pretty well in that area.

Mr. Giordano noted that there is a Fire Protection Form in the packet from the Cañon City Area Fire Protection District, and they had no recommendations other than non-applicable.

Mr. Lamanna said that if there is a fire, what can you do? If the response time is twenty-five minutes, a lot can happen in that timeframe.

Mr. Koch stated that the residence already exists, so there is a twenty-five minute response time for the residence. Adding the kennel shouldn't mean any change in that response.

Mr. Lamanna said that his only recommendation is that if there is any vegetation near the structures; make sure it is cleared out pretty well.

Mr. Alsop said he is a firefighter and he was looking at that. It looked pretty clear from the pictures.

Chairman Sandoval asked for any other questions. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

MOTION

Mr. Alsop moved to approve SRU 11-001 8 Mile Ranch Kennel with the following:

Recommended Conditions:

- A. Special Review Use Permit shall be issued for life of use.
- B. The Department shall review the permit annually to determine compliance with the conditions of the permit and forward it to the Board for their review as required by regulations. It shall be the responsibility of the permit holder to provide the Department with copies of other permits, licenses, or other documentation showing compliance with the requirements of any other governmental agency (*to include items such as changes to the documents, updates, renewals, revisions, annual reports*). Further it shall be the responsibility of the permit holder to provide the Department with copies of any documents that would affect the use of the subject property, such as but not limited to updated or renewed leases for use of or access to the subject property. Copies of these documents shall be submitted to the Department prior to the anniversary date of the approval of the use permit each year. If the Department has to notify the permit holder that the anniversary date has passed and/or request said documentation, then a penalty fee shall be charged to the permit holder. If the required documentation and penalty fee are not submitted to the Department within twenty (20) days following notification to the permit holder, then violation procedures may be commenced, which could result in termination, revocation, rescission or suspension of the use permit.

- C. Each year, at the anniversary date (approval date), the Applicant shall pay a Kennel License Renewal Fee, which includes an inspection of the kennel facilities.
- D. The Applicant shall conform to all plans, drawings and representations submitted with or contained within the application except as may be inconsistent with the other provisions of the permit.
- E. The Applicant shall comply with all laws and regulations of the County of Fremont, its agencies or departments, the State of Colorado, its agencies or departments and the United States of America, its agencies or departments, as now in force and effect or as the same may be hereafter amended.
- F. Applicants shall obtain, prior to operation, and keep in effect, throughout operation, all other permits, licenses or the like, including renewals, required by any other governmental agency and as otherwise may be required by Fremont County and shall provide copies of such to the Department. Revocation, suspension or expiration of any such other permits shall revoke, suspend or terminate the permit authorized hereunder, as the case may be.
- G. If a Special Review Use is abandoned, discontinued or terminated for a period of six (6) months, the approval thereof shall be deemed withdrawn, and the use may not be resumed without approval of a new application. Provided, however, if the holder of the permit intends to or does temporarily cease the use for six (6) months or more without intending to abandon, discontinue or terminate the use, the holder shall file a notice thereof with the Department prior to the expiration of the six-month period stating the reasons thereof and the plan for the resumption of the use. The requirement of a notice of temporary cessation shall not apply to applicants who have included in their permit applications a statement that the use would continue for less than six (6) months in each year and such fact is noted on the permit. In no case, however, shall temporary cessation of use be continued for more than two (2) years without approval by the Board.
- H. If a Special Review Use Permit is to be transferred it shall comply with all applicable Federal, State and County regulations regarding such transfer.
- I. Days and hours of operation shall not be limited.
- J. Documentation from the Colorado Department of Transportation as to an approved access permit from U.S. Highway 50 for the 20 foot access easement, prior to operation.
- K. Documentation from the Colorado Division of Water Resources stating that the existing well permit is adequate for a dog kennel and residence or a copy of the approved well permit which has been issued for the specified uses or a commercial use, prior to operation.
- L. Documentation from the Environmental Health Office as to compliance with the requirements as noted in the memo, dated January 10, 2011, from the Fremont County Environmental Health Officer, prior to operation.
- M. Applicant shall provide to the Department, documentation from the Fremont County Weed Coordinator that the applicant has in place an acceptable weed control plan, if required, (prior to operation), further the applicant shall implement and maintain the plan, yearly.

- N. Copy of a license from the Colorado Department of Agriculture, Pet Animal Care Facilities, to include at a minimum boarding and grooming or documentation from the Colorado Department of Agriculture, Pet Animal Care Facilities that the license is not required, prior to operation.
- O. The County shall retain the right to modify any condition of the permit, if the actual use demonstrates that a condition of the permit is inadequate to serve the intended purpose of the condition. Such modification shall not be imposed without notice and a public hearing being provided to the Applicant at which time applicant and members of the public may appear and provide input concerning the proposed modifications to the conditions of the permit.
- P. Only the named party on the permit shall be allowed to operate this Special Review Use Permit. Board approval shall be required prior to allowing any other person or entity to operate at the site under the conditions of this permit. All persons, entities or others requesting Board approval to operate under this Special Review Use Permit must agree to abide by all terms and conditions of this Special Review Use Permit and shall be required to be named on this Special Review Use Permit as additional parties who are bound by the terms and conditions of this Special Review Use Permit.
- Q. A Special Review Use Permit shall not be modified in any way without Department approval for Minor Modifications or approval of Major Modifications by the Board in accordance with Section 8.2 of the Fremont County Zoning Resolution (complete reapplication).

Recommended Contingencies:

None recommended.

Additional Notification Requirements:

Due to area density the Department is recommending that property owners within one-thousand five-hundred (1,500) feet (*the Planning Commission recommended changing this to one-thousand (1,000) feet*) of the SRUP boundary be notified in the method required by regulation and in addition, the following shall also be notified in accordance with regulations:

1. City of Cañon City, Planning Department
2. Colorado Department of Transportation
3. Fremont County Sheriff's Office
4. Colorado Division of Wildlife
5. Fremont / Custer Historical Society
6. State Historic Preservation Office

The Planning Commission recommended waiving the following:

Waiver Requests:

1. 5.2.6 Buffering & Landscaping Requirements:

The applicant shall be required to provide screening or a buffering strip, which will act as an opaque visual barrier, unless waived by the Board. Where in these regulations, any such screening or buffering strip is required to be provided and maintained, such buffering strip shall consist of a row of trees or continuous un-pierced hedge row of evergreens or shrubs

of such species as will produce within three (3) years a screen height of at least six (6) feet and shall be of the following minimum sizes at time of installation:

Deciduous shrubs	4' height
Spreading evergreens	30" spread
Tall evergreens	3' height
Screen planting (<i>evergreen</i>)	4' height
Trees	2 and ½" caliper
Ground cover	2 and ½" pot

The entire buffer strip shall be immediately adjacent to the lot line or portion thereof, with consideration given to utility or drainage easements. The remainder of the strip shall be used for no other purpose than the planting of shrubs, flower beds, grass, or a combination thereof. The buffer strip shall be at least eight (8) feet in width and shall be graded and planted with grass seed or sod and such other shrubbery or trees. The entire area shall be attractively maintained and kept clean of all debris and rubbish.

In required buffer strips where a natural buffer strip is considered to be impractical or inappropriate, an opaque fence may be substituted in whole or in part for a natural buffer provided its specifications are approved by the Board.

- 5.3.2 Surfacing:** Surfacing for all business, commercial, or industrial off-street parking areas shall be graded and surfaced so as to control dust and provide proper drainage. The driveway and parking spaces shall be asphalt or concrete surface unless waived by the Board. If asphalt or concrete, spaces shall be clearly marked. Curbs or barriers shall be installed so as to prevent parking vehicles from extending over any lot lines.
- 5.3.3 Lighting:** All off-street business, commercial or industrial parking spaces may be required to be adequately lighted to protect the safety of the individual using the area. Said lighting shall not cast any glare on the surrounding properties.

The applicant has proposed a light on the exterior of the residence at the parking area.

- 5.3.4 Landscaping:** All parking spaces (areas) used for business, commercial or industrial uses may be required to provide appropriate vegetation designed to break up the expanse of the parking area.
- Utility Plan:** Copy of detailed utility plan including approval signatures from all appropriate utility companies servicing the site.

The Planning Commission also suggested that the applicants be aware of the fire dangers and fire hazards, and make sure the area around the structures is clear. The well will be the only source of water for fire fighting, so if there is anything that can be done to help the Fire Department with hookups, etc., it is recommended that the applicants look at those modifications.

Mr. Krauth asked the applicants if they had any questions that would make their process easier.

Mr. and Mrs. Buckner answered no, they have Mr. Koch.

SECOND

Mr. Caruso seconded the motion.

Chairman Sandoval called for a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously. (5 of 5 members)

6. REQUEST: SRU 10-008 AT&T CELL TOWER COTOPAXI

Mr. Jeremy Mironas, Tower Engineering Professionals, Inc. representing AT&T Wireless, was present to request approval of a Special Review Use (SRU) Permit, Department file #SRU 10-008 AT & T Cell Tower - Cotopaxi, by AT & T Wireless, for property which is owned by Cotopaxi Consolidated Schools, to allow for the installation of a one-hundred (100) foot monopole, which will contain six (6) antennas, an equipment shelter, an ice bridge, a meter rack, and a telco cabinet. Access to the site will be via a twenty (20) foot easement from County Road #12. The property is generally located approximately ¼ mile north of the intersection of U.S. Highway 50 and County Road #12, on the west side of Fremont County Road #12, in the Cotopaxi Area. The tower and associated items will be located within a fifty (50) foot by fifty (50) foot, two-thousand-five-hundred (2,500) square foot lease area inside a 45.03 acre parcel. The property which will house the tower contains the Cotopaxi school and other accessory buildings and is located in the Agricultural Suburban Zone District.

Mr. Mironas stated that AT&T is proposing to put in a one-hundred (100) foot monopole tower to increase and bolster coverage along Highway 50. This is actually part of the build-out from what was Alltel which has been occurring over the past two years. Two SRU permits were approved last year that are located along the same highway. Now that AT&T has acquired what was remaining of Alltel, the company is trying to obtain the same service or the same coverage objectives. There will be a twenty (20) foot by eleven foot five inch (11'5") prefabricated concrete shelter which houses the equipment for AT&T and has two HVAC units with it. There is also a meter frame which has a telco board for the fiber system from CenturyLink that is located across the railroad tracks, and a meter and a generator hookup for a temporary diesel generator to be brought on site.

Mr. Giordano briefly discussed the conditions, contingencies, waivers and additional notifications as per the Department Review.

Mr. Giordano specifically discussed several of the recommended conditions:

- Condition A - Regarding the thirty year term of the permit, the lease is for a five year term, with renewal for five additional five year terms, for a total of thirty years.
- Condition I – The Department had a concern with the Cotopaxi Fire Rescue recommendation (*40,000 gallon cistern*) because we do not see a fire issue with the tower itself. There is more of an issue with the existing buildings on the site, but I'm not sure that is the responsibility of the applicant. I put this request in as a Condition because I didn't know how to handle it. I planned to meet with Ms. Jackson, the County Attorney, to see if we had legal grounds to require this. Ms. Jackson said this should not be included as a requirement. We cannot make a tie at all that this tower would be a fire safety issue. If this is what the Fire Department would like, and AT&T would like to work with them on their own, that is between them, and it is not an item that we should be requiring. If I had spoken to Ms. Jackson prior to completing the Department Review, I would have included this as an Item for Consideration. Since we asked the fire

department for a recommendation, we at least need to acknowledge their recommendation. I ask that Condition I be removed as a condition of approval.

- Condition J – The County Engineer stated in his review “the builder has broken up roadside flow by diverting storm water into the adjacent natural ground through swales at regular intervals along the driveway, which should eliminate significant changes to the drainage leaving the site.” That was not necessarily a recommendation. I think it was just a comment, but I think that is something AT&T should do. There should be an inspection follow-up on that.
- Condition L – We do require a permit for collocation on existing towers as an application process through our office. We don’t want an excessive number of towers if the existing towers can be utilized. This requirement is incorporated into our regulations.

Mr. Giordano noted that he asked the applicant to provide some different options as to tower type or color. The Planning Commission has the option to require the type of tower, and / or color, anything that would make the tower less obtrusive, if you feel that is a problem. In your recommendation, you need to specify if you are going to accept what the applicants are proposing, or do you want one of the other choices. The photos were provided to give you a general idea of each type of tower.

Mr. Giordano noted, regarding the waiver requests, that the County Engineer recommended a waiver of the hard surfacing of the paving requirements in his letter dated January 4, 2011. He also noted that under the SRU drawing requirements, we require that the applicant show all buildings that are on the property. Because of the large number of buildings, and the fact that they are not pertinent to this application, the applicant has asked for a waiver of this requirement. The Department has no problem waiving this requirement. The consultant or applicant would have to go out and measure each building. They are all pre-existing buildings, so I see no benefit in requiring them to do that. They have shown those buildings on the drawing, they just didn’t dimension them.

Mr. Alsup asked how the equipment would be washed to prevent weed seed transport, as mentioned in the application.

Mr. Mironas responded that because this site will be an unmanned facility, there is no need for water installation other than for purposes of construction. When the contractors show up on site, they have to adhere to the County Weed Plans for washing their trucks. They would have to transport water to the site.

Mr. Alsup asked if this would just be during construction.

Mr. Mironas answered yes. After completion of construction, there is a Weed Management Plan which is a contingency after the fact. The compound of the facility will be covered with a geotextile fabric and six inches of crushed gravel run. That does cut down on weed growth within the compound. The site techs visit the site infrequently, anywhere from once or twice a month to once every three or four months, depending on the upkeep required. They will look for any weeds on site and remove them. Weeds are a problem for the equipment too. You don’t want to have those weeds in there.

Mr. Giordano pointed out that the requirement for a Weed Management Plan is in recommended Condition K. This is a standard requirement in all SRUs. They have to have an approved Weed Management Plan and they have to keep it in place.

Chairman Sandoval asked if the County Engineer's comment in recommended Condition J is a suggestion or a requirement.

Mr. Moore answered that the grading plan doesn't really show the roadside ditches in detail and it would be difficult to do on a piece of paper.

Mr. Giordano asked if that was a suggestion or a recommendation.

Mr. Moore said it is a recommendation.

Mr. Giordano said we listed it as a requirement.

Mr. Mironas pointed out that the location of the tower is on the natural spine of the hill, so there is not a large amount of runoff that will occur in general. Most likely, there will just be small swales on one side of the ditch to help mitigate the flow.

Chairman Sandoval asked if the requirement will create a lot of manpower work.

Mr. Mironas answered that no, it is not going to be a huge issue. There is not going to be a large amount of water. We have to make sure to maintain historical flow.

Mr. Lamanna commented that it will take better care of the road. Otherwise, the water will be running alongside the road.

Mr. Mironas stated that we will be using part of an existing access road that is used by the cemetery and the school district.

Mr. Giordano stated that there is a very short distance from the road to the tower site. I think that the road that exists is pretty well drained.

Mr. Moore said the point is not to grade a ditch directed straight at the cemetery fence.

Mr. Alsup asked what fire mitigation efforts are planned around the structure.

Mr. Mironas answered that the tower is a steel structure, which is not flammable by itself. There are some electronic components on the tower that can catch fire. The equipment shelter is a prefabricated concrete shelter, fire rated to four hours for penetration from inside to outside. If there is a fire that occurs inside the shelter, there is smoke and fire alarms inside that notify the Network Operation Center (NOC), and the notification immediately goes to the nearest 911. There is no fire mitigation plan, other than the fact that a fire would be contained within the concrete shelter.

Mr. Alsup said he is one of the firefighters that may be responding to the site. He is concerned that if there were a wildfire that came across, and we had to get one of our fire trucks up there, are you clearing a space around the structure so that it is protected from wildfires that would come toward it?

Mr. Mironas answered that within the compound, in addition to the concrete shelter and the tower which are nonflammable, there is a buffer with geotextile fabric and crushed gravel and

with the weed growth being mitigated. There is a natural buffer from the facility itself. We are trying to leave in tact the natural cedar growth located there. I know the site is a dry, high risk area.

Chairman Sandoval discussed the visual obtrusiveness of the tower. He asked Mr. Mironas what he has found to be the most commonly used type of tower in rural areas.

Mr. Mironas answered the most common mitigating effort that is done is painting, usually a non-reflective color, something that matches the natural hillside. On the way down from Denver today I noticed a large monopole tower that is painted dark green or black, and it blends in with the hilltop that it is facing. From the road you can't see it unless you are really looking at it. Mr. Giordano pointed out that the Arkansas Headwater Association requested a monopine on a previous tower. Mr. Mironas stated that he typically does not advise his clients to use a monopine. There are a lot of issues that come up with monopines that you do not have with a typical monopole tower. Monopines have fiberglass branches with fiberglass needles that come off. Over time they degrade and you have issues with the wind breaking pieces of fiberglass off and they get into the natural area next to it. Also, monopines simply don't look very good. They are cell towers that look like one-hundred foot fake trees. The existing vegetation right next to the tower is usually ten foot tall cedar. A monopine tower would look like a big sequoia; it wouldn't blend in very well.

Chairman Sandoval noted there are a couple of monopines on the west side of Monument Hill.

Mr. Caruso commented that whether you put a monopine, a monopole, or a slim pole, once you start collocating other antennas, it is not the pole that sticks out nearly as much as the antennas. You can't disguise the antennas so much because then the reception goes away. In my opinion, in regard to the Arkansas Headwaters request, there has to be a compromise. People want cell phone service along the highway, so there is a trade-off. Based on what I have seen of what AT&T has done around the County, they are trying to be good neighbors. I think the standard monopole with the proposed antennas would probably be conducive. Once you start putting more collocating antennas on a tower, it is going to become more visible, but that is what we are putting into our Master Plan. You can't have an antenna that you can't see because that won't do any good.

Mr. Mironas stated that one of the biggest things about a tower is the size. They stand out from the natural terrain anywhere they are located. That is just an unfortunate drawback of the modern world. Similar conditions exist with high-tension power lines. They will cut right up the side of a mountain and there is no effort whatsoever to hide them. The general public doesn't notice after awhile. The same thing occurs with cell towers. You probably drive by them all the time and you don't think twice about it.

Chairman Sandoval asked, no matter if the tower is a monopole or a monopine, will it still have to have an antenna at the top?

Mr. Mironas said that with a slim pole, the brackets that hold the antennas are moved in and are closer, so they don't stand out as far. That type of pole is not very good for collocation. You have close, somewhat hidden antennas at the top, and the next arm branches with antennas down below.

Chairman Sandoval asked if the collocation attachments could be painted to match the pole.

Mr. Mironas said he has seen that before, where the co-locaters paint their panel antennas the same color as what is already there. That could be made a requirement for future co-locaters as part of the permit.

Chairman Sandoval said that not knowing what these different towers look like until they actually go up, what is your experience with seeing co-locaters painted the same color as the pole? How has the visual impact been modified?

Mr. Mironas answered that you will notice the tower. When you put co-locaters on a tower, it expands the eye view of what you are seeing because you have larger antennas down below, not just the pole. When they are painted, it mitigates the appearance the same way it does with just the antennas that are on the top. It is of benefit having the co-locaters painted the same color. With a monopine, another issue is that there is limited space for co-locaters to come on. You have these fake branches to make it look sort of like a pine tree. The next carrier comes on, and where can they put their antennas?

Mr. Krauth said it would be a tree with a bunch of antennas attached to it.

Mr. Mironas said he has seen co-locaters on monopines very infrequently. That is why there are two towers on Monument Hill.

Mr. Giordano said it is a trade-off. The County Commissioners have pretty much gone with painting the towers more than anything. When we do collocations, we have never requested any painting, but we have never asked for painting of towers, except for the tower out in Penrose. If anyone collocates there, we would probably ask that they paint the antennas the same color. On other existing towers, they are putting the same color as the tower, non-reflective antennas.

Mr. Krauth asked if a monopine is more expensive than a monopole.

Mr. Mironas answered the installation and upkeep is more expensive.

Chairman Sandoval asked if you can paint different sides of a monopole different colors?

Mr. Mironas answered that he has not seen that before. In theory, I don't see why that wouldn't work. If you have red cliffs viewing from the west and green hills viewing from the east, I could see it working to paint one side red and one side green. I have never seen that before and I am not sure what the process would be to paint a tower two separate colors.

Chairman Sandoval asked if this type of criteria should be put in the Master Plan or the Zoning Resolution.

Mr. Giordano said we regulate that already. Color and style of tower is one of the criteria for consideration of approval. It is also addressed in the Master Plan as view sheds. That is why you have the option now to determine whether you want the tower painted, or monopine, or what you want. The regulations are pretty broad, so to me they are adequate.

Mr. Krauth noted that in the simulation pictures, the existing power line along the highway is much more obtrusive than looking into the distance at a lone antenna. I am sure that most of the people in that area will be glad to have additional cell service. For unobtrusiveness, we could recommend monopole and have the contractor paint it to match the environment with

camouflage pattern or pine green pattern, something reasonable. We can't make it cost-prohibitive.

Mr. Alsup said he thinks a monopole painted brown or green would be adequate.

Mr. Krauth raised the fire chief's recommendation about the 40,000 gallon tank.

Mr. Caruso commented that it is ridiculous to expect AT&T to take care of the fire response up there, when already it is not an adequate response time, as the fire chief noted in his report. It would be a great thing, but I don't think AT&T is going to spend \$50,000 to \$80,000 for what they are wanting. I think the fire suppression that is required in that area is the responsibility of the people there currently. I agree with Mr. Giordano's recommendation that proposed Condition I be removed from the motion.

Mr. Alsup gave some history on the issue. For years, Deer Mountain Fire Protection District has been trying to get the school to put a cistern in there for extra fire protection. The school has argued that they believe they have enough water there and they don't want to go to the expense of putting that in. I think Deer Mountain Fire Protection was just trying to piggy-back something onto this request.

Chairman Sandoval suggested removing the cistern recommendation from the proposed Conditions and placing it in Additional Considerations.

Mr. Giordano recommended that the Planning Commission just leave Condition I out of the motion. The information will still go to the Commissioners so they will have another chance to consider it.

Mr. Krauth asked if there are fire hydrants at the school.

Mr. Alsup answered that they have standing hydrants there. We can draft water down at the river a quarter mile away, and there is also a spring-fed cistern that we have access to across County Road 12. There is access to water.

Mr. Krauth noted that the only fire issue that would affect the outside of the facility would be a lightening strike on the pole itself and not the structures.

Mr. Mironas said there is a grounding network that is installed with a lightening rod on the top that mitigates out the charge into a ground ring or ground mat, depending on the location.

Mr. Lamanna asked about the pole. Are there no guide wires?

Mr. Mironas answered that a monopole is a freestanding steel tube.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there is significant excavation to install the tower.

Mr. Mironas answered that AT&T has a fifty foot (50') by fifty foot (50') lease area. The geological study has not been performed yet, but typically in a rocky terrain, they will do a pad pier foundation. In 2001, they installed a one-hundred foot (100') monopole up by Buena Vista which had an eighteen foot (18') by eighteen foot (18') pad on the bottom with a six foot pier going up. Some excavation will be required, but that is all filled back in and is covered by the facility.

Mr. Lamanna asked if they would have to do some blasting.

Mr. Mironas answered most likely not.

Mr. Lamanna asked, in the event that you do have to do blasting, how will you handle that?

Mr. Mironas answered that blasting is typically not performed to install a tower. They will try to put the pad directly on the bedrock. Dynamite blasting is usually not required. If the soil is of different conditions, another option is what they call a drilled pier foundation. That is the most typical style that is used for monopoles. A big auger drills down thirty feet, and the hole is filled with concrete and anchor rods going all the way up through it. Given this location, which is a rockier terrain, they will probably determine that is not feasible because they would have to drill through that rock.

Mr. Giordano noted that blasting is not included in the application, so they will not be allowed to blast. If they need to do blasting, they will have to come back (*to modify the SRU*).

Mr. Mironas said that most likely the tower will be installed on a pad and pier foundation. I don't see any serious issue with it. If extensive blasting or earthwork is required that might be cost-prohibitive, AT&T might look for a new location.

Mr. Lamanna said a one-hundred foot (100') tower will need quite a foundation.

Mr. Mironas said the installation he just described had an eighteen foot (18') by eighteen foot (18') pad which was about two or three feet thick.

Mr. Lamanna asked about the five year initial term.

Mr. Mironas responded that the way the lease with the Cotopaxi School District is structured, there is a five year initial lease term with five additional five year terms after that. The lease is for thirty years total. After the initial five year lease period, AT&T has the discretion whether to terminate the lease or to enact the second term. It is a thirty year lease unless AT&T comes out with new technology and they don't need this tower here anymore, and then they would remove it.

Mr. Lamanna asked if the property owner would be left with the cement pad.

Mr. Mironas answered that the lease specifies that the site will be returned with normal wear and tear expected. The foundation and everything is removed to a certain depth and then refilled.

Mr. Krauth asked if the lease will benefit the Cotopaxi School District.

Mr. Mironas answered yes.

Chairman Sandoval asked if we require any reclamation of the site.

Mr. Giordano answered no, but there is a cleanup clause in the standard lease. The landowner requires the site to be cleaned up.

Chairman Sandoval asked if there are any towers on land owned by the communications companies.

Mr. Mironas answered that some cell companies do purchase land. AT&T, Alltel, Verizon, and other large carriers are not in the business of real estate, they are in the business of telecommunication. That is why they typically do not purchase land. They lease it from landowners.

Chairman Sandoval asked when AT&T anticipates having the tower up.

Mr. Mironas answered this is a 2011 build, so construction will occur this year. It will commence sometime between June and July, after all the rest of the studies have been done and the permitting process has gone through.

Chairman Sandoval asked that whoever makes the motion consider the appearance of the poles. I am in favor of a painted monopole. I would like indigenous colors to match the background from particular perspectives.

Chairman Sandoval asked for any other questions. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

MOTION

Mr. Lamanna moved to approve SRU 10-008 AT&T Cell Tower - Cotopaxi with the following:

Recommended Conditions:

- A. Special Review Use Permit shall be issued for a thirty (30) year term. *(The lease is for an initial 5 year term with renewal options for (5) additional 5 years terms.)*
- B. The Department shall review the permit annually to determine compliance with the conditions of the permit and forward it to the Board for their review as required by regulations. It shall be the responsibility of the permit holder to provide the Department with copies of other permits, licenses, or other documentation showing compliance with the requirements of any other governmental agency *(to include items such as changes to the documents, updates, renewals, revisions, annual reports)*. Further it shall be the responsibility of the permit holder to provide the Department with copies of any documents that would affect the use of the subject property, such as but not limited to updated or renewed leases for use of or access to the subject property. Copies of these documents shall be submitted to the Department prior to the anniversary date of the approval of the use permit each year. If the Department has to notify the permit holder that the anniversary date has passed and/or request said documentation, then a penalty fee shall be charged to the permit holder. If the required documentation and penalty fee are not submitted to the Department within twenty (20) days following notification to the permit holder, then violation procedures may be commenced, which could result in termination, revocation, rescission or suspension of the use permit.
- C. The Applicant shall conform to all plans, drawings and representations submitted with or contained within the application except as may be inconsistent with the other provisions of the permit.
- D. The Applicant shall comply with all laws and regulations of the County of Fremont, its agencies or departments, the State of Colorado, its agencies or departments and the United States of America, its agencies or departments, as now in force and effect or as the same may be hereafter amended.

- E. Applicants shall obtain, prior to operation, and keep in effect, throughout operation, all other permits, licenses or the like, including renewals, required by any other governmental agency and as otherwise may be required by Fremont County and shall provide copies of such to the Department. Revocation, suspension or expiration of any such other permits shall revoke, suspend or terminate the permit authorized hereunder, as the case may be.
- F. If a Special Review Use is abandoned, discontinued or terminated for a period of six (6) months, the approval thereof shall be deemed withdrawn, and the use may not be resumed without approval of a new application. Provided, however, if the holder of the permit intends to or does temporarily cease the use for six (6) months or more without intending to abandon, discontinue or terminate the use, the holder shall file a notice thereof with the Department prior to the expiration of the six-month period stating the reasons thereof and the plan for the resumption of the use. The requirement of a notice of temporary cessation shall not apply to applicants who have included in their permit applications a statement that the use would continue for less than six (6) months in each year and such fact is noted on the permit. In no case, however, shall temporary cessation of use be continued for more than two (2) years without approval by the Board.
- G. If a Special Review Use Permit is to be transferred it shall comply with all applicable Federal, State and County regulations regarding such transfer.
- H. Days and hours of operation shall not be limited.

The Planning Commission recommended deleting Condition I, which follows.

- I. Documentation from the Cotopaxi Fire Rescue, Fire Chief as to the following being approved and accepted:
 - a. It would be a benefit to have a cistern installed in the area consisting of at least 40,000 gallons of water with fire department hook ups and a way to secure the hook ups so the water is not taken by non-fire department people.
 - b. The cistern would have to have an auto fill capacity.
 - c. The cistern would need to be located north of the school building and plumbed down to a hydrant no less than 100 feet from the propane tank and tower location.
- J. Documentation as to compliance with the County Reviewing Engineers recommendation, in his letter dated January 4, 2011, shall be provided to the Department, prior to operation that: the builder has broke up roadside flow by diverting storm water into the adjacent natural ground through swales at regular intervals along the driveway, which should eliminate significant changes to the drainage leaving the site.
- K. Applicant shall provide to the Department, documentation from the Fremont County Weed Coordinator that the applicant has in place an acceptable weed control plan, further the applicant shall implement and maintain the plan, if required.
- L. The applicant /owner of the tower shall allow the tower to be used for co-locating purposes, if appropriate. If antenna collocation is proposed appropriate process through the Department will be required.

- M. The County shall retain the right to modify any condition of the permit, if the actual use demonstrates that a condition of the permit is inadequate to serve the intended purpose of the condition. Such modification shall not be imposed without notice and a public hearing being provided to the Applicant at which time applicant and members of the public may appear and provide input concerning the proposed modifications to the conditions of the permit.
- N. Only the named party on the permit shall be allowed to operate this Special Review Use Permit. Board approval shall be required prior to allowing any other person or entity to operate at the site under the conditions of this permit. All persons, entities or others requesting Board approval to operate under this Special Review Use Permit must agree to abide by all terms and conditions of this Special Review Use Permit and shall be required to be named on this Special Review Use Permit as additional parties who are bound by the terms and conditions of this Special Review Use Permit.
- O. A Special Review Use Permit shall not be modified in any way without Department approval for Minor Modifications or approval of Major Modifications by the Board in accordance with Section 8.2 of the Fremont County Zoning Resolution (complete reapplication).

Recommended Contingencies:

If approval of this application is considered by the Planning Commission the Department would suggest that the approval recommendation be made contingent upon, at a minimum, the following items being provided to the Department, by the applicant, within six (6) months (*no extensions except through regulatory process*) after approval of the application by the Board of County Commissioners:

- 1. Documentation from the County Engineer that the applicant has complied with the requirements of the County Engineer stated in his letter dated January 4, 2011.
 - a. A copy of an approved County Driveway Access Permit.
- 2. A report by a Colorado registered engineer demonstrating compliance with applicable structural standards and the general capacity of the proposed facility.

Additional Consideration

Determine which option is acceptable in reducing or eliminating visual obtrusiveness i.e. color and/or type of tower-monopine, monopole or slim pole, (*See photo simulation in packet*).

The Planning Commission recommended the monopole design, painted multiple colors as applicable, meaning indigenous colors to match the backgrounds from various perspectives.

The Planning Commission recommended the following:

Additional Notification Requirements:

In addition to the required notifications the following shall also be notified in accordance with regulations:

- 1. The Federal Communication Commission

2. State Historic Preservation Office
3. The Fremont County Department of Transportation
4. Fremont County Sheriffs Office
5. Fremont / Custer Historical Society
6. Colorado Division of Wildlife
7. Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area
8. Fremont County Weed Control Officer

The Planning Commission recommended waiving the following:

Waiver Requests:

1. 5.2.6 Buffering & Landscaping Requirements:

The applicant shall be required to provide screening or a buffering strip, which will act as an opaque visual barrier, unless waived by the Board. Where in these regulations, any such screening or buffering strip is required to be provided and maintained, such buffering strip shall consist of a row of trees or continuous un-pierced hedge row of evergreens or shrubs of such species as will produce within three (3) years a screen height of at least six (6) feet and shall be of the following minimum sizes at time of installation:

Deciduous shrubs	4' height
Spreading evergreens	30" spread
Tall evergreens	3' height
Screen planting (<i>evergreen</i>)	4' height
Trees	2 and ½" caliper
Ground cover	2 and ½" pot

The entire buffer strip shall be immediately adjacent to the lot line or portion thereof, with consideration given to utility or drainage easements. The remainder of the strip shall be used for no other purpose than the planting of shrubs, flower beds, grass, or a combination thereof. The buffer strip shall be at least eight (8) feet in width and shall be graded and planted with grass seed or sod and such other shrubbery or trees. The entire area shall be attractively maintained and kept clean of all debris and rubbish.

In required buffer strips where a natural buffer strip is considered to be impractical or inappropriate, an opaque fence may be substituted in whole or in part for a natural buffer provided its specifications are approved by the Board.

2. **5.3.2 Surfacing:** Surfacing for all business, commercial, or industrial off-street parking areas shall be graded and surfaced so as to control dust and provide proper drainage. The driveway and parking spaces shall be asphalt or concrete surface unless waived by the Board. If asphalt or concrete, spaces shall be clearly marked. Curbs or barriers shall be installed so as to prevent parking vehicles from extending over any lot lines.
3. **5.3.3 Lighting:** All off-street business, commercial or industrial parking spaces may be required to be adequately lighted to protect the safety of the individual using the area. Said lighting shall not cast any glare on the surrounding properties.
4. **5.3.4 Landscaping:** All parking spaces (areas) used for business, commercial or industrial uses may be required to provide appropriate vegetation designed to break up the expanse of the parking area.

5. **Dimensions of all buildings on the property:** Dimensions to determine lot coverage, etc.

Mr. Lamanna commented that there are benefits to having additional communication; the safety benefits have to be considered. I think it is a good project.

SECOND

Mr. Krauth seconded the motion.

Chairman Sandoval called for a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously. (5 of 5 members)

7. OTHER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Chairman Sandoval called for any other items for discussion.

Mr. Alsup requested status on SRU 09-004 Fremont Off Road Recreation Area.

Mr. Giordano stated that the application was tabled until the applicant brought in certain information. The item will be on the April Planning Commission agenda.

Mr. Caruso requested status on the Master Plan. Are we still in a holding pattern?

Chairman Sandoval responded that the Master Plan is his pet project because it is the main authority that Planning Commission members have. From my perspective, I hope that we can get active with the Master Plan. I hate to see us become stale waiting for things to happen. I would like to see us do something in a positive way. There is an economic crisis and we went the long way around to determine that we would like to have a professional consultant. The problem is that there are no funds. About \$12,000 has been budgeted for Master Plan, but it will probably cost twice that much.

Mr. Giordano pointed out that we haven't determined the scope of work, and I think we need to regroup. We were supposed to have a meeting with the Commissioners to discuss the funds, the use of the funds, and what is available. The County Manager wants to set up a meeting to discuss the Master Plan. Mr. Marshall Butler (*Planning Coordinator*) has been doing research to see if any of the colleges can help us. I am hoping that this month we will be able to get back to the Master Plan, at least to come back and report where the Commissioners are in terms of money.

Mr. Caruso made a comment that he would like to have passed along to the Commissioners. If possible, I would really like to have the County Engineer involved. I believe that Mr. Moore has a lot of good insight and input that will help us, because he knows a lot, and he can bring a lot of ideas and technical information that we as lay people may not know. I know the last couple of meetings we had he was not present. If he is available and willing to participate, I find his presence and his knowledge invaluable.

Chairman Sandoval stated that Mr. Butler has been looking at sources of revenue to fund the consulting process via some university settings. Commissioner Norden thought that there was a governmental agency that might be able to help us locate some funds as well. Commissioner Stiehl said the same thing a few weeks ago. I think that we all need to get on the same page and find out what funds are available so that if we do have an opportunity to have an outside consultant, we might want to take advantage of that. The consultant might be able to guide us in terms of what other resources such as the County Engineer's Office might be able to do for us.

Mr. Lamanna said that he started reading through the Master Plan. It is a very comprehensive document. There is a lot of good information in the document. When you start out, there is a lot of information on demographics. The problem that I see is it is based on a study that was done ten or twelve years ago. A lot has changed in that timeframe. If there is money that could be available, that would be part of the process I see is to try to update that information. We just had the census done. There is a lot of good information that could be put into the document there. Then we would have something to base our decisions on. When you mentioned government help, I thought about grants too. I guess they would be government grants.

Mr. Giordano stated that there is no grant money available right now through DOLA (*Colorado Department of Local Affairs*). They discontinued the grants. That is who we started with.

Mr. Lamanna asked if the initial cost was \$20,000 or \$25,000.

Chairman Sandoval answered that figure was based on what it cost ten years ago for the other consultant. We are using that as a point of reference. It doesn't mean that is how much needs to be spent or if that is even enough.

Mr. Giordano said the cost was actually quite a bit more than that, more in the \$70,000 to \$75,000 range, but that was for development of the Master Plan (*as opposed to an amendment or re-write*). That is the question – are we doing a rewrite, an update, or what? We need to make that determination. We will be getting to that. We are dealing with the Board in terms of the money so we can get back on track with what we need to do.

Mr. Lamanna said we already have a pretty comprehensive document. We are not reinventing the wheel.

Mr. Giordano stated that there are a number of things in the Master Plan that were recommended that have never been done. We are trying to rewrite sections, and we haven't even made a determination as to the items that were requested to be done in the Master Plan in the first place. Do we want to do those things? Once we make that decision, then we can decide where the money goes. Are we updating the plan or are we completing certain portions that were recommended by the plan in the first place? If we have never implemented the plan, do we want to rewrite it? Updating the population information is easy. The Master Plan contains recommendations for an Open Space Plan and other items that we have never done. We can do some minor updating and get everything caught up, but do we still want to do the major recommendations of the plan that haven't been done? Are they still pertinent? These are studies that need to be done and they have never been completed. For example, Visual Corridor Studies – do we still want those? Open Space Plan – do we still want that? Bike Trails, Walking Trails, Paths, Sub-Area Plans for the Penrose Area, Howard, Eight Mile, etc. – those are the types of recommendations in the Master Plan that have never been done. We are worried about updating and we haven't even done what we were supposed to do in the first place. We need to get over that hurdle and decide where we really want to go.

Chairman Sandoval said it would be nice if we could revisit the Master Plan and do a workshop to determine where we are without making it a public hearing.

Mr. Alsup said I don't know if we can do that.

Mr. Caruso suggested that the Planning Commission have a meeting and express to the public that it is a public meeting but it is not a public hearing. Therefore, no input can be taken from

them. They are observers only. We need to make sure that is clear from the beginning. We might have some success with that.

Mr. Giordano noted that with the number of new members on the Planning Commission, we are kind of starting over.

Chairman Sandoval pointed out that the new Planning Commission members can give us a fresh perspective. The Master Plan is a comprehensive document and it doesn't need to be rewritten. It would be nice for us to become familiar with the process without feeling obligated to let people provide us with information. Just give us some time on our own. Then we should be able to give some parameters to the County Commissioners.

Mr. Giordano said that once we meet with the Commissioners, then we will come back to you. We will probably have to rehash where we were, where we are going, where we have been, and where we want to go. With the new members, it wouldn't be fair to pick up where we were, because they would be lost.

Mr. Lamanna said I like the idea of getting together in a public setting to discuss the process. When would we want to do this? Would we want to wait until we have a full Planning Commission to start this?

Chairman Sandoval commented that there is always going to be some kind of glitch. I think the sooner the better.

Mr. Giordano said if we only had four members, maybe we should wait, but with six members, I think we need to move as quickly as we can. We have been on this for a long time.

Chairman Sandoval said Mr. Robinson will be in state fairly soon. He will not be here in time for the April meeting, but he will be here before the May meeting.

Mr. Krauth suggested that after the end of the April 5th meeting, we could go into session, open to the public, and have a discussion of the Master Plan. It would be open to the public for observation, not for comment.

Mr. Giordano asked what would be done at that meeting.

Chairman Sandoval answered we would discuss our direction on the Master Plan.

8. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. Giordano noted the Wednesday meetings on the calendar. The City Councils (*Cañon City and Florence*) meet on Tuesday when there is a holiday on Monday. Mr. Caruso and Mr. Robinson are affected by this. When this occurs, the Planning Commission meets on Wednesday. This will occur in July and September of 2011, and January of 2012.

MOTION

Mr. Caruso moved to approve the Planning Commission Calendar for 2011.

SECOND

Mr. Alsup seconded the motion.

Chairman Sandoval called for a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously. (5 of 5)

9. ELECTION OF FREMONT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS

MOTION

Mr. Alsup nominated Mr. Dean Sandoval for Chairman.

SECOND

Mr. Caruso seconded the nomination.

Chairman Sandoval called for a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously. (5 of 5)

Chairman Sandoval stated that he is not going to hang on to this office. I am taking seriously the comments about the Master Plan and I really want to be as instrumental as I can in providing a nice transition to getting us started with the Master Plan. Then I think it is time for someone else to be present not only on the Planning Commission but also as Chairperson.

MOTION

Chairman Sandoval nominated Mr. Daryl Robinson for Vice Chairman. He is not present, but I have talked to him and he said he would accept the nomination. Mr. Robinson is a city council member for Cañon City. He has served on numerous committees. He is an architect and has had a wide variety of leadership and committee experience. I think he would be a good choice.

SECOND

Mr. Caruso seconded the nomination.

Chairman Sandoval called for a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously. (5 of 5)

Mr. Giordano noted that the Planning Commission does not currently have a Secretary, but will need one for the Master Plan. The Secretary signs the Master Plan.

MOTION

Mr. Alsup nominated Mr. Joe Caruso for Secretary.

SECOND

Mr. Lamanna seconded the nomination.

Chairman Sandoval called for a roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously. (5 of 5)

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Sandoval adjourned the meeting at 5:42 p.m.

CHAIRMAN, FREMONT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE