



MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Board of Adjustment

Minutes

January 24, 2019

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Harris called meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

**ROLL CALL/
MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Abe Harris
Mr. Craig Cardon
Mr. Greg Loper
Mr. Jason Morris
Ms. Wendy Riddell (arrived 10:04)

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. Darren Gerard, Planning Services Manager
Ms. Rachel Applegate, Senior Planner
Mr. Derek Scheerer, Planner
Mr. Farhad Tavassoli, Planner
Ms. Jaclyn Sarnowski, Planner
Ms. Rosalie Pinney, Recording Secretary

COUNTY AGENCIES: Mr. Robert Swan, County Attorney

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Chairman Harris made all standard announcements.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 18, 2018 and November 15, 2018

AGENDA ITEMS: BA2018085, BA2018086, V201701823, TU2018038, BA2018062,
BA2018084, TU2018042

Chairman Harris requested the election of officers for 2019.

BOARD ACTION: Vice Chairman Morris motioned to re-elect Chairman Harris for 2019. Member Loper second. Approved 4-0.

BOARD ACTION: Member Cardon motioned to re-elect Vice Chairman Morris for 2019. Member Loper second. Approved 4-0.

Chairman Harris requested a motion for approval of the October 18 and November 15 minutes.

BOARD ACTION: Member Cardon motioned to approve the October 18, 2018 and November 15, 2018 minutes. Vice Chairman Morris second. Approved 4-0.

WITHDRAWN

**BA2018085
Applicant/Owner:**

Bates Property
James Bates

District 4

Location: 10704 S. 271st Ave. – U.S. Highway 85 & Hazen Rd., in the Buckeye area
Zoning: Rural-43
Request: Variance to permit:
1) Existing storage sheds 10 feet from the western property boundary where 40 feet is required in the front yard

Ms. Applegate presented BA2018085 and noted the applicant has withdrawn their application. No action required by the Board.

CONSENT AGENDA

BA2018086 **Cordova Property** **District 4**
Applicant/Owner: Thomas A. Cordova Sr.
Location: 23925 W. Gambit Tr. – west of 239th Ave. on Gambit Tr. in the Wittmann area
Zoning: Rural-43 and Rural-43 MAAMF (and within APZ-2)
Requests: Variance to permit:
1) Proposed front setback of 10' where a minimum of 40' is required and;
2) Proposed rear setback 28'-1" where a minimum of 40' is required

Ms. Applegate presented the consent agenda.

BOARD ACTION: Vice Chairman Morris motioned to approve BA2018086 with conditions 'a'-'d'. Member Riddell second. Approved 5-0.

- a) General compliance with the site plan stamped received December 26, 2018.
- b) Failure to complete necessary construction within one year from the date of approval, shall negate the Board's approval.
- c) There shall be no encroachment of the proposed residence in the Military Airport and Ancillary Military Facility Overlay Zoning District & APZ-2 on the subject property.
- d) Satisfaction of all applicable Maricopa County Zoning Ordinance requirements, Drainage Regulations, and Building Safety codes.

CODE COMPLIANCE REVIEW

V201701823 **Code Compliance Review** **District 4**
Respondent: Kevin and Stacie Brown
Location: Unaddressed parcel (parcel 201-22-008B)
Request: Appeal of the Hearing Officer's Order of Judgment

Mr. Gerard presented V201701823 and noted this case is being revisited from October 18. The respondent indicated they were not aware of that hearing, and they did respond from our certified mailing for today's date but he does not see them in the room. The verified violation is

operation of a commercial business without proper zoning entitlement - storage and stockpiling of various materials. The case was opened October 25, 2017 due to citizen complaints. There were hearings on the same date and advertised for the same time involving Flood Control District, the Air Quality Department, and Planning and Zoning - Code Compliance Division held September 11, 2018. The respondents initially attended the Flood Control District hearing but left before it was concluded, and were absent at the Air Quality and Planning and Zoning - Code Compliance hearing. The hearing officer found the respondent responsible for the violation and he ordered fines of \$750, and a daily non-compliance fine of \$75 from that date and to accrue until compliance is verified. To date no fines have been paid and he's not aware of progress towards compliance. We did have subsequent meetings with the applicant and other parties, and we were happy to enter into a compliance agreement to give them certain deadlines to clean the property, but there's been no request for a compliance agreement to date. The hearing officer made a finding of fact and reached his conclusion pursuant to Section 1502 of the Ordinance, and pursuant of Article 1504.3.2 of the Ordinance. This Board may affirm the hearing officer's order or remand it to the hearing officer due to finding of procedural error. Staff recommends the Board to affirm the hearing officer's order.

Chairman Harris asked if the respondent was here to speak. Mr. Gerard said they are not here and no speaker cards received.

BOARD ACTION: Member Riddell motioned to affirm the Hearing Officer's Order of Judgment. Vice Chairman Morris second. Affirmed 5-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

TU2018038	Remington Property	District 3
Owner:	Michael Remington	
Location:	48411 N. 31 st Ave. in the New River area	
Zoning:	Rural-43	
Request:	Temporary Use Permit (TUP) for temporary caretaker quarters in the Rural-43 zoning district	

Chairman Harris said we are moving agenda item #6 – TU2018038 up to the first case on the regular agenda.

Mr. Scheerer presented TU2018038 and noted this site has a single family residence and an RV that is being used as caretaker quarters. Usually temporary use permits are administratively approved after 10 days of posting the site if no opposition is received. Staff did receive one e-mail of opposition from a neighbor who is opposed to the request. Staff is recommending approval.

Member Loper asked if the opposed explained to what their opposition was. Mr. Scheerer said they were opposed and the neighbors have had previous issues with one another.

Ms. Jennifer Morse, an American Sign Language (ASL) interpreter spoke for Ms. Amy Remington, the owner of the property. Ms. Remington is requesting permission to keep her parents in the trailer on their property to care for her father with health issues. There are times when he has a hard time making appropriate decisions for himself, and quite often he comes and asks us for

help with business decisions. She checks on him often to make sure everything is okay and it is easier to take care of her family when they are close by.

BOARD ACTION: Vice Chairman Morris motioned to approve TU2018038 with conditions 'a'-'b'. Member Riddell second. Approved 5-0

- a) General compliance with the application stamped received October 26, 2018.
- b) This Temporary Use Permit is authorized for temporary housing for a period not to exceed two years. This Temporary Use Permit shall expire on January 24, 2021. The Temporary Use Permit approval letter must be visibly displayed at the front of the property at all times. Failure to meet this display requirement shall result in revocation of the Temporary Use Permit if a Zoning Citation is issued.

BA2018062	Swain Family Trust Property	District 2
Applicant/Owner:	Matthew & Sarah Robinson / Cheryl Swain	
Location:	17236 E. Melody Dr. – southeast of 172 nd St. & Baseline Rd. in the Gilbert area	
Zoning:	Rural-43	
Requests:	Variance to permit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">1) Proposed lot width of 131.45' where 145' is the minimum required and;2) Proposed side yard setback of 11.4' where 30' is the minimum required	

Ms. Sarnowski presented BA2018062 and noted there's no known opposition to the request and no code violations on the site. The site is comprised of 62,931 square feet and the surrounding area is mostly developed consistent with lots splits in the Rural-43 zoning district. According to the Assessor's parcel history it was unclear when the original lot split occurred. The area was historically split in the late 1970's and early 1980's. It was originally two substandard lots that were purchased in 1999 by the landowner to the east in an attempt to create a parcel that was closer to the minimum lot width. A lot combination of two parcels and a portion of the parcel to the east was completed in December 2018 resulting in the current configuration. The residence to the east was constructed in 1975 and is within the same family trust. The request for the reduced side yard setback is also to the east. This request is similar to the variance request that was approved by the Board in October 2018 which is located 175 feet east of the site for the sister of the current applicant. The proposed variance request could not be carried forward in October due to the lot combination.

Member Cardon said he noticed on a previous picture on the screen that there was a different outline of the parcel, and asked if the current picture outlines the total parcel. Ms. Sarnowski said the Assessor's Office has not updated the parcel combination, and the red line is the current configuration, and the line in the middle was actually the lot combination that occurred.

Ms. Sarah Robinson said they are asking for two variances - one being the lot width that does not meet the 145 feet RU-43 standard and the second one being the 30 feet side yard setback to be a variance to 11-1/2 feet. Throughout the neighborhood there are several variances like this and they wouldn't be different than the rest of the neighborhood.

Member Riddell asked why you want the variance for the side yard all the way down to 11-1/2 feet where most of them look like they are more in the 20 feet range. Mr. Matt Robinson said there are several setback variances within the neighborhood with the side yard. We have seen some sheds that are very close to the wall well within 30 feet.

Member Riddell said sheds are an accessory structure and are treated differently than a primary home. Mr. Robinson said he's also seen primary homes within the 30 foot setback, and they would like to build their home to be 90 feet wide. In order to accommodate that they would have to fall within the 30 foot setback. The setbacks normally put 60 feet between homes and theirs will be 85 feet between their home and the home to the east, which is her mother and father's house. These homes will be very much apart.

Vice Chairman Morris asked if they contemplated moving that other property line if there's a family relationship between the two to create a wider lot. Ms. Robinson said there is a gate on the front where it's used to move animals in and out of the pasture and they wanted to keep the gate there. That is one of the purposes for keeping the lot at the 131 feet.

Member Riddell said she initially thought with a family trust there's a way to solve this without a variance. Family trust verses same exact ownership have different obligations that go with it. This is clearly in character with the area and the applicant made a good point where the home is already set way back. This is going to look and feel like a typical Rural-43, and she is inclined to support it.

Vice Chairman Morris said this is the best use of this property and it is clearly consistent with the area.

BOARD ACTION: Member Riddell motioned to approve BA2018062 with conditions 'a'-'c'. Vice Chairman Morris second. Approved 5-0.

- a) General compliance with the site plan stamped received December 12, 2018.
- b) All required building permit for the proposed development shall be applied for within 120 days of the hearing date unless otherwise directed by the Board. Failure to apply for any required building permit within the specified time, or to complete necessary construction within one year from the date of approval, shall negate the Board's approval.
- c) Satisfaction of all applicable Maricopa County Zoning Ordinance requirements, Drainage Regulations, and Building Safety codes.

BA2018084	Bakerson Property	District 2
Applicant/Owner:	Bruce Wuollet / Bakerson, LLC	
Location:	31206 N. 65 th St. – Scottsdale & Lone Mountain Roads in the Cave Creek area	
Zoning:	Rural-43	
Request:	Variance to permit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">1) Proposed street-side setback of 38' where 53' is the minimum required	

Mr. Tavassoli presented BA2018084 and noted the property contains a 2,500 square foot residence and is located about 520 feet south of Lone Mountain Road and 65th Street. The area consists with single family residential lots of at least one acre. Although 65th Street provides legal access to the property as well as other properties in the area, but it is not a County maintained right-of-way. Most properties in the County Island are encumbered by a federal patent easement which provides legal access for the general public and have potential for future roadways. The patent easement on the property is 33 feet wide and runs immediately north of the southern property line. The applicant wishes to construct a 669 square foot addition to the primary residence which is five feet north of the patent easement. Since the street-side building setback must be measured from the edge of the patent easement, the subject property has a required side yard building setback of 53 feet. The proposed addition could be located elsewhere on the site so the zoning requirements could be met. They could also apply for an abandonment of the patent easement. The patent easement in addition to the existing pool and the wash to the north significantly limits the building envelope for the proposed addition. The applicant fails to demonstrate a peculiar condition facing the property, and the property has an undue physical hardship that prevents the development of the property. They failed to demonstrate that the physical hardship is not self-created, and they failed to demonstrate the general intent and purpose of the MCZO will be preserved with the variance.

Member Riddell asked if the patent easement is appropriate to be abandoned. Mr. Tavassoli said historically in this area there have been applications from various landowners of abandonment of the patent easements. It is a long drawn out process but in most cases they have been abandoned through that process.

Mr. Bruce Wuollet, the applicant said when he completed the application he didn't know what to put down. They are wanting to build a place for their elderly mother to live. They originally planned it further south but when they submitted the application they found out it was in the easement so they moved it north which will remove an access from the master bedroom into the pool area which they are fine with. It would still need to be in the setback to build that particular configuration, and they were told the abandonment process would take six to nine months. Their mother is currently living in one of the bedrooms at his brother house after she sold her place in Prescott Valley and she would like her own little space.

Mr. Steve Wuollet, Bruce's brother said there wasn't an option to build detached. His mom stayed at a friend's guesthouse last summer for a month to see what it was like, but there wasn't much light for her to go from the detached guesthouse to the main house. It was too dark and too scary for her. Once the sun went down she didn't feel comfortable walking across uneven ground in the dark to the house. There is a wash that comes in from the south to the north, and comes back out at the southwest corner. On the north side of the property the wash runs along the driveway and crowns across the top. Then the only structure they can build detached would be way back away from the house. She has been living with him since June of last year, but the bedroom is too small for her and she shares our space. It would be better for her to live at Bruce's house where she would have better care. They have six kids at home and it gets very crazy.

Member Riddell said the location of the federal patent easement is justification, and coupled with the washes that are on site create a hardship along with the six kids. She is supportive of the variance subject to the findings in the staff report and the stipulations. She encourages them to file for the abandonment of the patent easement even though it takes six to nine months, but they shouldn't have to wait that long to build.

**BOARD ACTION: Member Riddell motioned to approve BA2018084 with conditions 'a'-'c'.
Member Cardon second. Approved 5-0.**

- a) General compliance with the site plan stamped received December 17, 2018.
- b) Failure to complete necessary construction within one year from the date of approval, shall negate the Board's approval.
- c) Satisfaction of all applicable Maricopa County Zoning Ordinance requirements, Drainage Regulations, and Building Safety codes.

TU2018042	Wildlife Reservation Temporary Events	District 5
Owner:	Mladick II, LLC	
Location:	24445 W. Sunrise Dr. – Miller Rd. and Sunrise Dr. in the Buckeye area	
Zoning:	Rural-43	
Request:	Temporary Use Permit (TUP) Extension to permit ongoing special/temporary events at a private park/private wildlife reservation (fishing lake) for a two year period	

Ms. Sarnowski presented TU2018042 and noted there's no known opposition and no code violations. The site is on 120 acres and the surrounding area is mostly undeveloped, consisting of lot splits in the Rural-43 zoning district. The previous TUP was approved by the Board on January 17, 2017 for two years and at that time there was discussion to annex into the City of Buckeye. The applicant has submitted the necessary paperwork for annexation and a Planned Area of Development (PAD) overlay district with the City of Buckeye and it is scheduled for completion in June 2019. Because of the annexation timeline, staff recommends approval of the TUP for six months instead of the requested two years, subject to conditions 'a'-'p'.

Member Riddell noted if the TUP is granted in the city, but it expires upon annexation then they don't have the right to continue the use in Buckeye unless there's a new entitlement use in Buckeye. Ms. Sarnowski said the Planned Area of Development overlay district would give them the entitlement through the City of Buckeye.

Member Loper asked in terms of the annexation is it just their property or are there other properties involved. Ms. Sarnowski said this is adjacent to the City of Buckeye and she doesn't know if there are other properties included with this annexation, and with her correspondence with the City of Buckeye she does not believe there are any concerns for the annexation to not go through.

Mr. Richard Mladick, the property owner asked to be granted the full two year extension and not only six months. When successfully annexed into the City of Buckeye the TUP no longer applies. The annexation and the PAD process they are going through contains an exceptional number of stipulations and unknowns. The City of Buckeye's development code is clearly written to address residential, commercial and industrial uses, and it is very light on recreational uses especially private recreational uses. They have put in more time energy and effort than you can imagine. Many of the events and uses they have on this property require them to book out a year plus in advance, and to have a Temporary Use Permit expire when they are trying to plan and do these other things is problematic. Additionally they have been approached by a group that plans to purchase the property to the north and to remain in the County, and they would

like us to do the same. They are planning to bring in some infrastructure that may be beneficial and more cost effective for us to tap into verses the City of Buckeye. The city's infrastructure is more complex for us to access and its part of what they are working through right now. This project has positive impacts not just the wildlife and the environment, but also on the community. This is a 61 acre lake that should be available to the citizens and residents to access, and we would hate for it not to be available because we couldn't finish up the timeline with the annexation in the six month timeframe.

Member Riddell asked why this wasn't done as a Special Use Permit rather than a Temporary Use Permit. Mr. Gerard said a few reasons, they were approached by the City of Buckeye staff about seeking some kind of temporary entitlement while they were going through the annexation process. They have had this entitlement for two years and anticipated they would get the annexation in that time period. During a previous Ad-Hoc taskforce for process improvements, we set up an internal policy where we would do Temporary Use Permits for any period up to 10 years and Special Use Permits for over 10 years.

Member Riddell asked if they had an SUP in the County at the time they were annexed into Buckeye, wouldn't Buckeye be legally obligated to give them the same entitlements and perhaps not the same infrastructure obligations. Mr. Gerard said he believes that is correct.

Vice Chairman Morris said the options you have available to you under the County processes are probably more favorable and offer a better long term solution. He also understands from a County's perspective why an annexation might be an attractive use, but he also thinks all of this really vitiates towards the extension the applicant is asking for. From an applicant's perspective working within Maricopa County may be in your best interest based upon the vision you expressed in the application.

Mr. Mladick said this is the second time he's heard that in the past couple of weeks, this is why they are requesting the full two years and not just the six months. They would like to have some time to vet that and further understand the differences.

Chairman Harris asked where exactly this is located. Mr. Mladick it is as far south as you can go on Miller Road. It is where Miller Road dead ends and a half a mile to the east down a non-maintained County road just west of Sunrise Drive to the entrance of the property. Once you're on the property it's about another half mile down to the lake. Approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of mile to a mile to the east of the Buckeye Equestrian Center.

Chairman Harris said that's the area he grew up in before it was flooded out in the 70's. It is nice to see you guys doing something down there.

Vice Chairman Morris said he would move approval of the Temporary Use Permit and he recommends the full two years per the applicant's request.

BOARD ACTION: Vice Chairman Morris motioned to approve TU2018042 with conditions 'a'-'p' with modification to condition 'c' to amend timeframe from 6 months to 2 years. Member Loper second. Approved 5-0.

- a. Development of the site shall comply with the site plan, stamped received December 3, 2018, consisting of 8 1/2" x 14" pages, except as modified by any condition identified herein.
- b. Use of the site shall be in conformance with the Narrative Report consisting of 5 pages, stamped received December 3, 2018 except as modified by any condition identified herein.
- c. This Temporary Use Permit is authorized for ~~6 months~~ **2 years** and shall expire on ~~July 24, 2019~~ **January 24, 2021**. The Temporary Use Permit approval letter must be visibly displayed at the front of the property at all times. Failure to meet this display requirement shall result in revocation of the Temporary Use Permit if a Zoning Citation is issued.
- d. Temporary Use Permit shall not become effective upon approval and shall remain effective for six months.
- e. The property owner/s and their successors waive claim for diminution in value if the County takes action to rescind approval due to noncompliance with any condition.
- f. Approval of the Temporary Use is not an approval to construct. Prior to construction, development or use of the property, the applicant/owner shall obtain all necessary clearances and construction permits.
- g. All development and engineering design shall conform with the Drainage Regulation, Drainage Policies and Standards and current engineering policies, standards and best practices at the time of application for construction.
- h. Prior to zoning clearance approval, developer(s) and/or builder(s) shall establish emergency fire protection services, covering all real property contained within the project area during course of construction and shall obtain a 'will serve' letter substantiating coverage from the appropriate Fire District, Department or Company servicing the site.
- i. The Temporary Use Permit letter must be visibly displayed at the front of the property at all times. Failure to meet this display requirement shall result in revocation of the Temporary Use Permit if a Zoning Citation is issued.
- j. Structures erected pursuant to an approved Temporary Use Permit shall not require a building permit if standing for a period not to exceed 96 contiguous hours. The responsible party shall provide the Affidavit of Structures for Temporary Events documentation, as specified in the Temporary Use Permit that said structures were erected and maintained subject to all applicable building safety codes and manufacturer's specifications. The documentation shall be provided to the Department within two working days following end of the special event to be filed with the Temporary Use Permit. Failure to provide the required documents will render the Temporary Use Permit null and void and constitute a zoning violation in accordance with Chapter 15 of the Maricopa County Zoning Ordinance.

- k. The Temporary Use must be removed at the end of the approved time period. All temporary structures must be removed, and the site returned to its original condition or better upon completion of each event. No structures shall be erected more than 72 hours before the start of the event from which this permit is issued. All structures shall be removed within 72 hours following the end of the event for which this permit is issued.
- l. Prior to any event, food concessions shall be permitted by Maricopa County Environmental Services Department (MCESD).
- m. Alcohol is not permitted on site unless a Liquor License is obtained through the Clerk of the Board.
- n. The applicant or property owner/s will be responsible for contacting their applicable emergency and fire protection agency for medical/emergency services and fire protection.
- o. The Temporary Event or Special Event shall adhere to the Board of Supervisors Resolution, December 1980 as applicable which establishes guidelines and conditions for temporary uses. The following conditions shall apply:
 - 1. At least one patrolman or security guard for every 500 persons in attendance.
 - 2. The applicant shall provide adequate ingress and egress to the premises and parking areas. Traffic guards shall be employed to insure orderly traffic movement and relieve traffic congestion onto public rights-of-way.
 - 3. The applicant shall provide an ample supply of water for drinking and sanitation purposes. The quality and quantity of water and location of facilities shall be approved by the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.
 - 4. The applicant shall provide an ample supply of water for drinking and sanitation purposes. The quality and quantity of water and location of facilities shall be approved by the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.
 - 5. Supplemental toilet facilities must be provided for every special event. At least one closed toilet facility marked MEN and at least one closed toilet marked WOMEN shall be provided. A toilet for each 40 males and for each 40 females expected to attend the event may be required; the number and location of toilets shall be approved by the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.
 - 6. At least one trash can with 32 gallons capacity for every 25 persons expected to be in attendance shall be provided. Trash and refuse disposal

shall be pursuant to procedures established by the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.

7. Temporary uses conducted after dark shall provide lighting to insure public areas are adequately illuminated. All outdoor lighting shall be shielded so that it is directed downward below the horizontal plane of the fixture and does not trespass onto adjacent properties.
 8. Temporary Use Permit has been approved to include overnight use, the applicant is required to provide overnight camping facilities and overnight areas as identified on the site plan. Any overnight use shall be approved by Maricopa County Environmental Services Department.
- p. The following Planning Engineering conditions shall apply:
1. According to the effective FIRM panel number 04013C2580L, dated 10/16/2013, the entire property is designated under Zone AE (floodplain & floodway) one percent annual change (100-year) special flood hazard areas (SFHA). **Any development on this property must obtain a Floodplain Use**
 2. Any development in a floodway must be reviewed to determine if the project will increase flood heights. An engineering analysis must be conducted before a permit can be issued. A record of the results of this analysis shall be part of the permit file, which can be in the form of a No-rise Certification.
 3. There shall be **no grading associated to this Temporary Use**. Engineered Grading and Drainage plans must be provided for all grading within this project and required permits shall be secured.
 4. Any work on the existing buildings, identified as "A" on the submitted exhibit, will require a permit. Improvement, modifications, additions, reconstruction or repairs that reach a fifty percent (50%) substantial improvement threshold based on the valuation of the structure, require that the entire building be brought into compliance with all Flood Control & Drainage Regulations.
 5. The portable restroom trailer, as identified on the submitted exhibit, shall be fully licensed and ready for highway use at all times. "Ready for highway use" shall be defined as the trailer being on wheels or a jacking system, being attached to the site only by quick disconnect type utilities/security devices, and having no permanent attached additions.
 6. The proposed temporary caretaker facility, as identified on the submittal exhibit and described in the narrative as recreational vehicle (RV), shall meet the following requirements: EV shall be on-site for fewer than 180 consecutive days at a time, and shall be fully licensed and ready for highway use at all times. "Ready for highway use" shall be defined as the trailer being on wheels or a jacking system, being attached to the site only

be quick disconnect type utilities/security devices, and having no permanent attached additions. Otherwise, a Floodplain Use Permit will be required to show that the RV meets the elevation and anchoring requirements for mobile /manufactured homes, as described in the Floodplain Use Regulations for Maricopa County.

7. Due to the floodway and floodplain on the property, it is recommended, if not already in place, to file an evacuation plan with Maricopa County Department of Emergency Management and any other responding jurisdictions. The plan should indicate escape routes and alternative vehicular access in case of a flooding event.

Adjournment:

Chairman Harris adjourned the meeting of January 24, 2019 at 10:47 a.m.

Prepared by Rosalie Pinney
Recording Secretary
January 24, 2019