

From: [Terree Kay](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Comments for todays Planning Comm Meeting
Date: Wednesday, August 11, 2021 9:27:27 AM

I'm not sure if this meeting will allow more comments on the subject of the proposed changes for the FR and FA Ordinance Amendment concerning animals, so I wanted to send an email to include these comments into the attachments. I would appreciate them being read into the minutes for review and comment by the Planning Commission.

It seems to me the proposal hasn't varied much from the original. This appears to be all about ease of administration. Are you eliminating FR or just changing a few line items to match FA? You have yet to explain how much easier this will be for your staff. The size and condition of the lot should remain, hence the "conditional use".

You state in the second paragraph that in Hi Country 1 there are currently only nine conditional use permits and over 190 lots that are zoned FR. The numbers are incorrect as we have 123 lots (an additional 2 are easements), 89 residents that live here and a few that are part time residents. The number of conditional use permits is misrepresented as in my case of inquiring whether our old addresses (lot numbers) had been updated correctly was not answered. Inconsistencies of the conditional use permits in our community lie with your Code Enforcement staff as we have record of being told the permit isn't required because we are a horse community. I am unaware of any hostilities or heightened tensions between our neighbors, we just have a few that like to make everyone's business, their business.

You have had one person request a change in zone from FA to FR but are changing FR to be more compatible with FA which makes no sense at all. Your justification is weak at best.

#4 and 5 Public comment

Differences between east-side and west-side watershed protection is completely misrepresented as the west-side has the "non-attainment" is based on EPA standards due to KCC. This should be explored further and does make a difference in this case.

I also disagree with the removal of the Family Food Production permit. Families should have the right to raise animals for food similar to growing a vegetable garden. Adding Cow's and sheep but eliminating chickens seems unfair. Our surrounding cities allow chickens on much smaller lots without a buffer zone. Not sure I see the "ease of administration" for this change at all.

Thank you for your time.
Respectfully,
Terree Kay