



development meets fire code. Even if the county does not enforce the fire code the fire marshalls are supposed to enforce it. In a development like this it is not practical, Clay's concern is that we are aware of this code and in the future if something happens and if that secondary access would have been there for the fire department and it comes back on the County because we did not enforce fire code. Clay would like to send the plat to the State Fire Marshall's Office to see if they would approve and if not send us recommendations. This is something we need to talk about for the future and if there is a way to accommodate situations of this nature. Matt wants to know what their jurisdiction is and what is their hammer and Clay does not know, it is not clear nor does it go into that. Sherry stated that this was not pro-development because after lot 29 you have to have sprinklers if you do not do a secondary access. Possible to do a stub out on one of the cul-de-sacs, but not an actual road. It is not the Board's responsibility to enforce fire code that is up to the State Fire Marshall's. If the developer gets Fire Marshall approval that is their responsibility, we just need to tell them to follow fire code. Matt does not think we need to be adding to our rules unless we have an objective we are trying to achieve and does not think it is a good idea for us to adopt fire code. Motion to approve by Matt and second by Sherry, approved by all. Randy has agreed to work with the county on improving the road to his access point.

- **Kentucky Hills, Minor Final**

-Aaron Rasburry

Granting a sixty foot easement on Totten Road, thirty foot both ways of center line and would like that to be included in the legal description. Question of whether the plat should include the entire sixty foot or just the thirty foot easement on lot 6, Clay does not think that adopting this plat as is that someone could use the full sixty foot it would only be the 30 foot of lot 6. Matt would suggest changing that lot 6 is subject to thirty foot easement because right now it is implying there is sixty foot easement on lot 6 and the legal only encompasses to the center line. Matt suggests the simplest thing would be to have a 30 foot easement on lot 6 and 30 foot easement on other side so lot 6 purchasers do not think there is a 60 foot easement on that lot. No Health Department review will be required due to Health Department regulations. Motion to approve by Sherry and second by Matt, approved by all.

OLD BUSINESS

OPEN DISCUSSION

- **Health Department Approval Discussion**

Health Department would not give Mr. Williams a letter since their rules state that developments with 3 acres or more do not have to have Health Department Subdivision approval. Clay's understanding is there is subdivision review/approval for any development that has even one lot under 3 acres or you can request one from the Health Department. The county can require a developer to do a subdivision review process done and that the Board has required that in the past. The question is are we going to require that review of the developer? Board members state that they have never required



developers to do approval on developments with lots over 3 acres. Most developments of that size are able to get an alternate system and the County nor the Health Department are concerned as long as the discharge is the appropriate amount of footage away from lot lines. You're guaranteed a system as long as the discharge is 300 foot away from the lot line.

- **Fire Hydrant**

Why do we not require fire hydrant placement on preliminary plats? The water department and Health Department review the fire hydrant placement and water lines that the requirements are met and water flow is sufficient.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

- Kevin made a motion to adjourn, second by Matt and passed by all. Adjourn 6:20pm.