



COCHISE COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"Public Programs...Personal Service"

Rec'd. 5/22/19
3:45 PM
ZPD.

SPECIAL USE APPLICATION FOR APPEAL

NAME OF APPELLANT: TERRANCE C. HOGAN

ADDRESS: 365 W. CAMINO DE MANANA PARCE I.D. 106 04 132A

PHONE NUMBER: 651-450-5359

EMAIL ADDRESS: TERRANCE@TERRYHOGAN.COM

NUMBER OF DOCKET APPEALED: SU- -19-06

DATE OF COMMISSION DECISION: MAY 8, 2019

DATE OF APPEAL SUBMITTAL: MAY 22, 2019 FEE PAID: \$ 300.00

In addition to the \$300 fee, the following information shall be provided before an appeal can be accepted. If more room is needed please attach additional pages.

1. Description of the decision being appealed. An appellant can appeal the Commission's decision for approval or disapproval or any conditions stipulated as part of docket approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT "NATURE OF REQUEST"

SUBMITTED BY MR. ROBERT W. KIRSCHMANN DOES NOT ACCURATELY REFLECT THE TRUE CHARACTER OF THE RANCHOS COCHISE COMMUNITY & ACTUALLY MISREPRESENTS THE INTENT OF ARIZONA LEGISLATION OF GENERAL, COMPREHENSIVE, & ENVISION 2020. IN THE RESIDENTIAL RURAL ZONING DISTRICT MANUFACTURING IS "NOT ALLOWED" WHO UNLESS A SPECIAL USE AUTHORIZATION IS GRANTED. GRANTING THIS SPECIAL USE REQUEST WILL DO IRREPARABLE HARM TO THE RESIDENTS OF RANCHOS COCHISE, COCHISE COUNTY AS A WHOLE, THE STATE OF ARIZONA, & MR. HOGAN PERSONALLY.

PLEASE SEE EIGHT PAGE ATTACHMENT

Special Use Appeal Application

Page Two

2. A complete statement of all reasons why the appellant believes that the decision, or any part of the decision was erroneous, arbitrary, capricious, or any abuse of discretion.

MR. KIRSCHMANN CONFLATES THE ISSUE, RATHER
AD ISSUE NON-ISSUE, OF HOME OCCUPATION
WITH PURELY COMMERCIAL LAND USE.

~~***~~ PLEASE SEE ATTACHED EIGHT PAGE DOCUMENT

LOT MODIFICATION SHOULD BE REQUIRED

3. Written presentation of additional testimony & evidence. A full explanation of the additional testimony & evidence that will be submitted with explanation of why this was not presented to the Planning Commission.

IN THE ABSENCE OF PRESCRIBED AUDIO FILES
ALL TEN OF THE SPECIAL USE CRITERIA ARE
REDRESSED IN A SEVEN PAGE DOCUMENT RESEARCHED,
PREPARED, & DISSEMINATED BY MR. HOGAN.

~~***~~ PLZ SEE ATTACHED ^{B.P. REPORT} & OTHER COMMENTS

MR. KIRSCHMANN MISAPPLIED HIS KNOWLEDGE,
SKILLS, & ABILITIES IN JUSTIFYING THE FACTORS
IN FAVOR OF APPROVING THIS SPECIAL USE
APPLICATION

SIGNATURE

Tuan C. Hogan

TERRANCE C. HOGAN
May 22, 2019
Appeal Cochise County Planning Commission
Docket SU-19-06 (Counter Intelligence)

On Thursday May 21 I spoke to Mr. Montez. During our conversation he thanked me for calling and said No one else had contacted him. We agreed to seek a compromise. .. I admire Mr. Montez's ambition and respect his work ethic. I pray for Mr. Jonathon Montez, his wife Samira, and their four children that they may prosper and be in good health. My intention is not to cause him to stumble. In fact, he will always be welcome to a chair at my table and if he builds a garage and needs help I will gladly lend a hand.

As a rule of thumb the "No harm | no foul" should be applied. Mr. Montez can find alternative locations already zoned, and ready to accommodate. He can also build his garage. However, the harm that this "Special Use Application", if permitted, will not only harm me financially, emotionally and psychologically but will cause irreparable harm to the Cochise Ranchos Community at large.

I am appealing the Special Use Authorization from Cochise County Planning Commission docket SU-19-06 (Counter Intelligence) because the Cochise County Planning Commission's Decision is dangerously deficient, imminently harmful, lacking due diligence, and misleading the County of Cochise to misapply the law. I pray that Mr. Montez's request be denied and or referred back to zoning for lot modification because it is more appropriate to modify from currently zoned Rural Residential to commercial zoning than it is to allow the Special Use. Lot modification process is available to address exceptions administratively.

Incomplete, inadequate, and inappropriate Agency response:

HI-WAY AND FLOOD PLAIN:

1. Hi-way and flood plain comments insufficient not addressing lack of private road maintenance agreement.
2. Hi-way and flood plain comments not addressing excessive access points on privately maintained road.
3. Hi-way and flood plain comments failed to consider serious adverse impact to neighbors downstream.

Health, Safety, and Sanitation:

1. Did not consult with local Fire Department to determine if fabrication process, i.e., dust from grinding, sanding, milling, is volatile and therefore creates fire hazard.
2. Did not consult with Whetstone Fire Department to determine if vapors produced from using acrylic polymer during fabrication could cause an explosion.
 - a. Innocent Children needlessly exposed to adverse long term health issues such as asthma and pulmonary fibrosis.
3. No toileting for workers violates many levels including A. D. A., OSHA, E. P. A.

Planning Commission analysis is misrepresentative because it really doesn't represent the policies outlined in the General Plan, Comprehensive Plan, or the Envision 2020 Plans.

Does not adhere with the Bobocamari Plan:

1. Policy Number One "New land uses should be compatible with adjacent existing uses."

In their analysis of how the neighborhood would be impacted they couldn't be more wrong.

The notion that the proposed project is in compliance with the following use factors is preposterous:

1. The proposed project ***does not comply*** with the Comprehensive plan as attested to by the sixty-nine letters of opposition. Growth in the area has been largely rural residential including single family, farm, and ranch. The county would be hard pressed to find a single ongoing commercial / light industrial land use within Ranchos Cochise.
 - a. While the Planning Commission is correct in their assessment that Ranchos Cochise has build-out potential for residential and agriculture Ranchos Cochise does not tolerate Mr Montez's type of development and his proposed land use.
2. Planning Commission erroneously assumes this operation serves local needs.
 - a. Mr. Montez does not have any clients in Ranchos Cochise and is certainly not compatible.
3. The Hi-way Department failed to provide any data on the development of traffic.
 - a. Providing secondary access points is against policy.
 - b. Mr. Montez has failed to enter into a private maintenance agreement for the utilization of Busick Ranch Road.
4. The Hi-way Department failed to provide any data on the traffic.
 - a. Dune buggies, dirt bikes, ATV's, donkeys, horses, and mules traverse the road more quite frequently.
 - b. **Any increase** in vehicular traffic would be substantial, double digit increase.
5. The Planning Commission ignores the Shared Well Agreement legally documented with Cochise County which expressly forbids ***"commercial use of well water"***.
 - a. There is no remedy at law for monitoring this illegal use of the "shared well water".
 - i. Using shared well water for washing, cleaning, rinsing, drinking, flushing while at work are all violations.
 - b. No regard to federal agency requirements, i.e., A.D.A or O.S.H.A.
6. If County allows the applicant to move forward, the building garage doors could face East.
 - a. Every morning I would wake up to the noise and nuisance of the garage doors opening and the resulting commotion of loading and unloading.
 - b. Without **commercial screening** I would be forced to stare into the abyss of Mr. Montez's operation.
 - c. Instead of eating Wheaties, The Breakfast of Champions, I would be coerced into consuming the toxic and noxious waste billowing from within.
7. Intentionally left blank...
8. Yes, good old number eight. ***Whaat?***
 - a. Garage doors are weakest part of plan.
 - i. Maximum noise emissions
 - ii. Maximum air pollution.
 - iii. See Huachuca City Landfill and New England Journal of Medicine
9. Mr. Kirschmann conflates Home Based Business with commercial land use.
 - a. He neglected to reach out or consult with Cochise County Hi-way and flood plain or Cochise County Health and Safety, Whetstone Fire Department, or the Huachuca City Landfill and I doubt he has ever set foot on or even seen the premises.
 - b. His assumptions are doubtful because he didn't determine the listed agencies (others) if there would be a negative impact.

10. Water Conservation mandates that cooling be provided by air conditioning and prohibits swamp coolers. Water consumption for washing, cleaning, drinking, and flushing are an express violation of the shared well agreement with Dorothy Busick and on file with Cochise County.

TERRANCE C. HOGAN
May 22, 2019
Appeal Cochise County Planning Commission
Docket SU-19-06 (Counter Intelligence)

Definitions of Tools

- I. Rural residential
 - i. Lawn mower and weed whacker
- II. Ranching
 - i. Boots and spurs
 - ii. Bridles and saddles
 - iii. Horses, donkeys, and mules
- III. Farming
 - i. Pitchforks and grain shovels
 - ii. Combines and cultivators
- IV. Light manufacturing
 - a. Certified respirators, industrial sanding equipment, industrial grinding equipment, industrial milling equipment, heat activated thermo forming equipment, *fire suppression system, **dust collection system, ***hazardous waste disposal system, ****screening system, etc.

Definition of Intensity

- V. Mr. Montez is unable to do the job by himself, must have assistance, and requires special tools.

TERRANCE C. HOGAN
May 22, 2019
Appeal Cochise County Planning Commission
Docket SU-19-06 (Counter Intelligence)

IMMINENT FINANCIAL HARM:

By permitting a “SPECIAL USE AUTHORIZATION” the county has effectively changed the zoning from rural residential to commercial / light industrial.

1. Accordingly, because the zoning has changed, Mr. Hogan’s intention to occupy the premises has changed.
2. The proximity to a light manufacturing plant creates a noise nuisance and raises air quality issues ultimately resulting in reduced values for the neighboring properties. If the Board of Supervisors approves Special Use Authorization Mr. Hogan requests special use permission to sell, prematurely, his newly constructed residence at 365 W. Camino De Manana.
 - a. A. R. S. 32-1121A5
 - i. Grants property owners the right to do the work with duly licensed contractors.
 - ii. But does not apply if the property is intended for sale or rent.
 1. The offering of Mr. Hogan’s residence for sale within one year after the county’s date of final inspection constitutes contracting without a license and that the construction project was not intended for occupancy solely by the owner.

What is Mr. Hogan’s remedy at law?

IRREPARABLE EMOTIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM:

Mr. Hogan’s close proximity adjacent to a light manufacturing plant creates irreparable harm. Mr. Hogan is a combat veteran suffering from severely adverse long term health consequences because of exposure to the chemical referred to as “Agent Orange.”

- I. Mr. Hogan will suffer irreparable harm because of fears this related stress, from further exposure to potentially harmful heavy metal dust and chemicals, may lead to **“Post Traumatic Stress Disorder”**.
 - a. The prospect of living next door to this commercial operation is causing Mr. Hogan sleepless nights, migraine headaches, nose bleeds, and poor health.
- II. Mr. Hogan suffers emotionally and worries that the applicant himself, any of applicant’s employees, applicant’s entire family (especially children) visiting friends and family, and neighbors will be at risk of long term adverse health consequences.
 - a. ****See New England Medical Journal May 29, 2014
 - i. After sixteen years prolonged exposure 64 year old died from disease like “Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis”. Dust similar to Dust in shop, from fabrication of Corian, was found in lung.

- ii. Causality cannot be established from a single case. The author suggests and manufacturer disputes it.

What is Mr. Hogan's remedy at law?

IMMINENT HARM:

- III. Huachuca City Public Works Supervisor Mr. Jim Halterman, May 22, 2019:
 - a. Huachuca City "Land Fill will not accept waste from Mr. Montez's fabrication operation."
 - i. Heavy metal (aluminum trihydrate) and acrylic polymer slurry creates unacceptable HAZARDOUS WASTE risks to water supply and unnecessary exposure to neighbors and residents.

What is Mr. Hogan's AND THE COMMUNITY'S remedy at law?

TERRANCE C. HOGAN
May 22, 2019
Appeal Cochise County Planning Commission
Docket SU-19-06 (Counter Intelligence)

COMMON SENSE, FAIRNESS, AND RESPECT:

- VI. Nepotism and cronyism
 - a. Letter of support from Larry Lane, Mesquite Creek, having the contract to build.
 - b. will county provide same latitude to other applicants
- VII. Fairness to competitors
 - a. who pay commercial tax rates
 - b. provide bathroom facilities for employees
 - c. provide lavatory accommodations for employee to wash up
- VIII. Fairness to residents in the neighborhood
 - a. home owners not wanting the noise or commotion
 - b. 69 letters in opposition
 - c. Is this fair to the Greater Good and welfare of the neighborhood residents??
 - d. ***if it serves the local community it should be accessible to the public and handicapped accessible
- IX. Fairness to Fire Department
 - a. Exposed to hazardous material???
 - i. County failed to consult local fire department
- X. Fairness to Huachuca City Public Land Fill
 - a. County failed to consult local Land Fill
 - b. The Huachuca City Land fill permit granted by the State of Arizona will not waste from proposed operation.
 - c. If not why would the Cochise County Board of Supervisors subject neighborhood residents???
- XI. How is it fair to the fabricator, Mr. Montez, and his family be subjected to such long term health Hazards?
 - a. Will Mr. Montez ambush his own health and the health of his family causing himself to stumble?
- XII. Fairness to Huachuca City
 - a. County failed to consult local municipality and ask for input
- XIII. Fairness to Mr. Hogan
 - a. Peaceful enjoyment taken without consideration or compensation.
 - b. Condemnation
 - c. Substantially reduces Mr. Hogan's privacy
 - i. Create a situation where proposed use will create nuisance or hazard
 - ii. Substantial increase in traffic
 - 1. Any increase substantial increase
 - iii. Inconsistent application of zoning regulations
- XIV. How is it fair to subject a veteran suffering from exposure to Agent Orange?
 - a. Unable to sleep at night---worrying
 - b. Poor air quality
 - c. Potential of additional exposure to toxic vapors, dust and wind carried toxic waste?

- d. Suffering emotional, psychological, and physiological harm
 - e. Additional stress causing Post Traumatic Stress Disorder
- XV. How is this fair to the kids
- a. Contaminated environment
 - i. Contaminants introduced into the household by workers hands, hair, boots, and clothes.
 - ii. Neighbor kids, other family members, and friends
 - 1. ARS 13 105 (C)
- XVI. How is this fair to the Arizona State Legislature General Plan?
- i. Arizona Statute ARS 9.461.05
 - ii. Arizona Statute ARS 11.804
 - 1. Ignore intent of legislature
 - 2. Ignore intent of County Plan
 - iii. Ignore intent everyone participating in Workshops of Envision 2020 who expressly refer commercial development to I 90 corridor?
 - iv.
- XVII. How does this respect the Cochise Ranchos Residents wishes, intent of AZ Legislature, rights of soldiers from Ft Huachuca who might want to live in a neighborhood free from the presence of commercial noise, odors, traffic,
- XVIII. How is it fair and how does it respect the legitimate commercial property owners in Huachuca City?
- a. Unbridled Capitalism and Corporate Greed
 - b. New low for Lowe's
 - i. Mequilla migration Northward of the International Border?
 - ii. Open door for Home Depot---others?
 - iii. Tax evasion ?
- XIX. How is it fair to the lending institution relying on accurate application information
- i. Applying for a Residential Loan application being used for commercial purposes??
 - ii. Misrepresentation???
 - iii. Commercial loan higher interest rate?

Greetings.

I have prepared a response to the Planning and Zoning report that was presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding the Counter Intelligence SUP application. I have responded to the 10 points the planning office uses to determine if they should recommend to the Planning Commission to approve an application. As you know they recommended approval.

I thought some of this could be included in the appeal should we decide to appeal the approval of the SUP to the Board of Supervisors. The info. highlighted in blue was taken verbatim from the county's report that Ann sent everyone. My response to county is in black.

Please provide input.

Thanks. Eileen

From the Report:

Staff uses the 10 factors to help determine suitability of a SUP:

1. Compliance with Duly Adopted Plans: Complies

The proposed project complies with the Comprehensive Plan. The area is Designated as Category B,

Community Growth Area, Developing Areas. These areas are "designated has a moderate level of residential and/or non-residential growth" . The area is located near the junction of State Highway 90 and 82. As such, there will be continued developed pressures in the area. The proposed project will have a minimal impact on the existing neighborhood.

Our neighborhood does not comply with the existing plan since the designation "B" no longer fits the Cochise Ranchos neighborhood which is only a portion of the Whetstone area designated by the county as developing. Cochise Ranchos should be removed from the area described as developing and designated as a Category "D" area, a residential neighborhood.

The Cochise Ranchos neighborhood is residential with commercial development occurring along highway 90. Highway 90 is the eastern boundary of the neighborhood. Highway 82 bounds the neighborhood on the south where there is an electric substation and no other commercial development. The remaining land on the south side is vacant. On the west side, the neighborhood is bounded by N. Sands Ranch Rd. All development along Sands Ranch Rd. is residential. The neighborhood is bounded on the north by Sands Ranch, which has private land, BLM land and State Land used for grazing.

Within these boundaries there are xxx number of parcels. Of those xxx parcels are residential and xxx parcels are commercial and one is non-profit. The land use in Cochise Ranchos is no different than a residential neighborhood in Sierra Vista that has commercial use along the primary roads surrounding the neighborhood. We have five businesses (verify) in our neighborhood (Gas Co., Mr. Rooter, Whetstone Pottery, all on Highway 90. The electrical substation is on Highway 82 near Whetstone Pottery. The remainder of the neighborhood is residential with some vacant parcels.

Planning Staff at the public hearing for this application stated that there are many home based businesses in the neighborhood and the existence of these businesses help justify approval of a request for manufacturing. At this time, it is impossible to determine the number or even if there are home based businesses in the neighborhood since there is no evidence the businesses exist. Even if there are home-based businesses their existence has no relevance to an application for a manufacturing use. Home based businesses require no special permit.

To help understand the uses in the neighborhood see the attached maps showing the location and number of businesses, and residences and the location of SR 174, RU 4 zoned parcels and commercial zoned parcels in Cochise Ranchos. (these have not been made yet)

XXX number of parcels are residential, xxx number of parcels are commercial/business. xxx number of parcels are vacant. Of the vacant parcels xxx are zoned SR 174 which does not permit manufacturing and xxxx are zoned RU 4. The remaining parcels are vacant. Of those there are xxx number zoned SR 174, RU 4 and commercial. The residential parcels occur within the neighborhood. The commercial parcels are located along hwy 90 or hwy 82. To summarize x% of the neighborhood is residential and x% is commercial/business. There is no industrial in the neighborhood. (need to look at designation for electrical substation)

The report states development pressures the neighborhood. Development does not pressure the neighborhood because development is residential and consistent with the existing use. It occurs on 4.5 acre parcels or larger. Most of the neighborhood has developed (list percentage). The business development on hwy 90 and 82 has had limited impact on the neighborhood. The customers of these businesses, for the most part, do not use the neighborhood roads. The pressure to the neighborhood is in the form of approval of SUPs or a rezoning of residential property for higher density use imposed on the neighborhood by the County.

"The "Developing" (DEV) plan designation is used to describe areas experiencing non-rural growth rates that are developed with scattered, mixed residential, business or industrial and agriculture-related uses and that ultimately will accommodate future growth as the more populated areas reach build-out". This area has a variety of agriculture, commercial and home based business scattered throughout.

The above statement does not accurately describe the Cochise Ranchos neighborhood. Again, the neighborhood is developing as a residential neighborhood in a rural setting. There are no identifiable mixed residential, business or industrial uses in the neighborhood. Business development occurs on the perimeter of the neighborhood along highway 90. Residential development has occurred in the interior of the neighborhood.

The neighborhood is near "build-out" with xx parcels within the residential portion of the neighborhood and xx parcels designated on the perimeter of the neighborhood for commercial use. (Restate the percentage of residences to businesses and industrial and agricultural.) There is no industrial or agricultural zoning in our neighborhood. **Further, the county has no definition for**

mixed use (verify). It seems to be a term that is fluid when used in the context of county development. Mixed residential, business and commercial is a term most often found when describing urban development.

2. Compliance With Zoning District Purpose:

The purpose Section 601.02 states "To encourage those types of non-residential and non-agricultural activities which serve local needs or provide a service and are compatible with rural living".

Mr. Montez has a contract with Lowe's in Sierra Vista and Tucson to provide counters. For those persons in the community who contract with Lowe's, Counter Intelligence supplies the counters (provides a service). It would be difficult to link a specific need for his business in the Cochise Ranchos neighborhood since most of the parcels (%) have residences on them. **(Does he also sell to individuals?)**

3. Development Along Major Streets: Complies

The report states, staff has not received input from the "other residence that utilizes the road." Didn't Mrs. Busick address this issue in writing?

4. Traffic Circulation Factors: Complies

The proposed use will not increase neighborhood traffic beyond what is typical of a single family home.
Any thoughts on this. It seems traffic will be limited.

5. Adequate Services and Infrastructure: Complies

It seems the deed does not allow for a business use of the water well that serves the property. This needs to be documented. This would need to be enforced by the party who restricted use of the well.

6. Significant Site Development Standards: Complies with modifications

The Site plan shows adequate parking for both personal vehicles and the one employee.

Is there something to object to here?

7. Public Input: Does Not Comply:

The Applicant sent letters to all property owners within 1,000 feet of parcel to notify them of his application and to address any neighbor concerns. Staff also provided notice. Four letters in support, sixty-nine letters in opposition were received and are included in the packet. The majority of property owners in the area have expressed concern regarding this approval. Issues cited include noise, dust control, water use, manufacturing in the neighborhood, violation of CC and Rs.

Could someone respond to this. It would seem Linda or Ann would be good candidates since they drafted the letter in opposition to the application.

There is no manufacturing in the Cochise Ranchos neighborhood. Why wouldn't we object to the addition of a new use that is not compatible with residential living? And, why is that not a valid objection?

8. Hazardous Materials: Not Applicable

The Applicant will not be manufacturing anything on the premise. The Applicant will bring a whole slab in and finish the surface. The finishing process will produce non toxic dust that will be lighting washed off on to the floor, allowed to dry and be swept up.

Any thoughts?

9. Off-Site Impacts: Complies

The use will not have any significant impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed use is essentially a home based business, which per our Zoning Regulations is a non-discretionary permit. In fact, if the applicant were to reduce the shop, or area used to no less than 25% of the primary structure (456 square feet) it could be permitted as a matter of right.

This is not a home-based business. It is disingenuous of the Planning Staff to portray it as one. This business needs a zoning change to allow it to operate in a residential neighborhood. The statute cited in this item: ARS Section 11-820 Restriction on Regulation; home-based business; exception; definitions is irrelevant.

10. Water Conservation: Complies

The applicant will use a water nozzle rated at 1/2 gallon per minute to wash off excess material. Other than that there is no other water use proposed on the site. No new landscaping is proposed for the project.

Any comments on this?

The County Planning and Zoning Department provides no statistics, traffic counts or other information to support the claims made in the report recommending approval of this application.

On Sat, May 11, 2019 at 7:52 AM Ann Aust <ann.aust@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Everyone,

This is the information from the Cochise County Zoning Regulations on Appealing Planning Commission Decisions on Special Use Authorizations.

Ann

1716.04 Appeal of Special Use Authorization Decisions

A. The decision of the Planning Commission is deemed to be final County action on the issue unless that decision is appealed within **15-calendar days following the date of decision**. Any appeal shall be submitted for review by the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing to be scheduled within 60-days of receipt of the appeal. An appeal may be filed by the Applicant, by any other person aggrieved in any manner by the decision, or by the County Zoning Inspector, if the Inspector believes an error was made.

B. An appeal is filed by submitting a written notice of appeal to the County Zoning Inspector, together with an appeal fee in accordance with the adopted fee schedule. If the appeal is filed by the County Zoning Inspector, no fee is required. The notice of appeal shall include the following:

1. An identification of the decision being appealed;
2. A complete statement of all reasons why the appellant believes that the decision, or any part of the decision, was erroneous, arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion; and
3. Written presentation of additional testimony and evidence, a full explanation of the additional testimony and evidence that will be submitted, with an explanation of why this was not presented to the Planning Commission.

C. Upon receipt of an appeal, the County Zoning Inspector or designee shall compile the record of the proceeding and submit this to the Board of Supervisors with the appeal documents.

VIEW FROM HOGAN'S HACIENDA
& HOT TUB. VIEW FROM WEST FACING
WINDOWS.



ARTIST
RENDITION
OF
PROPERTY
IF
IMPROVED



CURRENT
VIEW