

**New Castle, Colorado
Planning and Zoning Commission
Wednesday, January 22, 2025, 7:00 PM**

Call to Order

Commission Chair Apostolik called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Present	Chair Apostolik
	Commissioner Cotey
	Commissioner McDonald
	Commissioner Graham Riddile
	Commissioner Alternate Parks
Absent	Commissioner Martinez
	Commissioner Westerlind
	Commissioner Sass
	Commission Alternate Rittner

Also present at the meeting was Town Administrator David Reynolds, Town Planner Paul Smith, Assistant Town Attorney Haley Carmer, Deputy Town Clerk Remi Bordelon, and members of the public.

Meeting Notice

Deputy Town Clerk Bordelon verified that her office gave notice of the meeting in accordance with Resolution TC 2025-1.

Conflicts of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest.

Citizen Comments on Items NOT on the Agenda

There were no citizen comments.

Public Hearing

Consider Resolution PZ 2025-1, A Resolution of the New Castle Planning and Zoning Commission approving a conditional use permit.

Chair Apostolik opened the public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

Town Planner Paul Smith reviewed the staff report for commission consideration of a self-storage condition use permit (Exhibit A). He introduced Grady Hazelton and Suzanne Hazelton, the applicants, who were seeking approval for outdoor storage of RVs, watercraft trailers, operable vehicles, and other items in the industrial area on the south side of the Colorado River, next to Truss Fab. Planner Smith explained it was the commission that would determine if the proposed use would be considered eligible and recommended to Council for consideration. He shared an example from a year prior of a similar inquiry from a nearby landowner in the industrial zone with the same interest in exploring storage options. Planner Smith remarked that their inquiry was discussed and staff's interpretation was their use would be considered 'auto-storage' which was

Planning & Zoning Commission
Wednesday, January 22, 2025

not permitted. He added that the landowner had the option to go through the land use permitting process to determine eligibility with the Planning and Zoning Commission, which that particular landowner did not elect to do, but was what Mr. Hazelton was doing with his proposal. He reminded the commission that they would be determining Mr. Hazelton's eligibility of his proposed use.

Mr. Hazelton introduced himself as a long-time resident of New Castle, having lived in the area for the majority of his life. He and his wife, Suzanne, raised their two kids in New Castle, and he was familiar with the community's needs. Mr. Hazelton shared that he had operated a few businesses in New Castle in the past, and continued to run a restaurant in the area, which he had owned for over 20 years. He was looking to embark on a new venture that he believed was much needed for the town. The proposed storage facility was intended to address the community's requirement for additional storage space, particularly given the local demand for a place to keep recreational vehicles, toy haulers, boats, and other similar items. Mr. Hazelton emphasized that the proposal would not serve as a construction yard but would rather focus on recreational items, like those stored at similar facilities, which had waiting lists due to high demand. He expressed hope for a positive reception by the commission and council, looking to provide a valuable service to the town.

Planner Smith provided background information on the proposal, noting that recent parking prohibitions in town had increased the need for vehicle storage. He explained that since the town introduced new parking restrictions on the streets due to COVID, the availability of parking, especially in the right of way, became more limited, heightening the demand for additional storage solutions. The proposal included up to 70 spaces in a fenced area with plans for a security gate to manage access and ensure safety. Paul described the industrial area zoning code, which categorized uses into permitted, non-permitted, and conditional categories. The proposed storage for recreational vehicles, watercraft, and other operable vehicles didn't clearly fall under the typical definitions in the town's code, leading to its classification under conditional uses. This meant the proposal required approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission, where they would assess compatibility with adjacent land uses, consistency with the comprehensive plan, and capacity to serve the proposed use. The commission also had to consider whether this type of storage should be viewed as a permitted use, similar to self-storage, or remain as a conditional use, given its implications for local property use and community aesthetics.

Planner Smith outlined the criteria for conditional use permits, which included factors such as eligibility, compatibility with adjacent land uses, consistency with the comprehensive plan, and capacity to serve the proposed use. He elaborated that the proposed storage facility needed to be assessed against these criteria to determine if it qualified as a conditional use, especially given its location in the industrial zone. Particular attention was given to whether the storage facility would harmonize with neighboring land uses without causing significant disruptions. Planner Smith further explained the zoning code, which separates land uses into permitted, non-permitted, and conditional categories. The challenge with Mr. Hazelton's proposal stemmed from the fact that the town's zoning code did not clearly define the terms 'self-storage' and 'automobile storage', leading to some ambiguity about how the proposed outdoor storage of RVs, trailers, and similar items should be classified. This posed a dilemma

for the Planning and Zoning Commission, as they had to decide whether the operation leaned more toward the concept of a self-storage facility as a permitted use, or resembled an auto storage yard, which was not allowed.

Commissioner Cotey asked for clarification on the permitted use by right definition for 'self-storage' where a site plan review would not be conducted. Attorney Carmer clarified that there wasn't an administrative review process for permitted uses. She added that, if deemed/defined by the commission, the 'self-storage' use would need a business license with the town but no further review would be conducted by the commission. Administrative Reynolds added that if deemed a conditional use, then review would be conducted by the commission. Mr. Hazelton expressed his content with labeling the use as conditional and going through the review process with Planning and Zoning.

The other question the commission discussed was the difference between 'self-storage facility' versus 'self-storage' in regard to the permitting process. The commission discussed the nuances of these definitions and the potential implications of the conditional use permit. They challenged whether Mr. Hazelton's planned facility could be classified akin to self-storage—thereby potentially bypassing the need for a conditional use permit—or if it required such a permit due to its possible classification as an outdoor or auto storage yard. Planner Smith emphasized the need for clarity to help guide the commission's recommendation to the council, stressing that their interpretation would set a precedent for future applications in similar zoning contexts. Planner Smith said they did not find any inconsistency with adjacent land uses.

Alternate Commissioner Parks identified that the 'self-storage' definition aligns with what Mr. Hazelton would require from storage customers: all vehicles would require proof of ownership, insurance and be operable. Commissioner Cotey questioned why the intended use would not be classified as auto-storage. Administrator Reynolds clarified that the storage of multiple types of mobilized vehicular and non-mobilized recreational vehicles clouded the definition for auto-storage and would be at the commission's discretion to categorize the use. Attorney Carmer added that auto-storage was more thought of the property owner owning and servicing the stored vehicles in the yard versus renting a space for outdoor vehicle storage.

The commission discussed the differences between self-storage facilities, auto storage yards, and outdoor storage. They considered examples from other areas in town and challenged whether the proposed use should be classified as a permitted use (self-storage facility) or a conditional use. Mr. Hazelton clarified that he was seeking approval for the storage of recreational vehicles, toy haulers, boats, and similar items, rather than construction equipment or daily-use vehicles. He emphasized the need for storage in the community, noting waiting lists at similar facilities in nearby areas.

Commissioner Riddle stated he felt the use should be categorized as a conditional use. Commissioner McDonald said a conditional use permit would provide the town with the opportunity to oversee the proposed use. Commissioner Cotey agreed with the need for a conditional use permit for the purpose of overseeing the proposal. She added that incorporating administrative reviews for certain permits, instead of a commission review, might be good to consider for future proposals to save time for the applicant.

Chair Apostolik closed the public hearing at 7:44 p.m.

The commission discussed various aspects of the proposal, including:

- Screening requirements: the commission discussed the necessity and extent of screening for the property, considering existing vegetation, fencing, and potential fabric screening. Mr. Hazelton noted he was not against screening but was hesitant on its effectiveness as the road and visual vantage point was higher than a screen would conceal. The commission agreed to modify the resolution to include specific screening requirements for the front and back of the property, with a review by staff after one year to determine if additional screening was necessary on the sides.
- Hours of operation: Mr. Hazelton proposed access hours from 6 AM to 10 PM for security reasons.
- Environmental concerns: the commission discussed potential measures to prevent spills or contamination, such as adding a small berm along the riverside. Mr. Hazelton said there would be a lease agreement that included a statement not allowing draining aside from fresh water.
- Site layout: Mr. Hazelton explained his plans for designated spots and angled parking to facilitate easy access and maneuverability.
- Security measures: Mr. Hazelton discussed plans for cameras and hands-on management to ensure security.
- Utilities: The presence of existing electrical service was noted, with potential future expansion to offer electrical hookups for stored vehicles.

Commissioner Cotey suggested clarifying the definitions for 'auto-storage' and 'self-storage' for future reference. Planner Smith said he would bring that request to Council. He added that Condition C needed to be stricken from the resolution as it was added by mistake.

MOTION: Commissioner McDonald made a motion to approve Resolution PZ 2025-1, A Resolution of the New Castle Planning and Zoning Commission approving a conditional use permit with the elimination of Condition C and amendment of Condition D regarding screening. Chair Apostolik seconded the motion, and it passed with a voice vote: Chair Apostolik: Yes; Commissioner Cotey: Yes; Commissioner McDonald: Yes; Commissioner Riddile: Yes; Alternate Commissioner Parks: Yes.

Staff Reports

Deputy Clerk Bordelon made an announcement regarding the difficulty in capturing accurate minutes due to overlapping conversations during meetings. She reminded the commission of the importance of speaking clearly and avoiding side conversations to ensure accurate transcription of the meetings.

Commission Comments and Reports

Commissioner Cotey asked about the process to replace a porta potty shelter at Alder Park. Administrator Reynolds explained that the shelter vandalism eventually resulted in the shelter burning down. He added that replacing a vandalized feature immediately often times results in it happening again. He said replacement of the porta potty

shelter was not on the top of the list for town projects. Commissioner Cotey requested it be considered for replacement sooner rather than later.

Review Minutes from Previous Meeting

MOTION: Chair Apostolik made a motion to approve the November 13, 2024 meeting minutes. Commissioner McDonald seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

MOTION: Chair Apostolik made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Riddile seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Chuck Apostolik, Commission Chair



Remi Bordelon, Deputy Town Clerk



Exhibits

Exhibit A – Staff Report for Resolution PZ2025-1.



Town of New Castle
450 W. Main Street
PO Box 90
New Castle, CO 81647

**Building & Planning
Department**
Phone: (970) 984-2311
Fax: (970) 984-2716
www.newcastlecolorado.org

Planning Commission – Public Hearing
Wednesday, January 22nd, 2025
Resolution PZ 2025-1
Staff Report

Name of Applicant	Grady & Suzanne Hazelton a.k.a Western Slope Investments
Mailing Address	PO Box 586, New Castle, CO 81647
Property Address	6255 CR 335, New Castle, CO 81647
Name of Property Owner	M&C Fattor, LLC
Existing Zoning	Industrial (part of Riverside Industrial Park)
Surrounding Zoning	Industrial, Open Space
Surrounding Land Uses	Open Space (Breslin Park), Propane Storage, Construction Storage, Warehouse
Recent Uses of Property	Truck Storage, Currently Vacant
Proposed Use of Property	Outdoor RV, watercraft, trailer, and other motor vehicle storage
Property Size	1.0 acre

I. Background:

The Applicant proposes the use of outdoor RV, watercraft, trailer, and other operable vehicle storage (hereafter “vehicle storage”) for the property located at 6255 CR335 in the Riverside Industrial Park. The Applicant maintains that additional vehicle storage is a much needed resource for the community (**Exhibit A, pg. 3**) and that an established facility will help balance out the townwide parking prohibition for RVs, trailers, and trucks in the public ROW (see Chapter 12.12). The proposal contemplates up to 70 spaces in a gated fence enclosure. Covenants will exclude inoperable vehicles and vehicle repairs. Furthermore, the Town’s performance standards will help control for nuisance concerns.

Prior to submittal, the Applicant and Staff discussed the proposal’s zoning status in terms of permitted (“self-storage facility”) or nonpermitted (“auto storage yard”) uses as listed in Sections

17.52.010-030 (**Exhibit A, pages 28-31**). Presumably, a self-storage facility could imply outdoor vehicle storage and therefore be permitted (See section 17.52.030). Conversely, the storage of autos in an outdoor yard (“auto storage yard”) is allegedly prohibited (See section 17.52.040). On October 15th, 2024, Staff presented the matter to the Board of Adjustments (“BofA”) pursuant to section 17.12.020 (C). This section authorizes the BofA to “decide the proper application of unlisted uses to a use group” within a



certain number of zone districts. So, if the BofA finds that a proposed use is similar enough in function and impact to a listed use (permitted or otherwise), then the status (i.e. permitted/unpermitted) of the listed use may be imputed to the proposed use. In the end, the BofA recommended that the question of outdoor storage of boats, campers, RVs, trailers, etc. be considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission (“P&Z”) since eligibility for CUP review is one of the criteria for CUP approval. Members of the BofA did note that oversight of this type of business would be important.

As a conditional use application, P&Z is required to hold a public hearing in accordance with the procedures set forth in Municipal Code Chapter 16.08. The hearing was officially noticed, **Exhibit A, pg. 35**. Within 30 days of the public hearing, P&Z must recommend to Council unconditional approval, conditional approval, or denial of the application.

CUP Approval Criteria: An approved application shall:

- 1.) be eligible for conditional review under § 17.84.040;
- 2.) be generally compatible with adjacent land uses;
- 3.) meet all requirements of § 17.84.020 of the Code, be in compliance with Title 17 of the Code, and minimize potential adverse impact of the conditional use on adjacent properties and traffic flow;
- 4.) be consistent with the comprehensive plan; and
- 5.) show that the Town has the capacity to serve the proposed use with fire and police protection and is not required to provide water or sewer service.

II. Staff Review and Comment:

1.) Is the application eligible for conditional review under 17.84.040?

The foremost question from October 15th, 2024 was whether the outdoor storage of boats, campers, RVs, trailers, etc. qualified as a permitted or a nonpermitted use. The code defines neither a “self-storage facility” nor an “auto storage yard” in its list of definitions. Sometimes analyzing the meaning of a term across the field of uses within the code itself can be fruitful. However, a comparative analysis of similar uses in other zones only yielded further ambiguity, especially when accounting for other uses such as “outdoor storage”. For instance:

- C-1 (i.e. the downtown zone) prohibits both self-storage and auto storage yards, but allows outdoor storage in the rear of lots.
- C/G (i.e. Pepsi building) allows self-storage, prohibits auto storage yards. Does not comment on outdoor storage.
- C/T (west end of downtown) allows outdoor storage with a CUP only. Does not comment on self-storage or auto storage yards.
- P (west end of town) allows outdoor storage with a CUP only. Does not comment on self-storage or auto storage yards. Columbine Storage was granted a CUP for self-storage.
- H/B (Coal Seam Hotel proposal) allows for outdoor storage and parking lots by means of CUP. Does not comment on self-storage or auto storage yards.

Among these uses there may be some relevance in how things are stored (i.e. inside/outside) or what is being stored (i.e. operable vehicles, construction materials). This prompted the question of whether use labels of the past were applied uniformly between zones. Staff was ultimately unconvinced that zone district regulations, definitions, or concepts elsewhere in the Code could fully elucidate the meaning of the use in question.

Staff, then, concentrated their efforts on common usage and meaning of these concepts in the world beyond the Town code. For **self-storage**, the Wikipedia definition seemed as good a start as any:

***Self-Storage** is an industry that rents storage space (such as rooms, lockers, containers, and/or outdoor space), also known as "storage units," to tenants, usually on a short-term basis (often month-to-month). Self-storage tenants include businesses and individuals." (1/10/25)*

At face value, this definition endorses the proposed use as a use by right. The images below demonstrate two local self-storage facilities, each with indoor/outdoor or mini-storage and vehicle storage. It is reasonable that both are deemed self-storage.



Canyon Creek Self Storage



Silt Self Storage

Interpreting “self-storage facility” to include both indoor and outdoor storage is also supported to some extent by Section 17.52.060(A), which states that “storage of materials shall be enclosed by a fence at least six feet in height.” This provision suggests outdoor storage may be contemplated as part of “self-storage” because, if storage could only occur in a building, there would be no need for a 6-foot fence. However, “Outdoor storage” is a separate and distinct use in other zone districts, which would suggest outdoor storage is its own type of use that is not subsumed under the general “self-storage facility” use.

Regarding an **auto storage yard**, the Code similarly provides limited guidance. One element that may distinguish “self-storage facility” (including vehicle storage) from an “auto storage yard” is that, generally speaking, self-storage facilities are used by their patrons for **private, non-commercial use**. This is consistent with the UHaul company’s explanation and nuance regarding vehicle storage:

“U-Haul has the extra space you need. Vehicle storage solves issues with neighborhood parking ordinance and parking space limitations with the added security benefit of keeping your vehicle at a secure self-storage facility.”

U-Haul locations have vehicle storage spaces that are up to 45 feet in length to accommodate any sized RV, boat or car. These spaces include enclosed, covered and uncovered storage spaces. U-Haul has the right vehicle storage for you, whether you have an RV, boat, car, pickup truck, ATV, project car, motorcycle or other vehicle.”
(<https://www.uhaul.com/Storage/Vehicle-Storage/>).

In other words, “vehicle storage” in a self-storage facility is merely a location to store automobiles or vehicles while their private owners are not using them. A distinction can also be made between auto vs. vehicle storage. Automobiles are self-propelled and include cars, trucks, RVs, UTVs etc. Vehicles would include these and trailers. The Applicant’s use aligns best with vehicle storage.

In contrast, an “auto storage yard” may be understood as limited to a single business or **commercial enterprise** by the storage yard owner. This is consistent with the nature of other prohibited uses in the Industrial zone such as an auto wrecking and salvage yard and truck repair and storage yard. Rendered in this way it’s conceivable that “auto storage yard” intends storage of inoperable automobiles, storage following repair, or perhaps a rental car lot. The Applicant’s proposal would only allow storage of operable vehicles by numerous, private “tenants,” which is more like self-storage and less like an auto storage yard.

Taking all these things into consideration, Staff sees three options:

1. A self-storage facility could be rendered a general category of use allowing for indoor and outdoor storage of various items, including storage of private, operable vehicles. If P&Z were inclined to understand the situation in this manner the Applicant’s use would be a permitted use and not require a conditional use permit.
2. If P&Z feels that the proposed use is coextensive with an auto storage yard, the Applicant’s proposed use is prohibited and ineligible for a CUP.
3. If P&Z determines that outdoor storage, including storage of operable vehicles, is its own unique use that does not fall within the “self-storage facility” or “auto storage yard” uses, it is deemed a conditional use and therefore eligible for conditional review under 17.84.040.

2.) Is the proposal generally compatible with adjacent land uses?

Adjacent land uses include:

- Natural gas storage and distribution (National Propane);
- Stoneryard (CK Stone);
- Truss manufacturing (Trussfab);
- Warehouse and freight company (NAP);
- Distribution Warehouse (Intermountain);
- Self-storage;
- Cabinet Manufacturing (V&R);
- Public Open Space (Breslin Park);

The Industrial District allows for a diverse mix of industrial/commercial uses (**Exhibit A, pg. 29**). With compliance to the performance standards, a vehicle storage facility seems consistent with the aforementioned uses. Though the Industrial district currently lacks a vehicle storage yard, numerous vehicles of various sizes and types are parked – often semi-permanently – throughout the district. Hence, once established, it would likely be a challenge to differentiate a vehicle storage yard from, say, a freight warehouse or V&R Cabinetry’s parking lot. However, it bares remembering

that the consistency of vehicle storage with adjacent uses does not nullify eligibility requirements discussed in section one above.

The Applicant is also subject to screening requirements per section 17.52.060(D). Screening improves curb appeal and security. The code requires vegetative screening (i.e. trees and shrubs). The Applicant prefers to screen with fabric fence screening (**Exhibit A, pg. 3 & pg. 29**), since potable water is unavailable.

3.) Does the proposal meet all requirements of § 17.84.020 of the Code, is in compliance with Title 17 of the Code, and minimizes potential adverse impact of the conditional use on adjacent properties and traffic flow?

The requirements of section 17.84.020 are addressed in the table below:

a. Adjacent land uses;	• Discussed in section 2.
b. Boundary and size of lot;	• 43,560sf; 20,000sf minimum per zoning
c. Building location height and setbacks	• N/A; No building contemplated
d. Off-street parking and loading areas	• N/A; All loading of vehicles will occur onsite
e. Points of ingress & egress	• Same entry and exit at SE corner of lot and CR335
f. Service and refuse areas	• Service and refuse will be offsite per covenants
g. Signs and lighting	• All signage to be permitted. Lights to be dark-sky.
h. Fencing, landscaping, and screening	• Applicant elects fabric screening. Vegetation required.
i. Compliance with performance standards	• Applicant agrees to enforce performance standards.
j. Anticipated utility requirements	• No utilities required.

Other than the required screening, Staff does not have further concerns with compliance to section 17.84.020 or Title 17.

4) Is the proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan?

With close proximity to the Colorado River (~170ft) and a Town pedestrian trail (30-40ft), preservation of the natural environment is a priority (**Goals EN-2, EN-6**). The Applicant's lease commits them to hazardous free operations. The Applicant allows only operable vehicles, the assumption being that leaks or spills from operable vehicles would be minimal. Staff recommends that the Applicant demonstrate enforcement policies in a draft lease so that P&Z can be confident management is sufficient.

The west end of the property (along the Colorado River) does appear to have ample native vegetation to screen operations from public view. P&Z will need to assess whether fabric fence

screening is an adequate substitute to vegetative screening along the property line. Screening requirements are described below (section 17.52.060D):

All property lines adjacent to the New Castle public parks are to be screened with trees and shrubs approved by the New Castle parks and recreation committee, and shall be in compliance with the tree city requirements as specified in Chapter 12.20. All property which is not adjacent to the New Castle public parks shall be screened with trees and shrubs on at least twenty-five (25) percent of their private property lines in compliance with Chapter 12.20, and with the approval of the New Castle parks and recreation committee. Review of screening by the parks and recreation committee shall be completed prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Lastly, Staff considered the anticipated vehicle density (up to 70 vehicles). With the protection of viewsheds in mind, it is vital that each lot be maintained without significant clutter or congestion. 6255 CR 335 is a one acre lot without structures. By comparison, Canyon Creek Storage (pictured above) is 3.43 acres. The picture shows 72 vehicles plus drive lanes and open space. Though not all 3.42 acres are usable, Staff had a concern whether the one acre proposal here would accommodate a comparable number of vehicles.

5) Does the proposal show that the Town has the capacity to serve the proposed use with fire and police protection and is not required to provide water or sewer service.

The site plan was reviewed and discussed with the fire marshal. Though the Town does not supply water service, need for fire flow was deemed unnecessary. The Police Department recommends a surveillance system to discourage trespassing and make the identification of potential violators easier. Public Works does not anticipate any change to water and sewer service.

III. Staff Recommendations:

Provided that P&Z agrees that the proposed use is conditional use, staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions to Resolution 2025-1:

1. Prior to Council, the Applicant shall provide proposed management policies demonstrating consistency with and enforcement of Town performance standards.
2. Applicant shall provide a security plan for the property for review and approval by Council. To the extent security cameras are part of the plan, the number and location of the security cameras shall be reviewed by the Town of New Castle Police Chief.
3. Perimeter fencing shall be screened with fabric or otherwise comply with Section 17.52.060(D).
4. Applicant shall provide hours of operation for review and approval by Council.

5. No auxiliary equipment, materials, or supplies shall be stored onsite.
6. Applicant shall provide a trash management plan for review and approval by Council.
7. The use approved in the application shall not be conducted until the Town Planner has issued a conditional use certificate. That certificate shall be issued only after the Applicant has entered into an agreement with the Town specifying that all conditions imposed by the Town Planning Commission will be completed and that the use and improvements will be in accordance with the approved application site plan and development schedule. The conditional use certificate must be issued within one year of the date of final approval by Town Council, or the application is deemed withdrawn by the Applicant and is of no further force and effect.
8. No approved conditional use may be altered or expanded in ground area unless the site plan is amended and approved in accordance with the procedures applicable to approval of a conditional use as set out in § 17.84.070 of the Code.
9. In the event the Town receives any complaints about the use of the site or observes or becomes aware of any violations of the conditional use approval, the Applicant and/or owner may be summoned before the Town Council in a public meeting to show cause why the permit should not be revoked, suspended, or additional conditions imposed. Such show-cause hearing shall be open to the public and the applicant or owner may present testimony or offer other evidence on its behalf.
10. Insofar as necessary, Applicant shall comply with all applicable building and municipal code requirements, including all signage permitting, and county licensing requirements.
11. Any added exterior lighting will be dark sky compliant pursuant to the Comprehensive Plan Goal EN-4.
12. All representations of the Applicant in written and verbal presentations submitted to the Town or made at public hearings before the planning commission or Town Council shall be considered part of the application and binding on the Applicant.
13. The Applicant shall reimburse the Town for any and all expenses incurred by the Town regarding this approval, including without limitation all costs incurred by the Town's outside consultants such as legal and engineering costs.
14. Development of the Property shall be consistent with the site plan shown in **Exhibit. A, pages 7-8**, as approved by the Town Council.

IV. Application Exhibits:

A. Applicant Submittal