Tentative Agenda for the Planning Board Regular Session Meeting to be held virtually by video conference on Tuesday, November 17, 2020 at 10:00 AM. To be broadcast live on KHBX FM 99.3 Radio and available via Livestream at www.hobbsnm.org.

AGENDA

1) Call To Order.
2) Review and Consider Approval of Agenda.
3) Review and Consider Approval of Minutes.
   October 20, 2020 – Regular Meeting

4) Communications from Citizens.

   Due to the current COVID-19 State of Emergency and the orders of the New Mexico Department of Health, public comment should be submitted in writing via email to the City of Hobbs Planning Department at krobinson@hobbsnm.org or via fax at (575)-397-9227 no later than 9:30 a.m. on November 17, 2020.

5) Review and Consider Front Yard Setback Variance as submitted by property owner for property located at 116 E. Sunset.

6) Review and Consider Final Plat Approval for Sweet Home Alabama Subdivision Unit 2, as submitted by property owner, Berry & Gomez, LLC.

7) Adjournment.

The City will make every effort to provide reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities who wish to attend a public meeting. Please notify the City at least 24 hours before the meeting. Telephone 397-9351.

“Notice is hereby given that a quorum of the Hobbs City Commission may be in attendance at this meeting.”
The Planning Board Regular Session Meeting was held virtually by video conference on Tuesday, October 20, 2020 at 10:00 AM. It was broadcasted live on KHBX FM 99.3 Radio and available via Livestream at www.hobbsnm.org. Mr. W.M. “Tres” Hicks Chairman presiding.

Members Present:  

Tres Hicks, Chairman  
Guy Kesner, Vice Chairman  
Bill Ramirez  
Larry Sanderson  
Brett Drennan

Members Absent:  

Ben Donahue  
Philip Ingram

Also present were members of the public and City staff as follows:  

Kevin Robinson, Development Director  
Todd Randall, City Engineer  
Julie Nymeyer, Staff Secretary  
Erik Scramlin, Deputy City Attorney

1) Call To Order.

Mr. Tres Hicks, Chairman called the meeting to order at 10:03 am. He did a roll call for members as follows: Mr. Brett-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes. There were five members present at the meeting and two absent.

2) Review and Consider Approval of Agenda.

The first item of business was to review and approve the Agenda for the October 20, 2020 meeting. Mr. Hicks asked if there were any changes to the agenda? Mr. Robinson said there were no changes. Mr. Kesner made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ramirez to approve the Agenda as presented. Mr. Hicks did a roll call for members as follows: Mr. Brett-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

3) Review and Consider Approval of Minutes.

September 15, 2020 – Regular Meeting
Mr. Hicks asked if everyone has had a chance to read the Regular Meeting Minutes from September 15, 2020? Mr. Sanderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ramirez to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes as presented. Mr. Hicks did a roll call for the vote, Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, and Mr. Drennan-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the vote on the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

4) Communications from Citizens.

Due to the current COVID-19 State of Emergency and the orders of the New Mexico Department of Health, public comment should be submitted in writing via email to the City of Hobbs Planning Department at krobinson@hobbsnm.org or via fax at (575-397-9227 no later than 9:30 a.m. on October 20, 2020.

There were no communications from citizens.

5) Public Hearing to Review and Consider a Special Use Map Amendment to create a Recreational Vehicle Park (RVP) Planning District per MC 18.04, located Northwest of the intersection of Navajo and Dal Paso at 500 E. Navajo.

Mr. Robinson said this is a Special Use Map Amendment to create a RV Planning District. He said this is the first stage of this process. He said the Board will consider if this is a good place for an RV Park.

Mr. Hicks opened the public meeting at 10:10 am. Mr. Robinson said there were comments from the people who own lots 17 and 18 said they are not opposed to the Map amendment but they desire that it is built to design standards and the neighborhood. Mr. Hicks asked who owned the business at lot #18? Mr. Robinson said Sears.

Mr. Aranda said they are only going to have 2 RV spaces for family when they come to stay in town. He said that they want to do this the right way and follow all the rules the City asks them to follow. Mr. Hicks asked what the buildings were on the property. Mr. Aranda said the sheds were the prior owners Auto Glass Brothers and one was where they had their office. He said the two others have been removed and the house is his parent's home.

Mr. Drennan asked about the entrances and exits would be. Mr. Robinson said that will all be discussed during the design phase. He said the municipality will be concerned about how many units will be on the site and about entrances and exits along with the width of the road. Mr. Hicks closed the public meeting at 10:18 am.
Mr. Sanderson said he did not see a problem with this. Mr. Ramirez made a motion, seconded by Mr. Sanderson to approve the Special Use Map permit. Mr. Hicks did a roll call for the vote, Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, and Mr. Drennan-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the vote on the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

6) Review and Consider Final Plat Approval for Zia Crossing Unit 7, as submitted by property owner, Black Gold Estates, LLC.

Mr. Robinson said the city does have an Engineer of Record certification and everything has not been 100% complete but will be prior to going to Commission on November 2nd. He said this will contain 99 single family lots. He said the Engineer of Record will issue a letter of compliance. Mr. Ramirez asked if all the utilities were good. Mr. Robinson said there are a few minor items but they will be completed prior to Final Plat approval. Mr. Kesner asked about setback issues on corner lots and if this will be addressed? Mr. Robinson said the lots become wider the further south it goes but there could be a few lots that may need variances.

Mr. Kesner made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ramirez to approve the Final Plat. Mr. Hicks did a roll call for the vote, Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, and Mr. Drennan-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the vote on the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

7) Review and Consider Final Plat Approval for Kass Glorietta, as submitted by property owner, Property Management Plus, LLC.
Mr. Robinson said this is a Final Plat Approval for Kass Glorietta. He said the lots being created are all adjacent to an existing infrastructure. He said that is the reason why there is not an Engineer of Record. He said there are no infrastructures being installed for this subdivision. He said there will be joint use driveway accesses. He said this is a minor collector.

Mr. Kesner asked with 45 foot width lots are they plan on putting in mobile homes? Mr. Robinson said they have not talked to the developer about what type of units they will put in there but they have been doing slab on grade construction. Mr. Kesner asked about the east side of lot 1 and if that was Jefferson Street? Mr. Robinson said Jefferson Street is on the east side of tract 2. He said if the developer of tract 2 subdivides or develops they would have to pay their fair share or develop Jefferson. He said tract 2 was divided where it had no access to developed property originally. He said the initial summary subdivision improved the situation. He said developing tract 2 will have difficulties developing.

Mr. Kesner asked about lot 1 and if they would have access to the easement? Mr. Robinson said yes. He said tract 2 granted a 35 foot driveway easement that will be improved. Mr. Kesner asked about when Jefferson extends shouldn’t they ask tract 2 for the easement at this time. He said he didn’t think it was fair to ask tract 2 to grant all the easement. Mr. Robinson said he agreed but when this was developed originally they did not ask them to grant the easement. He said development agreements are to help rectify developmental mistakes that occured years ago.

Mr. Hicks said that the owner of tract 2 is not party to this other than the 35 foot easement. Mr. Robinson said the development of Jefferson Street is not required of tract 2. He said it would offset Jefferson if they gave Right of Way. He said in the future if you want to develop your site further then you pay your assessment when you access or develop. Mr. Hicks asked if there would be a motion for approval as long as the driveway is shared on lot 1 and 2. Mr. Kesner made a motion, seconded by Mr. Sanderson to approve the final plat. Mr. Hicks did a roll call for the vote, Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, and Mr. Drennan-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the vote on the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

8) Review and Consider Side Yard Setback Variance as submitted by property owner for property located at 2822 N. Carino.
Mr. Robinson said the MTP requires 10 foot from the property line. He said the plan does show 10 foot but it should be 19.6 foot from back of curb which is 8.6 feet from property line. He said the developer could place a fence along the property line. He said every residential property must have 2 parking spaces on their site. Mr. Hicks said it is only a foot and half variance? Mr. Robinson said yes. He said there will need to be offsite parking in another area.

Mr. Sanderson asked if the garage was built? Mr. Robinson said yes Mr. Hicks said they can allow the variance with the condition to place the parking in another spot so both requirements are met. Mr. Caballero said the garage is built and they have dedicated parking that is 35 feet wide. He said they just need the 1.5 foot variance. He said it was their error because the concrete guys measured it with another house. Mr. Drennan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ramirez for the 20 foot setback for the garage. Mr. Hicks did a roll call for the vote, Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, and Mr. Drennan-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the vote on the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

9) Review and Consider side yard setback and parking variance request for 101 E. Marland as submitted by Cardinal Laboratories, property owner.

Mr. Robinson said this a variance request for 2 variances. He said the first variance will be for the setback and the second will be the parking. Mr. Kesner asked what the setback was at this location? Mr. Hicks said the building is built on the property line and their layout provides 20 parking spaces instead of 24. Mr. Kesner said he didn't see any issues. Mr. Kesner made a motion, seconded by Mr. Sanderson to approve the 2 variances. Mr. Hicks did a roll call for the vote, Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, and Mr. Drennan-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the vote on the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

10) Second review Sketch Plan Liberty Hill 1 & 2 (primarily discuss Jefferson ROW)

Mr. Robinson said this is a Sketch Plan primarily to discuss Jefferson Street Right of Way. He said the developer would be responsible for building Jefferson out to the north. He said it is required to project Jefferson. He said Jefferson south is an 80 foot right-of-way. He said the developer is requesting to do a 60 foot right of way with back to back of curb 41 feet but in a 60 foot right of way which would be a residential collector.

Mr. Robinson said access off of that street would need to have limitations but it still could move the amount of traffic that a collector roadway would need. Mr. Ross said headed south is not centered on an 80 foot right of way and would require a center road on an 80 foot right of way would require a 10 foot jog in the street. Mr. Robinson said they could get a roadway that would convey traffic on a 60 foot right of way. Mr. Ross said their Master Plan will be in compliance and there will not be access to Jefferson. Mr. Kesner said he thought it made sense. Mr. Sanderson said he was good as long as there was no residential access. Mr. Kesner asked if the City Commission would see this too? Mr. Robinson said there will be a variance on the 80 foot right of way so the Commission would see the Final Plat.
Mr. Sanderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Drennan to approve Liberty Hill Sketch Plan. Mr. Hicks said let the minutes reflect that The Board has consensus that the 60 foot right of way without residential access would work. Mr. Robinson said we will not be able to correct the errors of the past but from this point on there will be no access from Jefferson.

11) Second review Sketch Plan Ranchview Masterplan (primarily discuss Ranchland Alignment)

Mr. Robinson said this is a Sketch Plan Masterplan. He said a summary subdivision was produced and required the encumbrance of the right of way where Ranchland would go in. He said additionally the developer is discussing other alternatives and desiring to relocate Ranchland. He said staff has issues with this. He said Ranchland is a section line roadway and the further away it gets from the section line it causes an issue with the undeveloped area to the north. He said the issue is Navajo is not a true east/west street.

Mr. Caballero said they are proposing a larger S curve. He said they would like to move the road over to the east. He said they have created a racetrack with a straight road and their needs have changed. Mr. Robinson said the developer has the right to put the roads where they will need them but their concern is the connection with a Major Collector. Mr. Hicks said he did not think the 600 feet made that much difference. He thinks it is premature to say what is going to happen north of Navajo. Mr. Robinson said it is a Planning Board and they did need to Plan for the future. Mr. Hicks asked if they could minimize the 600 feet? Mr. Caballero said they actually wanted a little more. Mr. Ross said that they would lose a lot of lots if they brought the road straight out to Navajo. Mr. Hicks said this is done all the time in other cities. He said if it improves the safety of the road or accommodates the developer then he is for it. Mr. Kesner said he would not be in favor of moving it too far east. He said they are getting too far away from the centerline.

Mr. Robinson said they need to vacate the public easement that has already been granted and relocated Ranchland in a different area. He said if the developer had an additional plat and relocated it to where he wanted it to go that would be an assurance for the preliminary plat. Mr. Sanderson said he said a curve in the design doesn't bother him at all. Mr. Hicks asked if this was something they could have to do today? Mr. Caballero said his goal is to do Ranchland as soon as they can now. Mr. Sanderson made a consensus motion, seconded by Mr. Drennan to approve the Sketch Plan. Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, and Mr. Drennan-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the vote on the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

Mr. Caballero said it looked like something they could easily work with.

12) Discussion Items:
A. Illegal construction of a carport at 2704 N. Breckon.

Mr. Robinson said is discussion only. He said the property owner at 2704 N. Breckon was built without a permit. He said when staff discovered it was built we contacted the property owner and told them they needed a permit. He said they then applied for a variance and a denial letter was sent to the property owner because they did not comply because setbacks had been violated within their block lengths. He said they were told they could appeal. He said they were told if they did not appeal then staff would begin the process to remove the unpermitted structure. Mr. Robinson said it should be that 2 foot of this structure is in the public ROW. Mr. Hicks said there has been no appeal so when will staff move forward to removing it? Mr. Robinson said they will start proceedings soon.

13) Adjournment.

With nothing further to discuss, Mr. Drennan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Kesner to adjourn the meeting at 12:07 pm. Mr. Kesner-yes, Mr. Ramirez-yes, Mr. Sanderson-yes, and Mr. Drennan-yes, Mr. Hicks-yes and the vote on the motion was 5-0 and the motion carried as presented.

________________________

Tres Hicks, Chairman
5) Review and Consider Front Yard Setback Variance as submitted by property owner for property located at 116 E. Sunset.
Subject: Front Yard Setback Variance (Major Thoroughfare Plan) for 116 E. Sunset
Date: November 13, 2020

The City of Hobbs Major Thoroughfare Plan requires a minimum of 21’ setback from the property line at 116 E. Sunset. However, the Proposed Structure would be located in violation of the adopted setback requirement.

You are requesting the placement of a carport in violation of the front yard setback requirements of the City of Hobbs Major Thoroughfare Plan. The front yard setback requirements as dictated by the Hobbs Major Thoroughfare Plan have not been violated within your block, i.e.; Fowler east to McKinley. Therefore, the front yard setback variance request for 116 E. Sunset cannot be approved. If you have any questions regarding this issue please do not hesitate to call me at 391-4111.

Sincerely,

CITY OF HOBBS, NEW MEXICO

Kevin Robinson – Planning Department
I, Kevin Shearer respectfully appeal staff’s decision in denying a setback variance. I am requesting the City of Hobbs planning board to review my request. It should be this is an uninhabitable carport that although secured can be moved in the future. Please see attached documentation.

Thank you in advance.

[Signature]

Kevin Shearer

116 E. Sunset Dr.

Hobbs, NM 88240

575-631-5041
Application Date: 11-9-20
Variance for (circle one): front yard / side yard

Property Owner: Kevin Shearer
Phone: 575-621-5841

Address of proposed structure: 116 E Sunset

Subdivision (if known): _________________ Lot & Block # (if known): _________________

Type of proposed structure: CARPORT
Dimensions of proposed structure: 17' x 28'

Are subdivision covenants and/or deed restrictions available? _____ If so, please attach a copy.

The existing front/side setback for the structure at the above address is ______ feet. If the variance is approved, the new front/side setback with the front improvement will be ______ feet.

The Planning Board of the City of Hobbs has established a procedure to require each applicant for a setback variance to notify property owners within 150 feet of the proposed improvement. In addition, front-yard setbacks of less than 10' for buildings (excluding carports) are generally not permitted.

Addresses of existing carports/fences/porches in vicinity (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 E Sunset</td>
<td>Unaddressed building across street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 E Sunset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 E Sunset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 E Sunset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221 E Sunset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please attach the following documents:

- Copy of Building Permit Application.
- Sketch Plan showing dimensions of existing and proposed improvements and distances from proposed improvement to sidewalk, curb, and/or edge of street.
- Copy of Covenants and/or Deed Restrictions, if any.
- Signature Sheet containing signatures of adjacent property owners within 150 feet of above referenced lot.

Return completed form to:
City-Hall - Planning Division
200 E. Broadway St.
Hobbs, NM 88240
P: 575-397-9232
F: 575-397-9227

[Signature]
Property Owner Signature

[Date]
AMENDMENT #1 - JUNE 26, 2006

Major Variance Requests & Procedures

For major variance requests to the standards for Right-of-Way width, Street Standards, Major Thoroughfare Plan Map Amendments, Removal, or addition, removal or modifications to the street locations and classifications on the Plan Map, and other major amendments to the plan:

"In addition to the above requirements, Variance requests to Right-of-Way width, Street Standards, or Major Thoroughfare Plan Map Amendments, the Planning Board will consider these variance requests as modifications or amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Public Hearing, required publication and other notice procedures must be carried out. The City Commission must also approve all similar variiances and or amendments to the Major Thoroughfare Plan that result from these types of requests."

"In consideration of major variance requests to the Major Thoroughfare Plan, the Planning Board has the right to make subjective decisions to recommend approval or denial of a variance request, based on the sole determination of the Planning Board, based on several factors including historical and projected development trends, existing and projected traffic patterns, restrictive covenants, protest letters or comments, community planning concepts and other considerations. The Planning Board has the right to recommend approval or denial of variances to the Major Thoroughfare Plan regardless of public input and opinions."
Are there any traffic safety or other safety considerations impacted by the granting of the variance?

Is there a need in the foreseeable future to acquire additional right-of-way at this location to widen the street?

In the case of a carport, is the structure "open wall" and of non-conspicuous design and appearance.

2. If the City Planning Division determines that the carport construction is consistent with existing development in the nearby vicinity of the property, a written variance shall be issued by the Planning Division to the property owner with a copy to the City Building Official indicating that a variance to the setback provisions has been granted. The Planning Division may approve a variance with conditional approval stating in writing the conditions of the approval. In making this determination, the Planning Division must consider the following:

a) The property owners are aware of the existing protective covenants.
b) The carport design and construction is consistent with existing development in the nearby vicinity of the property.
c) No traffic safety or other safety considerations are created by the granting of the variance.
d) The City will not need to acquire additional right-of-way at this location to widen the street in the foreseeable future.
e) The carport design is "open wall" and of a non-conspicuous design and appearance.
f) The use of the property is residential and not commercial.
g) No structure shall be permitted within five (5) feet of the front or side property line.
h) A variance must not adversely impact neighboring property owners, and must not create any safety problems.

3. If the Planning Division determines that a variance cannot be issued for any of the above reasons, the variance request must then be referred to the City Planning Board, and notification procedures for a hearing will be required.

Notification and Public Notice Required:

1. The City shall carry out property research and verify to the applicant the names and addresses of all property owners of record within 150 feet of the proposed variance. The City shall also post "Notice Signs" at the location of the intended action with the date of the hearing.

2. The City shall conduct a public hearing of the Planning Board with legal notice publication of the hearing to be published in the local newspaper.

Policy Decisions To Be Considered By City Planning Board:

1. In considering whether to grant approval of a front setback or setback from the side yard or rear yard, the Planning Board should determine the following:

a) If granted, does the variance comply with the existing protective covenants?

b) Do any similar structures exist in the "nearby vicinity" of the property line of the lot where the variance is proposed? "Nearby Vicinity" is hereby defined as within one entire City block regardless of length in feet and including both sides of the street.
AMENDMENT #2 – APRIL 21, 2008
SPECIAL SETBACK CONDITIONS ON 80’ R-O-W STREETS

AMENDMENT #2. For Residential Lots located on Minor Residential Streets with street-right-of-ways that are 80’ width and greater dimensions with and existing City paved street width of 41’ measured from back of curb to back of curb, the minimum front yard setback shall be 11’ feet from back of property line, instead of 21’ feet. The minimum side yard setback for a corner lot street side setback shall be 5’ feet. Resolution No. 5044 adopted April 21, 2008

Front yard fences are permitted up to three (3) feet height at the front property boundary. Front yard fences at (5) feet height are permitted at a front setback of 11’ feet. A side yard fence up to 5’ feet in height is permitted within 11’ feet of the front property boundary.

The following conditions must be met:

1. The City Street must be 100% constructed and the City should not have any current or long term plans to widen the street pavements width.

2. The City will not permit any private construction or pavement encroachments in the City right-of-way.

3. The entire block must be designated to be constructed with the same front yard setback for each and every lot.

4. The City may consider even further reductions to the above front yard setbacks, if the street right-of-way is 90’ or 100’ width on a minor residential street.

5. For Collector Streets with 80’ feet right-of-way width, the City may consider reduced setback dimensions on an individual case basis.

6. Corner lot front and side yard fences must not interfere or block the minimum clear site triangle dimensions.
Application #

Building Permit Application

Application Received Date ______________ Phone 575-631-5631

Owner Kevin Shearer Address 116 E. Sunset

Circle One: Residential or Commercial Type: New ☐ Remodel ☐ Addition ☐ Other ☐ please attach required plans

Job Location 116 E. Sunset Hobbs NM 88240

Contractor E.A. Carpenter 210 Airport Rd Mount Airy NC 28758

Subdivision __________________________________________________________ Lot _______ Block _______ Lot Size _______

Building is to be _______ ft. wide by _______ ft. long by _______ ft. in height and shall conform in construction.

Area or _______ Square Feet

Volume _______ Cubic/ Square Feet

Type _______ Use Group _______ Basement walls or foundation _______

% of improvements _______ Flood Zone _______ Elevation Certificate Received

Subdivision Approved __________________________ Drainage Plan Approved __________________________

Job Description: Carport Install

Valuation $__________ Permit Fee $__________ Plan Review Fee $__________ Total $__________

I, ___________________ as the Contractor, hereby agree to comply under this permit with all City, State and Federal codes.

Contractor’s Signature __________________________ Date ____________
Eagle Carports
210 Airport Rd. Mount Airy, NC 27030
800-579-8589 Fax: 336-719-2091
Order submitted by fax or to orders@eaglecarports.com

Purchase Order ver.3.0
Dealer Name: AC Rocky
Dealer PH #: 875-420-4665
Order Date: 

Name: Kevin Shepper
City: Eagles
State/VM Zip Code: 28040
County: CA
Inside City Limit? Y N
Day Phone: 575-420-4665 Evening Phone: 575-420-4665 Email: 

[Table with details]

Special Notes:

LOT MUST BE LEVEL OR UNIT WILL BE INSTALLED AS IS ON LOT
Customers may incur extra labor fees if additional labor is required to install because of un-level surfaces, or for building over obstacles. Eagle Carports, Inc. not responsible for stopping or repairing leaks under base-rails.

NOTE: FRAME IS 1 FT. SHORTER THAN ROOF LENGTH

Is your Install Surface Level? Y N NO MORE THAN 4% UN-LEVEL & CLEAR OF OBSTACLES

Qty. Features Description Building Type: V.R. Carport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/8 x 30' Cut Size to 17' x 28'</td>
<td>2455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5' Legs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 GA#6s</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 30' Panel w/ 3 Trim</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PURCHASE AGREEMENT & TERMS v3.0 (see reverse side for terms and conditions)

Eagle Carports, Inc. reserves the right to correct any balance/pricing errors. Eagle Carports, Inc. holds the right to repose any buildings not paid in full upon installation. A labor charge will be added for any additional labor such as cutting posts to level carports, building over objects such as RVs & moving materials to remote locations, etc...

Customer responsible for pulling permits. Customer understands that all building frames are 1' shorter than roof lengths.

By signing this agreement, customer understands and agrees with all terms and conditions found on both the front and back of this document.

Customer Signature: Date:

With customer present at time of installation, customer will sign below to signify acceptance of unit as installed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Installer Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Office Use: □ Credit Card □ M. Order □ Cashier Check □ Other

No Card Fee inc CO, CT, KS, MA, NY, OK, TX

ALL ORDERS COD

Financed? □ No □ Yes

Subtotal: 3572.25
Tax: 23.28
Total: 3805.53
Down Payment: 513.75
Extra Labor
Equip. Rental
Balance Due: 3291.78
Card Fee 2.5%
Card Balance Due

Date: 

ALL ORDERS COD

Financed? □ No □ Yes

Subtotal: 3572.25
Tax: 23.28
Total: 3805.53
Down Payment: 513.75
Extra Labor
Equip. Rental
Balance Due: 3291.78
Card Fee 2.5%
Card Balance Due

Date: 

ALL ORDERS COD

Financed? □ No □ Yes
Eagle Carports
"Flying High with Great Deals"

STRUCTURAL DESIGN

STANDARD PACKAGE
FULLY OPEN (CARPORT) BUILDING

MAXIMUM 30'- 0" WIDE X 16'- 0" HEIGHT-
BOX EAVE FRAME AND BOW FRAME

11 November 2016
Revision 1
M&A Project No. 161668

Prepared for:

Eagle Carports
210 Airport Road
Mount Airy, NC 27030

Prepared by:

Moore and Associates Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
1009 East Avenue
North Augusta, SC 29841
MOORE AND ASSOCIATES
ENGINEERING AND CONSULTING, INC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOORE AND ASSOCIATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING AND CONSULTING, INC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAGLE CARPORTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10x16 SP FULLY OPEN STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PE SEAL COVER SHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRAWN BY: LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHECKED BY: PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NO: M301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE: 11-11-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE: 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB NO: 16542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIENT: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEET: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwg. No: 3X-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BOX EAVE RAFTERS
SHEET 5A  TYPICAL RAFTER/COLUMN END AND SIDE FRAMING SECTIONS
BOW RAFTER
SHEET 5B  TYPICAL RAFTER/COLUMN END AND SIDE FRAMING CONNECTION DETAILS
BOW RAFTER
SHEET 6   BASE RAIL ANCHORAGE OPTIONS
SHEET 7   BOX EAVE RAFTER GABLE END OPTION
SHEET 8   BOW RAFTER GABLE END OPTION
SHEET 9   WALL OPENING DETAILS
SHEET 10  BOX EAVE RAFTER LEAN-TO OPTION
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BASE RAIL ANCHORAGE OPTIONS FOR HIGH WIND SPEEDS

CONCRETE MONOLITHIC SLAB BASE RAIL ANCHORAGE

GENERAL NOTES

CONCRETE:
CONCRETE SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM SPECIFIED COMpressive STRENGTH OF 3,000 PSI AT 28 DAYS.

COVER OVER REINFORCING STEEL:
PER FOUNDATIONS, MINIMUM CONCRETE COVER OVER REINFORCING BARS SHALL BE AS SHOWN.
3" IN FOUNDATIONS WHERE THE CONCRETE IS CAST AGAINST AND PERMANENTLY IN CONTACT WITH THE EARTH OR EXPOSED TO THE WEATHER, AND 1 1/2" ELSEWHERE.

REINFORCING STEEL:
THE TURNED-END REINFORCING STEEL SHALL BE ASTM A516 GRADE 60. THE SLAB-REINFORCEMENT SHALL BE VELVET WIRE FABRIC MEETING ASTM A516 OR FIBERGLASS FIERCE REINFORCEMENT.

REINFORCEMENT MAY BE BENT IN THE SHOP OR THE FIELD PROVIDED:
1. REINFORCEMENT IS BENT COLD.
2. THE DIAMETER OF THE BENDING RADIUS ON THE PERIPHERAL OF THE BAR IS NOT LESS THAN 6-DIA. DIAMETERS
3. REINFORCEMENT MULTIPLES IPSHOWN IN CONCRETE SHALL NOT BE FIELD BENT

HEXLX ANCHOR NOTES:
1. FOR VERY SOFT AND OR CEMENTED SANDS, FINE GRAVE AND Silt, Calcite, Porous, Silts and Clays USE MINIMUM 3 1/2" HELICES WITH MINIMUM 36° ENWRAP OR SINGLE 6" HELIX WITH MINIMUM 36° ENWRAP.
2. FOR CLAY USE MINIMUM 3 1/2" HELICES WITH MINIMUM 36° ENWRAP OR SINGLE 6" HELIX WITH MINIMUM 36° ENWRAP
3. FOR MEDIUM SOFT CONCRETE, SANDY GRAVELS, VERY STIFF SEDIMENTS, AND CLAYS USE MINIMUM 3 1/2" HELICES WITH MINIMUM 36° ENWRAP OR SINGLE 6" HELIX WITH MINIMUM 36° ENWRAP
4. FOR LOOSE TO MEDIUM SOFT SANDS, FIRM TO STIFF CLAYS AND Silt, ALLUVIAL FILL, USE MINIMUM (2) 3 1/2" HELICES WITH MINIMUM 36° ENWRAP
5. FOR VERY SOFT TO MEDIUM SOFT SANDS, FIRM TO STIFF CLAYS AND Silt, ALLUVIAL FILL, USE MINIMUM (2) 3 1/2" HELICES WITH MINIMUM 36° ENWRAP

MOORE AND ASSOCIATES
ENGINEERING AND CONSULTING, INC.
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6) Review and Consider Final Plat Approval for Sweet Home Alabama Subdivision Unit 2, as submitted by property owner, Berry & Gomez, LLC.
November 9, 2020

Lea County Road Department  
5915 N. Lovington Highway  
Hobbs, NM

RE: Sweet Homes on Alabama Subdivision  
    Blue Skies Road

To Whom it May Concern:

Blue Skies Road has been completed per the design drawings dated August 7, 2020. The improvements are consistent with the subdivision approval. It is recommended that the completed improvements be accepted for maintenance and operations by Lea County.

Sincerely,

Matthew D. Kenney, P.E.  
(On behalf of Ken Berry Construction)