

City of Colville

PLANNING COMMISSION

April 24, 2013

7:00 P.M. – City Hall

MINUTES

The Colville Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, April 24, 2013, in the Council Room at City Hall. Chairperson Jody Hoffman called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. with a quorum present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Terry Cripps, Brenda Buckner, Jody Hoffman, and Alan Bedford. Russ Larsen arrived at 8:10 P.M. MEMBERS ABSENT: Dee Hokom. One vacancy exists. STAFF PRESENT: Assistant Planner Melinda Lee and Recording Secretary Susan Davis. OTHERS PRESENT: Jenny Lytle, Jerome Shoemaker, Ben & Amber King, and others.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes from the previous meeting of April 10, 2013 had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Alan Bedford moved and Terry Cripps seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written. Voice vote showed all in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Jenny Lytle, 676 E. 3rd Ave., approached the Planning Commission to request amendments to Zoning Ordinance, Section 17.64.190 Keeping of chickens, citing prohibitive cost and space requirements as a basis for her request. Ms. Lytle explained as she went through the permit process she found the regulations to be very prohibitive. In researching other jurisdictions, including Kettle Falls, Chewelah, Spokane, and Seattle, and reading literature she stated she found that Colville is the most restrictive.

Ms. Lytle distributed proposed amendments, along with copies of comparable city ordinances and research findings. She advised that Eric Ohrtman also had issues, especially with the space requirements as outlined in a letter, which she distributed on his behalf (copies attached hereto and made a part of these minutes).

At this time, Ms. Lytle summarized the following proposed amendments:

1. Eliminate item G.1, “The size of the coop will be based on 40 square feet per hen.” She requested that this item be changed to “10 sq. ft. per hen”.
2. Increase the maximum number of hens permitted from five (5) to ten (10).
3. Allow free ranging of chickens during the day, under direct supervision. Chickens must have one wing clipped to prevent flight.
4. Decrease the application and annual permit fee from \$25 to \$10 initially with a \$5 renewal fee.

Ms. Lytle requested a variance to the regulations, which restrict her to four (4) hens at this time, based on space requirements. Melinda advised that the Zoning Board of Adjustment is authorized to act on variance requests, which require a public hearing. The application for a variance is \$200 and the process

PLANNING COMMISSION

April 24, 2013

Page 2

takes a couple of months. Another option would be a formal text amendment to change the regulations, which would be processed during the annual review cycle. The deadline for submittal is September 30th with final action usually taking place in December.

Jerome Shoemaker, 375 N. Elm St., indicated that he had no problem with most of the regulations; however he would like to see the changes suggested by Jenny Lytle. He requested that consideration be given to allowing alternative designs such as a "chicken tractor" or "mobile unit" that is portable and allows the chickens to be rotated around the yard so they can graze on weeds and seeds. Mr. Shoemaker explained if chickens are confined to a restricted area they will eat all the ground cover, eventually creating a dust bowl. He felt that people should educate themselves about caring for chickens in an urban setting. He stated owners should still be required to properly care for their chickens and those that don't should be fined.

Ben King, 909 N. Maple St., explained he grew up on a dairy farm and they also raised chickens. He stated they had 30-40 chickens in a 10'x10' pen with a 10'x10' coop. He added that some of the chickens had their wings clipped and were allowed to roam free. Mr. King also expressed support for the proposed amendments.

The Planning Commission thanked the public for providing new information, noting that the suggested amendments will be taken under advisement for further review and discussion. As stated earlier, Melinda Lee explained that applications to amend the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations can be made to the City until September 30th, for consideration during the current annual review cycle. All amendments are processed in accordance with the public participation guidelines outlined in the Zoning Ordinance, which includes a public hearing prior to adoption. It was pointed out that the current regulations were drafted and adopted based on the information that was available at the time. It was pointed out that the Kettle Falls Ordinance was used as a model for Colville's regulations. Commissioners stated that throughout lengthy discussions they attempted to maintain a happy medium between the people who want chickens in town and those who don't. Part of that process was to try to protect the rights of property owners to enjoy their homes in an urban setting. Melinda pointed out that the Single Family Suburban District (R-1-S), with a minimum lot area of 9,650 sq. ft., allows for more chickens and the keeping of livestock, provided minimum land requirements are maintained.

Melinda suggested it would be appropriate for the public to request that this proposal be put on a future agenda for formal discussion. Public notification of meetings is done by posting the agenda in public places, including the City's website; and emails or mail outs to the local media and individuals on the Building & Planning Department mailing list.

Alan Bedford pointed out the Planning Commission currently has a vacancy and encouraged anyone interested to contact the City for an application.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Review of draft regulations for Recreational Vehicle Park design standards.

Melinda advised that she and Brenda Buckner met to revise the draft Recreational Vehicle Park design standards based on discussion at the previous meeting. A revised draft and photos of the NE WA Fairgrounds RV Park and the Franklin County RV Park in Pasco were distributed to each member prior to the meeting (attached hereto and made a part of these minutes). Review and discussion followed on the proposed revised draft and comments are summarized below.

PLANNING COMMISSION

April 24, 2013

Page 3

On Page 1, the Commissioners had no objection to eliminating the section on “density” because that will be determined by design standards.

The Commissioners had no objection to eliminating RV site size as the minimum site size will be determined by the design standards and it is up to the developer to decide if development of a smaller lot is cost effective.

Melinda suggested that all references to “city engineer” in item #1, RV Site Design, be changed to read “approved by the City of Colville” because that position is no longer filled.

Brenda noted as she designed a couple of mock-up RV Parks, it seemed reasonable to consider reduced setbacks, which she felt should hold true on corner lots as well. Revised setbacks, as suggested on Page 1 of the draft, were acceptable to the Commission.

On Page 2, item #3, Access Points – Brenda explained that some of the proposed language may require additional revision for clarification. She and Melinda proposed requiring a minimum of one (1) one-way entrance and one (1) one-way exit to the RV Park from a city street, which could work well for small parks. Two way entrances/exits would also be permitted. The Commission made no other changes at this time.

It was noted on Page 2, item #4, Internal Park Roads, that the words “city engineer” should be replaced with “City of Colville” consistent with item #1 above.

On Page 2, item #5(a), Parking – Brenda reviewed the revised draft regulations noting that a minimum of four (4) parking spaces are required at the main office instead of two (2) to comply with the American With Disabilities Act (ADA). Following discussion it was a consensus of the Commission to delete the first and last sentences of (a). Melinda pointed out that visitor parking would be dictated by whether or not on-street parking is allowed. She advised that she would recommend prohibiting on-street parking. Alternatively, the Commission felt the developer can propose visitor parking areas in the design of the park.

On Page 3, Brenda reviewed revisions to item #6, Open Space/Recreational Facilities. Item #6(a) states that “A minimum of 10% of each recreational vehicle park shall be set aside and maintained as landscaped open space for the recreational use of park occupants...” Brenda noted that she deleted the sentence stating “The percentage requirement may be reduced if substantial and appropriate recreational facilities (such as recreational buildings, swimming pool or tennis courts) are provided” because it is too vague. After review and discussion, the Commission suggested a change to the last sentence in item 6(a) to state “Parking spaces, driveways, access roads, and parking pads and their required 5’ side setbacks are not considered to be *landscaped* open space. In item #6(b), Brenda substituted “outdoor recreational facilities” for “recreational buildings”. She indicated she was hesitant to use the term “recreational buildings” unless they are simple structures, such as open shelters like in the city park, in which case we should just specify that. As proposed, “Outdoor recreational facilities, such as open picnic structures, swimming pools, hot tubs, tennis courts, playground equipment, horseshoe pits, etc. are permitted as approved by the city.” The Commission felt these types of “outdoor recreational facilities” should be permitted “...*in the open space areas* as approved by the city.”

Discussion followed regarding whether to allow “recreational buildings” in an RV Park such as community centers or movie theaters or similar enclosed buildings where people could assemble. Brenda

PLANNING COMMISSION

April 24, 2013

Page 4

felt that roads and parking areas in RV Parks are generally not designed to accommodate those types of uses. Melinda pointed out that the structures would be located on private property and managed by the RV Park. She advised the RV Parks are required to go through the conditional use permit (CUP) process. Any such proposal would go through intense review and evaluation by the Zoning Board of Adjustment at a required public hearing.

It was a consensus of the Commission to delete item (d) and let the park Owner manage smoking in the RV Park.

Lengthy discussion followed concerning item #7(a), Screening/Landscaping, which states “Recreational vehicle parks shall provide visual screening in all perimeter setbacks. They shall be enclosed by a fence, wall, earth mound, landscaping or by other design which will compliment the existing landscape and assure compatibility with the adjacent environment.” Alan Bedford suggested using the term “impassable barrier” instead of specifying “a fence, wall, earth mound...” to keep people and animals from wandering in and out of the RV Park. Others felt it might be better not to require screening or landscaping and just let the developer decide what kind of environment he wants to create. It was a consensus to give more thought to this section for possible revision at future meetings.

It was recognized that there may be some situations that need to be accommodated differently, like a small area (4-6 RVs) at the golf course that is not even visible from a public street. The Commissioners felt that the RV Park regulations should apply in this case because it is a business.

Regarding Item #7(b), the Commission felt that the fourth sentence should be changed to state “Dry beds are permitted, provided they do not conflict with the engineered site drainage plan.”

On Page 4, Item #8(b), Signage, states “Traffic direction shall be clearly marked on all internal roadways. Melinda suggested that the sentence be changed to state “...shall be clearly *visible*...”.

On Page 5, Brenda reviewed item #11, Safety. She noted that the specification for fire hydrants in (b) needs to be researched. Based on discussion at the previous meeting, she pointed out (d) states “Only one (1) recreational vehicle is permitted at any time per RV parking pad. Manager may opt to rent a maximum of two (2) congruent pads to one (1) oversized recreational vehicle.” In (e) Brenda explained that “detached accessory structures” would be permanent structures such as storage buildings or carports. Melinda added that tents or canopies were not specified because they are more temporary. Al Bedford suggested adding the word “motorized” to (f) to read “Parking of any “*motorized*” vehicle is prohibited in RV parking pad side yards.” Brenda questioned whether anything should be said about ATVs, motorbikes, etc. The consensus was that the park Owner could address the use of those types of vehicles in the park rules and regulations if it is on private property.

For clarification, Al suggested that the last sentence in item #13(a), Park Administration, be changed to state “Each park shall have an on-site manager available 24 hours per day, seven (7) day per week, *through the on-site management headquarters.*”

Discussion on the proposed draft Recreational Vehicle Park design standards was continued to a future meeting. Melinda advised that the proposed text amendment can be processed prior to the annual review cycle.

PLANNING COMMISSION

April 24, 2013

Page 5

NEW BUSINESS

Terry Cripps expressed a safety concern about the panhandlers at Walmart and Safeway. He was worried that they might get hit because they sometimes get too close to the driveways and aren't always attentive. Melinda advised that this may be an enforcement issue for the Police Department. Alan Bedford offered to check with a Police Officer.

REPORTS

Melinda reported that the Zoning Board of Adjustment approved a conditional use permit to allow a micro-distillery to operate in the basement of the Webster Law Office on N. Main Street. The distillery will sell retail and offer on-site sampling as well.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Commission, Alan Bedford moved and Terry Cripps seconded the motion to adjourn. There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned at 9:32 P.M.