

City of Colville

PLANNING COMMISSION

May 23, 2012

7:00 P.M. – City Hall

MINUTES

The Colville Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, May 23, 2012, in the Council Room at City Hall. Chairperson Jody Hoffman called the meeting to order at 7:20 P.M. without a quorum present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jody Hoffman, Brenda Buckner, Dee Hokom (arrived at 7:20 p.m.), Alan Bedford (arrived at 7:22 p.m.) and Russ Larsen (arrived at 8:37 p.m.). MEMBERS ABSENT: Two vacancies exist. STAFF PRESENT: Assistant Planner Melinda Lee and Recording Secretary Susan Davis. OTHERS PRESENT: Loren Storer, Sue Storer, Tony Gallo, Kim Hoogstad, and Deanna Draney.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes from the previous meeting of May 9, 2012 had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Upon establishment of a quorum, Alan Bedford moved and Dee Hokom seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written. Motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS

- A. Review changes to Colville Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17.12.070, Table of Uses as previously discussed.

Assistant Planner Melinda Lee reviewed the “draft of proposed changes” from the May 9, 2012 meeting as outlined on Table 17.12.070 (Permitted and Conditionally Permitted Uses), which had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting (copy on file).

Brenda Buckner questioned the reference to the Airport Landing Overlay (ALO) District for airports and landing fields on the Table of Uses. She pointed out that the ALO District is not on the zoning map or the Table, which could cause some confusion with the Airport Facilities (AF) District. Staff confirmed that the AL District is outlined on the zoning map and is referenced in a separate chapter in the Zoning Ordinance, which outlines the provisions for airports and landing fields. It was felt a change may be needed for clarification.

- B. Continued discussion regarding the keeping of chickens in residential districts.

Relative to questions raised at the previous meeting, Melinda referenced a comparison matrix on the keeping of chickens, which had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting (copy on file). The matrix outlined how some other jurisdictions regulate chickens including the number of chickens permitted, whether roosters are allowed, permit requirements, enclosures, nuisance clause, slaughter, property line restrictions, and details or unique regulations. Melinda suggested if the Commission decides to allow chickens the criteria should be clearly defined. Each member received another copy of the ordinance from Kettle Falls for review, which addresses the keeping of rabbits and chickens (copy on

PLANNING COMMISSION

May 23, 2012

Page 2

file). Photos of five local locations from which staff had received inquiries about urban chickens were distributed for information (copies on file).

Sue Storer felt that setbacks to property lines seem appropriate but asked if there should be a distance requirement between a coop and a dwelling. In discussion which followed it was felt that the intent is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public by mitigating potential impacts on surrounding properties. No one felt the need to regulate the distance between coops and dwellings if compliance with other regulations could be achieved.

Discussion followed relative to whether or not to allow slaughtering. Some members felt that if a maximum of 5 hens is permitted, there would not likely be many chickens slaughtered. Brenda felt that chickens should be removed from the City in order to slaughter them. Alan Bedford and Dee Hokom were not opposed to allowing occasional slaughtering in an enclosed building to avoid negatively impacting the neighbors. No decision was made at this time.

Brenda suggested basing the number of chickens permitted on square footage per chicken. A determination would also need to be made about whether chickens should be caged or allowed to roam free in a yard. She was uncomfortable with the idea of modifying an animal to fit local regulations, such as Kettle Falls, which requires at least one wing to be clipped. Kim Hoogstad felt allowing slaughtering or altering chickens in the city could open it up to humane handling issues. It was noted that Kettle Falls allows chickens to roam free in secured yards under supervision during daylight hours and must be put in a coop during non-daylight hours. Deanna Draney expressed support for allowing chickens to free roam in a secure yard. Lengthy discussion followed regarding what constitutes a suitable environment for chickens. Some felt that in addition to a coop, chickens should be able to have a run, but a consensus could not be reached concerning optimal size or what it should consist of. Jody Hoffman stated she was comfortable with the sample Kettle Falls ordinance but others felt more research is needed.

Relative to enforcement, Melinda advised that staff would investigate any complaints received and make determinations relative to possible abatement. Dee noted that a violation would be subject to a civil penalty, which should encourage people to comply with the regulations.

Staff was requested to do more research on possible square footage requirements per chicken, setback requirements, and minimum/maximum size for enclosures and runs.

C. Continued discussion regarding the keeping of livestock at meat processing facilities.

As a result of previous discussion, Tony Gallo and his daughter Kim Hoogstad, from Gallo Meats, were in attendance to answer questions about their meat processing operation. The Planning Commission had questioned how animals are cared for and how long they are kept on the premises prior to slaughter. Mr. Gallo and Ms. Hoogstad advised that they are licensed by many agencies including the USDA, FDA, Department of Agriculture, and the Health Department. Their facility is currently only licensed to slaughter on Wednesdays and Fridays. All slaughtering is done inside unless there is a unique situation such as an aggressive animal, which requires a certain protocol to be followed. He explained that clients are asked to bring animals in one day prior to slaughter. He felt during normal routine business, a day or so carryover is typical. On special occasions, such as at fair time, they receive a large number of animals at one time. It may be necessary to carry some of them over from 7-10 days in order to process them all.

Mr. Gallo pointed out they are required to feed and water the animals at their cost, as well as provide shelter, so it is not their intent to hold animals for an extended period of time. Another situation which may require an extended stay is a suspect animal that needs to be examined by a veterinarian or inspector.

In the discussion which followed Commissioners expressed a desire to limit the number of days animals could be kept on the premises prior to slaughtering in order to mitigate potential impacts on surrounding properties. It was suggested that a maximum of 7 working days seemed reasonable. Alan Bedford asked if Gallos would be willing to notify City staff whenever there are extenuating circumstances that would require an extension of time. The staff would be informed and could respond to the public if inquiries or complaints are received. Mr. Gallo and Ms. Hoogstad indicated that they had no objection to a maximum of 7 working days, as proposed, and would be willing to contact City staff for a time extension, when necessary.

Melinda explained that the staff has received inquiries in recent years about this type of use in the city. The current Table of Uses does not list meat packing and processing at all. It was noted that Mr. Gallo's facility has been permitted in the LI District since the property was annexed and zoned. Staff felt it would be appropriate to cover this type of use more clearly at this time and include it on the Table.

Melinda presented additional information regarding use of recreational vehicles as permanent dwelling units. She referenced RCW 35A.21.312 and RCW 43.22.340 regarding the placement of recreational vehicles as primary residences, which had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Random photos of local RVs without skirting and with wood skirting were also distributed for information and discussion (copies on file). Melinda explained that in July 1, 1970, RVs were required to be constructed to certain standards and anything older than that could not be used as a primary residence. She noted that jurisdictions can adopt local ordinances that impose fire, safety, or other regulations related to RVs, which could address the skirting issue. Melinda indicated she was unable to find anything real specific regarding skirting material in her research. The City of Airway Heights allows skirting if the RV is in place over 30 days and the City of Ocean Shores requires metallic appearing siding. It was noted for reference that manufactured homes are required at a minimum to skirt with pressure treated material. Brenda felt the example from Idaho Canvas was nice but does not address the issue of keeping children and animals from getting underneath the unit. Melinda indicated that the skirting requirement could be specific to certain RV units that are not stable and require some sort of jack or supports; or maybe just require skirting on all RVs. It was felt that a skirting requirement on permanent placements would be for safety reasons. No decisions were made at this time.

In response to a question, staff provided clarification concerning the temporary placement of an RV. The Zoning Ordinance allows an RV to be located on individual lots in any R District for a period of time not to exceed four (4) weeks in any one consecutive 12 month period. This allows for temporary placement on private property for visitors but stipulates a time limit. If a situation is reported to staff, an investigation is done and contact is made regarding the time limit. Melinda noted that RVs are not allowed to be parked on the street and used temporarily and should be reported to staff if observed.

D. Preliminary discussion regarding possible revisions to design standards for private roads.

Melinda explained that possible revisions to design standards will be considered during the amendment process. She indicated in the past staff has had discussions relative to design standards for private roads,

PLANNING COMMISSION

May 23, 2012

Page 4

which are regulated through the subdivision process. Staff has expressed concern about maintenance and repair issues. Private roads in commercial areas appear to be more of a problem than in residential areas because the general public also uses them. It was pointed out that private roads are not maintained by the City. Photos of existing private roads were distributed for information (copies on file).

Melinda noted that examples of Stevens County guidelines were also included for reference. She indicated if modifications to current private road standards are considered, we could possibly look at them as Type 1, Type 2, or Type 3 access depending on traffic volume. These types of access require different levels of improvement.

Melinda explained that private roads are currently allowed as an option because they are less expensive to develop and enable development that might not otherwise occur. She noted that staff has talked about considering allowing "private driveways" to serve up to four (4) lots with possibly a gravel surface. She pointed out that private roads will not be accepted into the City road system until they are brought up to city standards. If adequate right-of-way width can be acquired, road improvements could be required in the future to accommodate greater traffic volumes. Some members supported the acquisition of adequate street/road right-of-way for future widening as a condition of plat approval.

Melinda indicated staff would like to put together a presentation on this issue for future discussion, which could include revisions to surfacing requirements and addressing storm water drainage issues.

Russ Larsen questioned whether a Local Improvement District (LID) could be formed to bring private roads up to City standards. A LID is a method by which a group of property owners can share in the cost of public improvements, such as improving a street. No additional information was available about the LID process.

NEW BUSINESS: There was no New Business to be presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There were no additional public comments.

REPORTS

Melinda reported that the next meeting of the Planning Commission will be held on June 13, 2012. She advised that she would like to schedule two regular meetings per month to continue discussion on possible revisions. She pointed out this is not a total re-write of the development regulations but rather an opportunity to clarify issues, correct deficiencies, and resolve questionable issues that have come up over time.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, Dee Hokom moved and Alan Bedford seconded the motion to adjourn. Motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 P.M.