

City of Colville

PLANNING COMMISSION

September 12, 2012

7:00 P.M. – City Hall

MINUTES

The Colville Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, September 12, 2012, 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: Alan Bedford, Russ Larsen, Dee Hokom, Brenda Buckner, and Jody Hoffman. MEMBERS ABSENT: Two vacancies exist. STAFF PRESENT: Director of Building & Planning Jim Lapinski and Recording Secretary Susan Davis.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes from the previous meeting of August 8, 2012 had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Russ Larsen moved and Alan Bedford seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written. Voice vote passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposed Amendment to the City of Colville Development Regulations.

A draft outline of proposed revisions to the Development Regulations had been distributed by staff to each member prior to the meeting (attached hereto and made a part of these minutes). Proposed discussion items included the following:

- Chapter 16: Land Division Ordinance
- Chapter 17: Zoning Ordinance
Table of Uses, Chapter 17.12.070

Building & Planning Director Jim Lapinski explained that the draft outline is a compilation of previous discussions and recommendations made by staff and the Planning Commission. Jim advised that he and Melinda Lee recently discussed the possibility of allowing beekeeping outright without a conditional use permit (CUP). They could not identify other conditions and safeguards that the Board of Adjustment would need to require through a CUP that isn't already covered under the criteria proposed by the Planning Commission. Jim stated he could support allowing beekeeping outright, subject to compliance with specific standards.

In regards to proposed standards for private roads, Jim indicated he felt the proposed standards are acceptable. They will need to be approved by the Street Department and the City Council. At this time, Jim had no significant changes or further recommendations.

In the review and discussion which followed, Dee Hokom noted a correction in Chapter 16, Land Division Ordinance, Section 16.16.010, Item C, line 2, should read "...is included in the Water/Sewer...".

PLANNING COMMISSION

September 12, 2012

Page 2

Brenda Buckner asked what “these” standards refers to in line 2 of Section 16.16.060.F.2)A. For clarification, it was suggested that a change be made to state “...the standards below...” The numbering sequence of this section was questioned, i.e., 16.16.010.F.2)1). It was suggested that Melinda be requested to consider possible changes for clarity.

Brenda also noted minor corrections and made suggestions regarding Chapter 17, Zoning Ordinance, Table of Uses, Section 17.12.070, as follows:

- For consistency, use a semi-colon on the table when further describing the use, such as “Bakery; wholesale or distribution.” There were no objections to the suggestion.
- For consistency, the word “home” should not be capitalized for “Funeral home and/or crematorium”. There were no objections to the suggestion.
- It was questioned why the word “battery” was highlighted for “Electric vehicle battery charging station”. Clarification from Melinda Lee will be requested.
- Are “chickens” defined as “livestock”? It appeared that the intent of the proposed definition of “livestock” includes chickens.
- It was suggested that Note #43 be reworded to state “provided they are located within a manufactured home park, or recreational vehicle park (in C-3 District only), per standards in Section 17.64.080(A). It was a consensus to ask staff to make the suggested change in order to cover all of the required standards for permanent RV’s.
- It was noted that Melinda had not included skirting for RVs because she was unable to find any examples of standards from other jurisdictions. In discussion which followed the Commissioners felt consideration should be given to requiring some sort of “protective barrier” around permanent RV’s to limit access by humans and animals for safety reasons. No specific skirting material was identified and it was suggested that it could be some sort of “material” acceptable in the park. Staff was requested to add a requirement for a protective barrier through the permitting process.

Review and discussion followed relative to the proposed standards for beekeeping in residential districts (copy on file). As proposed in the outline, “Beekeeping will be allowed with the approval of an annual permit application on any lot occupied by a single family residence in the R-1, R-2, and R-3 districts, subject to the ability to meet applicable standards.” It was noted that the Zoning Ordinance currently allows beekeeping outright in the R-1-S District without any conditions. The Commissioners felt that beekeeping in all residential districts should be subject to the same standards, including the R-1-S District. It was a consensus to add “note #47” to beekeeping in the R-1-S District on the Table of Uses to make the standards consistent. For clarification, it was suggested that item #3.e be changed to read “An apiary (beekeeping) shall be identified by placing a sign so it is visible to passers-by.” The Commission felt signage would alert the public about the activity, especially neighbors who might be allergic to bees. Jim felt that public notification could be a requirement of the annual permit. It was requested that item #5 be changed to read “There will be an annual application and permit fee of \$10.00 to inspect the site for compliance with these standards and to provide public notice to the neighbors” to address safety concerns. No one was opposed to allowing beekeeping as an outright permitted use in the residential districts subject to an annual permit and compliance with specific standards.

The criteria for registrations and training outlined in item #4 were reviewed. Brenda felt that an applicant should be required to provide proof of compliance with item 4.b similar to the requirements in items 4.a

and 4.c. Following discussion, it was a consensus to add a sentence at the end of item 4.b, such as “Proof of compliance must be submitted to the City.”

Russ Larsen asked if an experienced beekeeper would be allowed to get a permit to put hives on someone else’s property. The beekeeper would be responsible for caring for his hive(s). Following discussion, it was concluded that a registered beekeeper could apply for a permit to put hives on someone else’s property as long as compliance with all of the standards can be achieved.

Review and discussion followed relative to proposed standards for the keeping of chickens in residential districts only (copy on file). Brenda pointed out, in item #8.b; violators are provided an opportunity to get an “approved reinstallation of a coop and hens subject to a one-year probationary period. If violations continue to occur, future applications may be denied.” She supported the provision for reinstallation due to extenuating circumstances; but did not feel the intent is to allow people to continuously keep seeking approval for reinstallation following violations. She suggested striking item #9 to eliminate the provision for future appeals. It was noted that proposed item #9 states that “A person may appeal the denial, suspension or revocation of an application or permit by the City of Colville before the City Council within thirty (30) days of the decision being made.” Jim Lapinski indicated he was opposed to sending these types of appeals to the City Council due to their political nature. He was uncertain whether the City Council would be receptive to being the appeal body. Dee expressed the opinion that people should be entitled to appeal an administrative decision to someone. However, she did not feel that these types of appeals should go to court. Discussion followed relative to who would hear appeals – it was noted the Planning Commission is only an advisory body. Jim stated that the Zoning Ordinance provides appeal procedures depending on the type of application being processed (Type I, Type II, Type III, etc.). In conclusion, it was a consensus to strike item #9 from the proposed standards for the keeping of chickens and item #6 from the proposed standards for beekeeping recognizing that appeal procedures are already contained in the Zoning Ordinance. Jim suggested that staff review the appeal chapter and put together information for the Commission to illustrate how the process works.

B. Annual Amendment to Comprehensive Plan.

As noted in the handout distributed earlier, the annual Comprehensive Plan amendment will be forthcoming after the docket deadline date of September 30th. Jim noted that there will not be any changes proposed this year in reference to the capital facilities plan (CFP).

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

REPORTS: No reports were presented.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to come before the Commission, Alan Bedford moved and Russ Larsen seconded the motion to adjourn. There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned at 8:26 P.M.