

# **TITLE 21 COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES**

**10-11-07**

## Chapter 21.05

The Committee came to order at 9:35 a.m. All three committee members were present as well as staff and members of the public.

The Committee started with the Public Institution Use at page 44, in Chapter 5 of the public hearing draft dealing with Transportation facilities. No comments.

Then, the Committee addressed Utility Facilities on page 45 with its use-specific standards. Ms. Selkregg discussed the screening issue and lighting. Mr. Coffey suggested that we “shield” the lighting as per Chapter 7. They are required to go thru a site plan review prior to construction in some districts. Also, L-3 landscaping is appropriate given the new sites. The problem, to the extent it exists, is found with the older sites.

The committee then reviewed the telecommunications facilities on pages 45 thru 54. Staff reported that this proposal is substantively the same as existing law. Clarion (previous consultants) recommended an entirely new code which suggestion was rejected.

Staff reported that change in the code on this issue were related to the processes of permitting and not on the substance: administrative permits, site plan review, etc.

Staff will provide information to Ms. Selkregg on the Clarion recommendations which were previously reviewed and rejected.

The committee then began its review of commercial uses on page 54. There were no comments on the purpose statement or the agricultural uses provisions.

Ms. Ossiander requested the animal control advisory board to review some of the use-specific standards. Mr. Coffey asked the definition of “soundproof building”. There is no definition in code. Mr. Coffey recommended that this term be defined.

Ms. Ossiander also expressed her view that most/all regulation of domestic animals should be addressed in title 17.

On the issue of Assembly use and definition on page 57, line 22. Mr. Coffey was concerned about the multiple use of these facilities and that we do not limit or prohibit longstanding uses.

Ms. Ossiander moved back to page 55, line 14 under retail and pet services which requires use specific standards like an animal shelter including soundproofing.

On page 59, Motorized Sports Facilities, Mr. Coffey asked if this was existing code. Staff will check and advise.

On page 60, section 8 b. Mr. Coffey asked about “decks” and “off-premises”

On page 61, section 9. A. Mr. Coffey asked if there are any changes in Shooting Range, outdoors” from existing codes. Staff will check and advise.

On page 62, Theater Company where there is live entertainment and alcohol may be sold as well. Mr. Coffey asked how this is different from a night club. He urged that we focus on impacts and not just attempt to define each and every conceivable use under the sun.

Next, the committee discussed the land use permits for liquor licenses. Ms. Selkregg was concerned that the inquiry and the process of under the conditional use process would be limited under the special land use permit process. This is not the case.

The committee had no comments on any of the definitions on pages 64, 65 and 66. However, Ms. Selkregg asked about screening for vehicles and equipment uses on page 65. Staff reported that the landscaping section deals with perimeter landscaping depending on adjacent zoning.

Ms Ossiander was concerned about storage of heavy equipment and how we can recognize the need for some flexibility for its use during the construction season and for snow removal. Mr. Coffey could we address this problem by having an accessory use on the property. This is provided current code, but is subject to abuse. Staff will review the existing code and the problems of abuse.

Ms. Ossiander had a question on “Vehicle-large” on page 67 and the limitation on gross vehicular weight rating (GVWR) on page 68, lines 4-6. Again, the question comes back to the impact resulting from these restrictions.

On vehicle service and repair on page 68, line 15, there is a similar prohibition based on GVWR for major repair shops.

The committee discussed the “hostel” definition and use. Everyone agreed on the need to limit hostels in the lower density residential areas, but permit them (with limitations) in the higher density residential districts.

Ms. Ossiander asked about Inns on page 70, lines 13. This is an effort to bridge public accommodations between bed and breakfast and a full service hotel.

We will resume the review of chapter 5 on page 70 with Industrial Uses at the next committee meeting.

Ms. Selkregg then presented her concept for enhanced public involvement. Her proposal is four (4) pages in length. She made a presentation to the committee outlining what she has proposed.

Mr. Coffey noted that this proposal was prepared, in part, based on his request of Ms. Selkregg last meeting. The proposal was presented at the end of the meeting and that he had not had an opportunity to review the proposal. Staff has also not had any chance of review. Mr. Coffey asked for time to review this proposal. He also asked for a staff response to the proposal.

Ms. Ossiander noted that this was substantially what was initially done years ago by Clarion. The reaction at that time was not good. There are many controversial issues in the proposal. Ms. Ossiander believes that what is proposed may stop the process in its tracks.