

**WHITMAN COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
August 3, 2022
Zoom Meeting**

MEMBERS:

**Chad Whetzel, Chairman
David Tysz
Weston Kane**

**Brian Davies, Vice-Chairman
Rusty Jamison**

Staff: Alan Thomson, WC Planner; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planer; Brandon Johnson, Public Works; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

Others: Shelly Chambers Fox; Ken Duft

7:05 p.m. – Chad Whetzel called the meeting to order. Introductions were held.

MOTION by Brian Davies and seconded by Rusty Jamison to approve the minutes from July 5, 2022. Motion passed.

Reports: Alan Thomson

- a. Board of Adjustment forthcoming hearings – None.
- b. Forthcoming Administrative Use Permits – None.
- c. Forthcoming Variances – None.
- d. Update on previous conditional use permits and variances – We had a variance on July 28th for a setback variance for two parcels setback 5 feet instead of 20 feet. That was fine.
- e. Update on previous administrative use permits – None.
- f. Board of County Commissioners’ action – None.
- g. Update on previous Board of County Commissioners’ action – None.
- h. Forthcoming Shoreline of the State Substantial Development Permits – None.
- i. Update on previous Shoreline of the State Substantial Development permits – None.
- j. Planning Commission forthcoming hearings – None.

Unfinished business: Shoreline Master Program update continues. Nothing to report there. We don't expect to hear from the consultant until probably later on this month. Maybe have a meeting in the beginning of September. That was kind of the timeline that the consultant was thinking about. Nothing going on right now. I don't know where she is at with the progress being made. She'll probably have something to report to us in September.

Brian Davis – Some deliverables will be coming?

Alan Thomson – She will deliver something, yes. Then the Planning Commission and Staff are going to be looking it over. We haven't had any deliverables yet to the DOE other than telling them that the update is ongoing and, of course, the consultant is billing us and we are taking care of that. But we don't have any documents yet to report on.

Chad Whetzel – Any more questions about that? Okay, we will move on.

7:08 p.m. – Adjourned to workshop

WHITMAN COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION

August 3, 2022
Zoom Meeting

MEMBERS:

Chad Whetzel, Chairman
David Tysz
Weston Kane

Brian Davies, Vice-Chairman
Rusty Jamison

Staff: Alan Thomson, WC Planner; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planer; Brandon Johnson, Public Works; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

Others: Shelly Chambers Fox; Ken Duft

7:09 p.m. – Chad Whetzel opened the workshop.

Alan Thomson – So, let's start with Chapter 19.10. I've done a number of different changes. We looked at this last time and we discussed this and didn't come to any conclusions at that time. So, we are going to look this over again.

Let's just start at the top and go through it. No decisions to be made really. I just wanted to get everybody's opinion on what you think here and if we need to change anything. If we make the conclusion that this is okay, then we can move on because there are a few other ordinances that need to be looked at. We are not looking at a hearing on this probably for a few months anyway. I just wanted to go over it and see if we are all in agreement with the language that is changing.

19.19.020 – Permitted Uses.

B. Two (2) single-family dwellings per parcel conforming to provisions of Section 19.10.060 and not located within the CRD Opportunity Area. Adding a separate dwelling unit within an existing residence or converting an accessory building to a residence counts as a second residence.

So, as we all know, one single family residence per parcel is changing to two. I've added this in here, "Adding a separate dwelling unit within an existing residence or converting an accessory building to a residence counts as a second residence." That is just a point of clarification.

The strike out here is no longer necessary because what it was there for was the possibility of being a short plat and including or not including two houses in a short plat. So that is old language that I don't think is relevant anymore because we are going to have two residences on a parcel and you don't have to do a short plat in order to do that. You can just build a house on the same parcel along with the existing residence. You can also, we still have the grouping potential which means you can create a parcel as well, so the public has a choice. Either you put a house on there without changing any parcel boundaries, just adding it to the existing residence, or you can actually create a new parcel. That is already in the code and allowable anyway. That is why this is struck out. It is not necessary anymore.

Brian Davies – Is that allowable without any caveats?

Alan Thomson – The caveats, you mean the second residence?

Brian Davies – Correct. If you create a new parcel to go through a short plat?

Alan Thomson – Yes, you do. So that's the grouping that is already in the code right now. We're not really changing that right now. That is still going to be an option.

Brian Davies – It is further down in the document.

Alan Thomson – Yes, we will be getting to that further down in the document. Right now, we are just at the beginning of the ordinance and we are stating that we will allow two homes on a parcel. Are there any questions about that?

Rusty Jamison – I do have a question. I had a person ask a question about that yesterday. His question was when you come out and advise somebody on a second residence, would you recommend he drill a separate well and what about the septic system? (Inaudible)

Alan Thomson – Rusty, you are breaking up. I think I caught most of what you said. I think your question is if you build a second residence on a parcel, what do you do about the well and the septic?

Rusty Jamison - (Inaudible)

Alan Thomson – The choices are, if you only have one house on the parcel and you have your existing well and drain field. The new house will have to have its own well and drain field system. So, that goes through Environmental Health. Once we get through the Rural Housing Certificate, we have to get Environmental Health involved. They have a choice. They can drill another well or tie into the existing well. Keeping in mind that two houses on a parcel of land, both houses are subject to the limitations of state code regarding water usage. That means 5,000 gallons a day shared by both of them. That would be 2500 gallons a day per house. They could drill another well. It's not necessary because you could tie into the existing well assuming there is enough water pressure.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, I just wondered, because (inaudible) would not allow.

Alan Thomson – No, we wouldn't allow that and that is up to Environmental Health. That is not done through the Planning Office. It is all Environmental Health and Chris Skidmore will run them through that. We have to assume that this area is sufficient area for a new drain field system. This is one of the limitations. If we have smaller parcels, maybe a 2-acre parcel, it is limited by can you put in a drain field system and a replacement drain field for the new house? Then are you sharing the well or drilling a new well? Two acres is not a very big area and that is controlled by Environmental Health. If EH says you can't put everything on this parcel, then potentially you won't be able to build a second house. But if your parcel is big enough, that's not a problem.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, thank you.

Alan Thomson – Anybody else have any questions?

Brian Davies – So, the drain field needs to be within the boundaries of the parcel which would be the limiting factor if you couldn't squeeze something in on a parcel. What about if they owned all the adjacent property around it?

Alan Thomson – Yes, it can happen. Environmental Health does not like the drain field system or the well to be off the parcel, but it can happen. We don't want it on farmland because big tractors, heavy vehicles, driving over a drain field system is not a good idea.

Brian Davies – But five feet over the parcel line or something like that.

Alan Thomson – It is possible but you would have to get an easement from that landowner in order to do that.

Brian Davies – What if that landowner owned all the property, if it was just farm ground beyond the parcel?

Alan Thomson – I think we would still require an easement because the house itself or the farmland could sell to another party. You want to make sure that the other party doesn't say, "I don't want your drain field on my land anymore." We would tackle it that way.

Okay, moving on, Accessory Dwelling Units.

~~*I. Accessory Dwelling Units conforming to provisions of Section 10.10.065.*~~

I made the suggestion last time that we strike the Accessory Dwelling Unit section out of here and that would mean that you would have to strike this part here. We can talk about this further when we get to the Accessory Dwelling Unit section. That is why I am striking this out right now, because I am assuming that is going to be struck.

Okay, **19.10.050 – Height of Buildings.**

D. Commercial wind turbines, transmission towers, and wind measuring devices such as anemometers, have no height restrictions.

We talked about this last time. That again, is just for clarification. We don't want to have any height restrictions on there. We don't have height restrictions on wind turbines because they can go up to over 500 feet tall. Whatever height they are, that is what they are. That's why we don't want to have any height restriction on them.

Brian Davies – So, the wind farm wants to put in some massive turbines to take advantage to generate as much wind as possible. You don't have a restriction on that.

Alan Thomson – Yes, that is how they are designed. They are designed to get into the wind stream which is way up there. If we get a new commercial wind farm the new turbines that are on the market right now are different than the ones that are on the ground in the northern part of the County. They are considerably taller now. We don't want to step in here and limit the choices for the wind operators. They choose a particular wind turbine and it happens to be this amount of height. We are not restricting them in any sense like that. Any other questions? Okay.

19.10.060 – Rural Residential Use.

Two single-family dwellings and one bunkhouse or one cabin per parcel shall be a permitted use whenever the requirements of this Title are fulfilled.

So, now we getting into the meat of things here. This section tells us how a house gets built in WC. In this first section there are three possible ways. A, B and C down below here.

- a. *Creation of a new residential parcel or*
- b. *Alteration of an existing residential parcelto a boundary line adjustment.*
- c. *Construction of a residence on an existing parcel **created before January 1, 2007.***

So, “c.” deals with parcels that already exist out there that were there before 2007, before we changed the code. We want to accommodate them and allow them to be built on and this section here tells us how that would happen. So, let’s just start at the beginning.

Again, *“Two single family dwellings and one bunkhouse or one cabin per parcel.”*

Chad Whetzel – Have we approached the definitions of bunkhouse and cabin?

Alan Thomson – I have started looking at it but I don’t have anything yet. But we will definitely have a definition.

Chad Whetzel – My definition of cabin and somebody’s definition of a cabin on Lake Coeur d’ Alene are not the same thing.

David Tysz – What about the new mini homes?

Alan Thomson – You mean the tiny homes? They are not allowed in the State of Washington right now. They are not up to building codes standards.

Brian Davies – Even on the West side?

Alan Thomson – I had a conversation with our building inspector, Ginny. There is one place in the State of Washington where they are allowed and there is particular code language that has to be involved there that talks about the building specifications. The rest of Washington does not allow it unless they include this language, and WC is not considering it right now and neither are the other counties. That is one county out in the West side. I forget which one it is right now.

David Tysz – In Tekoa we were talking about allowing, we haven’t decided anything yet, if people wanted to put one in, would we allow it. So, I guess now we can’t.

Alan Thomson – I guess you’d better look into that as far as building codes are concerned. They are just like an RV. They are not constructed properly for snow load, or for warmth. They are not constructed well so the building codes do not allow them. That is the same with Tekoa, and the same with the County, anywhere in the State right now.

That is being worked on but that is what I understand right now that they are not allowed until they come up to snuff with the building codes. The people who have been building tiny homes right now have not been constructing them sufficiently well.

Brian Davies – I’m glad you brought that up. That is good to know, because that topic comes up in my town in a lot of conversations and we have been having an ongoing conversation about allowing a

property owner to use an RV on his or her property by himself and we haven't gotten, we allow it if the person has a building permit and they are doing some remodeling work on their house, they can stay in their RV. But that's the only way we would allow it. The tiny homes have come up in a lot of conversations. It would be good to get more information on this for everyone.

Alan Thomson – You need to have a conversation with the building inspector, your building people, because it is the building codes that are not allowing it to happen. It is the same in Uniontown, or Tekoa, the building codes are the uniform building codes.

Brian Davies – Either the UBC or the IBC codes.

Alan Thomson – They are not allowed because they don't come up to building codes.

Brian Davies – Is the State putting stipulations on this?

Alan Thomson – It is the State as far as the building codes conditions. Everybody is using the same building codes. It is not coming from the State Legislature, it is coming from the building codes.

David Tysz – So we need to inform our building inspector that he needs to look into this.

Alan Thomson – Have him talk with Ginny Rumiser. She is up to snuff on this one. Call Ginny and she will help you out with that one.

Brian Davies – Okay. thank you.

Alan Thomson – This language that has been struck out is not necessary. It is just like what is up above talking about short platting homes within 500 feet of each other. That is no longer relevant.

This one, "c." is talking about parcels that were created before 2007. Before we brought in the viewshed, there were a bunch of parcels that were already created. They were already platted so we didn't want to tell them, "Sorry, the code has changed therefore you cannot build on them anymore if you are in somebody's view shed." So, this is why this came up in the first place.

So, we are making a few suggested changes here, and this was created before January 1, 2007, and this is just a clarification. That wasn't in the language before, so that makes it easier to understand. This has not been certified. Not being certified means there is not a Rural Housing Certificate associated with this parcel or a Certificate of Zoning Compliance which was the previous zoning permit before the Rural Housing Certificate.

It has not been reviewed for a house. But it exists and the size and shape, and we understand that some of these parcels are small. We've got some parcels out there that are about an acre and less.

So, the normal size of a parcel per state law is two acres. If you are creating a new parcel today, it has to be at least two acres and you have to be able to put in the replacement drain field, the well, and the house.

So, this part here is in response to this smaller parcels that already exist. *"In this circumstance, if the size and shape of the existing parcel, natural impediments such as trees and steep slopes, and wetlands or flood hazard areas limit the location of the new residence....,"* which it could do and does do, then we are giving them little bit of wiggle room.

We are going to relax the codes, so we relaxed the viewshed one, for instance, the setbacks to agricultural land but we want to encourage them to try and meet those setbacks if it is possible. So that is the original language that is in there and I've just added in for clarification, ***"...natural impediments such as trees and steep slopes."***

That has been an issue with people that we have dealt with in the past. They want to build somewhere but they are confined to a particular area on their parcel because they have a bunch of trees that they don't want to cut down and they've got steep slopes. So, this allows them that flexibility. Maybe they can't meet the 100-foot setback to the road or to the adjacent Ag land. We are going to give them a pass on that but we want them to make it as close as possible to that setback.

Chad Whetzel – On those setbacks, if you have a house that is 75 feet from the road instead of 100, does that mean that you are going to try and put the second house behind the first house to get it that far, or is there a possibility that it can go to the 75 feet next to it instead of behind it?

Alan Thomson – That is coming up, Chad. That is the answer to your question, yes. We will match what exists there. So, if the existing house is 75 feet from the property line and you want to put a second house in there, the language is going to say is you can meet that setback of 75 feet or you can increase it but you can't decrease it.

Chad Whetzel – Oh, okay.

Alan Thomson – This part right here, ***"Where there are no limitations as mentioned above, and no short plat requested,"*** addresses larger parcels which we were struggling with last time. That basically is meaning that this is a larger parcel. It is not a small parcel. You can meet setbacks. You've got a big enough land area that you can meet the 200-feet to the adjacent farmland or 100-feet, and you can meet the 100-foot setback to the road.

So, that means where there are no limitations as mentioned above and no short plat is requested. So, somebody may have a quarter section of land and they want to put a house on it. So, the planning department would tell them that you have to meet the regular setbacks in this section, and that is what this is saying. You have to meet the setback requirements of the underlying chapter and the underlying code.

"In the case of a parcel of land in existence prior to January 1, 2007, if the parcel is within an adjacent viewshed then a variance to the viewshed rule is required. Excepted to this requirement are lots and blocks that are part of a platted subdivision."

This is already in the code, so Chapter 19.06, you can get a variance if you have an existing parcel and it is in somebody else's viewshed. So, there is a house right next door. But this is a parcel that existed before 2007. There is no house on it, but there is a house next door. We want to give you a chance to put a house on there so you have to go through a variance with the Board of Adjustment and have that reviewed and make sure there is no significant objection, meaningful objection to not having a house on that parcel. Does that make sense?

That is an exemption to the viewshed which is 1500 feet. The houses have to be 1500 feet apart, but this already exists. This parcel exists. There is no house on it. Are we going to tell that owner that he

can't build on that because there is a house right next door to you? That is the language right now in the code. The BOCC are fine with that. They think there is no problem with that one.

I'm putting that in because there was nothing written in Chapter 19.10 to talk about a variance under that circumstance. It is in Chapter 19.06 which is the Board of Adjustment chapter. This is linking this to Chapter 19.06. What I am saying here is that we are excepting that out with lots and blocks.

So, there are a number of lots and blocks in the County that were created decades ago and they were supposed to be part of a town. So, they are not in the town. They are in the County and they are 50 by 100. A lot that is 50 by 100 and then you have blocks of those six or seven, twelve blocks with twelve lots on them and they are only 50 by 100 feet.

So, you say there are going to be houses close by right in the town, Johnson, for instance, that is a platted town even though it is unincorporated. There are a bunch of lots there that are not built on. So, 1500 feet, if you have one house close by, it is blanked out by a number of lots and blocks. That is not right. That is not fair. So, this is saying that we are not going to have the viewshed part of the ordinance active here. And you don't have to go through a variance, either. Are there any thoughts on that? Are you okay with it?

Brian Davies – So, this refers to platted lots and blocks, the excepting platted lots and blocks like in some of these unincorporated towns, like Diamond and Johnson. Yes, there is a lot of stuff out there that hasn't been vacated.

Alan Thomson – But this part, ***"In the case of a parcel of land in the existence prior to,"*** so we've got independent lots out there that are not part of a platted subdivision. Somebody created an acre parcel decades ago and there is no house on it.

Brian Davies – Here is an idea. If somebody bought a bunch of those lots in Johnson and then they wanted to build something like that, it could be complicated. Is that what you are saying?

Alan Thomson – Well, this code, the Agricultural District Code is set for the Agricultural District. Those lots and blocks are set for a town zoning ordinance like Pullman setbacks of five feet or zero feet.

Brian Davies – When there is no municipal government and the County is the municipal government overseeing the unincorporated community, how does that play out?

Alan Thomson – When you say municipal, you mean the,

Brian Davies – Johnson has no municipal government.

Alan Thomson – Right. So, you can't develop, those lots and blocks were set up for public water and sewer. That is not available in the unincorporated area of the County. Therefore, these lots and blocks are too small to be built upon with the County Code.

The County Code is different from a city code or town code. We've got 20-foot setbacks, we've got 1500-foot viewshed. We've got all kinds of parcels in here that would negate being able to build on their lot that is 50 by 100 feet.

Brian Davies – I can tell you that when these lots were platted back in the late 1800-1900's they were platted for a wall tent at the front of the lot and an outhouse at the back of the lot. That was all the size

they needed so, we have lots of those lots in our small communities, mine included, but, so if somebody bought a bunch of those lots out in Johnson and they wanted to build they would have to, what would they have to do? Have it vacated by the County?

Alan Thomson – No, so this is already happening. It has happened and it continues to happen. This is not news to us. So, what we do under those circumstances is if somebody owns like six lots in a block, all 50 by 100 feet, we tell them that one of those is not likely to be large enough for you to put a house on it and a drain field system and a well.

But you own six lots. We don't care if you build over the interior property lines. We only care about the exterior property lines and if you meet setbacks to the exterior property lines and you build over the lot right next to you, you might be able to fit a house and all the parts on two of those lots, definitely three of those lots.

So, you can build on under that circumstance. But this is Environmental Health that is going to dictate what you can do here and what the size of the area needs to be because they are the ones in charge, not the Planning Department. As long as you meet the setback to the exterior property lines, that is all we care about. If Environmental Health says you can build a house on two or three of those lots with all the stuff that goes in there, we are fine with that. We have had that happen in Johnson.

Brian Davies – Then the Assessor's Office or whoever generates the parcel numbers, it will say, Lots 1-3 or 1-6 in Block 7 in Johnson.

Alan Thomson – Yes, that is how it would be written down in our brand-new GIS system. So, we will know exactly what we are dealing with. Also, we will have a file on what we have done here. They will still have to get a Rural Housing Certificate to build a house and then that RHC will get filed and there will be a map showing exactly what we did here.

Brian Davies – Is our GIS system going to wait to documents like that in the land use ordinance for certain areas? Say, if there is an overlay, if there is a critical areas overlay is that going to (inaudible)?

Alan Thomson – I don't know that detail, Brian. That's a good question. Our GIS system is not up and running properly yet. There are still a lot of gaps in there. That's a good question. I'll tuck that way in the back of the brain and ask the IT guy if that will be possible to pull that information out.

Okay, so that explains that part. Any other thoughts on that? That last one deals with the Rural Housing Certificate. These are three situations where you have to have a Rural Housing Certificate. So, we will keep going.

The other part of building a house or accessory building or expanding an existing house, that is called a Rural Residential Site Review, RRSR. So, this one deals with how you do that and what qualifies for a RRSR instead of an RHC. This is all the existing language.

If you are going to expand the existing house, if you are going to build a shop a barn, whatever, you are going to add to our parcel you have to go through a RRSR which is quicker review than the RHC review and cheaper. It is \$75 for the RRSR and \$150 for the RHC.

An RRSR will be required for the addition of a second residence, single bunkhouse, or single cabin on a certified parcel with the same requirements stated above about limitation due to

size, shape, or existing vegetation applying. The second residence, bunkhouse or cabin must be within 300 feet of some portion of the existing residence. The setback to adjacent farmland for the second residence, bunkhouse or cabin can be no closer than the setback of the existing residence to adjacent farmland and no closer than 20 feet from the adjacent property lines.

So, we are making a suggestion that when you have a second home on your parcel, or you build a cabin or a bunkhouse, the suggestion is not to go through a RHC but just to do the quickie review, the RRSR. Currently in code for an accessory dwelling unit we don't require any review, the RRSR or the RHC. It is just a building permit.

My thought on this for a second home or the cabin or bunkhouse is we need to have a little bit more of a review in that circumstance. So that is where this is plugged in. It would be a RRSR for a second house, a cabin or a bunkhouse. We talked about that last time and you seemed to be okay with that. Are you okay with that?

So, ***“An RRSR will be required for the addition of a second residence, single bunkhouse, or a single cabin on a certified parcel.”*** A certified parcel means that we have already got a house on here and it has gone through an RHC. Now they are putting the second one on so, the RRSR would be the tool that we would use. In this case, the same requirements stated above about limitations due to the size, shape, existing, we are applying that too. So, this is a smaller parcel and maybe the existing house is not meeting the setback requirements.

This would be a case that you brought up, Chad, if the existing house is 75 feet away from the property line, then we would allow the second house to be 75 feet away from the property line or further, if they can make it further away. But no closer. So, this basically is speaking to smaller parcels where there might be some impediments in the way for a second house. This is a debatable point.

Remember the last time we had this discussion about the impacted area. Building within the impacted area. I tossed that language out and I've put in here something that parallels with the existing code for a new house, a grouping. So, under the grouping scenario we have existing language that allows you to create a new house within 300 feet of the existing house. In the past the Planning Commission has been hot on keeping consistency.

So, we have something in the code right now that is not going to change where you can build a new house within 300 feet of the existing house. That is the grouping language. I'm throwing this out as a possible solution to our conversation last time with that fuzzy language about the impacted area. This matches with what is in the grouping part of the code. We could increase this distance or not. So that is open for debate.

Chad Whetzel – The way that you have it written, it seems like for that 300 feet if you had a piece of property that was fairly steep, and you needed to move the house say, 350 feet because of the terrain and to stabilize the bank to keep it from sluffing off, that 300 feet would probably still be, you'd be allowed to do the 350 because of the terrain and property. Is that correct?

Alan Thomson – I wasn't thinking about adding 50 feet in there. I was thinking about maybe increasing the 300 feet to 400-500 feet.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, well, I am just going with the 300 feet that you have there right now. I can't really think of an example of where that might be. According to some of the other terminology earlier on, would that be allowed to go a little bit further if the terrain dictates that?

Alan Thomson – You are correct that there is language in here about, that language is for replacing a home and replacing it in the same spot. That we give them a 50-foot leeway for that because you can't put it exactly in the same spot. If you keep it within 50 feet but, and I'll get to that language where, here it is, *"For replacement purposes, the new residence may be sited up to 50 feet from the original residential footprint."* That is a slightly different scenario. That is for replacement.

You are replacing the house and we allow them a little bit of leeway but now we are talking about what is going to be the buildable area on an already built area. What distance are we going to think about here or are we going to leave it in that gray language about the impacted area? I've got some thoughts about maybe increasing this number both for the grouping and here, to maybe 500 feet.

Grace and I were dealing with a client today who has a really strange shaped parcel. Almost like L-shaped and there is a house on it and they want to build another house on it. We were really struggling to try to find a location within 300 feet of the original house. We found an area that was possible but it was right on the bubble of 300 feet and then if you go beyond that 300 feet maybe another 50 feet or so, it was more feasible.

In that one circumstance, 300 feet was maybe a little too short. What do you think about increasing that to 500 feet both for the grouping and here?

Brian Davies – I think it is a good idea.

Alan Thomson – Does anybody else have any ideas on that one?

Rusty Jamison – As a farmer I understand why you are trying to limit these to certain locations, but I also feel the landowner has the right to do with his land (inaudible) but certainly if the one house that is out there does make it (inaudible) pesticide use and all that (inaudible)

Alan Thomson – Okay, that is a good point, Rusty, but think about it this way. The landowner is probably a farmer so you are making the choice. The code is making a choice for you and the code gives you up to 500 feet and you think, "That is going into my field. I'm not going to do that." That is up to you as the individual landowner to make that decision and that would maybe discourage people from taking out a farm field.

Rusty Jamison – I guess too that the landowner does have more of a right (inaudible) increase it so that he can still farm (inaudible) in the future. (Inaudible) I agree it is his right to do what he wants with his land. But sometimes people make decisions without knowing to realize the impact that they have on future generations. I would encourage you to bring back some of the (inaudible) adding new houses spreading out too far. If you want to increase it to 500 feet, I would be willing to go along with that.

Alan Thomson – Okay, even 500 feet, we are trying to keep houses closer together. It is not 1500 feet. It is not half a mile away. We are still thinking about the impacted area and farmers are reluctant to take land out of production. So, they may be limited as to where they want to go, and they make the decision that we are going to be 200-300 feet away because they don't want to take out farmland.

The parcel out there like the one we were looking at today, the 10-acre parcel and it is not farmed. This is a restriction. The 300-foot is a bit of a stretch for them to find a suitable area and if we sketched out the 500 feet, bingo. They've got a location that would be pretty perfect for them to build another home. No farmland is getting taken out of production, because it is not in production in the first place.

Rusty Jamison – If you are advising them to build in a location that is very suitable for their property, you should have the ability to increase the distance (inaudible) of that property. If it is not the best location, then (inaudible). They need to be aware of that because a lot of people (inaudible) the water and the well, they don't realize what they've got (inaudible).

Alan Thomson – That's really where the planners come in with all of that stuff and they need to understand that, so we help them understand and then as the landowner they make the decision. So, am I hearing a consensus on 500-feet?

Rusty Jamison – I'm okay with it.

Chad Whetzel – I do agree, I don't have a problem with the 500-feet. I was just looking back at the RRSRs and that has nothing to do with what we are looking at now, correct?

Alan Thomson – This is under the RRSR. We are talking about a second house. The zoning application would be a Rural Residential Site Review rather than a Rural Housing Certificate. That's all the difference there is.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, I was looking at that language and that language there would actually solve your issue with the 300-foot setback in this L-shaped property you are dealing with.

Alan Thomson – It would be 100-feet to the road and 100-feet to the adjacent landowner with an exception there. That does solve it. It gives this person out there with these weird shaped parcels an opportunity.

Chad Whetzel – My question is if we are trying to keep houses grouped up, leave it at the 300-feet but use that same language that you put in for these weird shaped parcels so that way you can expand it if necessary.

Alan Thomson – Okay, so that would be something like this language here. For replacement purposes, if some circumstance comes up and you can't meet the 300-foot setback you could site the residence up to 50-feet more.

Chad Whetzel – No, over on page 5, where they are talking about the RRSRs. If we left it 300-feet so we are trying to group the houses, but add that language in so that way if you do have a funky shaped piece of property, you can do a site review to come out and say that, yes, this is the best location for this house. It meets the other requirements but it's 300-400 feet away, whatever.

Alan Thomson – That is a thought. I can consider that for next time.

Chad Whetzel – With this grouping, we want to try to group them, I don't have a problem with 300 or 500 feet, honestly, but the more we go out, the less of a group it looks like. Basically, make that same exception.

Alan Thomson – Keep in mind that we are talking about defined areas. This is a parcel, a legal parcel that has legal boundaries and you could have built anywhere on this parcel before this code was there. It is all kind of eligible but we have to have some sort of restriction as to how far away.

If you want to keep houses grouped, there are 10-acre parcels that you could get another house several hundred yards away. More than 300 or 500 feet because of the size of the parcel and that is not really close to the original house. We are trying to keep them close together.

Brian Davies – What could we add in there for irregular shaped parcels or something so that we can say for these kinds of oddly shaped parcels we could extend that to 500 feet if that would satisfy a better building site? Just to give them the option to be able, just to not limit them to that 300 feet if it is a weird shaped parcel or it has a geographic or a slope or something a natural issue. We can't put the house there so we have to go farther so, what do you think about that?

Alan Thomson – The language here, which mirrors the language further up gives us leeway too, because of the shape, slopes, trees, that gives us, the Planners, some leeway here for the setback distances. But the distance from house to house, I look at that slightly differently because you have to have some sort of number in here.

What if you've got a 13-14-acre parcel and you could put another house half or a quarter mile away, and there may be things in the way that the quarter of a mile away is a good spot, but we are trying to group houses together. We are trying to keep houses closer together. I think we really do need to have a number.

Right now, 300 feet is what we have for the grouping and if you increase that to 500 feet the rest of the weirdness of the parcel is written in here. Like the size, shape, trees or steep slopes, we are going to allow you to build somewhere else but it has to be within 500 feet. Otherwise, we are defeating the purpose of keeping houses closer together.

I think the language here works, and it would have worked on this funky shaped parcel that we were dealing with today. Three hundred feet was almost okay, it would have been better to have it 350 feet. So, if we increase that number from 300 to 400-500 feet, I think that is giving people the additional leeway they need to find a spot. I think we really need to have a number in there.

Chad Whetzel – I'm good with 500 feet.

Alan Thomson – Okay, moving on, then on to a Residential Group. Now we are talking about the grouping. This is different than the RRSR. We are talking about grouping houses together which means they have to create a parcel. There has to be a short plat for a residential group. This goes through a RHC not an RRSR. So, I added some language to clarify what we just talked about, because this wasn't in here before.

*ii. Creation of a residential group. The owner of any residence constructed prior to January 1, 2007, may apply for review to create a residential group by submitting an application for a Rural Housing Certificate to obtain permission to construct a new residence which must be located within 300 feet of the existing residence. **If due to the size and shape of the parent parcel it is not possible to meet agricultural setbacks or the 100-foot road setback the conditions in 19.10.060 (A)(1)(c) apply.***

This is someone who owns maybe a 10-acre parcel. They already have a house on it so you could split the 10 acres into two 5-acre pieces. That is large enough to put all the parts in. But what if there is a mitigating factor there? There is a slope, trees, maybe a wetland, so that takes care of that here. ***“If due to the size and shape of the parent parcel, it is not possible,”*** this is language that is already in other parts of the code, then we are going to exempt you from “does not apply.”

That was missing out of this section before where it was already in other parts of the code so I just thought it would be good to add it in here.

Chad Whetzel – With this residential group section what is the difference between doing a residential group with 5 houses and our cluster developments?

Alan Thomson – It is a different code and I don’t necessarily think this is good code. Because the grouping allows you to group up to nine houses. So, the idea originally was to have an existing home as the center of your hub, so to speak, and then around that hub you could put a circle of houses. That was the original concept. Nobody has ever done that in WC.

Chad Whetzel – I’m trying to figure out, really it is pretty much the same thing as the clusters and it doesn’t make sense to have two codes that really apply to the same thing.

Alan Thomson – No, the clusters are different, quite different, because the cluster is very specific. One, you have to have a minimum of 20 acres. You have to own 20 acres. You have to create a 20-acre parcel.

You have to create the 20 and you have to change the zone to the Cluster Residential District. Then you subdivide that 20-plus acres into four buildable lots. Those four buildable lots can be a size all the way down to half an acre, all the way up to five, six, seven acres. We give the owner of that 20 acres the choice as to what size of parcel he wants to create. There are no restrictions on where you can build on that 20-acres. That is really different from what we are dealing with right now.

A grouping means that you’ve got a farmstead out there, a home on land and the landowner wants to have second house and sell it to a family member. So, you have to create a parcel, one other parcel. Not four parcels and there may be some restrictions on that parcel because of size, shape, or what is on it, like trees, steep slopes, or wetlands or floodplain, whatever. That is quite different from the cluster residential situation. This is just giving them a little leeway as to how that grouped parcel gets created.

Brian Davies – Nine units on, that almost sounds like Okanogan County when you deal with migrant worker camps on orchards.

Alan Thomson – Fortunately, we don’t have the same pressures on us that they have. Nobody has even thought about doing that. The grouping, all that the grouping has accomplished since 2007 is that the landowner has subdivided their land and put another house on it. One more house, that’s it. Nothing else has happened in that regard. Okay, moving on.

19.10.065 – Accessory Dwelling Units. Again, I don’t think this section is necessary. This basically allows you a second home on your parcel and that was the accessory dwelling unit. The accessory dwelling unit has limitations with 1200 square feet and two bedrooms. We don’t need this anymore. This language was before I thought about it and I was going to keep it in here and it talks about the size of the parcel.

We've got small parcels out there that are too close to farmland. This code at the moment compels you to meet this setback in the Ag District. Therefore, a one or two-acre parcel you would not be able to put an accessory dwelling unit on because you would not be able to get 100 feet away from the farmland. Or you couldn't get 100 feet away from the road. We are going to lift that restriction. We will delete this whole section. Is that okay?

Chad Whetzel – What do you have under historic structures if we delete that section?

Alan Thomson – I'm going to give that one a little thought. Maybe this part needs to be in here, so I'll look that over. Other than that, the rest of it isn't necessary. I will review this and make sure we are not eliminating something that should still be in here.

Brian Davies – It is embarrassing when you have a tool and you give it away and then you need it.

Alan Thomson – Okay, short plats and subdivisions. I'm just been making this make a little more sense to me.

19.10.080 – Short Plat and Subdivisions

No short plat or subdivision for residential use shall be accepted by the Planning Office unless such plat complies with this chapter:

- A. **New Residential short plats in the Agricultural District must comply with the requirements of Section 19.10.060. A short plat means the division or re-division of land **less than 20 acres** into four or **fewer** buildable lots.**

The reference here is wrong anyway. It is the wrong letters and numbers. I don't think it is needed anymore. "*Must comply with the requirements of Section 19.10.060.*" ~~(B)(1) regarding viewsheds and groupings.~~ This is not necessary. This is just clarifying what a short plat means in WC.

A short plat is different in WC compared to the rest of the State. We do have written into the subdivision ordinance that anything over 20 acres is exempt from the subdivision ordinance. Therefore, it is not considered a short plat. Anything less than 20 acres is considered a short plat in WC. All that is doing is clarifying that.

- C. A short plat may be used to separate out a parcel on which is located a residence **or residences**. A home site must meet the requirements of Section 19.10.060 to be considered a conforming rural residential use, and shall be issued a Rural Housing Certificate.

Brian Davies – Doesn't the size of the short or long plat depend on the number of lots as opposed to the total acreage?

Alan Thomson – It does, so a short plat can be up to six parcels and a long plat is six parcels or more. We've got written in here further along that residential short plats in WC are limited to four, as are commercial plats. Actually, three lots for residential and four lots for commercial. So that is just peculiar to WC.

In here now we are talking about conditional uses in the Ag district.

19.10.090 Conditional Uses and Administrative Permits.

5. Commercial horse boarding facilities.

12. Non-profit environmental operations.

We are adding commercial horse boarding facilities. It is mentioned elsewhere in the code but it wasn't on this list. So that is just putting that in here. So, somebody can't say it isn't on that list so therefore I shouldn't be doing a conditional use for a horse boarding facility.

We had this big discussion about non-profit environmental operations last time. I had that in the list of permitted uses, and I think we all agreed that it should go through a conditional use. Here is my attempt at describing that. **Non-profit environmental operations.** What do you think of that?

So, this is a case where you have a couple of houses and we actually have the Rose Creek Preserve, a house there, on Collins Road and the Albion Road. Rose Creek Preserve has a house on it and I think they are actually using that house for maintenance of the preserve there.

Then there is another case that I told you about north of Colfax, on the way to Palouse where this guy is wanting to build a house that he will dedicate to a PCEI, the Palouse Clearwater Environmental Institute, and give it to them sometime in the future, like a base for that environmental operation.

So, these are the two instances I can think of right now and that's why I'm putting this in here, because he is not allowed to do that right now. He wants to build the house so that when he kicks off, he is going to give it to the environmental company where they will have their office. It is in an area where there are other houses around but not too close to any other house and be used for an office space for an environmental non-profit.

Rusty Jamison – What's the difference between building an office on an old farm site (inaudible) building a residence for people to live in. (Inaudible)

Alan Thomson – Think about it in the way of impacts to adjacent landowners. That's how I think about anything that is written in the code here. We've got a list of things here for a CUP. Things that could be anywhere in the County. A church could be very noisy, but we could have a church there. We could have an ag commodity warehouse. A vet clinic. Boarding kennels. That is how I judge that.

How is it going to impact the surrounding landowners? That's why it is in this list for conditional uses because we get to evaluate that. They go in front of the Board of Adjustment and we evaluate the impacts to the surrounding landowners. We could limit the times of operation, we could limit a bunch of other things if it is going to negatively impact the neighbors.

Brian Davies – I've had experience with that with the vet clinic. We had to mitigate our release of animals that were boarding just two times during the day. They could go out and we still do that because some people within 300 feet of us said it was ruining their lives. But the Town was conflicted because we were vested.

We had been given a building permit for a vet clinic back in the 80's and so it was vested and there were stickers on the electrical panel that showed that it was approved back in the early 1980's so they couldn't say anything about it. We did our very best to mitigate the problem and it is just what it is.

Alan Thomson – So, in this case, if that facility ever becomes a non-profit environmental operation the impacts are going to be negligible. You're going to have Ranger Rick sitting in there and maybe there is a conference table and a whole bunch of people come in and they have meeting every now and again and a few more cars come up the driveway. That hardly seems to rise to the level of a dire impact to the adjacent landowners, Rusty.

Rusty Jamison – (Inaudible) If they ever (Inaudible)

Alan Thomson – My comment to that, Rusty, is here is the list of permitted uses. Permitted uses don't need a zoning permit. *"Government facilities, offices, and the County fairgrounds."* That could go anywhere in the Agricultural District. Government office could be a noisier, busier place.

You compare it to, and this is in the woods, sheltered, kind of off the road, compare it to an environmental non-profit government. I don't think this rises to the level of concern as far as how it is going to affect the adjacent landowners.

Chad Whetzel – These are conditional use permits, correct? So, one of the conditions is if you are traffic level rises to "X," then we have to reconsider it.

Alan Thomson – Yes, and we could actually have that as a limitation on the permit. It could be you are only allowed to operate on certain days at hours of the day, certain days of the week, and you are limited to "X" number of vehicles coming and going.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, I guess I'm saying, you should make sure that the (Inaudible) doesn't limit (Inaudible) the situation that could occur that is unforeseen. I know that there have been situations in the past (Inaudible) in those areas (Inaudible)

Alan Thomson – So what is imbedded in every conditional use permit that is issued in the County is, if there are complaints, we take it back to the Board of Adjustment. So, we can adjust that. If something comes up that we did not anticipate and is causing a problem, back to the BOA and they remedy that.

So, *"Agricultural and commercial trucking repair shops."* You were okay with that last time. We've got Ag shops out there and we are going to include commercial shops as well, because we have people doing that. *"Metal fabrication shops for the construction and agricultural industries."*

We have metal fabrication shops already in the County but it is not on that list. So, that is why I'm putting that in there. That covers that gap there right now. I think that is it for 19.10.090. This is the heavy lift. It seems like we have an okay for this, right?

Rusty Jamison – I am in agreement that you are going to change the 300 to 500 feet. (Inaudible).

Alan Thomson – Okay, there are a couple more chapters that will be really easy to go through compared to this one.

Keeping in mind, in the Comprehensive Plan we had language put in there about expansions of commercial surface and mining rock and I think we need to add this in.

19.59 Surface mining and rock crushing.

- B. Expansions of existing permitted surface mining and rock crushing operations of less than 10 percent of the current quarry site does not require further conditional or administrative use permit review as long as the expansion does not fall within 1,000 feet of a residence. A residence owned by the landowner of the quarry site is excepted.***

So, this is language that is in the comp plan. Essentially what we have to do right now is anybody, and that includes the County, if they want to increase any area that they are mining they have to go through a new conditional use permit to review the area that has not been reviewed before.

This is cutting out an exception for an area less than 10% of the quarry would not require any more of the review as long as long as it is not within 1,000 feet of any home.

Chad Whetzel – The way that is written, if my quarry is 5-10 acres and I decide we need to mine a little more, and you could pick whatever size property falls in the setback and now I want to do more. So now I can go to 11 acres. So next year we finish off those 11 acres and I decide I want to expand more. So, now I can go another 1.1 acres. How far, how many times can I expand that before you got to get another CUP?

Alan Thomson – We could solve that by saying this is a one-time use.

Weston Kane – Ten percent of the original size, or what are you thinking on that?

Alan Thomson – I think that is what the comp plan language was suggesting that you have the size of the quarry that gives you 10 acres as an example. That is what your original permit allows for and you can get a one-time 10% expansion without having to go through another CUP. So, I'll add that if everybody is okay with that, I'll add that language in there. Weston, does that solve it for you?

Weston Kane – Yes, I think so.

Brian Davies – Sounds good to me.

Alan Thomson – That's it for that one. We will tackle this one. This is a little more involved. This is the Cluster Residential District Code. Things have changed.

Section 19.12.030 – Zone and Lot Size Requirements, and House to Acreage Ratios.

- A. The minimum zone size for a short plat consisting of four buildable lots shall be 20 acres. ~~The minimum zone size for a long plat consisting of at least six buildable lots shall be 60 acres.~~*
- B. This zone must be capable of creating at least four lots that are suitable for building a single-family residence.*
- C. Lots may be as small as ½ acre. ~~As long as the short plat ratio of at least 5 acres per residence is maintained, or the long plat ratio of at least 10 acres per residence is maintained.~~*

This language that is struck out was part of the original deal that the State Legislature allowed WC to include. This was all tied to water usage.

So, the minimum zone size for a long plat, so you have short plats and long plats, consisting of at least six buildable lots shall be 60-acres. The original contract was if you are going to do a short plat with 4

parcels you get 5,000 gallons a day for all four of those parcels. That means 1,250 gallons for each lot. The State allowed us to do this.

If you create a long plat, first of all the ratio has to be different. It is a 10 to 1 for the long plat. Ten acres to one house. The idea here was that you could have as many lots as you wanted at a 10-1 ratio and you could get 1,200 gallons per day for each one of those lots. That law is no longer. It is off the books.

No developer went there anyway because you would only get half as many houses as doing the short plat. The short plat you would get twice as many houses. That is what everybody chose to do that developed a cluster residential district was the 20-acres and the four lots. But this no longer is applicable so that language has to go away.

Chad Whetzel – On those clusters, you said that they are designed to have a single well servicing all the houses?

Alan Thomson - Not necessarily, you could have four wells. You could have a well on each lot but the total for that whole 20-acres for the 4-lots is 5,000 a day, so 1,250 gallons per lot.

David Tysz – Are you talking about water rights for that area?

Alan Thomson – That is an exemption to the water rights. So, there are two ways to get water. One is with a water right or the exemption to the water right. The exemption is 5,000 gallons a day.

Chad Whetzel – Do you know what the average home usage is?

Alan Thomson – I can't give you an exact number but it varies and it is somewhere in the 200-400 gallons a day range.

David Tysz – In speaking on that, I'm with the rural water and that is what we kind of average, about 300 gallons per day. But in the city sometimes it is a little bit more. But here in this area, it seems to come about 300-400 gallons per day.

Chad Whetzel – My question is where we are allowing second homes even in these cluster areas, so that will take you from four to eight houses and if they are only using a single well allowed at 5,000 gallons, you could still do that and probably make that number.

David Tysz – When you are over 3-4 homes, aren't you on a water system then?

Alan Thomson – The one you're on is a commercial system. You're on a public water system. A Group A or a Group B. We are dealing with state law here, Chad. It is not local.

Chad Whetzel – I just wanted to make sure that what we are doing wasn't going to conflict.

Alan Thomson – It doesn't. So, on "C." here, this is telling how small a lot can go. It can go as low as a ½ acre. This is 5-acres to one residence and since the 10-acre part is gone and that old law is gone that is really not necessary anymore.

There is only one way to develop a Cluster Residential District in the County now, and that is a short plat with 20 acres, or you can have slightly more than 20 acres, four lots, 5,000 gallons a day, 1,250 gallons for each lot. That's it. So this is no longer necessary, this language.

Then, the long plat has gone away.

Section 19.12.070 – Short Plat and Long Plat Subdivisions.

This is something that has to happen, a public water system, so if you are developing four lots for four houses, that immediately is a public water system. Anything over two hook-ups is a public water system.

Each cluster will require a public water system approved by the State Department of Health.

Chad Whetzel – This is all under the subsection of cluster housing?

Alan Thomson – Yes.

Chad Whetzel – The way that I'm reading that is, are you saying that each cluster has to be serviced by one well?

Alan Thomson – Okay, so the "one well" part, you're hung up on that. It is the usage of the water. You can have four wells. You can have one well. One well could service all four lots. That is a choice that the landowners make but you could have four wells or you could have three wells. But it is the total 5,000 gallons a day for the 20-acres that is important.

Chad Whetzel – Right, there you're talking about four buildable lots and you say each cluster will require a public water system.

Alan Thomson – A cluster is twenty acres and four lots. That is a cluster.

Chad Whetzel – But you also said that they could each drill a well. But doesn't that negate being able to drill a separate well for each house?

Alan Thomson – No, it is written in the CC&R's, Covenants, Codes and Restrictions, that we the County have to have the landowner, the single landowner who owns the 20-acres up front, has to develop a public water system. So, that person is responsible for putting a well on the property. The CC&R's will say that you can have all four lots have access to this one well.

We have to do it this way because you're not going to be drilling four wells. You have to drill one well and then you have to make sure that all four lots have access to it. However, when the second party comes in and buys the second lot that person has a choice. They can tie into the existing well or they can drill their own well.

David Tysz – I thought there was a law that once there is a water system in there, you can't put another well in that system because it is competing.

Alan Thomson – I'm not aware of that, David. This is something that we've gone over with Environmental Health and the Department of Health.

Brian Davies – In an incorporated community like in Uniontown there is no way I could put a well in in my property. I asked that before, because I was told I have an artesian well 12 feet below the surface in my hay field. I didn't know how it applied to the unincorporated county but obviously the State looks at,

Alan Thomson – We’ve run this through the State Department of Health many, many times and nobody has batted an eyelid about it so I’m assuming that that means this is not a problem. This is the only way we can deal with this.

If we are going to create a 20-acre parcel and one person owns this parcel right now, there are four lots that are saleable and you have to have to have water that will be available to each one of those lots. Otherwise, we are not going to give them any permits to do that.

In the choice when the second, third and fourth individual comes in and buys those lots, they can drill their own well, which has happened, people have done that, or they can tie into the existing well. So that has to be written in on the CC&R’s because we have to make sure that water is available for all four lots.

Chad Whetzel – According to the CC&R’s then it depends on which cluster development you are in. If the CC&R’s say you must use the public water system then that’s the way that it is, or it will say that you a drill your own well.

Alan Thomson - Again, keep in mind what the definition of a cluster is. A cluster is a 20-acre parcel that has been subdivided into four lots which is distinct from any other cluster. So, when I say each cluster, each individual cluster is named something, the landowner gives it a particular name and then that’s what we are referring to.

Then up front, that has to be a public water system because we know there are going to be four lots and four houses. State law says that once you get to the third hook-up you have to have a public water system. So, it is only fair that the initial landowner has to create that public water system because when #3 comes in and the other two have snuck under the exemption, and they didn’t have to pay anything, but the third party comes in and has to pay for a water system. Not fair.

Chad Whetzel – Right, no. I’m just trying to make sure that everything lines up, that’s all.

Alan Thomson – That’s what that is intended to make sure that everyone who wants to develop a cluster understands they have to create a public water system with the State Department of Health. All of this long plat language needs to go. You can’t do a long plat anymore. That State law has gone away and I think that’s it for this one.

There is only one other thing I will deal with tonight and that is really quickly. This is the SEPA Ordinance. There was a mistake made. The original language did not have the word, “not.” *“Appeal of the intermediate steps,”* I don’t want to get into too much detail about what the SEPA steps are, but there are a number of steps before you get to the final decision. This is what they are talking about.

9.04.085 – Appeal

*A. Appeal of the intermediate steps under SEPA (e.g., lead agency determination, scoping, draft EIS adequacy) shall **not** be allowed.*

So, an appeal shall be allowed with the intermediate steps. Well, that is not right. It cannot be allowed and I’m going to show you the actual SEPA law rules so that you don’t have to take my word for it. So that needs to get changed.

WAC 197-11-680

Appeals:

(ii) Appeal of the intermediate steps under SEPA (e.g., lead agency determination, scoping, draft EIS adequacy) shall not be allowed.

So, our code is wrong and I want to correct that because we don't want SEPA appeals for the intermediate steps. These are the SEPA rules. So, is everybody okay with that?

Chad Whetzel – Okay, word for word.

Alan Thomson – Okay, that is it for tonight. I will tidy things up and will continue to look through the code to see if there is anything that I have missed but I think that is it for right now. When we meet again next month, we can go over this preliminarily again, quickly again, in case I come up with something else.

At some point, we'll come to a public hearing to make these changes real, which could be a couple months down the road.

Chad Whetzel – Looks like our next meeting would be Sept 7th, which in case it is important for anybody, it falls into the Fair.

Alan Thomson – I'll get in touch with you to see who is available. Rusty still might be farming.

Rusty Jamison – That's the time when I may not be able to be there.

Grace Di Biase – I just want to remind Alan that is your Planning Director's week.

Alan Thomson – That's right. Thank you for that Grace. I'll be in Chelan on that day.

Chad Whetzel – They have internet there, don't they?

Alan Thomson – I think the connection is pretty bad up there. Okay, so that means that we're going to have to come up with an alternative. The first and third Wednesdays of the month are the usual times.

How about the third Wednesday in September, the 21st? So, we can plan on, I'm pretty sure that the consultant for the Shoreline Update will have something in September.

I'll keep you posted. Hopefully I will hear from the consultant.

Adjourned - 8:45 p.m.