



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

1 A meeting of the Okanogan County Planning Commission will be held February 24, 2014 at 7:00
2 PM. The meeting will be held in the Okanogan County Commissioners Hearing Room, 123 5th
3 Ave. N., Okanogan, Washington.

4 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS** present included: Chair Albert Roberts, Vice Chair Phil
5 Dart, Commission Member Schulz, Commission Member Marlene Rawley, and Commission
6 Member Tim Woolsey.

7 **OKANOGAN COUNTY STAFF MEMBERS** present included: Director of Planning Perry Huston,
8 Senior Planner Ben Rough and Administrative Secretary Anna Randall.

9 **APPLICANTS OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES:**

10 **OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Liz Johnson, Howard Johnson, Peter James, Matt H Welles III, Tim
11 Vallo, Satya Kent, Aidan O'Connor, Anastasia Baum, John Sunderland, Marjorie Cross, William
12 Pope, Karen Renemu, BlueJay Hankins

13 7:00 pm Monday February 24, 2014 Chairman Roberts called meeting to order.

14 **Approval of February 24, 2014 Agenda**

15 Commission Member Schulz moved to approve the agenda, Vice Chair Dart seconded the motion.
16 Motion passed.

17 **Approval of November 25, 2013 Meeting Minutes**

18 Commission Member Schulz moved to correct the November 25, 2013 Meeting Minutes lines 14
19 and 15 regarding the approval of the October 28, 2013 Meeting Minutes. Commission Member
20 Schulz pointed out that the minutes needed to read that he had moved to approve the minutes and
21 Vice Chair Dart seconded the motion. Commission Member Schulz moved to otherwise approve
22 the minutes, Vice Chair Dart seconded the motion. The Motion Passed.

23 Commission Member Woolsey made a motion to reconsider the minutes from the November 25,
24 2013 meeting. The motion to reconsider the minutes was to correct an error in line 155.
25 Commission Member Rawley seconded that motion. The motion passed.

26 The reason for the motion to reconsider was because Commission Member Woolsey noted that on
27 the minutes from the November 25, 2013 meeting, on line 155, it stated that Commission Member
28 Woolsey amended the motion by striking item #6. The Minutes should read that Commission
29 Member Woolsey made a motion to amend the previous motion by striking # 4 on the list. He

30 pointed out that he agreed with #6 on the list and did not motion for it to be stricken from the
31 motion.

32 Director of Planning Perry Huston confirmed that Commission Member Woolsey wished to strike
33 #4 from the list.

34 Commission Member Woolsey made the point that he himself could not amend a motion, but
35 rather that such an amendment would have to be approved by the Planning Commission via a
36 vote. Commission Member Woolsey stated the importance of the minutes reflecting this correctly.

37 Chairman Roberts also noted that the minutes did not say who seconded Commission Member
38 Woolsey's motion.

39 Commission Member Rawley made a motion to amend line 156, that it should state that the
40 amended motion was passed. Commission Member Woolsey seconded the motion. The motion
41 passed.

42 **Old Business**

43 **Trailside PD 2012-1**

44 Sr. Planner Ben Rough introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He then apologized that
45 the Memorandum before them had not been included in the packet mailed out. That Memo's
46 purpose was to clarify the resolution. An example of this was the number of units vs. lots, there
47 were to be 6 units. This project is on hold until the application has been modified and then will go
48 through another review. Sr. Planner Rough stated the resolution to deny the Trailside PD should
49 be adopted to formalize the record. Sr. Planner Rough brought up that in the original motion to
50 deny there were 5 reasons. One of these was that there was no pre-application meeting with the
51 Mazama Advisory Committee. He wished to make the Commission aware that an informal meeting
52 did occur in the Planning Department and two members of that committee were there. Sr. Planner
53 Rough wanted the Commission to be made aware of that. If the Commission wished to modify
54 their motion, now would be a time to do so and the Planning Department would draft a new
55 resolution. If the Commission does not wish to modify then the draft before them should be
56 sufficient.

57 Vice Chair Dart stated that at time of the motion that was the information the Commission had.

58 Sr. Planner Rough pointed out that information on the pre-application meeting was in the staff
59 report. It was not brought up in the hearing. He stated that the resolution before them had the
60 correct information in it. He informed the Commission that the document was still a draft and
61 therefore can't be signed at this time. If the Commission wished to adopt it then he would put it in
62 final format and Chairman Roberts could come to the Planning office and sign it at his leisure.

63 Commission Member Rawley wished to discuss the pre-application meeting and whether or not
64 what occurred was sufficient. She asked what the rule was.

65 Sr. Planner Rough explained that the rule is gray. It says a pre-application meeting with the
66 Mazama Advisory Committee will take place but doesn't specify what the Mazama Advisory
67 Committee is. Nothing in the rule defines the Mazama Advisory Committee, whether there needs

68 to be a quorum or minutes. At this time the Planning Commission can identify whether two
69 members on the Mazama Advisory Committee meets that requirement or not. If that is the case
70 then Sr. Planner Rough could put that in the resolution, if that is not the case then the language in
71 the resolution should stay. He felt that the Commission needed to be made aware.

72 Commission Member Woolsey stated that the part of the resolution regarding the Mazama
73 Advisory Committee was very important. The Commission should always defer to community and
74 the people who live there. Two members do not constitute a quorum. Vice Chair Dart agreed with
75 Commission Member Woolsey, that two members being present at a meeting didn't follow the spirit
76 of the rule. Commission Member Schulz pointed out that local committees have been very helpful
77 and should not be ignored.

78 Commission Member Rawley pointed out that now was the time to set a president.

79 Director Huston stated that if the Commission decides the meeting being referred to, which was a
80 pre-application meeting and did contain members of the Mazama Advisory Committee, fulfills the
81 requirement for having a pre-application meeting with the Mazama Advisory Committee, then that
82 is how he will interpret that in the future.

83 Commission Member Woolsey asked if by passing the resolution in its present state they would be
84 saying that a few members of the Mazama Advisory Committee sitting in on a meeting would not
85 constitute a meeting with the Mazama Advisory Committee.

86 Sr. Planner Ben Rough responded that is accurate.

87 Commission Member Woolsey made a motion to approve the draft resolution as is. Commission
88 Member Schulz seconded the motion. The motion passed.

89 **New Business**

90 **Future Schedule**

91 Director Huston discussed projects that will be coming before the Planning Commission in the next
92 few months. These include the Shoreline Master Plan, perhaps in April. The Comprehensive Plan
93 is currently undergoing revision and will probably come before the Commission soon. This summer
94 will see the Zone Code and Subdivision Regulation.

95 Commission Member Schulz made a point that he would like the Comprehensive Plan completed,
96 as it will affect future projects and code amendments.

97 Director Huston noted his point and agreed. The current draft is not that much different then what
98 the Commission saw before; most of the changes have been in the area of environmental review
99 and cleaning up procedural issues.

100 **Public Hearing Item #1**

101 **Code Amendment 2014-1 "Festival Permits"**

102 Sr. Planner Rough offered his staff report for the record. He also added a comment sheet from
103 Okanogan County Health, stating that the Festival Permit should site some of that department's
104 codes.

105 The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) asked the Planning Department to evaluate the
106 efficiency of the current Festival Permits. Currently there is more than one process for permitting
107 similar events. Temporary Use Permits (TUP) for smaller festivals and the Festival Permit that is
108 issued by the BOCC for larger events. The goal of this was to consolidate these two processes
109 into one. The Festival Permit is the only application the BOCC processes and grants. The new
110 Festival Permit would be granted under the Planning Department, which already handles
111 applications, and very efficiently. That is one of the main changes. The next large change is that
112 the current regulation is section 5.24 and the new one will be 5.25. Our attorney recommended
113 repealing the old regulation and creating a new code section, that we couldn't delete large sections
114 and add new content. The new regulation is shorter and with fewer sections. Sr. Planner Rough
115 acknowledged that one size does not fit all. There is a section that explains what festivals are, and
116 what would be exempted from the process. There was a meeting with several Okanogan County
117 agencies last fall which generated feedback and questions which are reflected in this proposed
118 permit.

119 Commission Member Schulz questioned whether the current Commissioners were still interested
120 in this new permit process being developed.

121 Sr. Planner Rough stated the request to amend this permit was made by the current
122 Commissioners. The notes from the meeting referred to above was in his staff report.

123 Commission Member Schulz took exception to the fact that none of the Commissioners were
124 present at that meeting, only the secretary.

125 Director Huston made the point that one of the members of the current BOCC has been very
126 active in this review process. One of the objectives, as directed by the BOCC, was to make this
127 process something that you could literally go to the book and know what you are supposed to do.
128 While the process for the old Festival Permits was outlined, it was seldom followed and in the case
129 of the TUP there was no process. When applicants would come in and ask what do I need to do
130 we would have to walk everyone through it and our department was not always consistent
131 depending on what part of the code triggered the requirement for a TUP, they would have different
132 formats, different levels of information and comments and would have no timelines. While this may
133 seem complicated to some but from the viewpoint of the TUP where there was nothing to guide
134 anyone, there is more verbiage than before but an applicant and staff can look at this permit and
135 know what they need to do for the type of event you are planning. This could be used as a
136 template for those who put on annual events. The goal was to make a simple process the told
137 everyone what they needed to do in accordance with the different agencies involved in that
138 discussion last fall.

139 Commission Member Schulz was also concerned that the Commissioners will no longer be
140 involved in the permit process but rather the Director of Planning would be granting these permits.
141 Commission Member Schulz didn't feel that the Commissioners should be removed from this
142 process.

143 Director Huston said the objective was to make this an administrative process. That for the smaller
144 events at least, the need for a public hearing, notices and comments was not necessary. Any

145 decision that Director Huston makes as administrator of the code, is appealable to the BOCC. This
146 will remove a layer of approval.

147 Commission Member Rawley asked Sr. Planner Rough if he had noted the comments put forth by
148 JJ Bellinger of the Okanogan County Public Health regarding the number of medics needed as
149 well as other points. Commission Member Rawley noted that these points differ from his Staff
150 Report and questioned whether he had gone over that list.

151 Sr. Planner Rough stated that he received this comment after his Staff Report was completed and
152 sent out to the Commission members. He has adjusted for those comments on a draft in case the
153 Planning Commission felt that needed to be added, that he will bring forward if ordered to.

154 Commission Member Rawley thought it should be added if it is part of an RCW. She also noted a
155 clerical error on page 4 section C of the proposed new Assemblies and Festivals.

156 Commission Member Schulz commented on Commission Member Rawley's point, commenting
157 that the Health Code changes all the time, if we refer to it in too much detail will have problems
158 with it later.

159 Commission Member Rawley stated we were trying to give someone what rules they need to
160 follow, if we don't give them the rules then how are they supposed to follow them. We should make
161 it match the current rules.

162 Commission Member Schulz stated we should refer to the rules broadly so the permit does not
163 become outdated.

164 Sr. Planner Rough responded that what he did was to refer to the specific rules as well as point out
165 that applicant must comply with the Okanogan County Board of Health regulation and a citation.
166 This would enable the applicant to very easily find what the requirements are and ensure the
167 applicant would always be current on Board of Health regulations.

168 Commission Member Schulz said that in the past the permit would be approved subject to the
169 approval of the Health Department, and that was helpful.

170 Commission Member Woolsey asked how many permits currently need to go before the BOCC.

171 Sr. Planner Rough responded that the breaking point for needing to use the old Festival Permit is
172 3000 attendees, and currently there are about three issued a year. This is not a permit that gets a
173 lot of use, but will be used.

174 Chairman Roberts asked for clarification between temporary festivals and permanent venues.

175 Sr. Planner Rough explained that if a group wanted to become a permanent venue, they could do
176 so. They would have to meet the standards of the Festival Permit all the time, but then they
177 wouldn't have to inform the County when they wanted to operate.

178 Director Huston explained that the break point for becoming a permanent venue is infrastructure.
179 This is a permit for the actual event. Creating a permanent venue such as an event center would

180 involve a different process. When that process was complete, a festival would simple be a
181 permitted use of that venue.

182 Sr. Planner Rough pointed out that there has been very little feedback regarding the proposed
183 definition of Assemblies and Festivals and the exemptions to it. If there was anything that needed
184 to be added or taken from the list, now would be the time to have that discussion.

185 Chairman Roberts asked the Commission if there were any other questions for staff at this time.
186 There were none.

187 **Public Comments** Chairman Roberts called for the sign in sheet. He explained to the public that
188 he would be calling forward those who signed in and indicated that they wished to testify. When a
189 person is called forward, please state their name and address. Please keep testimony to 5
190 minutes.

191 **Liz Johnson**, of Twisp. She and her husband own Signal Hill Ranch. Every summer since 2009,
192 they have hosted the Methow Valley Chamber Classical Music Festival. This is a small non-profit
193 entity whose mission is to promote the appreciation of Classical Chamber music throughout the
194 Methow Valley and Okanogan County. This festival brings world class artists from all over the
195 world for five main stage concerts at their ranch. In addition to the main concert the artist's work
196 with local music students and also play a free community concert in Twisp. This is a small
197 organization run primarily by volunteers who donate their time, money, food, the use of their
198 homes, and whose budget barely covers its cost. They provide world class musical concerts
199 whose prices are affordable to the people of this community. Each year they apply for a TUP and
200 the Johnson's, as the property owners, handle all of the compliance. She is voicing her concern
201 over this proposed Festival Permit and applying these rules to small festivals and could put them
202 out of business. Here are the issues they face. Applicant must invite a Noxious Weed Inspector to
203 their festival cite. The Johnson's take care of all abatement themselves because they own a ranch,
204 by having an inspector come to their property; this adds a level of uncertainty. The provision for
205 First Aid, that there needs to be a station with 2 medics per 1,000 people. Their event host
206 approximately 250, so what does that mean for an event of their size? Another issue is the section
207 on if alcohol is served then security is required at the point of sale. She appreciates the fact that
208 the Commission strives for clarity, but she does not see that in this document on some of these
209 requirements. Mandatory dust abatement is another point; it is expensive and would be prohibitive
210 for their small festival. This festival has been going on for 18 years and these changes could hurt
211 them and the benefit they provide for the community. Please allow small festivals with fewer than
212 300 people and under 200 cars in it to be exempt from this permit process.

213 **Peter James**, of Tonasket. He is co-owner of 160 acres on Cayuse Mountain Road with the
214 Okanogan Neighbors, which is the land that the Barter Faire and other events are held on. His
215 question is what a permanent site is; the Barter Faire and others have been using the property
216 owned by Okanogan Neighbors for 20 years. They are interested in becoming a permanent venue.
217 They would always continue to meet all of the requirements. He himself has been dealing with the
218 permit process for 15 years, meeting with all of the different agencies, and improving yearly. They
219 are not just a field but also have a kitchen. They are a non-profit organization; they only have one
220 paid employee and thousands of volunteers. All money generated goes to the funding of next
221 year's festival, as well as funding different grants and scholarships. They want to continue, they
222 believe they bring a lot of revenue to the community and look forward to working with the Planning
223 Department. They are used to having to have their permit completed 45 days before their event.

224 They can't advertise until have permit and the 14 days the permit outlines is too soon. His
225 organization looks forward to streamlining this process so that it works for everyone.

226 **Tim Vallo**, of Oroville. He is affiliated with The Okanogan Family Faire. He had some basic
227 questions. What is an organized event? There is some ambiguity in the wording regarding a
228 permanent venue, and what is an acceptable use. He questioned the 14 day limit, that is too short
229 and amount of time, the 45 day permit time was much better. He asked if the application fee was
230 still the same. The proposal doesn't say, he was wondering if there was going to be any monetary
231 additions. He was concerned that the application would be going through the Planning Department
232 and Director Huston would be signing off on it, then they have lost communication with the
233 Commissioners. Everything else outlined in the new Festival Permit they are already complying
234 with. He can understand why Liz Johnson and their small festival is concerned, it is expensive for
235 dust abatement and Noxious Weed compliance.

236 **BlueJay Hankins**, of Tonasket. He runs the Conscience Culture and Okanogan Highway
237 Productions; they use the same The Okanogan Neighbors site. The cost is hard. They are also run
238 by volunteers. His concern is that the fees aren't listed. He would like that clarified and with all of
239 the fees listed so someone going into this would know upfront what they will be paying. He has
240 worked with The Planning staff and Director before and has had a good experience; he thinks that
241 there should be some oversight by the Commissioners as well. He also feels that the property
242 owned by The Okanogan Neighbors should be eligible for becoming a permanent site as it already
243 has the permanent infrastructure.

244 Chairman Roberts asked if anyone else would like to speak. No one came forward. Public
245 testimony was closed.

246 Chairman Roberts asked if there was a there a trigger for attendees? Is there a scale for the
247 applications?

248 Sr. Planner Rough answered that no, this regulation was drafted to work for festivals big and small
249 alike. There is more of an impact from big festivals than small ones. It is difficult to draft regulations
250 that work for both on a sliding scale, but that was our attempt. If there are certain sections that
251 need to be reviewed. There are some areas where all festivals have similar impacts. Also, the
252 Board of Health regulations are required whether the Festival Permit includes it or not. This
253 document almost mirrors those regulations.

254 Commission Member Rawley asked at what number is it required to have medics on site. She
255 thought it was 500 people. Sr. Planner Rough thought it was for 1000 people.

256 Commission Member Woolsey asked how much of a change this is for the smaller events.

257 Sr. Planner Rough responded that the earlier number he gave was for how many large events
258 apply for permits and this did not include smaller events. For the smaller events the Planning
259 Department receives TUP for events that are under 3000 people, and we see about 3 a year. That
260 TUP process is what this form was modeled after. The application fee will probably be similar to
261 the TUP fee, which is \$350.

262 Commission Member Woolsey asked if the requirements were the same for abatement dust
263 control and noxious weed control in the TUP.

264 Sr. Planner Rough said no, those specific requirements were not listed in the TUP section of the
265 code but usually required when the application is sent to other departments for comment and then
266 those comments are included in the document.

267 Commission Member Woolsey responded that was done on a case by case basis, whereas with
268 this new permit is uniform and everyone has to do all of it.

269 Sr. Planner Rough said that was the main purpose of this process, we wanted to give clarity. When
270 someone comes in to apply for a TUP now, they do not know what is required, but this permit
271 would mean that right away an applicant would know what is required. The other point is whether
272 the Planning Commission feels the regulations in this code amendment proposed are fair.

273 Commission Member Woolsey commented that the generality of the code amendment was one of
274 its big problems. Okanogan County is very big; there are too many different areas. Is it necessary
275 to create a kind of permit process that is so general? Commission Member Woolsey was not sure
276 if this is what we want. If nothing else the proposed code amendment needs work.

277 Director Huston made the point that this is an opportunity to decide how to continue and the time
278 to streamline the process. The objective is to create a process that works. The Festival Permit was
279 an involved process for the large events but with the TUP there was no process to go by. The
280 involvement of other departments as regards to comments was not always consistent and the
281 amount of time that an application was submitted was not always sufficient. This is a way to
282 resolve all of that. We aren't looking for a decision tonight; we want input in order to work on this.
283 The Commissioners did not want heavy regulation; they wanted a process that works. The process
284 for the Festival Permits was not always being followed and in the case of the TUP, there was no
285 process. If the Planning Commission feels there is a threshold where we don't need to worry
286 about, now is the time to discuss that.

287 Commission Member Rawley found the citation regarding an outdoor event by the Health
288 Department, an event lasting 2 or more days and 500 or more people for which drinking water and
289 sewage shall be provided. There should be a difference in requirements for small festivals and
290 large. With the comments about the 45 day permit she understands the concerns, but there is
291 nothing that says you can't turn in your permit application 90 days before your event, but some
292 small festivals don't need that kind of time. You can always turn in your application earlier. Maybe
293 we should look at some of this to see what should be required of the small festivals.

294 Vice Chair Dart felt there should be a tiered fee and tiered requirements. Each of these sizes has
295 different needs and issues. There should be a clearer breakdown of what each size needs.

296 Director Huston stated that was something they struggled with, how to distinguish between events.
297 The impacts are not always based on the number of attendees but more on what will take place at
298 the event, such as alcohol, food, overnight camping, from the view of public safety. We tried to go
299 away distinguishing by number of people and geared it more towards the type of event, and the
300 requirements that resulted from those.

301 Commission Member Rawley said she liked the idea of the Planning Department meeting with
302 volunteers for feedback. They might not understand what all of the regulations mean and have
303 some misconceptions. Perhaps they could formalize the procedure for becoming a permanent site.
304 They should be consulted on the impact this could generate. She does not want smaller events
305 priced out of business or scared away.

306 Chairman Roberts asked if there was a way to create ranges of requirements based on certain
307 criteria, stating that something does or does not apply.

308 Director Huston said that if that is what the Planning Commission wants, then we will attempt to do
309 so.

310 Chairman Roberts wished to continue this code amendment. Public comment has been closed but
311 public hearing is still open.

312 Director Huston responded that the Planning Department could take the draft back and work on
313 reviewing it and could take the sign-up sheet and set up a meeting to garner input.

314 Commission Member Schulz noted there was no timeline in the application process, and he thinks
315 there should be. He feels that 14 days is not sufficient time for review for a large festival.

316 Sr. Planner Rough responded that there doesn't need to be a timeline in the application process,
317 there is not supposed to be a timeline there. The timeline is for processing the application, it must
318 be submitted, already complete, 14 days before the event.

319 Chairman Roberts stated that the application could be submitted 60 to 90 days in advance.

320 Sr. Planner Rough remarked that yes, you can turn in your application early. All of the
321 requirements should already have been complied with before an applicant comes in to submit their
322 application. This would ensure that there will be no hold ups in the review process for things such
323 as noxious weed compliance. That should already be done before hand. The new process clearly
324 outlines what needs to be done so that someone can easily have all of this taken care of ahead of
325 time. If someone follows these guidelines then 14 days is more than sufficient.

326 Director Huston pointed out that some applicants would come in the day before, so that is what
327 this time schedule was geared toward. If an applicant needs to have this application submitted at
328 an earlier date for advertising or any other reason, then they are welcome to do so.

329 Commission Member Woolsey suggested that there needs to be a timeline for the department,
330 which might be helpful, reflecting when they would get an answer.

331 Director Huston responded that could easily be added and worded so that an applicant would be
332 aware that they could apply early up to a certain period of time and the time to process time upon
333 receipt, which is in other areas of code.

334 Commission Member Woolsey added that if the application was not reviewed by the Planning
335 Department within that time frame then it would be considered approved.

336 Vice Chair Dart had some questions regarding the section on fire safety. Water and shovels shall
337 be available at all times for fire control, which sounds like the event hosts have to provide a bucket
338 and shovel to anyone who has a fire. That would be expensive for a large festival. It should read
339 any persons with a camp fire are responsible for having a shovel and bucket for fire safety. If they
340 do not provide their own shovel and bucket then they cannot have a fire. The DNR code is very
341 specific on what the code is for a legal campfire.

342 Director Huston not all of this came from somewhere. This document is a compilation of other parts
343 of the code, meetings with other departments and other permits. If the Planning Commission
344 believes that something is not needed, it can be removed. It is important to list those regulations
345 that are required under other parts of the code.

346 Vice Chair Dart also questioned the section on drinking water, the proposed code amendments
347 states that the event hosts must provide drinking water for all attendees. Is that correct and if so
348 does it have to be free or can it be for sale. That is a huge expense.

349 Sr. Planner Rough answered that yes everyone has to have water available to them. As to whether
350 it has to be free of not, he did not know for sure, but thought it could be for sale.

351 Vice Chair Dart also pointed out that sanitary restrooms are required, but questions whether port a
352 potty qualifies as that. Perhaps the verbiage needs to be improved.

353 Sr. Planner Rough said that is a good example of where a reference to the Board of Health would
354 be useful, the same as with the section on first aid.

355 Vice Chair Dart brought up the section about the price of admission cannot exceed the cost of the
356 permit perhaps that should be referring to the number of people the venue can have.

357 Commission Member Rawley pointed out that is taken care of with the Site Analysis and is part of
358 the review process. She pointed out that some of the language needs to be cleaned up in the
359 proposed Code Amendment where it refers to the Board, is this supposed to state that it refers to
360 the Planning Department or the BOCC. That language needs to be clarified since if this is
361 approved the application will no longer be going to the BOCC but the Planning Department. Also
362 what is the requirement for police attendance?

363 Sr. Planner Rough answered that he had discussed the matter with Sheriff Rogers, and while the
364 Sheriff thought it was a good idea to have 1 officer per 250 people but hard to require it of all of the
365 venue holders. He felt that someone to check ID for alcohol sales was the most important. If
366 additional security was needed, then it was up to the venue holder to decide that and provide.
367 Sheriff Rogers did not feel it was necessary for all venue holders.

368 Chairman Roberts stated that staff needs to revise the code amendment based on the testimony
369 and comments heard and then come back to the Planning Commission with revisions.

370 Commission Member Woolsey stated he would like to make a motion to continue the hearing.

371 Sr. Planner Rough asked for two months to revise the proposed code amendment.

372 Commission Member Woolsey made a motion to continue the hearing for the proposed Code
373 Amendment Festival Permits to the April 28, 2014 meeting. Vice Chair Dart seconded the motion.
374 The motion passed.

375 **Public Hearing Item #2**

376 **Code Amendment 2014-2 “Planned Development Lot Size”**

377 Sr. Planner Rough introduced himself. He offered his staff report for record. He also pointed out that
378 there was a typo on page 3, under the SEPA review section it states that the review period ended
379 in March of 2012 when in actuality it should say February 27, 2014. The final SEPA review section
380 is over but the final SEPA appeal period ends this week. The Planning Department knew that
381 before coming to the meeting tonight. The review process has been very silent. This code
382 amendment has been requested by numerous members of the community as well as the BOCC.
383 We are confident the Commission can make a decision tonight knowing that the final SEPA
384 determination would not be appealed. But, since the appeal period is not over yet, the Commission
385 can always choose to continue the hearing until next month. This code amendment would add
386 language in the planned development regulations to increase lot size for planned developments to
387 be twice the minimum lot size of the underlying zone district in rural residential zone, which is 5
388 acres so it would require 10 acres, and the low density residential zone, which is 20 acres and
389 would require 40 acres for a planned Development.

390 Vice Chair Dart commented that this mostly applies to the Methow Review District but as the
391 Comprehensive Plan comes in it could be applied county wide?

392 Sr. Planner Rough responded that review of regulations should happen frequently and often, and
393 code amendments should take place to make sure parts of code match other parts of code,
394 although this doesn't always happen. There is speculation that this should have been done in the
395 2000 Comprehensive Plan Amendment that was an oversight that it did not occur. This shows that
396 a consistency review should occur. Was this intentional, who knows. In the future, when the new
397 Comprehensive Plan is amended and zoning plans change then this will need to be reviewed
398 again.

399 Chairman Roberts asked if there were any questions for staff. There were none.

400 **Public Comment** Chairman Roberts opened the meeting to public comments. He called forward
401 the member of the public who wished to testify from the sign in sheet.

402 **John Sunderland**, of the Mazama Advisory Committee came forward. He stated conclusively that
403 the omission of the code amendment was definitely an oversight about new zones. At the time the
404 focus was on establishing the new zones. It was never the intention to omit the section about lot
405 size from the previous zoning. Extensive public comments were done at the time and it was never
406 considered to not have the minimum lot requirements be twice the size for subdivisions. This was
407 definitely an accident that it was left out. We in the Mazama Advisory Committee always meant for
408 the requirements to be the same as before. Thank you to the Planning Commission for being
409 diligent about the minutes and such. Consistency is always important.

410 Chairman Roberts asked if anyone else wished to speak. No one came forward. Public comment
411 was closed.

412 Chairman Roberts asked if there were further questions or comments for the board or staff.

413 Commission Member Schulz moved to recommend approval to the BOCC of Code Amendment
414 2014-2, and to direct staff to prepare enabling documents supporting the decision including
415 findings of fact, draft code amendments and conclusions of law. Vice Chair Dart seconded the
416 motion. The motion passed.

417 There was no further business from staff

418 Commission Member Rawley moved to adjourn. Vice Chair Dart seconded the motion. The motion
419 passed.

420 **Adjourn at 8:54 p.m.**

421 **SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

422 ***Commission Member Schulz moved to approve the agenda, Vice Chair Dart seconded the***
423 ***motion. Motion passed.***

424 ***Commission Member Schulz moved to correct the November 25, 2013 Meeting Minutes***
425 ***lines 14 and 15 regarding the approval of the October 28, 2013 Meeting Minutes.***

426 ***Commission Member Schulz pointed out that the minutes needed to read that he had***
427 ***moved to approve the minutes and Vice Chair Dart seconded the motion. Commission***
428 ***Member Schulz moved to otherwise approve the minutes, Vice Chair Dart seconded the***
429 ***motion. The Motion Passed.***

430 ***Commission Member Woolsey made a motion to reconsider the minutes from the***
431 ***November 25, 2013 meeting. The motion to reconsider the minutes was to correct an error***
432 ***in line 155. Commission Member Rawley seconded that motion. The motion passed.***

433 ***Commission Member Rawley made a motion to amend line 156, that it should state that the***
434 ***amended motion was passed. Commission Member Woolsey seconded the motion. The***
435 ***motion passed.***

436 ***Commission Member Woolsey made a motion to approve the draft resolution as is.***
437 ***Commission Member Schulz seconded the motion. The motion passed.***

438 ***Commission Member Woolsey made a motion to continue the hearing for the proposed***
439 ***Code Amendment Festival Permits to the April 28, 2014 meeting. Vice Chair Dart seconded***
440 ***the motion. The motion passed.***

441 ***Commission Member Schulz moved to recommend approval to the BOCC of Code***
442 ***Amendment 2014-2, and to direct staff to prepare enabling documents supporting the***
443 ***decision including findings of fact, draft code amendments and conclusions of law. Vice***
444 ***Chair Dart seconded the motion. The motion passed.***

445 ***Commission Member Rawley moved to adjourn. Vice Chair Dart second the motion. The***
446 ***motion passed.***

447 Prepared by Anna Randall
448 Administrative Secretary