

**WHITMAN COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
July 6, 2022
Zoom Meeting**

MEMBERS:

**Chad Wetzel – Chairman
David Tysz
Matt Webb**

**Brian Davies – Vice Chairman
Dave Gibney
Rusty Jamison**

Staff: Alan Thomson, WC Planner; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planner; Mark Storey, WC Director; Brandon Johnson; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

Others: Ken Duft; Shelly Chambers Fox

7:03 p.m. – Chad Whetzel called the meeting to order. Introductions were held.

Mark Storey – I just want to say a few words before we begin. Yesterday the BOCC had their final hearing on the Comp Plan and they approved it unanimously with a few changes. Very minor changes, I will let Alan go through that. I want to personally, and from Whitman County, thank the Planning Commission for all the hard work put in on that. I know we were a couple of months late from what we wanted to do but we set extremely aggressive schedules. I think we got it done in what I consider to be lightning-fast speed and I think it is a very good document.

So, I wanted to personally thank all of you and I would also extend that from the BOCC as well. They thought the Planning Commission did a very good job of putting this together with a bit of help from the consultant. But the bulk of the heavy lifting was by you guys. So, thank you very much from all of us. I want that on the record because it was a big deal.

Brian Davies – Do you want it done again this century?

Mark Storey – We were talking about that today, and the last time it was done was in 1979 so that was 43 years. In another 42.5 years we will start talking. If you see the color of my hair, you will see that I will probably not be a participant on that next version. Thank you all. It is very much appreciated.

MOTION by Brian Davies and seconded by David Tysz to approve the minutes from the June 1, 2022 meeting. Motion passed.

Reports:

Alan Thomson

- a. Board of Adjustment forthcoming hearings. We do have something for the Board of Adjustment and that will be a variance which is two more down from this one.
- b. Forthcoming Administrative Use Permits. None.
- c. Forthcoming Variances – We have a request for a setback, to a 5-foot setback to a, Grace, help me out here. Is it a rear setback or side setback?

Grace Di Biase – It is sort of funny. I think we determined it was the rear because it wasn't abutting the road. It was abutting a parcel so we went off of that. It was a bit confusing but we sorted it out.

Alan Thomson – It will be in front of the BOA on July 28, 2022. It is a very simple matter for them.

- d. Update on previous conditional use permits and variances. None.
- e. Update on previous administrative use permits. None.
- f. Board of County Commissioners' action – We did have a public hearing on the Comp Plan yesterday, July 5, 2022, and as Mark already said, they unanimously approved it. I sent you the link to the final plan today. We can talk about this during the meeting what was changed. They were pretty minor changes and I can go into more detail on that if you want to.
- 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.

Alan Thomson – That's it.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, on to unfinished business.

7:10 p.m. – Adjourned.

**WHITMAN COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
July 6, 2022
Zoom Workshop**

MEMBERS:

**Chad Wetzel – Chairman
David Tysz
Matt Webb**

**Brian Davies – Vice Chairman
Dave Gibney
Rusty Jamison**

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

Others: Ken Duft, Shelly Chambers Fox

7:11 p.m. – Chad Whetzel opened the workshop to unfinished business. We have the Shoreline Master Plan update and that we are pushing off for now. Is that correct?

Alan Thomson – Yes, nothing to report for that at the moment. So, the consultant is working on this but I have had no communication with them.

Chad Whetzel – Why don't we also include the changes that BOCC made to the Master Plan.

Alan Thomson – So, you want to say that will be an addition on to unfinished business? I will put that in. Do you want to discuss that right now?

Chad Whetzel – What is the Board feeling about that? How long do you think the code revisions will take?

Alan Thomson – We should do it before we get into the code changes.

Brian Davies – Let's touch on it quick and hear what they want to do.

Alan Thomson -Okay, has anyone had a chance to look at the final product? Let me just bring it up on the screen.

Mark Storey – I think it would be safe to say there were some minor edits to some of the maps. There were a number of Scrivener's errors to fix little blemishes in the English presentation of the details.

The only substantive change is that they simplified the railbanking portion and eliminated some of that language that we took testimony on. They replaced it with the simple statement that railbanking was in compliance with this Comprehensive Plan, rather than try to go through details of legal explanation of right-of-way, acquisition disposal, whether or not we want it or don't want it. It is all future conversations.

They just simply said that railbanking is consistent with the Plan. That is fundamentally what it was as far as a change. You can go through the language itself but that is the big thing. We all thought the BOCC will edit that section anyway.

Alan Thomson – So, I will go through that. That was the first major thing that happened and that was on page 20.

Railways and Railbanking

Railroads and the associated railbeds are essential transportation corridors in Whitman County. The County supports the active use of rail transportation in Whitman County.

Railbanking is consistent with the Whitman County Comprehensive Plan.

Alan Thomson – This is the track change that we sent over to the BOCC. This is the first part that they changed. Railbanking has to be one word so we went through the document and corrected anywhere where it was two words. As you can see, now this whole thing is just right down to, “*Railbanking is consistent with the WC Comp Plan.*”

All of the maps were changed. So, we sent this to Jeff Marshall who is our Public Works GIS guy. We got the GIS files from LDC and Jeff worked on them and there were a lot of inconsistencies in the maps so he made them all consistent and certain things got taken out according to what the public wanted and what the BOCC wanted.

So, on Map 2, **WC Zoning Map – Pullman Area**. This one in particular we had a couple of changes in here. We recreated the city boundaries, that was different from the original map. Some of the labeling was off so Jeff corrected all of that.

Page 30, Chapter 3, **Transportation Element**. We did have some changes. The BOCC noted that Rose Creek Preserve is not a County park. So that was taken out. Then added was Elberton Park Trails on page 35 because that is a County-owned park.

Around page 44, on Map 5, **WC Road Transportation and Port Map**, this map got changed. Originally the rail line between Pullman and Colfax was in here. That got taken out because it really is not a transportation corridor. It is a “wished for” trail but it shouldn’t have been part of this map.

On Map 6, **WC Railroad Network Map**, this one was changed a little bit. There was a rail line, actually that one is still in there. It should have been changed because this is not an active line anymore between Pullman and Uniontown.

Mark Storey – You better make sure the BOCC have the correct version in their package, because that was to be removed.

Alan Thomson – Yes, actually I misspoke. So, this is a track change one, so on the one the BOCC adopted, that was gone. So BNSF Railway is gone. That line is no more.

On Page 49 in the **Parks and Recreation**, it talks about Railbanking, so consistent with the WC Comp Plan.

Railbanking – The use of railbanking for the development of multi-purpose trails along existing rail lines is consistent with the Whitman County Comprehensive Plan. Railbanking, or commonly known as “rails-to-trails,” is a method by which rail lines proposed for abandonment can be preserved for future rail use through interim conversion to trail use. Two existing examples in the Palouse region are the Bill Chipman Palouse Trail and the Palouse to Cascades Trail.

Alan Thomson – They decided to make this a simpler statement about the Palouse to Cascades Trail. They eliminated all of the extra and just kept it like it is.

Environmental Protection and Climate Change. – There are some changes in here on page 71. They didn't like the original statement so they changed this one.

Goal CC-3: *Encourage multimodal transportation.*

Policy CC-3.1 – *Whitman County supports multi-modal alternatives that reduce harmful emissions.*

There was an additional map put in. I'll back track on that one because that is not in this version. There was a change here on page 78. The Commissioners wanted additional language in here.

GOAL F-6 – ENCOURAGE WATER SYSTEM PLANNING TO PROMOTE EFFICIENT SERVICE, PROTECT THE NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENSURE ORDERLY PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT IN WHITMAN COUNTY.

Policy F-6. I – *Encourage public and private water purveyors to implement measurable water conservation practices and improve or enhance the water supply.*

Chapter 4: PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS ELEMENT. Page 49. There was a discussion about the Palouse to Cascades Trail. Some people in the public wanted the Palouse to Cascades Trail map put in here. So, there was a debate about that. There are some gaps in the Palouse to Cascades Trail that were not shown on the original map.

So, the BOCC, thanks to one member of the public, Nancy Belsby, sent in a map from the State Department of Parks and Rec that shows the actual trail, all the way to the West side. So, the BOCC decided to add that in as an additional map at the end of the chapter, **Map 8.**

So, those are all the changes that the BOCC made and this is now the official document. Any questions or thoughts?

Chad Whetzel – It looks like they pretty much left it the way we had it.

Alan Thomson – Substantially, yes, the way Mark said, railbanking was really the only part that they changed a little bit.

Dave Gibney – And, as Mark said, we expected that.

Alan Thomson – Yes, the Planning Commission elected basically to let the BOCC do that, which they did. So, well done, guys. Thank you. That was a humungous task to get that out of the way.

Chad Whetzel – So, we can move on to our new business.

Alan Thomson – Since we have changed the Comp Plan, there are some things in the development regulations that should change a little bit. So, we will start with **Chapter 19.10.**

Brian Davies – So, does **19.10** all involve crushing pretty much?

Alan Thomson – Crushing is part of it but it is not just crushing. So, **19.10** essentially is the zone of the majority of WC. It is the Agricultural District. There is a specific mining and crushing ordinance which we get a little bit of attention to a little later.

On page 1, **Chapter 19.10.020 – Permitted Uses**. Here is the big deal of the development regulations. I'll just go right through them step by step. This reflects what the Comp Plan says, a change from one house on a parcel of land to two houses on a parcel of land.

*B. **Two (2)** single-family dwellings per parcel conforming to provisions of Section 19.10.060 and not located within the CRD Opportunity Area.*

We talked about this and the BOCC concurred that this was something they would like to see. So, two main homes on a parcel of land.

Chad Whetzel – So, probably not anything to do with us but does that require a whole new set of permits running water to the second home?

Alan Thomson – No, it doesn't. So, as far as the State Department of Health is concerned, and also the local Department of Health, up to two homes on one well is fine. We have always had that. It is when the third one comes in that it is up to a public water system.

Chad Whetzel – Somebody asked me about a Class B water a while back. How does that get triggered then if you, if the water went into more than one building you needed a Class B?

Alan Thomson – It depends on the use. For residential use, the first one and the second one does not require a public water system. For instance, in the Clusters, there are four houses in a Cluster. That is one of the changes that we are going to make to the Cluster Development Code to clarify this. That will require a public water system because there are four hook-ups. Four houses sharing the water.

In the case of residential development, the first two hook-ups do not require a public water system. If there is a third one, yes, they do.

David Tysz – What about septic tanks? Does each unit have a separate septic tank? They can't all hook up to one tank.

Alan Thomson – Well, no, typically that is the case that everyone has their own septic system.

David Tysz – Is that in here somewhere?

Alan Thomson – We don't deal with that. That is the Environmental Department of Health. Those guys deal with that. So, how this works is when somebody wants to build a house, they come to the Planning Department first and they have to go through what is called a Rural Housing Certificate or a Rural Residential Site Review.

So, we are the gate keeper and during that process the Environmental Health Department comes into the picture. We do not give them a permit until Environmental Health has okayed the water and septic system.

Brian Davies – Is there a specific gallon per minute or recharge time on their wells?

Alan Thomson – That is entirely up to Chris Skidmore in Environmental Health and the well driller. When the well driller is out there drilling the well, they are trying to get as much water pressure as possible, gallons per minute as possible. So, that really gets done in the field and then Chris comes into the picture and hopefully, there is enough water to support a house. But the Planning Department doesn't deal with that.

Dave Gibney – Assuming the standard setbacks on all sides of the parcel still apply? Is there anything about how close the units can be to one another?

Alan Thomson – That is a building code question and typically there really isn't. So, I think, 5-10 feet is fine but again, that is the Building Department's requirements and I'm not aware that there is a specific setback. You don't want them butting up against each other.

Dave Gibney – If they are butting up against each other it is not two houses, it is (inaudible).

Alan Thomson – And then Chad, going to your question, commercial operations are different. There is a Group B system, a public water system if there is public involved and employees involved, it immediately is a public water system.

Dave Gibney – How does it work if there is a barn, a shop with a sink or whatever?

Alan Thomson – That can all be supported by one well up to 5,000 gallons a day. So, you have a shop and you want to put a bathroom there, that's fine. But again, it gets to the number of hook-ups. If you had three shops and a house, I think you're probably triggering a public water system. It is the number of hook-ups and the fact that it is a commercial operation. That triggers a public water system.

The strike out would be pertinent if we were only having one house on a parcel of land. That was written in here specifically taking into consideration that there are parcels out there already that have two houses on them. Our code before 2007 allowed two houses on a parcel. So, now we are putting it back to the pre-2007 situation.

This language that is being struck out is unnecessary now. If anybody wants to short plat their homes, you can still do that. If you have two homes on a parcel you don't need to have them within 500 feet of each other and all the other language that is in here. You can still short plat them if you want to. There is nothing to stop you from doing that. That language is not required anymore.

Brian Davies – If you create more than three lots you have to have (inaudible)

Alan Thomson – Creating three lots is problematic in today's world, because you now have the viewshed. So, what are the lots for? Are they residential? That isn't happening any more.

Brian Davies – That's good.

Alan Thomson – That is what the Commissioners want. We don't want to have large lot, long plat residential subdivisions. We don't have the water for that. That is the main thing. Are we okay with the strike-out there? Are there any other questions? Okay.

Page 2, ***Chapter 19.10.020 Permitted Uses***. I have already had a discussion with Art Swannack about this. This has arisen because of a couple of situations in WC where there is a single-family residence that is now within an environmental area, like Rose Creek Preserve. There is a house that now belongs, I

think, to Palouse Clearwater Environmental Institute. It is a preserve with a residence on it and if they wanted to use it as a base for their business there is nothing in the code that allows them to do that.

Then I've got another person who wants to build a house right now and deed it to an environmental non-profit organization sometime in the future. Again, that is not spoken about in this ordinance. So, this is my thought about trying to include something like that in the AG district but I think we need to think that one through, how to word that.

I originally had non-profits in there, but Art had some heartburn on that one because that would include just about anything. We do have government facilities and offices in here already as a permitted use. So, what are your thoughts on allowing somebody to deed their house to a non-profit environmental organization and have that environmental company work out of that house?

K. Government and agriculturally related non-profit facilities, offices and the County Fairgrounds.

Rusty Jamison – I have a question. On that if they were a non-profit, then would they be exempt from property taxes, once they receive the house?

Alan Thomson – That would be an Assessor question, but I think that may be so.

Dave Gibney – Non-profits are not automatically exempt from property taxes.

Brian Davies – I believe that a non-profit is exempt from certain kinds of taxes but I think if it came down to them owning a piece of property, they would still have to pay property taxes like everybody else would. I don't know, churches I believe are exempt but, I'm not sure about municipal, an incorporated town like say, Uniontown. Do we pay property tax on our town hall, our community center, on our parks, I don't know?

Dave Gibney – Gladdish pays property taxes.

Rusty Jamison – I just feel that, I believe that property rights and the person has the right to make the decision as to what he wants to do with his estate. But if there is an organization using somebody to try and get a piece of property zoned so they don't have to pay property taxes, I don't believe that would be right. I'd like to know if they would have to pay property taxes or not.

Alan Thomson – We can find that out Rusty, but neither of the two examples that I have given you here had any kind of intention such as you were suggesting. Rose Creek Preserve, the landowner died and deeded it to an environmental organization because he wanted to preserve that area. I don't know if you've ever been in the Rose Creek Preserve but it is really nice.

Brian Davies – A conservation easement might be a better description.

Dave Gibney – How is Rose Creek Preserve related to agriculture at all?

Alan Thomson – If you are related to Agriculture, it is the Palouse Prairie Reserve.

Dave Gibney – Agriculture is disturbing the land and growing stuff off of it.

Alan Thomson – I put that word, "Agricultural," in there because Art pushed me on it. He said what is this got to do with agriculture? When there was just a little buffer,

Dave Gibney – Well, it is in the Ag zone.

Alan Thomson – Here is the deal, Dave. Does it always have to deal with Agriculture, because they have certain things that are allowed in the Ag district that are not really related to Agriculture.

Dave Gibney – Sure, I'm saying how do you argue that the house on the Rose Creek Preserve fits your wording here at all?

Alan Thomson – Okay, so the question is, how do we word it then in order to make that fit?

Brian Davies – Add it to the overlay zone. Add it to the Critical Areas or something for conservation. There is a conservation easement or preservation or something that could be classified with a description and it could be, does that make sense?

Alan Thomson – No, so what are you talking about? Are you talking about the Critical Areas Ordinance?

Dave Gibney – I don't think the Critical Areas Ordinance has land uses permitted in it.

Alan Thomson – Exactly. It doesn't. Land uses are right here. It has to be in this document somewhere.

Brian Davies – So, it has to be under the listing of approved uses for that.

Alan Thomson – It is either going to be outright permitted or is going to be a conditional use. Those are the two choices. But Dave is saying we have to have the right verbiage here. That is why I am asking you guys. How could we word that to make it reasonable? I originally had in there, "government and non-governmental agencies," NGO's. But that is a broad swath there.

Dave Gibney – I think non-profit facilities,

Alan Thomson – And take out agricultural?

Chad Whetzel – So, if we allow it outright, I am thinking of the ramifications here. You have somebody that wants to donate their property to some non-profit that makes some product, that would normally have to be zoned for light industrial but because it is a non-profit then can you just turn it into a light industrial zone in the middle of a bunch of houses that are in the Ag district?

Alan Thomson – I want it to be specific to environmental issues.

Chad Whetzel – That's why I am throwing that out there. I know where you are going but if we just say, "non-profits," it would open it up to all.

Brian Davies – Environmental education? Something to do with education or preservation?

Alan Thomson – So like the conservation districts. They are quasi-governmental anyway. But what if a CD wanted to move out into the country somewhere. Say they have an opportunity to move into, somebody who wanted to sell or deed their house to that kind of organization. They are an environmental kind of company. The conservation districts.

Dave Gibney – I think you need to do an "Item L." and flush out your intent a little more.

Alan Thomson – So, help me along with this. I am grasping for language. How do we describe that? I think it is going to be fairly narrow too. Environmentally focused, not necessarily agricultural, although

the CDs are pretty much involved in Ag activities. But that could come under government facilities because they are partially government, anyway, the CDs. So, just the non-profit environmental companies like PCEI, Palouse Prairie Foundation, stuff like that.

Dave Gibney – Preservation is not too very a word, then, **“Item L. non-profit environmental and conservation facilities.”**

Brian Davies – I don’t see having an office in a building just for administrative and those sorts of things is going to change. It is no different than if we were to allow a home business in a, at Rusty’s office in his home.

Alan Thomson – That was Art’s concern, the impact to adjacent landowners. I have not had an in-depth conversation with Art, but it is almost like a forest service facility out there. It is that kind of operation. You’ve got some staff in there. You may have some meetings and the public is invited, as well. What kind of impacts would that have to the adjacent landowners? That begs a question. Maybe should it be a conditional use, and take it to the BOA and have the public have their say. Because we don’t know what kind of environment this might be in. There might be a bunch of houses there, there might not be. But the impacts to the adjacent landowners. So, would that be better as a CUP?

Chad Whetzel – I think so. If you take a house and convert it all of a sudden to commercial, and if you got 4-5 other houses around there, which is kind of what we are trying to do with group houses and not have them spread all over the place, it is really going to change the use of that property. Plus, if it is on a gravel road, it gives the County a chance to say that you can do this but you will be responsible for extra maintenance or whatever it requires and they can see what size of vehicles and all that fun stuff.

Alan Thomson – Okay, I like the sound of that. Anybody else got any thoughts?

Rusty Jamison – I like the sound of that. I was going to ask about we are talking about this one specific house, if it is deeded over to this environmental group do you know whether that organization has wording and restrictions on what they can and can not do with properties like this within our organization?

The reason I am asking is I kind of know and have been to some of the Idaho houses that are along the Snake that are a part of that forest department and I’ve seen what they do down there. I think it is kind of their own regulations as far as what they can and can’t do with those houses. I am wondering if there are regulations within the Environmental Department or whatever is the non-profit that is going to be using it.

Alan Thomson – As far as the company that you are talking about, these potential companies, they would want to set up whatever way they wanted. So, the thing from a governmental aspect from the County aspect would be, is it allowed to be zoned there? Is that an allowed use and then the Building Department and the building codes. So, if there are members of the public coming in, now you’ve got the ADA to deal with and so that would have to come up to building codes specifications. That would be the only thing that we would have involvement in. What else goes on inside there is private business.

Rusty Jamison – I know and non-profit private business.

Alan Thomson – Yes, and that wouldn’t be a concern for us as far as zoning is concerned. Other than what are the impacts to the adjacent landowners? That would be covered under this CU permit.

Rusty Jamison – I understand what you are saying, but I certainly don't believe that we should create a loophole here for a business to try and get around certain regulations that we may require if it is wasn't a non-profit.

Alan Thomson – I don't know what regulations you might be referring to there, Rusty.

Rusty Jamison – I couldn't answer that question but I know that as a business person you can sometimes create or use a loophole that benefits my business. That if I take a look at that, that is just human nature to do that, I guess. Some of it I would consider would not be very ethical. But in this case where they are wanting to use it as a non-profit, to me that is a little red flag and always will be. So, the regulations for using this property, I agree with what you said that we need to put more regulation in.

Alan Thomson – Anybody else comment? So, we can move on the next one?

Rusty Jamison – So are you going to put the wording on there so we can review it next time?

Alan Thomson – Yes, we will come back to this. I will take it out of here, put it under CUPs and we will look at it next time we meet.

Page 3. Okay, **19.10.050 – Height of Buildings.**

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

This is a point of clarification. It doesn't mention this, commercial wind turbines have no height restrictions. It mentions this in the particular zoning ordinance, **19.61**, which is commercial wind turbines, but this is the Ag district, so I think this should be added in here that wind turbines, transmission towers and wind measuring devices such as anemometers, have no height restrictions. And they don't. This is just a point of clarification. Any thoughts or comments?

David Tysz – Isn't there a certain distance required from the bottom of the blade to the ground?

Alan Thomson – So, that goes to **Chapter 19.61**. All of that detail is in there. It is not necessary to have all that detail in here. Other than, there are no building restriction heights because this is the Agricultural District Code. Wind turbines are in the Agricultural District. Therefore, they should be mentioned in this chapter here. But the detail on how you build a wind farm is all in a specific different code.

Okay, are you ready to move on? Okay, now we get into the detail of how residences get built in the County. **Chapter 2 - 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.

Since we added this into the Comp Plan, one bunkhouse allowed on a parcel of land. So, two potential homes and a bunkhouse or a cabin.

Brian Davies – For each home.

Alan Thomson – For each parcel. We are only talking about parcels here, a parcel of land. Again, this language in red that is struck out, is not required anymore because that is the previous code. Since now

we are going to have two homes on a parcel, we don't need to worry about separation distances and what not. Is everybody okay with that?

Chad Whetzel – When you were talking about the distances between houses and know that the building code says that somewhere, you said it is 5 feet is the minimum between houses?

Alan Thomson – I was guessing there, Chad. I don't know exactly.

Brian Davies – That might be between a house and a garage or a breezeway. I don't think you can put houses that close to each other.

Chad Whetzel – In some counties in the State they have gone to these ridiculously narrow lots and they are super close. They are a just a fire hazard. That's my only concern. I don't know what the distance is but it can' be so narrow that you can't get people between there safely.

Alan Thomson – That is all written in the building codes. When somebody wants to build two structures next to each other in WC, I send that to the Building Department. They deal with that distance. There are three essential ways of putting a house on a parcel.

So, “a” here is if you are creating a brand-new parcel. That is how you do that. Then “b” is if you are moving boundary lines. BLAs.

Then “c” says if you have an existing parcel that has no house on it, it is not built on it, that is the one I focused on. Because when they did the review of this in 2007 and the viewshed and all the other language came into being at that time, there were a lot of parcels that existed in the County at that time, that we allowed for them to be built upon even if we are going to change the code.

It would not have been fair to tell that landowner the code is now changed and you are now in someone's viewshed and so therefore you cannot build on that parcel. That was the premise and that is how we have been operating since 2007. So, this is an existing parcel. It was there before 2007 so we will allow them to build on there even if it doesn't meet setbacks or it is in someone's viewshed, etc., etc.

*c. Construction of a residence **and a bunkhouse or cabin to be included in the application for a residence**, on an existing parcel **created before January 1, 2007**, which has not been certified. In this circumstance, if the size and shape of the existing parcel and wetlands or flood hazard areas limit the location of a new residence so that it is not possible to meet the agricultural buffer or 100-foot **residence** setback distance from the road, these specific regulations shall not apply except that the greatest adherence to these distances possible is encouraged.*

Where there are no limitations as mentioned above, and no short plat requested, new residences or accessory dwelling units will comply with the setback requirements of this Chapter and will be contained to the impacted footprint of the existing homesite. In the case of a parcel of land in existence prior to January 1, 2007, if the parcel is inside the viewshed of an adjacent residence (s), a variance to the viewshed rule can be sought per Chapter 19.06.020(1)(e). Revised 10/27/08, Ordinance #068837

Alan Thomson – We want them to meet all the requirements, if possible. But we have a number of parcels out there that may only be an acre or two acres and therefore it is not possible to meet the

setbacks to agricultural fields or to the roads and there might be a house right next door. So, this is my way of trying to figure out how to build on those kinds of parcels.

If you are going to put a second residence on it, or a bunkhouse or a cabin on it, that's why they have created before January 1, 2007 in there. So, these parcels are what referred to those parcels that were there before the code changed in 2007.

Dave Gibney – So, you are going to let them put two houses on the vacant parcel?

Alan Thomson – If they can fit it. So, the way this is limited is Environmental Health.

Dave Gibney – You don't say two there. You got, "**Construction of a residence.**" Everywhere else you allow two residences.

Alan Thomson – Yes, one could argue that construction of a residence can mean two residences. You are constructing a house. It doesn't say a number but on the other side of the page it says, two single-family dwellings are allowed on a parcel. We can change that if you want that is the intention that is if you want another residence and a bunkhouse or a cabin, you've got to try and make it fit as much as possible.

That's is where the change at the bottom states, *"Where there are no limitations as mentioned above, and no short plat requested, new residences or accessory dwelling units will comply with the setback requirements of this Chapter and will be contained to the impacted footprint of the existing homesite."*

This is a dilemma because, what is a parcel of land? A parcel of land could be 2-4 acres. It could 60-100 acres. Well, we don't want them building willy-nilly all over a quarter section of land. That is not the intent. So, in the Comp Plan we've got language that says, *"the impacted footprint of the existing homesite."*

That is not exactly very tightly worded there, but I don't know that we want to tightly word that, so it contains it to where there is already activity. "Already impacted land." You know, there is a shop or a barn and a house maybe, so that is the impacted footprint. You can't go way out to the back 40 and build another house there, if you have a large enough parcel. Of course, that doesn't apply to parcels that might be 1-3 acres.

Brian Davies – To an existing farmstead.

Alan Thomson – Yes, so that is my intent to keep that area contained. We want to put other houses where there already are houses or where there is already impacted lands. Not taking up farmland. So, any thoughts on that one?

Rusty Jamison – Do you think we should put a reference back to where we were discussing the water and the water hook-up situation? So, if somebody just read this and they met the requirement that we came up with, but they may not meet the requirement with the water. I mean I know it is already in there and they should read it but if there was just a reference to review the water hook-up regulations, it might help somebody decide whether they want two residences on their old homestead because of the way the water hook-up situation is.

Again, I know we all do septic systems but if I was going to do this, I would certainly want to know what regulations are involved and the sewer.

Alan Thomson – That is where we as the Planning Department come in, Rusty. As soon as that person walks in the door, we have to educate him as to all the parts that are required which includes water and sewer. That is our job.

All those regulations are in the hands of the State Department of Health and the local Environmental Health Department. They get involved in this. No building permit is issued without Environmental Health's signature.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, so in this case then, it is a little bit vague, but then that allows you as the person that goes out and looks at the site plan you would work with the individual and say maybe move the house this way or move this back.

Alan Thomson – That is exactly what would happen. Also, if they are going to a third hook-up for water, we would tell them right off the bat, that this may be a public water system. That may discourage them right there and then.

But we would be obligated to tell them that and then Environmental Health would come in here and verify that and if they wanted to go ahead to do that, to apply for a Group A or B water system, they can do so. But again, that is State law not local WC law.

Chad Whetzel – On your statement on "c." where you are talking about, "*the impacted footprint of the existing homesite.*" If I remember correctly, most of the houses in the County, let's say, we have 20 acres and they are assessed, a residential home is usually assessed 1-acre or ½ acre or however they do that and the rest is agriculture. You say then the second home has to be placed within that one acre or can I put it on the other side of my property? If my kids decide they want to come back and live here I don't have to look at them every day but I can go visit them whenever I want.

Alan Thomson – No, that is not what we are trying to do. That would require a different review. If somebody has 100 acres or 50 or whatever you could potentially do a short plat somewhere on the acreage that you are outside of the viewshed of any other house. That is a possibility. This is particular to the impacted area around the house. So, if you have a house there already and you want to put a second house on it you have to stay within the footprint of the impacted area. You can't be ½ mile away.

Chad Whetzel – So, basically what we are trying to force these houses in on top of each other.

Alan Thomson – Yes, and there are a number of people that want this. We deal with these people all the time. This is why the accessory dwelling unit was great in a sense but the number of times we've had landowners come in here and say that I wish I could put something in there that is bigger than 1200 square feet. That is the only alternative right now. If you want to put a second house on your property, it has to be considered an accessory dwelling unit, 1200 square feet and no more than 2 bedrooms.

Brian Davies – This has to be in the interest of the property owner having family coming move on the property.

Alan Thomson – That is exactly it. We've got a number of people that are doing this that want to put a second home on their property because mother-in-law, father-in-law, kids coming back home to the ranch. This is to accommodate that perceived need. They don't want a limitation. Sometimes that

limitation works. If it is a mother-in-law apartment, that would work for some people. But others want to put a full-sized house on their property.

Chad Whetzel – So, how do we determine exactly what that footprint is then?

Alan Thomson – Well, that is the fuzzy part there. I don't know if we can make that an exact area but the language in there is the impacted footprint of the existing homestead. Usually that is fairly clear.

Chad Whetzel – It shouldn't say homestead, though. Oh, no, homesite is fine. You got homesite there.

Alan Thomson -I like the fact that there is maybe a little wiggle room there. If you want to get close to the field then and there is more property line there, then that is up to the landowner. As long as they are not going into the field and taking up farmland. That would be the Planning Department's call there. It's like, okay this looks like an impacted area. You're fine there.

Chad Whetzel – The fuzzy part is how do they determine, because if you have 20 acres and you're, does the County consider my homesite a ½ acre, 1 acre, ¼ acre? Is it different for all homes or is it consistent all the way across the board?

Alan Thomson – There is no such consistency. No. That would be a judgement call so, when you go on to somebody's property, if you look at Google Earth, you can usually see an impacted area. Then there is a field and a crop. There is a line there. That is the line we are talking about. The impacted area.

Chad Whetzel – If you got it in pasture, you can't do this at all, then.

Alan Thomson – Pasture is still agricultural land. Again, we get back to what is the impacted area? Pasture is impacted.

Brian Davies – Are you talking about adding another house to an existing,

Chad Whetzel – No, what I am saying, if I built a house and I've got 10 acres and I've got my house and I decide I really don't want to mow a lawn so I put pasture right up to the side of the house within say 15-20 feet. Then I am excluded from being able to do this at all.

Alan Thomson – No, that would be a judgment call there. If it is pasture, pasture. What do you mean by pasture? Like a yard?

Chad Whetzel – No, horses grazing or sheep or cows.

Dave Gibney – It doesn't look impacted by your definitions on google earth. All I really have to do is move the fence line.

Chad Whetzel – I was saying the definition is super fuzzy when it is really up to a lot of judgment that I am not particularly fond of, I guess.

Dave Gibney – What it really sounds like there is a point somewhere, there is a circle you are drawing around that house and somewhere in there you can do this and somewhere outside of that you are impacting the viewshed of that house.

Alan Thomson – The other way to deal with that, Chad is to put a hard number, a hard distance on here.

Matt Webb – That's about impossible. If you have a 50-acre or a 10-acre piece it is going to be different.

Chad Whetzel – The shape of the ground is going to determine a lot of things too.

Matt Webb – Right. But what you are saying there, Chad, if it is pasture ground it isn't being tilled under. It is kind of a stagnant ground even though it has grass growing on it and it is pasture. Yes, like you say, you pastured it because you didn't want to mow it and now you want to put another house in. You are moving a fence but you aren't really changing the layout of the field that is being plowed, cultivated, etc. That kind of thing. I don't know if that helps.

Chad Whetzel – Right.

Brian Davies – We're not taking land out of cultivation. In other words, we do not want to take land out of cultivation. Pasture is kind of a separate land use.

Chad Whetzel – Maybe the terminology should be something along the lines of, "within the footprint of the house excluding cultivated ground."

Matt Webb – But then let's just say if you are talking pasture, obviously you are not going to pasture on straight grass alfalfa mix. You're still going to go in every so many years and scratch it so. Where do you draw the line?

Chad Whetzel – Even on top of that, I know guys that buy ground, you know they want their 5 acres but all they can get is 20-acre plot so they let the farmer farm it. Sometimes they charge, sometimes they don't. And they got crop planted up pretty close. I should be able to build on a piece of property that I bought. There has got to be a better way to do it.

Alan Thomson – Let's make one thing clear, Chad. This is an existing parcel and it is a 20-acre parcel. A house can be built on it.

Chad Whetzel – But if I built a house already,

Alan Thomson – Now where the second house goes or the cabin goes, is the question mark.

Chad Whetzel – I only wanted 5-acres because for whatever reason, but I could only get 10 or 15 or whatever. Then I decide no, I really don't like dealing with weeds, I'm just going to let the neighbor farm it. It is still mine but he is going to farm it so I don't have to deal with that garbage. I should be able to build another house within reason of the house even if it is cultivated.

Rusty Jamison – I guess the way I read it is still that the landowner with the 20-acre parcel he would still be able to put a house, even if he was allowing it to be farmed. He would still be able to come to us and say that I want to put a house on the other corner of my property and Alan and his staff would go out and make a determination to whether he could do that or not. Isn't that right the way it is written right now?

Chad Whetzel – The way it is written right now it is anything other than gravel or used or one you couldn't do it.

Alan Thomson – Okay, let me try and explain it this way. If we just have a 20-acre parcel and there is nothing on it, nothing else and it was there before 2007, that is a buildable site. You could put one house on it initially. But what the code say is if you can meet their underlying requirements of the code

such as setbacks and viewshed. We require you to do that. That is the existing language today and it is still going to be the language if this changes.

So, we allow somebody to build a house on a 20-acre parcel but if you can meet the setbacks, we want you to do so. So, that means you can't just build anywhere, Chad. Unless there is some impediment which is the first part of this here. If there is something in the way, we are going to allow you to be exempted from say, the ag setbacks from the fields for a residence.

So, we plunk a house down there in that spot, we decided this spot works. That could be farmland. It is a 20-acre piece of land and someone bought it and it was farmland. So, you can build on that. Now they want a second house. What are we going to do? You've got 20 acres. We're not going to allow you to put down a house in the back corner half a mile away from the existing house. This here means we want you to consolidate the second house and get it as close to the first house as possible.

So, part of that parcel has been farmed and continues to be farmed. Then we don't want you in that farmland and we want you closer to the house that exists. So, there is going to be an impacted area with that house. There may be a shop or a barn there, whatever. The intention is to keep the houses close together even though you have 20 acres.

Chad Whetzel – The way it is written right there, if I am building, if I had a piece of ground for so many years, and I had some engineering job in Seattle and now I want to move back here, it is all either farm ground or something along those lines. So, I could build my first house with all farm ground around it according to that, because there is no real footprint outside of that.

Alan Thomson – When you build the first house, there is going to be a footprint.

Chad Whetzel – Right, but it will be a very small footprint.

Alan Thomson – And we want to keep you within that footprint as close as possible.

Chad Whetzel – So you're not going to be disturbing a whole bunch of ground outside of where they need to build. Usually that is a small area.

Alan Thomson – There has to be some limitations.

Chad Whetzel – Right, I agree. I'm just saying that I think this is awfully gray.

Alan Thomson – Okay, well, then give me some suggestions to make it a little less gray. Keep in mind that this is in the Comp Plan within the existing homesite there. Impacted footprint. That language is in the Comp Plan.

Chad Whetzel – That is not something that I am particularly fond of in general because it is pretty darn subjective.

Alan Thomson – The Comp Plan can be subjective. The development regulations can be specific. So, do you want to put a distance on here?

Chad Whetzel – I don't like the distance on here because it depends on the chunk of ground that you're on. There are a lot of variations of the way they view things.

Dave Gibney – Right now, let's think about the language for the next go-around. But the fact is, is that if somebody that's got a house on a chunk of land for whatever reason they want to put another home on it, I think there is going to be an amount of flexibility provided by the, this could be gray but it could be gray to what the Planning Department allows versus gray to how tight they are going to restrict things. I suspect the reasonable situation, at least as long as it is Alan, it would be a reasonable situation.

Alan Thomson – That's what I was thinking. There is going to be a judgment call and I know a lot of folks don't like judgment calls by government people but otherwise you have to make it a tight call. I don't see how you can do it any other way.

Dave Gibney – If for some reason, I haven't even put in the lawn and I haven't even weed-eated whatever, you know the impacted weeds around the house and where they park the car and then I get out the weed eater and expand that and it changes over night.

Alan Thomson – I wouldn't even consider that situation as being agricultural land, there, Dave. That would be within the play. It could be a possible location for the house.

Dave Gibney – I just planted a bunch of blackberries and they have grown up over what used to be pasture and then became blackberries at my place down in Klickitat County. At one point you could have said is that blackberry bush that somebody's allowed to build within 5 feet of my house, is it impacted or not?

Chad Whetzel – One of the questions I'd like to have answered, is what does the Assessor's office do with homesites? How big in the Ag area? Is it consistent or not?

Alan Thomson – It is consistent and there are houses on large acreages and they slap a distance around it whether it be an acre or something. They take the house out of the farmland and tax it at a different rate.

Chad Whetzel – Right. I'd just like to know what they do for that because if they are saying it was a quarter acre or whatever their determination is that may help us say that within that whatever that boundary is. I don't know that there is really anything on maps anywhere for that. So, that is pretty subjective, too.

Alan Thomson – There are two different things we are talking about here. You've got a 2-4-acre parcel and we give them a Rural Housing Certificate. I look at that as a residential parcel. The entirety is the residential parcel. Regardless of what the Assessor does. Presuming it is that small of a parcel it is residential. All of it. Now if you are talking about a house that is on large acreage, never been parceled out.

Chad Whetzel – What is the definition of large acreage?

Alan Thomson – Large acres could be anything. Twenty, thirty, or hundred, two hundred acres. Could be anything like that. So, this is key to that type of parcel where you've got multiple areas of acres of space. Now we've got a house on here and we want to keep any secondary house or residence close to the existing house. Not halfway down the road there, a couple of miles because you own that much acreage. This is how that is geared. It is geared to the large acreage parcels which could be a 20-acre parcel too.

So, that is what we are trying to accomplish here. Not to build a house half a mile away in a 50-acre parcel. That is the objective and like Dave said, let's just let this one go for right now. Think about this one and we will re-visit it next time we meet. That is a hard one to deal with right there.

Rusty Jamison – I would say too, as long as you are in this position, I don't think WC will have any problems, but at the point when you decide you are going to retire, WC is looking for a replacement, I hope you have somebody in mind because these issues that Chad is bringing up could be a real nightmare there if it wasn't someone like you that was being reasonable with all the people that you work with. It can be a disaster if they were not easy to work with.

Alan Thomson – I appreciate that, Rusty, thanks. But we need to, whoever might take over my position when I retire, would read this and have pretty much the same idea of what we are trying to accomplish here. That we want to keep houses close together. Some farmland might get taken out of production but they are not going to build, I don't think anybody can interpret this as we can build half a mile away from the existing house.

Dave Gibney – At some point in the future, or after a change in commissioners and local culture all that, this all could change anyway, but for right now,

Alan Thomson – Okay, let's table that for right now and move on. This next one is talking about issuing the Rural Housing Certificate and this thing called the Rural Residential Site Review.

Page 5 – 2. 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 limitations due to size, shape, or existing vegetation applying.

Alan Thomson - In the case of, and this is the way it is with accessory dwelling units right now. You don't need to go through, you only need a building permit for an accessory dwelling unit as the current code states. But in the case of, just because of this last discussion that we had, I think we need to go through a review for an additional house, a second house, or a bunk house or a cabin.

That would require a permit from the County. So that we can deal with some of the issues, Chad, that we have just been talking about. Where exactly does this thing go? Where does this building go? So that is the ability to control where a second house, bunkhouse or a cabin goes. It would require a Rural Residential Site Review.

Rusty Jamison – So the way I understood it the language you put in there was mainly like if someone wanted to have a garage or a little shop or something like that? Is that correct?

Alan Thomson – Right now, if you wanted to add a shop or a garage or whatever, that would require a Rural Residential Site Review. Now we are talking about a second house only or a bunkhouse or cabin. That is the something that is new now, and I want to loop that in with if you wanted to build a shop, you still have to go through an RRSR. That would require them to go through an RRSR for a second house, bunkhouse or a cabin.

Dave Gibney – I think that is perfectly reasonable if we are going to go down this path of two residences on a parcel, anyway whatsoever you need the review process there. This is a no brainer.

Alan Thomson – Right. That is why I put this in here because we need to review it.

Chad Whetzel – Do we have someplace the definitions of the bunkhouse and the cabin?

Alan Thomson – Not at the moment. But we can certainly do so.

Chad Whetzel – We need it.

Alan Thomson – Art brought that one up. What is a cabin? Is it a recreational cabin?

Chad Whetzel – I know guys up at Coeur d’Alene that have a cabin that is 4-5 times the size of my home.

Alan Thomson – Yes, well that might need a little fine tuning.

Dave Gibney – I remember the discussion of bunkhouses and specifically for Ag workers. When did we get cabins? I don’t remember that.

Alan Thomson - Cabins happened because of again, people asking about them. That’s something that happens in this office. People come in here and ask me if they can build cabins and I have to tell them no. So, there is a number of people out there that are interested in doing that.

Dave Gibney – Cabin fever. It’s different than the man-cave or the she-shed.

Alan Thomson – Yes, so I think it would require a definition. That would have to be part of the definition. What is a bunkhouse? What is a cabin? What does that mean? So, that is a discussion for another time.

Dave Gibney – Does a bunkhouse include cooking facilities?

Alan Thomson – Let’s discuss that at some other point.

Brian Davies – Electric range or gas?

Chad Whetzel – You can’t have gas anymore if it is new. The People’s Republic of Washington outlawed that. Seriously, you can’t have natural gas or propane on a new building.

Alan Thomson – Okay, moving along. This is the accessory dwelling unit section of the code.

Page 11 - Section 19.10.065 – Accessory Dwelling Units.

My thought is, do we need this now because we are allowing a second residence on a parcel of land. That’s what exactly this one was designed to do, to allow a second residence on a parcel of land. Now we are allowing that and there are no restrictions on the size of the second house. Do we need this section?

Brian Davies – I would say no if we are going to cover it all under,

Dave Gibney – Does this actually say that after I got those two houses, I can add a couple more accessory dwelling units?

Alan Thomson – That would not be, we don’t want that.

Dave Gibney – I know but isn’t that what it says?

Alan Thomson – You mean the current code right now? Or the proposed code?

Dave Gibney – The proposed code. If we amend the proposed code as we have today, and discussed already I don't want to look at it again, if we leave the accessory dwelling unit in there does that say you could actually,

Alan Thomson – No it doesn't. Here is the exact language. *“Two single-family dwellings and one bunkhouse or one cabin.”* It doesn't talk about accessory dwelling units. That is the further case for eliminating it.

Dave Gibney – That's what I'm trying to say.

Alan Thomson – Okay, I agree.

Dave Gibney – If you don't adjust it at all with it is right now, you get two houses and then next year you get two accessory dwelling units right next to it.

Alan Thomson – So we don't want that. So, is everybody okay with eliminating this section?

Chad Whetzel – Before you eliminate that, although I agree that you can, is there something in there in the accessory dwelling units that we can basically steal so we don't have the definition of a cabin,

Alan Thomson – I don't think so, because this is very specific to the size and the number of bedrooms,

Chad Whetzel – Right, well I think that would kind of just about fit a cabin in my mind, anyway.

Alan Thomson – We can make a definition of a cabin and not have a section of code in here about it.

Chad Whetzel – Right, no, I am just saying that is something we could look at to maybe come up with a definition of a cabin. I am agreeing it needs to be removed. That might be a shortcut to figuring our definition of a cabin.

Alan Thomson – Okay.

Rusty Jamison – I suggest that when you look at that definition, we don't have HUA housing here in WC but if we were a fruit growing county those houses and cabins the definitions of them would be pretty important.

Alan Thomson – Yes, I agree. That is something we need to work on if we allow cabins, then we need to define what that means, along with what bunkhouse means. So that is something we could potentially do there.

Page 13. The next one is on Short Plats.

19.10.080 – Short Plat and Subdivisions

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 less buildable lots.

C. A short plat may be used to separate out a parcel on which is located a residence or residences.

So, I am adjusting this so it makes sense. If you are putting in a new residence, so this is a residential short plat. We are creating a parcel. That goes without saying it needs to comply with that section and I'm making this clear here because WC's definition of a short plat is different from Pullman's and pretty much any other jurisdiction.

We have a section in our sub-division ordinance that exempts out parcels which are greater than 20 acres. If you are creating a 20-acre parcel that is not in WC jurisdiction a short plat. A short plat is something less than 20 acres. So, this is just clarifying that if there is no land less than 20 acres and took four or fewer buildable lots. So, there is a definition of what a short plat is and there is a definition of a long plat.

State law says, short plats are up to six parcels. If it is over six parcels it is a long plat. WC has determined before my time that four parcels is a short plat. That is just particular to WC. So, this is just clarifying that. So, again, *"a short plat may be used to separate out a parcel on which is located a residence or residences."* So now, it is including a second house and it is okay to put both houses on a parcel of land if the landowner wants to do so. Are there any questions on that?

Chad Whetzel – So, that **Section 19.10.060**, is that setbacks and stuff?

Alan Thomson – Yes, that is Rural Residential Use. So, all of that that we just went through on page 3. That is there. So, this is how you put a house on a parcel of land.

Chad Whetzel – I am just wondering if somebody builds two houses on a piece of land and they die and the kids want to sell it, they can subdivide those two houses into two lots.

Alan Thomson – They could, yes. Today you can do that and tomorrow you can do that, too.

Chad Whetzel – But they don't meet the setback requirements then.

Alan Thomson – Well, they would have to. When you do a short plat, you are compelled to meet the setbacks.

Chad Whetzel – So, if you cannot meet the setbacks, you can't do it.

Alan Thomson – Well, it depends on what you are talking about. If you build two houses like ten feet apart, that could be a problem. I would not recommend that if you are thinking about short platting this in the future. That would be part of my conversation with this landowner.

If you want to put another house ten feet apart from your existing house you wouldn't be able to short plat the two because you couldn't meet the 20-foot setback to the new property lines. You might want to re-think that one.

Rusty Jamison – I know some farmers that already made that mistake and it's going to be a disaster, because no one is going to want their house.

Alan Thomson – Again, that falls on the Planning Department to educate the landowners about doing things like this. Okay, any further thoughts on the short platting process? It not, now we are into the conditional use list.

Page 14, **19.10.090 – Conditional Uses and Administrative Permits.**

5. Commercial horse boarding facilities

So, commercial horse boarding facilities do require, and that is written into other parts of the code but it has not been listed here before.

15. Agricultural and commercial trucking repair shops.

16. Metal fabrication shops for the construction and agricultural industries.

Then, the reason I'm putting these things in here is because we've got people in the County that are doing things that are not always associated with Ag. That's is what the limitation has been in the language. Agricultural repair shops. We've got people that want to do commercial trucking repairing so that is something that people have been asking about and there could be a combination of Ag activity, ag repair shop and commercial trucking.

So, my thought was to add that in there because Ag repair shops, the impact compared to a commercial trucking shop is probably the same. You are working on vehicles. You are making noise. Ag repair shops are already allowed, so why not commercial trucking repair shops?

The same with metal fabrication shops for construction and ag industries. Again, we've got somebody who is asking to start a business doing that. Right now, it is all tied to ag. So, we are allowing it for other sectors about business other than ag.

Rusty Jamison – Over at my house what used to be an agricultural airport is now a shop with engineers in it for a very large airport company and there is a residential house right next to it. It is just the way it was subdivided when the owners sold it.

Alan Thomson – Again, this has to go through a conditional use permit so it goes in front of the BOA and we do have major operations next to residences in WC and whenever that happens the BOA can put limitations on when you can operate and make noise. Any other thoughts, comments?

Okay, so that's it for this chapter. We will probably tackle the other chapters next time because this one was a handful. If you have any feedback on what we discussed tonight, get in touch with me and I will re-do things and bring it to you next time.

Brian Davies – So if we have comments or ideas, we should forward them to you with regard to two residences on an existing homesite?

Alan Thomson – Look at everything in this chapter Brian, and everybody else. You all have a copy of this and so there are points of discussion, contention here. If you have some solutions as to how to word things better, just let me know so we don't have to keep hashing out over and over again next time. Let's see if we can make this a bit more efficient.

Dave Gibney – Since the Comp Plan has been adopted, this is the time to look at all the code.

Alan Thomson – I am going through that systematically. So, this is going to take several months to get through this. I've sent you two other ordinances to look at slightly less contentions than this one, but I will be looking at every code and see if things need to be adjusted and bring to you guys.

So next month is August. That is typically when we don't meet. You farmers probably are going to be busy, right Rusty?

Rusty Jamison – Well, if it rains like it has been, I don't know. My crop is not too good for Spring so it won't take too long for the Spring crop. But the Fall crop looks good.

Alan Thomson – So, do you want to consider meeting next month?

Rusty Jamison – I think we need to keep moving along. Am I the only one who is going to be affected?

Alan Thomson – What about Chad, Brian, Matt, everybody.

Brian Davies – August 3rd?

Chad Whetzel – No, I'm planning on putting it out there and see if we can get a response or not and trying to go ahead and move forward. We do have a lot to cover and eventually we need to get back to our critical areas stuff. I think that will take us a fair amount of time once we get started.

Alan Thomson – So, let's just tentatively say if we can get a quorum for August 3rd, I will talk to you guys and see how you are doing and I will have a chance to look over more ordinances, but 19.10 is a biggie and I would like to get that one nailed down as soon as possible.

Rusty Jamison – You need five for a quorum, right? You know, I miss a meeting once in a while but I feel that the rest of the Board members are mostly on the same page most of the time. So, if I miss a meeting and some business gets done, I'll not lose any sleep over it.

Alan Thomson – I don't think you are going to miss it because it has to go to a public hearing first with the Planning commission and I don't see that happening for several months. We've got a lot of work to cover with the other ordinances and I want to package them all together once we have discussed them all and come to a conclusion about the language. We are talking probably the end of the year before we get to a public hearing. On that note, gentlemen, we are done.

MOTION by Rusty Jamison and seconded by David Tysz to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed.

Adjourned - 8:42 p.m.