

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2012**

Public Services Center  
BOCC Hearing Room  
1300 Franklin Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Vancouver, Washington

6:30 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

DELEISSEGUES: I'll call the Clark County Planning Commission to order for Thursday, October the 18th, 2012. Can we have roll call, please.

BARCA: HERE  
USKOSKI: HERE  
GIZZI: ABSENT  
QUTUB: HERE  
MORASCH: HERE  
WRISTON: HERE  
DELEISSEGUES: HERE

Staff Present: Chris Cook, Prosecuting Attorney; Jan Bazala, Planner; Michael Mabrey, Planner; Kevin Tyler, Environmental Services; and Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter

**GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Approval of Agenda for October 18, 2012**

DELEISSEGUES: Do we have approval of the agenda for October the 18th, 2012, any changes? Motion.

BARCA: Motion to approve the agenda.

QUTUB: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and approved. All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

**B. Approval of Minutes for September 20, 2012**

DELEISSEGUES: Approval of the minutes for September 20th.

BARCA: Motion to approve the minutes.

WRISTON: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and approved. All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

**C. Communications from the Public**

DELEISSEGUES: No communication from the public so we'll move to public hearing items and Planning Commission action for the biannual code amendments. Staff report, please.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

**BIANNUAL CODE AMENDMENTS:** Clark County is proposing several code amendments as follows:

<b>BI-ANNUAL CODE CHANGE ITEMS – FALL 2012</b>			
No.		Title/Chapter/Section	Description
<b>Scrivener's Errors</b>			
1		40.350.030.B.3.b.(2) (b) (iii)	Add arterial streets to the list of street classifications that prohibit curb extensions
2		Section 1.2 of the Highway 99 code, Appendix F of Title 40	Correct references to certain Highway 99 standards
<b>Reference Updates</b>			
3		40.210.0020.D.6	Change/correct the reference to a native plants list in Section, the rural cluster provisions

4		Table 40.220.010-1.	Update references to special use standards that apply to townhouse developments
5		Table 40.220.010-3	Removed outdated footnote allowing 10 foot front setbacks when alleys are used in the single family residential zone
6		Table 40.350.010-1	Update Table 40.350.010-1 to allow 5' wide detached sidewalks along arterials and collectors, consistent with the revised road cross section requirements in Table 40.350.030-2
7		40.500.010.B.2	Update the reference to approval timelines for the extension of phased developments
<b>Clarifications</b>			
8		Tables 40.210.010-1, 40.210.020-1, 40.230.070-1 and 40.260.245	Clarify which zones allow tasting rooms and event facilities associated with a winery
9		40.510.025	Clarify that Type II-A neighborhood meetings must be held within the 90 day period prior to submittal of an application, not after submittal
10		40.530.010.F.6	Clarify the review process for changes of nonconforming uses
<b>Minor Policy Changes</b>			
11		2.37.010	Allow higher value contracts to be negotiated without advertising or competitive bids (consistent with state law) and remove other outdated requirements regarding such contracts
12		40.350.030.B.5.c.(1)	Extend the option to pay a proportionate share of road frontage improvements to six years, instead of three
13		40.350.030.B.10	Provide more flexibility, and clarify the approval criteria for private roads

14		40.520.030.I.2 40.520.040.B.4.g	and	Remove the Type I review requirements for school modulars in the conditional use section to be consistent with the site plan review exemption for modulars; but set limits to the modular gross floor area allowed under the site plan review exemption
15		40.520.060.E		Simplify and add flexibility to the post decision review criteria to allow more Type I post decision reviews of Type II and Type III applications
16		40.570.090.D.1		Eliminate the need for SEPA review for "Shoreline Exemptions" (a review process to determine whether a project located in Shorelines is exempt from obtaining a Shoreline Substantial Development permit), provided the project is not undertaken wholly or partly on lands covered by water
17		Table 40.210.030-1		Allow dental and medical offices as permitted (versus conditional) uses in the Rural Center Residential (RC) zones

BAZALA: Good evening. Jan Bazala, Community Development. Tonight we're here to review the Fall biannual code amendments. These range from scrivener's items to some minor policy items. There's 17 on the list, but a couple of them will not require your review and I'll call those out as we get to them.

Tonight submitted into the record are two additional documents that were not in your original packet. One of these is an e-mail from Marnie Allen with the school districts elaborating on the temporary nature of school modulars. And the second document is a recommendation from the Development and Engineering Advisory Board. These documents were e-mailed to you a few days ago.

So without further ado I will start out with the Scrivener's Errors, but typically I don't go over these, but there's just a couple so might as well just cover them. The first one is to add arterial streets to list of street classifications that prohibit curb extensions.

They're in Batch 6 of the retooling our code project. Curb extensions, that is like rain

garden facilities that protrude into lower classification streets, which are those with lower traffic volumes and speeds were allowed, and arterials did not make it into the list of those streets where such facilities are prohibited. So they always were meant to be, it's just a scrivener's error that they did not get into that list.

The second scrivener's item is just to correct some references in the Highway 99 standards. They're self-evident so I won't go into those particularly.

The next category of code changes would be Reference Updates, and these are on Page 1 still of the Attachment A. Number 3, there is an addendum to this item, and let's see, that did get into the record; is that correct? Do you have a sheet that says Addendum Revision to Attachment A, Item 3, you got those?

DELEISSEGUES: I think so.

BAZALA: Well, let's refer to that for this section here, for this item. Basically there is no document that's formally entitled the Clark County Plant List, so that's in the standard details manual. There's only lists of various native and nonnative plants that are approved for certain locations.

The Clark Conservation District does have a list of exclusively native plants and, therefore, we're proposing that we use that list instead of the misleading reference to the Clark County Plant List in the standard details manual that doesn't really exist.

Number 4, we're back to the main Attachment A document, would be to update references to special use standards that apply to townhouse developments. This would be in the single-family zones use table.

Basically townhouse standards used to be found in Section 40.260.230, and that section was replaced with the new narrow lot standard section, so basically the reference is referred to the new narrow lot standards.

And it also refers to Section 40.520.080, which that refers to the planned unit development section of the code, which is the only way that town homes are allowed in the single-family zones.

Item Number 5 is on Page 3 of Attachment A. It's to remove outdated footnote allowing ten-foot front setbacks when alleys are used in the single-family residential zone. During a recent code amendment ten-foot setbacks were allowed for living space in all circumstances, so the footnote that said you use a ten-foot setback when providing alleys is no longer relevant, so we're going to get rid of that footnote.

Item Number 6 is an update to Table 40.350.010-1 to note that five-foot wide detached sidewalks along arterials and collectors are allowed, and this is consistent with the revised road cross-section requirements in Table 40.350.030-2. During Batch 6 of the

retooling our code project, the decision was made to allow five-foot wide sidewalks when they're detached from a street, so we just missed updating this table to reflect the five-foot allowance.

Number 7 is to update the reference to approval timelines for the extension of phased developments where recently the shelf life of preliminary approval for most development permits was extended to seven years in Section 40.500.010.B.1, but text that refers to that preliminary approval timeline in a phased development section of the code was not updated at the same time, so we're going to fix that by deleting some language that had the old five-year time limit in there.

And on to Clarifications, on Number 8, this is on Page 6 of Attachment A, is to clarify which zones allow tasting rooms and event facilities associated with a winery. Wineries are considered agricultural uses and as such are allowed in all the zones; however, winery tasting rooms and events are only allowed in the rural and the urban holding zones.

So other than one incomplete listing in the resource zones use table and the definition of a winery in a different section, it was not evident in the code where tasting rooms and event facilities associated with the winery are allowed, so we're adding those to the appropriate zones.

And this is not a change of anything, this is just a clarification in the code so you can actually find out where such things are allowed, there's no policy change at all in that.

Number 9 is to clarify that Type II-A neighborhood meetings must be held within the 90-day period prior to submittal of an application and not after submittal. Conditional uses can now be applied for under a Type II-A process in which case a neighborhood meeting can be substituted for a public hearing.

The neighborhood meeting has to be held during the 90 days prior to submittal of an application, but the existing text as written makes it look like you could do it either before or after the application is submitted and that was never the intent. The meeting needs to be held first, after that meeting people can ask for a public hearing if they think it's necessary, that's part of the inherent process of the Type II-A. And just stop me if there's ever any questions on any of these.

DELEISSEGUES: Why don't you go to 10 and then we'll stop and have discussion on that, and if we can vote on that, then we'll take the rest of them and see how far we get without having to stop and vote individually. Maybe we can get them all, I don't know.

BAZALA: Okay. Number 10 is to clarify the review process for changes of nonconforming uses. Legal nonconforming uses are those that were allowed under a previous zoning code or when there was no zoning code, but are no longer allowed under the current code. The establishment of zoning districts, the Growth Management Act

and legal cases all support the idea of phasing out or bringing nonconforming uses more towards compliance with new codes.

The current code allows changes of legal nonconforming uses, and that can be either to a use that's permitted in a zone or to another nonconforming use as long as the new nonconforming use is found to have no more impacts than the original nonconforming use. It makes sense that changes from a nonconforming use to a permitted use should be encouraged for consistency with zoning.

So there are two sections of this code section, and the first one is changing to an allowed use. Right now the existing code requires a Type II site plan review to change a nonconforming use to a permitted use; however, sometimes a conversion might not really require physical improvements that would normally trigger a Type II site plan review.

Staff is thinking that if the physical improvements are minor and if the new use is permitted by code, then it doesn't seem to be a whole lot of sense to make somebody go through a Type II site plan which requires public notice and is more expensive if they're going towards compliance, so we shouldn't be penalizing moving towards compliance if there's very few improvements that need to be done.

And the second circumstance if you're changing to another non-permitted use, under the existing code it's not clear what type of Type II review is needed to change from one nonconforming use to another. It could be a planning director review, it could be site plan review, it's not really clear. Planning director reviews don't normally include engineering review, while site plan reviews typically do.

We're proposing to specifically state that Type II site plan review is required to go from one nonconforming use to another. Type II review would provide notice to the neighbors so they know what is proposed next to them, they'll go from one nonconforming use to something else.

Some of the text in the requirements are softened a little bit. When we brought this to the Board, they were concerned with some very stringent language regarding bringing the site up to the greatest extent possible, and so we're just softening some of that language to allow staff some leeway and what requirements are needed to ensure that the new use won't become worse than the original nonconforming use.

BARCA: Number 10 --

BAZALA: Yes.

BARCA: -- if we're already stating that the nonconforming use is to have no greater impact than the existing use, why are we going to the site plan review? Wouldn't we just be getting that type of information from the applicant as part of the decision-making process even in a Type I?

BAZALA: Well, we would, but with the site plan review, with a Type I, you're not providing any notice to the neighbors.

If there's an existing nonconforming use there now and somebody wants to change to another nonconforming use, public notice would be a good thing because neighbors might provide us some information that we don't already know regarding a nonconforming use, and they might have an opinion on the site that we may not be fully aware of.

So it seems that we want to be very careful and we want to get as much information as we can by doing a Type II review if they're going to go to another nonconforming use.

BARCA: I hear what you're saying in that regard, but I think we're starting off with the idea of saying that the applicant is going to show that it is no more of an impact, should we as the County disagree with that proposal in the context and say we do anticipate it is going to have a greater impact, doesn't the whole process stop just based on that finding right there?

BAZALA: Well, we could negotiate with somebody and impose some conditions so the application can meet the criteria.

BARCA: And those conditions could include a Type II review in place of a Type I?

BAZALA: Well, in this case we're proposing that all changes from a nonconforming use to a different nonconforming use would be a Type II.

BARCA: Right, I understand that. And what I'm trying to work out is in the context of saying that in good faith if we believe that the applicant comes in with the idea that there is no more of an impact than the existing use, then let's not burden them with the extra administrative expense and the time for the County's hours to have to prove what we're going in with when that isn't presented by the information right up front.

BAZALA: Yeah. Well, I think our idea at this point has been if a use is not really compliant with the code that we would like to at least give the neighbors opportunity to know what's coming.

BARCA: So we're saying that regardless of the change you want to let the neighbors know?

BAZALA: Yes.

BARCA: But if they were going to go to a conforming use, we wouldn't have to let them know?

BAZALA: Right. When we brought this issue to the Development Engineering Advisory

Board, they were kind of thinking that it makes sense, and staff agrees that it makes sense, that we don't want to really encourage more nonconforming uses, so it kind of makes sense that the process to go to a permitted use might be able to be easier than it is to go to another nonconforming use.

DELEISSEGUES: I kind of had the same question that Ron's talking about, I think, I said maybe the proposed nonconforming use is closer to meeting a permitted use. I mean it's not as nonconforming as it had been, it's getting closer to a permitted, it's not there yet, but it's a lot better than what's existing. Do you still have to go through this review process when the impact is actually less on the neighbors than it is now?

BAZALA: Well, that would be our opinion that it's less, the neighbors may have some input and maybe they would think that possibly the new impact --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I just wanted to clarify that.

BARCA: Well, then I have to ask the questions in the context that says so the neighbors think that there is a greater impact, where do we go from there? The applicant says it's not, the neighbor says it is.

QUTUB: And the County says it's not.

BAZALA: Well, we would have to make that decision. We'd have to make that call.

BARCA: So would we put ourselves in a better position if we just made this a planning director review?

BAZALA: Well, this part of the code actually will go in addition to the regular site plan review code. So the language in here that says that the use won't introduce hazards and all this stuff, all these criteria are something that staff can fall back on, and, yeah, it's clearly going to be in our opinion. I mean that's the nature of these kind of things.

DELEISSEGUES: I think "finding" would be a better word than "opinion."

BAZALA: Yeah, right. You're right, we would make findings.

DELEISSEGUES: Finding of fact.

BAZALA: Yeah. So these criteria give us a basis to approve it or not. And people can disagree and they can appeal. If they don't agree that our findings are correct, they can appeal it to a hearing's examiner.

BARCA: So, Mr. Chair, based on your discussion about whether we could go 1 through 10 and take them in order, I have to take exception with Number 10 here.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, how about 1 through 9 then?

BARCA: 1 through 9 I'm comfortable with.

DELEISSEGUES: Anybody else have any problems with anything on 1 through 9? You want a motion to approve 1 through 9?

MORASCH: I'll move to approve 1 through 9.

QUTUB: Second.

USKOSKI: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and approved 1 through 9. No discussion. Is there any discussion before I decide there isn't any? Roll call, please.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

USKOSKI: AYE  
BARCA: AYE  
QUTUB: AYE  
MORASCH: AYE  
WRISTON: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: On Number 10, do we want more discussion on 10?

BARCA: I'd like to hear from the rest of the Commission.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, you heard from me, I kind of questioned the same thing. Anybody else want to weigh in on 10?

USKOSKI: Steve, I think he's got some things.

MORASCH: I've got something actually a little different on 10 that I wanted to talk about, and it's just a technical matter, and we may need to hear from staff or maybe from legal counsel on it.

But I'm a little troubled by Number (6), the proposed new language which says, "The responsible official may impose conditions to ensure compliance with subsections (1) and (2) above," and the reason I'm troubled by that is my understanding is the County always has the ability to ensure compliance with any code criteria through conditions.

So I'm wondering why we're just calling out these two in this section, and if by doing that

by implication we're implying that the other sections can't be enforced through conditions. So it just seems like that's redundant language to me to the County's general authority.

So I was just curious why we had that language in there and if there was a reason for it, and if we might be better suited not to have it or to have some language somewhere else in the code that just says the County can impose conditions to enforce any provision of Title 40.

BAZALA: That might be a good legal point that I hadn't considered. The reason that --

DELEISSEGUES: He's talking about 6 we already approved.

QUTUB: No, it's (6) on your tab.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I understand.

BAZALA: The reason that was added was because we were getting rid of or we were replacing the old language in (6), that is that the Board found to be quite strict. So we wanted something that kept our foot in the door, but you might be very right that it's -- well, I don't know. Maybe legal staff has an opinion. Right now the criteria doesn't -- I don't know. Maybe we'll let Chris Cook weigh in on that if she like.

BARCA: Or not.

DELEISSEGUES: Or not.

COOK: Sure. Good evening, Commissioners, Chris Cook, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. I think that's a good point, Commissioner Morasch, and I hadn't really thought about that, but probably the solution is as you suggest to say somewhere that conditions of approval are always appropriate, that the responsible official may always impose conditions to ensure compliance with the code.

To some extent putting things like this in the code is kind of a matter of notice to the reader so that somebody who applies for a different nonconforming use knows that there might be conditions as part of it. I've never done this with a musical score before but that's okay. So I think that's the reason for its placement there.

BAZALA: Yeah.

COOK: And I would agree that it would be appropriate to put an overall provision.

MORASCH: If we had an overall provision elsewhere, you could --

COOK: Right.

MORASCH: -- reference it here --

COOK: Right.

MORASCH: -- for the checklist purpose of notifying the reader that, yeah.

COOK: Uh-huh, that would be absolutely a way to do it. This, by the way, I think speaks a little bit, if I can go back to Commissioner Barca's question, to the idea of notifying neighbors.

Neighbors come to hearings or to give evidence often that is not known by the County and is not given by the applicant, that's one of the functions that they provide in terms of making the process better, so that's one of the reasons to have a Type II kind of proceeding rather than a Type I.

In thinking about this it's important to realize that there is not in Washington law, nonconforming uses are very much not favored and that's because they're not compliant with what the current society, if you want to call it that, thinks of as the law.

For example, if you have a nonconforming use and you want to apply for a different nonconforming use, somebody might have moved into the neighborhood knowing it was zoned in a particular manner and they say, ah, but I see this thing, but they know it's zoned in a particular way, they don't expect to have a use come in there that's different from what they see and different from what's allowed by the zone, and that is yet another reason to allow public involvement.

As to whether you want to do that, that's obviously your decision, but I just wanted to address those two issues.

BAZALA: If I may add a little thought that I had in regards to looking back at this, we're calling for a site plan review process, but because we have these criteria we wanted to make it clear that this is sort of like a conditional type of use in our opinion, you know, in our view, because we do have subjective criteria up here, so we wanted to make it clear.

If it's not evident everywhere else in the code, we want it clear that specifically in this case we want to be able to impose conditions. Typically site plan review is pretty much you meet the code or you don't and so this is a different wrinkle in addition to the site plan review criteria, so that was the thinking that went into that.

DELEISSEGUES: Before we go any further, sir, in the audience, I don't have a sign-up sheet, did you want to testify on any of these and if so which ones?

TYLER: I'm a County employee and I may testify on one of them --

DELEISSEGUES: Which one?

TYLER: -- if we get to it and if you need me to. So what number is it on?

BAZALA: I think it's going to be actually the last one I believe, it would be Number 16.

TYLER: Do you guys want to do that sooner than later?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I don't care, we could get to it next as far as I'm concerned when we're finished with this one.

QUTUB: Mr. Chair, I had a question. Just to wrap my mind around the example that Chris Cook gave, and maybe staff can answer it too, what kinds of things might come up by neighbors that the County didn't know or the applicant didn't open? I haven't been on this Commission that long so it just would be interesting to know.

COOK: Well, for example, neighbors can testify very directly to sensory impacts of a use that the County doesn't go out --

QUTUB: Go out there, yeah.

COOK: There's nobody out there 24 hours a day to listen and smell and whatever. Sometimes neighbors are very familiar with traffic patterns in an area, they know that there's a school bus stop somewhere. If somebody looked hard for that information they'd find it, but if it's not brought to the County's attention, County staff might not know that while reviewing an application, so just things like that.

QUTUB: Thank you.

COOK: You're welcome.

MORASCH: Neighbors also sometimes may hire experts to do their own studies and bring those to the County's attention.

DELEISSEGUES: Any more discussion on 10?

WRISTON: I had a quick question, I don't know, it's probably for Chris, Number (7) was taken out, I think that's been in there for a long time, the financial hardship and whether or not it constitute grounds for finding compliance, why was that stricken and is that something that's in case law? I don't see it referenced anywhere else in here. Is looking at financial hardship in case law or something?

COOK: My understanding of case law is that when you're talking about a hardship that justifies for example a variance, it's not financial hardship, it's more physical difficulty in compliance with the criteria, but I don't know why they chose to deal with this at this time.

BAZALA: I don't think it shows up anywhere else in the code to my knowledge and so it just seemed sort of sticking out, why have that in this particular case, and we would just handle it like we would any other application in the code.

WRISTON: Can you look? I mean we don't need to do anything with it tonight, but I've dealt years ago with nonconforming uses with respect to an asphalt plant and basically updating an asphalt plant, almost along the lines of what Ron and Dick were talking about, where you brought in a new asphalt plant that had new technology and everything else, cleaner and all those things, and we had to go through the process, but I do remember the financial hardship argument being brought up in some context, or maybe I'm just remembering that it's always been in the code, so I'm just wondering if it's somewhere in case law.

To me it makes sense as an argument. Some of these things come down to changing a nonconforming use along the lines of you have a - and I'll just use my background - you have a concrete plant or something out there or something and you want to add another silo or something and that changes that you can't do that.

Or you want to add some kind of air quality measure and someone can argue that you're adding to the plant itself and you're violating the nonconforming use and so you're trying to do X and then they want you to do Y which is economically infeasible, it's a financial hardship, it makes sense to me.

And so I think somewhere, it must be in case law or something, and if the intent of this is to soften, which I heard you say the intent of some of this language is to soften, then taking that out doesn't seem to go with the intent. I mean the language itself can be softened to say that financial hardship may be considered and not be grounds alone but may be considered, something like that. So I don't think we have enough information to go and make a decision on that tonight, but if you guys can look at that.

COOK: I think the other reason, if you pardon me, I'm sorry, I spoke without permission, but the old Number (6) is being taken out.

MORASCH: Yeah, I was just going to say that.

COOK: That says "The proposed change in use shall be brought into compliance with all applicable standards," and since that's no longer a requirement or brought into compliance to the greatest extent practicable, since that's no longer needed, then you don't have to have this argument about how much you're bringing it into compliance at all.

WRISTON: That makes sense.

COOK: It doesn't need to be there.

WRISTON: That makes sense.

MORASCH: That's the way I read it too, that the site improvement requirements referred to in Number (7) were those things discussed in Number (6), so if you delete (6), then you don't need (7) anymore.

WRISTON: Okay, good.

DELEISSEGUES: Anything else on 10? Well, let's have a motion on 10, we'll get rid of it.

BARCA: I didn't hear from very many people. I'd make a motion if I thought that we were going to gain traction with it.

WRISTON: I'll make a motion to move to approve.

QUTUB: I'll second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded to approve Number 10. Any further discussion? Roll call.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

BARCA: NO  
QUTUB: YES  
USKOSKI: YES  
MORASCH: NO  
WRISTON: YES  
DELEISSEGUES: YES

DELEISSEGUES: If it's okay with everybody, then we'll go to 17 so you can go home.

BARCA: Uh-oh, I hadn't read that far.

DELEISSEGUES: Uh-oh, glass of water for Mr. Barca.

BAZALA: It will actually be Number 16.

DELEISSEGUES: Mine says 17.

BARCA: Oh, he's on 16.

BAZALA: So basically I'll just do a brief synopsis, and then if there's questions, then Kevin is probably the one that's best qualified to answer this. So we'll go to Number 16 which is on Page 18.

DELEISSEGUES: 16 on 18?

BAZALA: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: And not 17?

BAZALA: Correct. This is in regards to Section 40.570.090, which is part of the SEPA code, it's eliminate the need for SEPA review for shoreline exemptions which are a review process to determine whether a project that's located in the shoreline environment is exempt from obtaining a shoreline substantial development permit. So basically we're looking at eliminating the need for SEPA provided the project is not undertaken wholly or partly on lands covered by water.

A shoreline exemption is a Type I review to determine that a shoreline substantial development permit is not needed for a given project. There are several types of projects that could qualify for an exemption such as for a new single-family residence.

Right now the code requires that all shoreline exemptions have to go through the SEPA process; however, there might be reasons for avoiding this SEPA review under certain conditions such as when a project is not located in a wetland area, it may be within shorelines, but it's not in a wetland area per se, or when a project is otherwise exempted under the State WACs.

So that is a brief rationale as to doing this, and if you have further questions on it, I would suggest that we ask our friend Kevin.

DELEISSEGUES: So is a shoreline that is influenced by the water level to the high water mark?

BAZALA: Yes. I'm not an expert on shorelines, but my understanding is that the shoreline jurisdiction goes out 200 feet from the ordinary high water level.

TYLER: That's correct. This is Kevin Tyler with Clark County Environmental Services. The shoreline environment is an arbitrary measurement, 200 feet from the ordinary high water mark of the stream.

DELEISSEGUES: But it could be lower than the historic high water mark?

TYLER: In certain cases it could be, yes, and in that case it would be within the 100-year floodplain. And in this situation the SEPA would apply because a 100-year floodplain is considered land covered by water or partially covered by water at least during certain times of when Mother Nature decides. Any other questions?

DELEISSEGUES: Questions? Here's the expert.

TYLER: This proposal is slightly different than when you saw me two months ago.

DELEISSEGUES: At the workshop?

TYLER: Yeah. And the addition to it this time is that there are certain instances in the State code, the Washington Annotated Code, where SEPA is exempted even on lands covered by water and that certain circumstances might be maintenance of an existing pier --

DELEISSEGUES: Sure.

TYLER: -- whereas if you look at our existing shoreline code, it says SEPA may be required for that because any land within shoreline jurisdiction is considered a critical area and SEPA exemptions according to our code do not apply. So we tried to create some flexibility for planning staff to not require SEPA when it made sense.

MORASCH: And it looks to me like you're trying to maximize what's allowable under the WAC with respect to these shoreline issues?

TYLER: That's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? Okay, thank you.

TYLER: All right, thank you.

MORASCH: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank's for coming tonight.

TYLER: And I appreciate you guys letting me go first.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah. Well, second anyway. Any other questions of staff? Discussion? Motion.

MORASCH: Move to approve.

USKOSKI: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded. Roll call.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

QUTUB: AYE  
MORASCH: AYE  
USKOSKI: AYE  
BARCA: AYE  
WRISTON: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: So then back to 11.

BAZALA: Correct. And Number 11 is regards to fees, so you won't have to review this one, I just left it in there to keep things straight.

DELEISSEGUES: Yes, you certainly don't want us sticking our nose in that one.

BAZALA: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: So on to 12.

BAZALA: Number 12. This is to extend the option to pay a proportionate share of road frontage improvements to six years instead of three.

Briefly, when a development is required to construct road frontage improvements, if there is an existing project that the County has in the queue within the next six years, an applicant can opt to pay a proportionate share instead of actually constructing the improvements, the idea being that when the County comes along years later and reconstructs the road entirely, that those improvements that the applicant makes might be wasted anyway.

So this proposal would extend the option of paying for a proportionate share from three years to six years. So if you have particular questions on that, Mike Mabrey is here to answer them.

DELEISSEGUES: My only question would be would it be a higher proportionate share or the same?

MABREY: No, it would be the same proportionate share. I mean you have X amount of frontage proportion of the project.

DELEISSEGUES: So you wouldn't add interest because of the additional three years on the kind of a loan?

WRISTON: Inflation.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, right. Increased cost and so forth.

MABREY: I don't really negotiate the costs, but that wouldn't be the intent of it. Basically it's just to keep us from having to tear out something that's recently been built.

BARCA: So, Mike, in the rationale it talks about the code change would extend the option of paying a proportionate share for the road frontage improvements if there is a TIP project scheduled for construction within the six years, so are we saying this is only an option if there is a TIP project already slated?

MABREY: Correct.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, that's what it sounds like.

BARCA: Does the wording of the actual proposal say that rather than just in the rationale?

BAZALA: Yeah, it should be. I believe that's on Page 10 on line item Number 42 through 46 refers to that.

BARCA: You fooled me by spelling out the word TIP.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, six year transportation improvement program, fooled again.

BAZALA: Sorry about that.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other discussion? Motion.

BARCA: Are we going to go through these one at a time the rest of the way?

DELEISSEGUES: Might as well, it won't take long.

MORASCH: I'd move to approve.

BARCA: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Roll call.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

USKOSKI: AYE  
BARCA: AYE  
QUTUB: AYE  
MORASCH: AYE  
WRISTON: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: 13.

BAZALA: 13 is to provide more flexibility and clarify the approval criteria for private roads and bridges. The proposed changes that we have here would give staff the flexibility to allow private streets to connect to public streets on both ends under certain circumstances and would also give the County the option of not accepting the conversion of a private road to a public street when there's no public circulation benefit.

The changes that we have here also modify current language to state where private streets would be allowed rather than stating where they're not allowed, so that aspect of it is a formatting issue.

And then we've tagged on to the private bridges section because the text in the new private bridges section uses the same approval criteria as that that we're discussing in the other section, so it makes sense to update the private bridge section to refer to the new criteria if we do indeed approve them.

So again on this one, Mike Mabrey is the mastermind behind this item. I shouldn't say that, I'm just trying to be glib. I shouldn't be. He's the expert on it.

DELEISSEGUES: I'm sure Mike would agree with you.

MABREY: That's fine (inaudible.) Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I had just one question. If there was a cluster development like we were talking about Tuesday night and there was no outlet out of that development and there was a one way in and then a number of roads circulating within the development but no other circulation in and out on the County road, those would be private roads in there and there would be no public roads considered?

MABREY: They would be eligible to be private roads.

DELEISSEGUES: They would be?

MABREY: If they didn't serve more than 50 residential lots in the rural area or 200 lots in

a PUD or 100 lots in an urban area.

BARCA: So 50 in the rural.

DELEISSEGUES: I doubt they would.

MABREY: And there's nothing magic about those numbers, that just carries over the ones that have been in the code for a while.

DELEISSEGUES: So circulation is not necessarily from an arterial to a collector to a local road, that kind of circulation could be interior circulation just on all local roads interior within the development?

MABREY: Well, one of the criteria under (1)(b) is that there's adequate public circulation and if we can't make the finding that there is, if you're developing a large area and there's one way in, I wouldn't say there's adequate public circulation.

DELEISSEGUES: That's what I was wondering, yeah.

MABREY: But the genesis for this is we had an instance where there was a little minor street that was part public, part private, and had a lot developed there, we didn't have any option but to require them to dedicate the right-of-way, and then they came back two months later and asked us to vacate it and we went through that whole process.

So it was just because staff didn't have the abilities in code to say, well, because this is connecting two public streets, this little alleyway basically is what it looked like, it has to be public. This way they could at least look at it and say, well, it doesn't make any sense, this is already part private, it will never be public, so it gives some code language to make that flexibility happen.

BARCA: So the way that this is written in (b)(1) where it appears that Sub (a), (b) and (c) are all connected through the "and" word and then down to "or," but then we get into (d) and (e) and they are separate in their thought but connected to themselves, is that correct, that you have to hit all of the criteria of (a), (b) and (c) and separately the criteria of (d) and (e)?

MABREY: Let me take a moment to read that because I know we worked on it quite a bit. It makes sense to me that (a), (b) and (c) are interconnected and somewhat separate from the other two. (D) is the threshold, and (e) is a unusual circumstance. Yeah, I'm pretty comfortable that that's correct. The first three are interconnected in terms of being locational criteria and (d) and (e) are more threshold criteria that both have to be.

BARCA: So (d) and (e) both have to be met?

MABREY: Right.

BARCA: It seems to me that (e) would be able to stand on its own as a reason for approval.

MABREY: Well, basically (e) is simply taking a subclause out of the existing (d) and moving it down separately. So instead of provided that you have "and" and then the same condition separated out as (e), so there's really not any substantial change from the existing language.

BARCA: That doesn't necessarily mean the language was great.

MABREY: Yeah, I know, that's why I tried to fix it.

BARCA: I just really want to be clear that, so (d) they're saying they're providing access to less than, and it has some criteria, "and where connection to a public road is not feasible and the affected internal and frontage roads are improved to public standards." So we're saying that the (d) criteria will have to have roads that are improved to public standards?

MABREY: If otherwise required. And that's somewhat confusing to me as I look at it now. I think that (d) and (e) are meant to address a situation where you have a development proposed that doesn't have access to a public street and this would be to address the connecting street that would have to be built to get to it.

The concept as I understood what was currently in the code was that that connecting street could be private under certain circumstances given the limitations of the number of lots as stated in (d), and that it wasn't feasible to build a public street in that same connecting location. So it's not really to address internal streets in a subdivision as I understand it.

BARCA: So if I take this going to the example that Dick brought up earlier, let's just say it's a cluster out in the rural lands, we are saying to them, then, we want them to build to an improvement that is equal to public standards?

MABREY: No. Rural streets up to a certain level can be built as private streets. I'm not sure how large the cluster that was being discussed was.

BARCA: Well, it's obviously less than 50.

MABREY: Yeah.

BARCA: But I guess my point is I don't see a way around it based on the way these are connected.

MABREY: You don't see a way around building public streets --

BARCA: Building them --

MABREY: -- within a cluster?

BARCA: -- improved to public standards.

MABREY: Yeah, I can see where you could lead to some confusion.

BARCA: But I think for me I genuinely understand the intention, but I don't think that will necessarily get us the outcome of that intention based on the way it's written.

MABREY: Sure. As I understand it, the intention was not to tell you what you had to build inside of a subdivision either rural or urban in that (e), but rather to clarify what kind of a connecting road to that subdivision is required if there's not currently a public street, that there would be a private street exception under certain circumstances and if that's not the way it's read, then it probably needs to be modified.

BARCA: Would you be willing to take it back and clarify it further --

MABREY: Sure, I'd be glad to.

BARCA: -- for whenever the --

MABREY: If I'm looking at it now after a couple of months and it doesn't make much sense to me either, there's something wrong with it, so I'd be glad to.

BARCA: All right, thank you.

MORASCH: I've got a couple of questions also. And, yeah, anything you can do to make this easier to read and understand would be helpful because I'm kind of confused a little bit by it too.

Particularly with all the ands after (a), (b), (c), they all have an and, and (d) -- wait, they all have ands. No, (c) doesn't have an and. So (a) and (b) have ands, (c) doesn't and then (d) does and that's kind of got me a little confused.

But I have another question also about (c) in this, what's the planning policy behind not wanting people to connect to public roads?

MABREY: Well, it's because if it connects two public streets people are going to treat it like a public street and they're going to use it as a way of getting from one public street to the next and that's going to require additional maintenance by the private property owners that have to maintain that street, so it becomes a cut-through that's not specifically to

benefit the property owners that it was built to benefit.

MORASCH: And I guess I'm wondering, I mean we're having some exceptions for commercial and industrial districts, but going back to the idea of a cluster development in the rural area it seems like, I mean I can envision where you might have a cluster subdivision in the rural area that might meet (d) and you might want to have private streets inside that cluster subdivision, but as I'm reading (c), then they pretty much can only have one access point to a public road because otherwise if their internal private streets connect to a public road at two access points, then they would violate (c) by connecting two public roads --

MABREY: Right.

MORASCH: -- but it seems like we want to encourage more access points for safety reasons, particularly out in the rural area where fire responses might not be as quick as they are in an urban setting, having two ways out of your subdivision could be something that would add to the safety of the subdivision, it's something we'd probably want to encourage rather than discourage.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, in a way that was my question, but there's another side to it, a lot of the developments don't want more than one access into there. In fact they're even going back to gates. A lot of the --

MABREY: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: -- subdivisions I've seen lately have gone back to gates to keep people out.

MABREY: They are trying to do that more and more and we don't have a real clear policy on it frankly.

DELEISSEGUES: When our subdivision was built it had two access points off of public roads, you could come on 202 or 164th and the people treated it as a shortcut and come up 212, come across, cut through our subdivision and then go on to 164th, and it was a nightmare so they closed off one of those access points so that people have to go around it, but it's not always good to have that circulation pattern through a development.

MORASCH: Well, you're talking about something that sounds kind of urban, if you're way out in the rural area the cut-through traffic problem is going to be much, much less.

DELEISSEGUES: You'd think, but we have a school there and that was a traffic magnet.

Well, any other discussion on this? Do you want to talk about the bridges while we're at it or just delay the whole thing until Mike has a chance to rework it?

MORASCH: Well, we can talk about it, I'd like to see his reworking before we make any decisions.

MABREY: Sure.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, he's agreed to do it.

MABREY: I'm not sure that I have a firm grasp of where you're trying to go in terms of rural private streets. On the one hand you want safety of the access to two locations on the public streets, but does that mean you don't want to allow private streets in cluster subdivisions where there's two points of access?

DELEISSEGUES: I think the point was just to clarify what's here. Like Steve was saying, it's not real clear as to whether all of these are required or the ands and the ors.

MABREY: Right.

MORASCH: Maybe if we could get both a red line and kind of a clean version of what you're proposing --

MABREY: Yeah, that would help.

MORASCH: -- that might make it easier to read because part of the issue I think is with all the red lines, it's a challenge to sort through it.

BARCA: And, Mike, for me was going through the rationale and still trying to really understand the wording of the text itself versus what the rationale said we wanted for outcome. So I think going through that text and making sure it matches up with the rationale or providing maybe a little bit more clarity in the rationale, one of those two things might help clean it up for us.

MABREY: Okay. I'm not sure that I understand the existing language in the rationale of April 12th, 1994 being a cut-off date for certain number of lots and all that sort of thing, I'll have to dig into that a little bit.

DELEISSEGUES: Do you want to move to approve this with those recommendations and those changes or do you want it to come back?

MORASCH: I think I'd like to see it come back and then when we have the revised language, we can have a policy debate about rural cluster developments and that sort of thing.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we need a motion on 13 unless you want to go on to the bridge part of it.

BARCA: Yeah, the bridge is part of it.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I know it is. Do you want to take that --

BARCA: Bring it back at a time.

DELEISSEGUES: Is the bridge part okay or do you have changes on that too?

QUTUB: Yeah, just in case he wants to --

MABREY: Yeah, the point is to keep them identical so we can come back in November with it.

DELEISSEGUES: We don't need a motion then, we'll just go to 14.

BAZALA: Number 14. This is to remove the Type I review requirements for school modulars that exist in the conditional use section to be consistent with the site plan review exemption for school modulars, but in addition to that set some limits to the amount of modulars that can be exempted under the existing site plan review exemption. That's a mouthful.

I'll just explain the situation here. Section 40.520.040.B.4.g, which is the site plan review section, currently exempt school modulars from site plan review unless the size of the school modulars triggers SEPA and the applicant cannot perform their own SEPA. In the case of public schools, they can do their own SEPA.

So basically under this existing site plan review section, the school could put in unlimited amount of school modulars on their property, do their own SEPA and not have to go through site plan review. So there's that one code section that says modulars are exempt in the site plan review section.

However, the conditional use permit section says that a Type I site plan review is required for school modulars and that would be regardless of size or SEPA or anything like that.

So what we're proposing to do is that we are going to get rid of the Type I site plan review requirement language in the conditional use section, but then add in the conditional use section that there are caveats to the site plan review exemption and that site plan review might be required.

I've already explained that right now there's no limit to the amount of modulars that could go in for a school that can do their own SEPA. In response to your concerns regarding this issue from the work session, I worked with some of the school districts and they provided some information on square footages and all of that.

And there's some e-mails from Marnie Allen, who's an attorney for the school districts,

and they are comfortable with a 30-percent threshold. I think it's reasonable and understand that at some point some site plan review might be necessary to address the traffic and parking. So that's kind of where we stand, so fire away with any questions.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, her letter of September 11, 2012 says, since she's not here to say it, "seems to me the 30 percent threshold is reasonable and hopefully the Planning Commission will adopt the staff recommendation to use 30 percent," so it sounds like she's in agreement with your proposal.

BAZALA: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions or discussion?

BARCA: I have none.

DELEISSEGUES: Anybody? Jeff? A motion.

WRISTON: Move to approve.

USKOSKI: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: It's moved and approved to approve of Number 14 to remove the Type I review requirements for school modulars in the conditional use section to be consistent with the site plan review exemption for modulars, but set limits on modular gross floor area allowed under the site plan review exemption. Can we have roll call, please.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

USKOSKI: AYE  
BARCA: AYE  
QUTUB: AYE  
MORASCH: AYE  
WRISTON: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Go on to 15.

BAZALA: Number 15, and this will actually be our last one tonight, is to simplify and add flexibility to the post-decision review criteria to allow more Type I post-decision reviews of Type II and Type III applications.

A post-decision review allows changes to be made to a preliminary approval but before final approval such as a final plat or the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for a site

plan review. The existing post-decision review criteria seemed to be unnecessarily conservative.

For instance, a post-decision review of a Type III decision cannot be reviewed as a Type I, which is a relatively simple process, it doesn't require public notice, can't be reviewed as a Type I unless the proposed change can be found to decrease the potential impacts of a project.

Now there might be circumstances where a inconsequential change that's not going to be of concern to the neighbors is proposed, but if we can't, the staff say it's decreasing improving the impacts, then we wouldn't be able to do a post-decision review as a Type I, and whereas common sense could say this is a really minor thing, no big deal, why charge the applicant all the additional fees for a Type II versus Type I and the additional time.

So we've proposed some revisions to Subsection E.2 to allow Type I reviews if the change doesn't increase land use activity, intensity or adverse impacts. These are basically more flexible and they are more subjective, but it kind of gives staff some room for common sense is how we're looking at it.

Another aspect of these that's kind of problematic is that there's no provision right now to allow a Type II post-decision of a Type III decision, the only options right now as stated in the code is for a Type II A application.

So basically they could come in, if they meet the criteria, they could do it as a Type II A, but under a Type II A process that will get notified to the neighbors, sent out to the neighbors, and within 15 days of the notice anybody can request a public hearing to be held on that.

So the applicant doesn't have any certainty that his Type II A post-decision review won't become a Type III subject to a public hearing. So we're trying to provide some certainty in that. Shouldn't make somebody go through a hearing or a Type II A and then string them out there again and maybe subject them to another public hearing without them really being clear on that.

And then, thirdly, a lot of the text is written in the negative and it makes it more difficult to understand, so we're trying to provide flexibility, more simplicity, give staff some more leeway as to process these in the ways that makes sense and try to make it more understandable. So do you have any questions?

DELEISSEGUES: I just had one in the wording here under E.2 where it says, "If the responsible official finds that the requested change in the decision will not result in an increase in land use activity or intensity or in an adverse impact and because the county can assure," it seems like it should be "if the County assures."

BAZALA: Yeah. And I was looking at this, I was thinking that it would be more clear if I line itemed out each one. So I'm thinking that the next version, if you guys approve this in principle, I'll reformat that, instead of making it one long sentence and substituting "because" with "if" would make sense. So I think the main thing is that we're on board with the concept, but that's a good point.

BARCA: So what if a nonconforming use was of a less impact?

BAZALA: You mean if they were to do a nonconforming use application and then change it somehow?

BARCA: Or show that it was going to be less of an impact.

BAZALA: Well, it would be a Type II to start with, so if we looked at the original application and we found that under their post-decision review that the requested change will not result in increased land use activity, then it would be a Type I.

BARCA: Okay.

DELEISSEGUES: Just another, on Page 17 where it's the new e, "Does not involve an issue of broad public interest, based on the record of the decision. An issue of public interest is one about which testimony was submitted to the record either at the public hearing or in writing," a lot of testimony is submitted that's not verified or maybe even accurate, so just because they submit testimony doesn't seem it would subject the whole thing to a different type of hearing unless there was some truth --

BAZALA: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: -- some credence to it.

BAZALA: I think that within any of this there is a little bit of subjectivity that's inherent in anything. So that language is there, staff would be making that interpretation of what is "broad public interest."

DELEISSEGUES: Maybe it said if it was verified or something, public interest was verified. I don't know. It just struck me that I remember the arguments about the barking dogs and all that and they went out there and there was a little puppy or something that yapped 15 minutes a day and they brought him back in the house and the difference between what the testimony and what actually was occurring was night and day. Just a question.

I mean here we are spending our valuable time, we might as well make comments, suggestions and recommendations whether they're any good or not.

BAZALA: Well, I think that's a valid point.

MORASCH: It seems like you could delete that e because under a staff has to make the finding that there's no increase in the potential adverse impact of development authorized by the decision, and if staff decided that there was a big issue of public interest here, they could decide that there was potential adverse impact enough to kick it up to the other type, so I don't know that we really need both a and e.

WRISTON: That makes sense to me.

DELEISSEGUES: Where is it?

MORASCH: On Page 16, the very bottom, the first criteria, staff has "the responsible official finds that the requested change in the decision does not increase the potential adverse impact of the development authorized by the decision or SEPA determination."

WRISTON: That makes sense to me. A lot of what we get in testimony is -- well, I mean a good portion of what we get really are questions. I can't think how many times we get someone coming up and testifying that are issues that they're concerned about that are really issues that are not applicable to this forum, for instance.

So I'd just be concerned that one or two people got up and said something, got their questions answered and that triggered this public interest paragraph, so I think Steve's suggestion was a good one.

DELEISSEGUES: You get the gold star, Steve. Are there any other discussion on this one? Sounds like the school districts happy. Roll call, please.

BARCA: Do we need a motion? Do we have a motion?

DELEISSEGUES: I thought we had a motion.

BARCA: I'll make a motion. Let's make a motion to approve as written.

DELEISSEGUES: Second?

WRISTON: Second.

QUTUB: I thought we were taking that section out?

WRISTON: Oh, good point.

MORASCH: So do you really want to second that motion?

WRISTON: No, I'm backing up.

BARCA: All right then.

DELEISSEGUES: Backpedaling.

DELEISSEGUES: What's the motion?

WRISTON: I'm on auto here.

BARCA: There's always opportunity for a friendly amendment, it's been seconded.

USKOSKI: I'll make a friendly amendment to delete e as discussed or recommended by Steve.

BARCA: I'll accept that.

WRISTON: It's like we're playing Monopoly or something.

DELEISSEGUES: Is the original motion maker okay with the friendly amendment?

WRISTON: I am.

QUTUB: Well, don't we vote on the amendment and then we go to the big motion?

WRISTON: No.

USKOSKI: We just do it all at once.

DELEISSEGUES: We're going to vote on the motion as amended. Is everybody clear on what we're doing here?

QUTUB: He moved to amend it, we didn't amend it.

DELEISSEGUES: Oh, she said she made a friendly amendment and they were both okay with adding it to their motion, so now we've got one motion that's been amended the way I see it. Let's go with that. I think we'll get there. We'll get there.

WRISTON: We're only advisory.

DELEISSEGUES: Roll call.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

USKOSKI: AYE  
BARCA: AYE  
QUTUB: As I understand it AYE  
MORASCH: AYE  
WRISTON: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: And as I understand it AYE

BAZALA: We've already covered Number 16 and Number 17 has been pulled as being unnecessary and so we're done.

DELEISSEGUES: It sounds good to me.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

WRISTON: I just want to thank everyone for the card, I appreciate the thoughts, thank you.

WISER: You're very welcome.

DELEISSEGUES: My comments are that Sonja is being considered for a new position in Community Development instead of Planning.

USKOSKI: Can we vote on that?

DELEISSEGUES: And all I could say is we'd certainly miss you, Sonja, if you were --

QUTUB: I move we keep Sonja as our --

USKOSKI: Yes.

MORASCH: Second.

USKOSKI: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: If anybody wants to share their opinion on that with anybody that could help her, I would suggest they do so.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The hearing adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonite's hearing can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:  
<http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/commission.html#agendas>

Proceedings can be also be viewed on CTVV on the following web page link:  
<http://www.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/>

---

**Chair**

---

**Date**

*Minutes Transcribed by:*  
*Cindy Holley, Court Reporter*  
*Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant*