

REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

- MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: May 17, 1996

TO: Bob Derrick
Greg Kipp
Tom McDonald
Mark Carey
Gary Kohler
Lisa Pringle

Pam Dhanapal
Ken Dinsmore
Harold Vandergriff
Terry Brunner
Mike Sinsky

FM: Jerry Balcom

Present: Jerry Balcom, Priscilla Kaufmann, Pam Dhanapal, Steve Bottheim, Harold Vandergriff, Gary Kohler, Terry Brunner

- 1. Would the replacement of a single detached residence, which burned down prior to November 27, 1990 but left intact the pilings on which it was constructed, qualify for the partial exemption from the SAO pursuant to K.C.C. 21A.24.060.A.2? (Steve Bottheim/Pam Dhanapal)**

The partial exemptions provisions of the SAO allow a “structural modification of, addition to or replacement of single detached residences in existence before November 27, 1990 which do not meet the building setback or buffer requirements for wetland, streams or steep slope hazard areas ...” Previous discussions on this matter by the Regulatory Review Committee concluded that the physical condition of the structure is not germane. (See minutes from the February 11, 1994 and April 1, 1994 RRC meetings.) In keeping with previous reading of the code, the committee agreed that a single detached residence could be replaced and qualify for the partial exemptions from the SAO if the only portion of the structure remaining is the pilings. It was also agreed that K.C.C. 21A.24.060 should be amended to require that the structure that was in existence before November 27, 1990 still be in existence and habitable at the time the structural modification of, addition or replacement is proposed.

2. Can a nonconforming structure be repaired or reconstructed under the provisions of K.C.C. 21A.32.070 and still qualify for the partial exemption section of the SAO (K.C.C. 21A.24.060)?

If a proposal meets the partial exemptions provisions of the SAO, the proposal is not nonconforming, it is exempt. Therefore the nonconformance provisions of K.C.C. 21A.32..070 would not apply.

3. Does the SAO partial exemptions section (K.C.C. 21A.24.060.A.2.) for single detached residences differentiate between primary and accessory residences?

The SAO partial exemptions does not distinguish between primary and accessory single detached residences.

4. Legislative Update.

The proposed ordinances relating to impervious surface standards and medical handicaps, fire hydrants and water mains, and mobile home requirements were before the Growth Management, Housing and Environment Committee this week. The council-generated impervious surface proposed ordinance will probably be amended to distinguish between medically recommended and medically required structures for medical hardships. Amendments are expected to the executive-proposed fire hydrant and water main ordinance to allow no exemptions within the urban area and to be more specific on when exemptions would be allowed in the rural area. All three of these ordinances are scheduled to be back for discussion next week for possible action.

The Vashon Town Plan ordinance will be back for discussion in two weeks before the Growth Management, Housing and Environment Committee. The proposed ordinance has removed the Special District Overlay. Most of the area-wide P-suffix conditions for Vashon are expected to be removed under the Phase 2 Zoning Code Conversion project, which is being reviewed by the Prosecuting Attorney.

Regulatory Review Committee
Meeting Date: May 17, 1996
Page 3

Proposed ordinance 96-65, which would adopt the uniform codes and make King County amendments, is under review with the Council and waiting to be placed on the Growth Management, Housing and Environment Committee agenda.

On Monday, May 20, 1996 the proposed ordinances relating to sports clubs and marinas and the resource lands notice will go before the full Council with do-pass recommendations from the Growth Management, Housing and Environment Committee.

JB:pk

cc: Priscilla Kaufmann, Code Development Planner
Steve Bottheim, Earth Scientist, Land Use Services Division