

## REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

- MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: September 12, 1997

TO: Building Services Division Staff

Lynn Baugh  
Chris Ricketts  
Pam Dhanapal  
Terry Brunner  
Ken Dinsmore  
Priscilla Kaufmann

Land Use Services Division Staff

Mark Carey  
Lisa Pringle  
Marilyn Cox  
Lanny Henoch  
Gordon Thomson

Greg Kipp, Deputy Director  
Michael Sinsky, Prosecuting Attorney's Office

FM: Sophia Byrd, Code Development Coordinator

Present: Sophia Byrd, Terry Brunner, Pam Dhanapal, Ken Dinsmore, Lanny Henoch, Gail Riseberg, Jeff Stern, Gordon Thomson, Harold Vandergriff

- 1. K.C.C. 21A.08.060B8 states in part that private stormwater management facilities in commercial/industrial zones, or shared facilities, not located on the lot they are designed to serve shall be located on a lot with the same or "more intensive" zoning. While the former zoning code (Title 21) was organized as more and less intensive uses, Title 21A does not employ this concept. How do we address the use of the phrase "more intensive" in this section of the code? (Jeff Stern, Harold Vandergriff)**

This issue was discussed at the September 5, 1997 meeting. Jeff Stern provided additional information on the reasoning behind reference to "more intensive." Jeff noted that it was recognized that the phrase was imperfect. However, it was felt that a distinction was necessary to avoid being too restrictive.

The group reconfirmed last week's discussion and decision to pursue a code amendment. Regarding the particular case at hand, Lanny noted that we could determine that the two uses were neither more or less intensive than the other. Therefore, a shared facility would be allowed. The group agreed with this approach.

2. **Temporary Growing Structures -- Are we violating the local building code if we do not require a building permit for a commercial greenhouse that is intended for growing purposes only? If a building permit is not required, do we have any control or review authority if an applicant wants to place 40,000 sq. ft. of greenhouse in a floodplain, and construct a road to get to it? (Tom McDonald)**

Deferred until Tom McDonald is available to discuss.

3. **Does the designated "building line" on a recorded plat have to be met or does the setback requirement in Title 21A preside? (Pam Dhanapal)**

The "building line" must be met because it was adopted as a condition of the plat or as a covenant on the plat. In either case, the adopted condition would preside over the zoning code condition. If adopted as part of a covenant, the County would have no enforcement authority. Gail Riseberg said she would do further research on the issue.

4. **Legislative update**

The Department's supplemental budget was approved. The comprehensive plan amendments are still in Growth Management Committee, with a possible vote on September 24. Growth Management Committee is tentatively scheduled to address the first quarterly package of 1997 code amendments by mid-October. SEPA review of sensitive area amendments is scheduled to begin October 1, 1997.

SB:sm

cc: Gail Riseberg, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney  
Harold Vandergriff, Zoning Technician, Building Services Division