

ISLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS - MINUTES OF MEETING

SPECIAL SESSION /WORKSHOP - MAY 22, 1998

The Board of Island County Commissioners met in Special Session on May 22, 1998, beginning at 9:00 a.m. in the Commissioners Hearing Room, Coupeville, WA. The purpose of the special session to provide an opportunity in joint workshop for the Board to meet with the Planning Director and staff, Island County Planning Commission, and Keith Dearborn. The specific agenda for the workshop includes; SPR study, NR Zone, RS use/Study, Design Guidelines, SPR/PRD Approval Criteria, Signs & Lighting.

Attending today's workshop were:

Board of County Commissioners: Wm. L. McDowell, Chairman, Mike Shelton, Member .

Planning Commission: Commissioners Sheilah Crider, Bill Vincent, Rufus Rose, Tom Olsen, Linda Moore. Commissioners Jo Ann Silvers, Richard Hart, Anne Pringle, Pat Churchill were absent.

Consultants: Keith Dearborn., Emil King, McConnell/Burke.

Staff: Vince Moore, Planning Director, Donna Keeler, Erika Jensen, Stacy Tucker, Debra Little, Jeff Tate, Pam Dill, Adm. Asst. – Hearing Examiner.

Others Present: Approximately 10 people were in the audience [Attendance list on file].

Presentation by Rich Untermann: Design Guidelines (slide presentation on file, Island County Growth Management Record #3248)

Discussed design guidelines for Non-Residential development and development that is principally visible from the State Highway system.

Rural character is enhanced by screening. To help integrate the use there are three simple techniques, setback, at least 50 feet of vegetation; including both mature evergreen trees and understory, and narrow, gravel roads that bend so the building is not visible from the road.

Other suggestions were to use berms to help reduce the buildings apparent height, keep parking on the opposite side of the building, and use earth colors to help soften the buildings.

In the village or community center areas, such as, Greenbank, Freeland, Clinton or Ken's Korner the attempt is not to make the development invisible because these are places where people do business on a daily basis. However, there needs to be some attempt to integrate them and this can be done by more organized street tree planting and in some cases by screening and in other cases by the placement of parking lots and the size of the entry.

Clinton and Greenbank's main street is a state highway which could be improved with a commitment to add sidewalks, trees, crosswalks, and to slow traffic, an unpopular but possible change if the community really wants it.

Presentation by Jerry Hill: Lighting and Signs, Commercial and Residential for Island County (slide presentation on file, Island County Growth Management Record # 3249)

I have read the draft sign ordinance and compliment you on many improvements and clearer definitions of standards. I am including recommended minor changes to this draft ordinance and submitting over 60 pages of documentation with a list of attachments for reference, in support of the changes I recommend. I have included in this information zoning ordinances from other counties and municipalities, research on problems from poor lighting, and the economic benefits of good lighting. This information also contains solutions to fix existing poor lighting so that fixes don't cause economic hardship on citizens and they can comply with ordinances in a reasonable number of years.

The first question we need to answer is "Why is there outdoor lighting?" Outdoor lighting is used to illuminate roadways, parking lots, yards, sidewalks, public meeting areas, signs work sites, and buildings. It provides us with better visibility and a sense of security.

When well designed and properly installed outdoor lighting can be and is very useful in improving visibility and safety and a sense of security, while at the same time minimizing energy use and operating costs.

John Hitt, Economic Development Council, design guidelines need to be clear so that any developer can read and understand what they need to do to comply with them without a lot of ambiguity and subjective interpretation. The other critical factor is for the process to be able to be done in a timely manner.

He pointed out the need for more locally based employment opportunities, noting that a huge percentage of the County's population is working outside the county, commuting to jobs primarily in Snohomish and King County. The EDC feels that it is crucial to provide the necessary zoning, permitting process and infrastructure so that the EDC and the private sector can have the opportunity to develop more quality jobs for our residents locally.

Stan Stanley, Economic Development Council, discussed background, rather than specifics, of why we need to have a viable economic base for employment in Island County.

If you look at growth in Island County from 1990 to 1997 we have a 2.51 percent compound growth rate per year. Interestingly our unincorporated areas are growing at 2.55 percent compound growth rate and our incorporated areas are growing 2.39. Washington State as a whole is growing at 2.04 percent compound growth rate. It's unincorporated areas are growing at a .46 percent compound growth rate and it's incorporated areas are growing at 3.39 percent compound growth rate. Island County has a reverse trend and that is something we need to be very careful with. If we are going to continue this growth rate then we are going to have to figure out how these people can earn a living and it is going to have to be in the unincorporated areas.

In regards to employment, the 1996 employment security figures show that the civilian employed labor force in Island County was 23, 360, the covered employment was 13,637, a difference is 9,723. If we assume that there are approximately 4,000 proprietors, which is an estimate based on the number of businesses we are looking at, we are looking at about 5,000+ people leaving Island County to work elsewhere. This is a transportation issue that needs to be considered. In terms of our wages and the ability to have a lifestyle here, 1996 employment security figures show Island County's annual average wage was \$19,992.00. Washington state average annual wage was \$27,432.00.

We need to look at our rural atmosphere from an economic standpoint. In our proposed zoning we are going to eliminate 25 acres of Non-Residential land and increase our Rural Residential and Agriculture by 21,500 acres. 1995 employment security figures show Island County provided 97 agricultural covered employment jobs, out of the 9,422 that were reported that year. In terms of income it provided .7% of the income in Island County. We like our rural atmosphere but our rural atmosphere is something we have to figure out how to afford and we are not doing it with agriculture.

He also noted that the ability to air commute is going to be essential to the future of the economic base on the island.

He talked about the information systems industry, an industry that Island County is uniquely well suited for. Island County has the information infrastructure. South Whidbey Telephone Company provides "points of presence" for all the major long distance services.

The problem with locating this type of industry in Island County is that they want to be in business in six months. We need to find locations for these types of industries to locate and pre-designate them.

Planning staff presentation: Comments on Existing Site Plan Review Criteria (ICC

16.15.040) (Island County Growth Management Record # 3250)

- 1. Preservation of natural features and landscape.** Natural features and landscape shall be preserved in their

natural state, insofar as practical by minimizing tree and soil removal. At the minimum, 20 percent (20%) of the gross site area shall remain in undisturbed open space and/or as a landscape buffer. Removal of any vegetation shall be in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighborhood to protect natural features and views.

- *The phrase "insofar as practical" is difficult to quantify, is open to interpretation, and makes this criterion difficult to consistently implement. As a result, planners rely on the defined standard of 20 percent open space in determining whether a project meets this criterion. Clearing up to 80 percent of a rural, forested site threatens remaining vegetation, as it is subject to windfall, and does not retain rural character.*
- *The criteria does not encourage project developers to minimize the scale of development. Many times, far more parking is provided than needed, exacerbating the amount of tree and soil removal, but the project may still conform to this criterion because clearing is limited to designated parking and structure areas.*
- *This criterion does not establish priorities for what form open space should be provided in: undisturbed open space and/or a landscape buffer.*
- *This criterion does not effectively deal with developers removing mature tree stands prior to site plan application submittal.*
- *When analyzing the character of surrounding areas, how far do we look? ½ mile, ¼ mile?*
- *The criterion places too much reliance on the character of the surrounding neighborhood. If development permitted in the past was very land intensive, did not retain natural vegetative features, and impacted natural features, should new development be allowed to continue this pattern? What type of character is desirable and should be preserved and which type should not? These are policy issues which the County policy-makers should decide.*
- *The history of implementing this criterion has resulted in the following broad interpretations: If the surrounding areas have been completely cleared, the developer is allowed to clear a large portion of his lot; if the surrounding area is primarily forested, we would require the retention of buffers along the roads, but have not required maximum clearing limits as a percentage of each lot, because there is no standard.*
- *Protection of natural features and views can be contradictory because the best views are on steep slopes. How do you clear for project on a steep slope or ridgeline, or remove trees from a shoreline bluff for views and still protect the slope or shoreline as a natural feature? What is considered a natural feature and what is more important- protection of a natural feature or protection of views?*
-

1. Relation of proposed buildings to site. Proposed structures shall be placed to relate harmoniously to site terrain and natural features. Placement shall consider spacing, protection of privacy, location of balconies and patios for noise reduction, and orientation to views and vistas, sunlight, and prevailing winds.

- *This criterion focuses heavily on the interior design of the project. These issues are somewhat beyond the scope of review for the protection of the environment, public health and safety, and general welfare. In instances where the developer is the primary operator/user of the project, the political environment has not supported planner suggestions for interior design changes to conform to this criterion.*
- *This criterion does not work effectively when reviewing Binding Site Plan reviews because building design is not specified at that point. Plans submitted for review do not include locations of patios, etc.*
-

1. Relation of proposed building to surrounding area. Proposed structures shall be placed to provide a

harmonious and compatible transition with the surrounding community, existing and proposed land uses and general development pattern. The transition to adjoining uses and streets shall be provided by native vegetation undisturbed open space, landscape screening, fencing, or other buffering techniques. The compatibility of proposed structures and/or lots shall be considered by taking into account bulk, scale, orientation, placement, style, design, and view obstruction. In no case may a Site Plan be granted approval if it is found to disrupt the character of surrounding permitted uses.

2.

- *The criterion does not provide a priority for what type of screening or buffering should be developed: native vegetation undisturbed open space, landscape screening, fencing, or other buffering techniques. Native vegetation is a better buffering technique than newly planted landscape materials. Many project proponents have used chain link fencing with slats to screen uses.*
- *The criterion relies too heavily on the presence of a buffer in determining whether or not a use can be developed at a site. The site plan review criterion does not provide information on use-to-use compatibility issues, and instead relies on landscaping to shield uses from view.*
- *What is the character of the surrounding neighborhood? When analyzing the surrounding areas how far do we look? ½ mile, ¼ mile?*
- *The terms "harmonious and compatible transition" are difficult to quantify, are open to interpretation, and thus make the introductory sentence of this criterion difficult to consistently implement.*
- *The criterion places too much reliance on the character of the surrounding neighborhood, instead of encouraging the use of good design concepts. Many new developments or additions are located in areas typified by lack of landscaping, flat roofs, large expanses of pavement, or poorly designed buildings. This criterion makes it difficult to require that new development or additions incorporate design features which are possibly more expensive but better designed than existing development. In order to have well designed areas, the existing surrounding area must be well designed. The only requirements that have successfully resulted from this is the provision of minimal landscape areas and pitched roofs. Color change and good design have been accomplished only where the applicant has voluntarily provided them.*

1. **Driveways, parking, and circulation.** Relationship to traffic circulation of the surrounding area, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and arrangement of parking areas that are safe and convenient shall be considered. Insofar as practicable, such activities should not detract from the design of proposed or existing buildings or structures of surrounding properties, and access points to the surface street system shall be minimized.

- *If planners are going to be reviewing for these issues, a design manual should be provided or criterion should be clarified to provide guidelines for safe maneuvering, turnarounds, minimum drive widths, etc. Generally applicants expect this information to come from traffic engineers and are skeptical when it comes from a planner.*

1. **Surface water drainage.** Special attention shall be given to proper site surface drainage so that site drainage will enhance groundwater recharge and not adversely affect downstream properties and the site. In no case will more than 50 percent (50%) of the gross site area, excluding areas encompassed by development limiting overlay zones, be covered by impervious surfaces.

- *Other than the 50 percent impervious surface area, these issues are reviewed by the Engineering Department.*

◦

1. **Utility services.** Wherever feasible, electric, telephone, and other utility lines shall be underground. Any other

utility installations remaining above ground shall be located and screened as to have a harmonious relation to neighboring properties and the site.

- *The term "harmonious relation" is difficult to quantify, are open to interpretation, and thus make the this criterion difficult to consistently implement.*
- *This has been used successfully to require individuals to underground utilities. However, more direction is needed in cases where a site is being redeveloped, or where the surrounding area is typified by above-ground utilities.*
- *We have had problems with certain utilities (e.g. propane tanks) not being shown on the site plan, but then being later placed on-site.*

1. **Advertising features.** The size, location, design, color, texture, lighting, and materials of all exterior signs and outdoor advertising structures or features shall be harmonious with the design of proposed and existing buildings and structures and surrounding properties. The number of signs shall be minimized and coordinated to avoid visual clutter, and the design shall present a uniform character.

- *What is the relationship between this criterion and the standards for signs in the zoning ordinance? Is this intended to be more restrictive than the zoning standards? If so, it is extremely difficult to implement. When the individual businesses in a complex come in to change their signs or put up new signs, planning doesn't ordinarily review the building permit. It is reviewed for consistency with the zoning. In addition, it makes it difficult to be able to tell someone over the counter what sign requirements apply without checking the conditions of approval for the particular project/development.*
- *The application of this criterion has not been consistent because it is so general that different planners may have different interpretations of how a design is to present a uniform character, or what "minimizing the number of signs" should mean. It would be clearer to provide guidance as to what characteristics of signs should be uniform such as color, typeface, sign type, materials.*

1. **Special features.** Exposed storage areas, exposed machinery installations, service areas, truck loading areas, utility buildings and structures, and similar accessory areas and structures shall be discouraged from being placed along or facing street frontages and be subject to such setbacks, landscaping, screen plantings, or other screening methods as shall reasonably be required to ensure a harmonious transition with the existing or planned land uses and the surrounding properties.

- *The term "reasonably be required to ensure a harmonious transition with existing or planned land uses and surrounding properties" is too general. Most utility areas are screened with chain link fences with slats, which is not as effective as well designed landscaping, a wood fence, or a combination of the two. There should be standards for how well the screening is to perform: Oblique screen, opaque screen. In addition, if the surrounding development has poorly screened storage areas, this is used as a rationale to allow proposed development to have poorly screened storage areas.*
- *Businesses where outdoor storage of equipment, vehicles, lumber, landscape materials or other items is the primary business are often not subject to site plan review if the only structure proposed is under 1,000 square feet. These types of outdoor storage are the ones that have the biggest visual impact, but they are the ones which are usually exempt from this criteria. When site plan review is required, the amount of screening and landscaping that would be required to screen such areas is so large (and potentially expensive), and the standards so general, that the most lenient of standards have been applied as "reasonable."*

Site Plan Review - Proposed Criteria (Island County Growth Management Record #3251)

Site Plan Review is required for more intensive land uses in order to ensure they are generally visually and functionally compatible with the Rural Areas and natural environment. The criteria should be supplemented with a landscape

ordinance.

Visual Compatibility

1. Minimum Open Space Requirement. The proposal should provide open space in the amount required in the zoning ordinance for the proposed use. The location and design of the open space should meet the following criteria, in addition to any zoning code requirements pertaining to sensitive areas:
 - a. *The open space should preserve critical areas including wetlands, their buffers, slopes greater than 15%, bluffs, shoreline, flood hazard areas, and fish and wildlife habitat.*
 - b. *Open space areas should protect stands of mature timber or forested areas, and natural vegetation should be incorporated into screening and buffers for the proposed development.*
 - c. *The proposed amount of vegetation and soil removal must be the minimum necessary for the reasonable use of the site.*

1. Site Lay-Out. The location of the development, landscape screening and buffers on the site should meet the following standards:
 - a. *Development should not be located on or in critical areas such as steep slopes, bluffs, shoreline, wetlands, their buffers, flood hazard areas, and fish and wildlife habitat.*
 - b. *Development should be located in areas which would require the least amount of disturbance to natural features and landscape.*
 - c. *Development should be setback and screened from adjacent parcels with a site obscuring buffer of native vegetation, or a combination of landscape screening and berms comprised of fast growing, low maintenance, drought tolerant, native trees and shrubs.*
 - d. *Parking areas and interior roads should be screened with dense evergreen landscaping and berms and/or a structure meeting the standards for Building Design as listed in Number 5 below, and be suitably setback from roads and adjacent properties.*
 - e. *Large expanse of parking areas should be broken up with landscaping and bermed areas.*
 - f. *Equipment storage areas should be suitably setback from roads and adjacent properties and screened with a combination of solid, dense evergreen landscaping, berms, and wood fencing.*
 - g. *For screening, retention of existing native evergreen trees and shrubs is preferred. New landscaping should be evergreen. Low ground cover is not an acceptable landscape screen.*
 - h. *Topography should be used to screen buildings, parking areas from adjacent properties and roads.*
 - i. *The proposed design should not adversely impact the established character in the surrounding parcels.*

1. Interior Circulation.
 - a. *Multi-building projects should provide sidewalks through the interior to provide convenient pedestrian access between buildings and county roads.*

1. Lighting.
 - a. *Exterior light poles must be no higher than 15 feet.*

- b. Lighting fixtures must be shielded, hooded and oriented towards the ground so that light is not visible past the property boundaries.*
 - c. The lighting fixtures should be similar in architectural style to the proposed buildings.*
 - d. The maximum number of lighting fixtures should be the minimum needed to adequately light the use.*
1. Building/Structure Design. On sites where there is very little native evergreen vegetation (trees and understory), building design must ensure that the proposed use is visually compatible with the surrounding area.
 - a. Development should be designed to appear similar in height, size, placement, style, materials, color and design to other development typical in the zone.*
 - b. Color and materials should blend into surrounding area. Bright or brilliant colors should be used only for accent*
 - c. The size of the building should be proportionate to the size of the site.*
 - d. Windows, pillars, textures, materials, wall modulation and articulation should break up large expanses of wall. Separate structures clustered together are preferred to one large structure with long walls.*
 - e. Planting should be used to screen foundations, soften large expanses of wall, and provide transition between the building and the remainder of the site.*

Functional Compatibility

1. The applicant should demonstrate that the conditional use will have no more impacts off-site than other uses which are permitted outright within the zoning district.
 2. The proposal should not substantially impact the reasonable use and enjoyment of surrounding properties.
 - a. Interior roads, parking areas, equipment storage, outdoor recreation areas, and other areas of outdoor activity should be suitably setback and buffered so adjacent properties and public rights-of-way are not impacted by noise, glare, odors, vibrations, heat, dust, smoke, and other safety hazards.*
1. Traffic and Circulation.
 - a. The proposed project should not overburden the capacity of existing roads.*
 - b. Vehicular access should be designed and located to minimize interference with traffic flow on adjacent roads.*
 - c. Access points to the site should not interfere with access to adjacent and nearby properties, or create difficulty in accessing adjacent and nearby properties.*
 - d. If traffic generated from the proposal exceeds that generated by uses permitted outright in the zone, the use must be located on a collector/arterial and may be required to reduce traffic through carpooling, private buses or other means.*
 - e. Interior roads should be designed to minimize conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular circulation.*

- f. Interior roadways and parking areas should be designed so there are not conflicts between the maneuvering areas for the parking spaces and the major circulation through the site.*
- g. An exiting vehicle must not back out into an adjacent road.*
- h. Loading bays and docks should not require truck traffic to cross high pedestrian or vehicular traffic.*
- i. Minimize paving to reduce impacts to drainage systems and maximize the amount of native vegetation and soils to remain.*

1. The physical impacts associated with the proposed project must not overburden the capacities of existing utilities, drainage systems or other public facilities.
2. The project should provide adequate sanitary and potable water facilities and services without affecting groundwater quantity or quality or existing facilities.
3. All utilities should be underground.
4. Best Management Practices should be used to mitigate potential impacts to surface or groundwater systems due to emissions or production of contaminants.
5. The proposal is consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

Public Comment

Tom Roehl - Noted the controversy regarding the issue of backlit signs. He said the sign industry uses the term "internally illuminated" instead of backlit. He said there is no assurance that by prohibiting the word backlit signs we are going to have nice frontlit signs. The issue is not whether we are going to have the lit signs, the issue is that we need to create a standard that avoids an end result that we don't want.

Chairman McDowell - Do you think it is doable to describe the difference between a good and a bad internally lit sign?

Tom Roehl - There are ways of describing the kinds of illuminating signs you want to allow.

Bill Thorn - If the site plan review proposed criteria is going to be a specification all the words that say "should" should say "shall".

Reece Causey - Noted that sidewalks in the Clinton and Bayview area seem to be in conflict with our attempt to retain rural character.

Dick Collins - Noted that the Site Plan Review - Proposed Criteria, 2. c), uses the term "native vegetation" and he did not believe it was necessary to have Whidbey Island native vegetation in every buffer. In regards to the proposed lighting criteria he felt that there needed to be more flexibility in the height of the exterior light poles.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:30 p.m. and reconvened at 1:15 p.m.

Keith Dearborn - Noted that staff had prepared a worksheet with suggestions on Non-Residential uses that should be permitted or conditional uses in the Rural Residential zone. He noted three good examples of Non-Residential uses in the rural areas, projects that either through design and architecture or through screening and landscaping or a combination of the two seem to work well in the rural area. The Birthing Center on South Whidbey, the Jehovah Witness Church in Central Whidbey, and Henderson Storage on South Whidbey. In addition there are institutional uses in the rural area, and staff has recommendations on those as well.

Staff is currently going through an analysis, based on the OFM forecast, to identify the number of school class rooms

by grade type that we are going to be needing over the next 20 years. Once we have a better idea of what our needs are and have verified those with the school districts we can talk about what we are going to need in term of providing siting opportunities in the rural area for public schools.

Essentially what we are thinking is that uses that have the same kind of intensity and impact should be treated the same way. We should be looking at their intensity of impacts, categorizing them the same, and expecting the same kind of standards.

Presentation by Debra Little: Land Uses in the Rural Area - Draft Recommendation (Island County Growth Management Record # 3252)

List of uses in the rural area with recommendations on whether they should be permitted uses or conditional uses. Also noted are standards specific to the use which mitigate functional or visual impacts of the proposal.

Commissioner Shelton - Noted that provisions were going to have to be made in the code to allow existing churches to grow.

Presentation by Jeff Tate: Summary of Non-Residential Acreages (Island County Growth Management Record # 3253)

A preliminary calculation of improved and unimproved lands within the Commercial Center, Village Commercial, Light Manufacturing and Business Park Non-Residential zoning districts. An analysis is currently being done with regards to potentially developable land within these district as well as an overall analysis of the Light Industrial (surrounds the airfields).

Presentation by Emil King: Potential Rural Service Lands Study (Island County Growth Management Record # 3254)

I. ISSUES

- A. Should defined Rural Service uses be categorized with a separate zoning designation?
- B. What potential uses should make up the Rural Service Zone?
- C. What type of expansion and reconstruction should be allowed in the Rural Service zone?

II. BACKGROUND

- A. **Planning Commission Recommended Land use Element.** The current version of the Land Use Element contains provisions for a Rural Service zone but intentionally does not have any land with such a designation. The topic was intended to be covered at this time, in Phase B.
- B. **Studies by the Island County Economic Development Council.** During the current comprehensive planning process, the Island County EDC prepared recommendations for isolated non-residential uses in their report entitled Business Land use Needs for Island County to the year 2016, May 17, 1996.

The EDC states that the NR Floating Zone concept developed in 1984 led to unpredictable and unplanned growth and resulted in a cumbersome, slow, and uncertain permitting process. The business community was frequently discouraged by the subjectivity and delays associated with obtaining permits under the NR Zoning provisions. In addition, it would not be allowed under GMA.

The EDC also states that the historic commercial or business districts such as Clinton, Freeland, Bayview, Whidbey Air Par, the County Landfill area, Wes Lupien Field, Deception Pass, Camano Gateway and Camano Plaza/Annex, should be the sole foci for future business growth and change. These areas possess most of the infrastructure needed for modest future growth.

The EDC recommended in the Business Activities in Rural Land, An EDC Overview, Island County Economic Development Council, February 1998, that "small retail/service businesses" be allowed in all zones with no site plan review required. The maximum principal size would not exceed 5,000 square feet. There would be no minimum parcel size.

III. ISSUE DISCUSSION

- A. Concern of Citizens. The concern of property owners during the public comment period on the Team Draft focused on how landowners could trust that the County will continue to view them as "existing uses" in the future. They cite the fact that the current Board of Commissioners, Planning Commission, and Planning Staff will eventually change over time, and will the new people have the same view of an existing use as is now proposed. Property owners have a desire for the Rural Service zone to be implemented so that it recognizes them with the potential for limited expansion without simply being an existing use in the rural areas.
- B. Inventory of Potential Uses. This inventory of Potential Rural Service uses included on pages 5 through 25 includes those lands with an existing non-residential use which are not currently designated as one of the non-residential land use categories in the draft Future Land Use Plan (i.e. Commercial Center, Village Commercial, Business Park, Light Manufacturing or Light Industrial). Potential Rural Service parcels may be either inside or outside of defined areas of more intensive rural development. Many of the potential parcels have uses which were established prior to the establishment of the non-residential floating zone and do not necessarily have an "old" (i.e. technically existing) zoning designation of Non-Residential. Shown for each potential Rural Service area is the specific use, size in acres, old zoning, draft future land use designation, key on where it is located in the County, generalized use category and Staff Recommendation.

In total, the potential Rural Service lands inventory starts with 38 uses, encompassing 150 acres, provided that some uses have an actual area of use far less than the parcel size. For example, the Sound View Shopper has an area of development of less than an acre on a 38 acre parcel. Only a few of the uses encompass more than a single parcel. Seventeen uses occur on Camano Island, with the remaining 21 located on Whidbey.

The inventory of potential Rural Service uses was divided into a number of use categories to assist in analysis. The uses are arranged as if you were driving counter-clockwise around Camano Island and from north to south on Whidbey Island. A locator map is provided on page 5. The categories being used for analysis are: grocery/convenience store (including gasoline); sale of goods (excluding groceries); restaurants; lodging; real estate offices; professional services; mini-storage/RV storage; plant sales; and miscellaneous uses.

IV. OPTIONS

- A. The following are the three preliminary options for each potential Rural Service Use:
1. Have the potential Rural Service Use remain in the Residential or Rural Residential future land use designation as is shown in the Planning Commission Recommended Plan (April 17, 1998).
 2. Place the potential Rural Service Use in the Rural Service future land use designation.
 3. Treat each potential Rural Service use as the starting point for the establishment of a logical outer boundary which may be larger than the existing property boundary of the use and which may include other lands appropriate for similar development.

V. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- A. Staff recommends that Options 1 and 2 be utilized to differentiate the appropriateness for Rural Service inclusion

of potential uses. It does not seem appropriate to have a land use designation include uses that are already going to be either principally permitted or conditionally permitted in the Rural Area under the new Zoning Regulations, or to include those uses that are currently in the Rural Area but are not desirous to have expanded in the future. Therefore, some of the potential uses should be redesignated as Rural Service and the other should remain with their Residential or Rural Residential land use designation as is shown in the Planning Commission Recommendation. The Staff Recommendation for each use is shown in the inventory.

- B. Option 3 for having the isolated non-residential uses serve as a basis for establishment of a logical outer boundary of surrounding parcels does not seem to be appropriate at this time. The GMA and hearings Board decisions limit the opportunity for inclusion of undeveloped land that is simply zoned non-residential in an area of more intensive rural development.
- C. The following is the staff recommendation for the Rural Service zoning district:
1. The goal of the Rural Service zone should be to provide for commercial activities associated with the provision of daily convenience goods and services for the County's rural area population.
 2. The Rural Service zone should include only existing grocery/convenience stores and establishments for the sale of goods (excluding groceries). These uses are all located outside of the larger planned non-residential areas and are primarily oriented to serving local needs. These are 11 uses which fit into these two categories encompassing 56.8 acres (Note that the Sound View Shopper is on a 38.2 acre parcel and Tyee Grocery is on a 9.8 acre parcel.) Not counting the Sound View Shopper and Tyee Grocery, the average parcel size is approximately 1 acre.
 3. The other potential uses covered in this inventory which include restaurants, lodging, real estate offices, professional services, mini-storage/RV storage, plant sales, and other miscellaneous uses should keep their Residential or Rural Residential future land use designation. There are a number of reasons for this decision. Restaurants (for indoor seating up to 40) are provided for in the Rural Area as a recreation and tourist use under the proposed development regulations. Larger lodging establishments are provided in the development regulations as either bed and breakfast inn (3 to 12 rooms) or country inns (13 to 40 rooms). It has been discussed whether or not limited-scale mini-storage should be a conditionally permitted use in the Rural Residential zone so that it does not consume the fairly limited Commercial Center, Village Commercial, Light Manufacturing and Light Industrial land supply. Future establishment of real estate offices, professional office and other similar uses greater than a home occupation of home industry should probably only be allowed in the Commercial Center and Village Commercial areas.
 4. The Rural Service zone should provide for conditional expansion of an existing business as well as the right to rebuild in case of fire or other disaster. Upon further analysis, staff feels that expansion or reconstruction should not result in a building area greater than 4,000 square feet in size. For reference, Bailey's Corner Store is 2320 square feet, Soundview Shopper is 1396 square feet, and Huntington's is 1890 square feet. There is a question as to whether expansion should be limited to the confines of the currently developed parcel or whether adjacent properties under the same ownership would be available to accept expansion, while still not exceeding the maximum square footage threshold.
 5. Change of use in the Rural Service zone would not be confined to a list of permitted uses, but would rather be limited to the determination by the County that the change of use is not of a greater intensity than the existing use.
 6. On a case by case basis, landscaping and other improvements should be required for the change of use or expansion of existing use in the Rural Service zone so that the surrounding rural character is not adversely impacted. Expansion should require closer scrutiny than a change of use.

Public Comment

Don Jewitt - Noted that there was no mention of the Homes Harbor Rod and Gun Club or for that matter any of the

other gun clubs on the island in the Rural Service Lands Study.

Bill Thorn - Regarding Page 1 of the Rural Service Lands Study, Lines 16 and 17, "The EDC recommended in the Business Activities in Rural Lands, An EDC Overview, Island County Economic Development Council, February 1998, that "small retail/service business" be allowed in all zones with no site plan review required. The maximum principal size would not exceed 5,000 square feet. There would be no minimum parcel size." He said it was his understanding that this zoning is a tactic for grandfathering existing businesses and we are not talking about creating any new business under this zone.

Emil King - The staff recommendation is for existing only.

Frank McCowskey - There are a number of existing Non-Residential properties that are presently providing rural services such as the lumbermill, sawmill, and gravel pit off of Jewitt Road. This property is right next to Boots Ranch but it is not included in the rural service designation. It seems that owners of these existing unimproved NR zoned properties should have some sort of opportunity to opt into a rural service designation.

Keith Dearborn - Gravel pits are conditional uses in the Rural Residential, Forest and Agricultural zones. We have not addressed saw mills because by all growth board decision those uses are to be permitted uses as a rural resource industry.

John Hitt - Noted that EDC's intent on Lines 16 & 17 of the Rural Service Lands Study was that it be a conditional use with very clearly prescribed limitations and standards.

In regards to the Site Plan Review proposed criteria, Page 2, 2.i), "*The proposed design should not adversely impact the established character on surrounding parcels.*" He said the word *character* is too vague suggested *uses* instead.

Under Page 2, 5.a), "*Development should be designed to appear similar in height, size, placement, style, materials, color and design to other development typical in the zone.*" What if the existing building materials are corrugated metal and someone wants to put in something that looks nicer?

Under Page 2, 5.c), "*The size of the building should be proportionate to the size of the site.*" Whatever that ratio is it needs to be clearly established and fairly well defined.

Dick Collins - Felt the limitation of 2,000 square feet on a clubhouse was a little low. Noted that the Baby Island/Saratoga clubhouse was 2,400 square feet and he considered that a small clubhouse. He questioned where you would locate a large college or other educational facilities in the RAIDs or UGAs, it almost seems they would have to locate in the rural area.

In regards to the overnight guest facilities he questioned the need for the requirement of gravel parking. The workshop adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

**BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS**

ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON

W. L. McDowell, Chairman

Mike Shelton, Member

Tom Shaughnessy, Member

Attest:

Margaret Rosenkranz, Clerk of the Board