



SKAMANIA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

Tuesday, April 6, 2021, 6:15 PM

REMOTE PARTICIPATION BY ZOOM MEETING TELEPHONE AND VIDEO CONFERENCE

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

4. AGENDA ITEMS

- a. Approval of minutes from the March 16, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting.
- b. Recommendation of finding of adequacy to complete Shoreline Master Program periodic review.
- c. Workshop to discuss recreational facilities.

5. PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS

6. ADJOURN

Participation Instructions:

To join the Zoom meeting online, visit <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6564597957>.

To join by telephone, call **(253) 215-8782**, and enter the following meeting ID when prompted: **656 459 7957**



SKAMANIA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Tuesday, March 16, 2021, 6:15 PM

REMOTE PARTICIPATION BY ZOOM MEETING TELEPHONE AND VIDEO CONFERENCE

1. CALL TO ORDER

Cyndi Soliz called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Cyndi Soliz led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

Planning Commissioners Present: Anita Gahimer Crow, Sue Davis, John Prescott, Cyndi Soliz

Staff Present: Mike Beck, Andrew Lembrick, Alan Peters

4. AGENDA ITEMS

a. Approval of minutes from the March 2, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting.

Sue Davis moved to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting. John Prescott seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

b. Workshop to discuss alternative energy facilities.

Alan Peters provided a summary of revisions that were made to the draft alternative energy facility proposal.

The Planning Commissioners discussed the proposal and asked questions of staff. John Prescott suggested that the new draft be sent to the Skamania PUD. Anita Gahimer Crow made recommendations for revisions to the text to allow for installation of screening plantings to mitigate glare and reflection of solar arrays, to exempt forestry uses from the noise limit for wind turbines, to require safety barriers to prevent climbing of towers, and to ensure adequate clearance between turbine blades and nearby trees and structures. Mr. Peters stated that he could work these changes into the draft and that he would schedule the item for a public hearing in the near future.



SKAMANIA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

c. Workshop to discuss recreational facilities.

Alan Peters gave a presentation about recreational facilities and current zoning regulations related to recreational facilities. Planning Commission members discussed what a recreational facility is, and staff identified some facilities that have been developed in recent years.

The Planning Commission was supportive of addressing this topic and directed staff to prepare definitions for new land use terms related to recreation facilities for discussion at the next meeting.

5. PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS

None.

6. ADJOURN

Cyndi Soliz adjourned the meeting at 7:21 PM.



Skamania County

Community Development Department

Building/Fire Marshal • Environmental Health • Planning

Skamania County Courthouse Annex

Post Office Box 1009

Stevenson, Washington 98648

Phone: 509-427-3900 Inspection Line: 509-427-3922

MEMORANDUM

TO: Skamania County Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Staff
DATE: April 6, 2021
RE: Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

Background

Skamania County is undertaking a periodic review of the County's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) as required by the Washington State Shoreline Management Act (SMA). The SMA requires that each SMP be reviewed and revised, if needed, on an eight-year schedule established by the Legislature. The periodic review ensures the SMP stays current with changes in laws and rules, remains consistent with other Skamania County plans and development regulations, and is responsive to changed circumstances, new information, and improved data.

The county has elected to utilize a joint review process with the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) in order to streamline this periodic review. As outlined in WAC 173-26-104, the process combines the local and state public comment periods required by RCW 90.58.090. The county and Ecology accepted comments over a 30-day comment period from February 3, 2021 to March 4, 2021. The Planning Commission also held a public hearing at its March 2, 2021 meeting.

One county resident provided testimony at the hearing and provided a follow-up comment letter. No other comments were received. After reviewing these comments, staff determined that these comments did not necessitate any changes to the SMP or to the proposed finding of adequacy.

On March 11, 2021, the county provided an initial submittal of the proposed finding of adequacy to Ecology under WAC 173-26-104(3)(a). The submittal included a copy of the draft finding of adequacy resolution, the periodic review checklist, legal notices of the comment period and Planning Commission hearing, and the hearing agenda, staff report, and meeting minutes. Ecology was also provided with an audio recording of the hearing comments, a copy of written comments, and the county's written response.

On March 19, 2021, Ecology provided the county with a written statement of initial concurrence of the proposed finding of adequacy. With this initial determination from Ecology, the next step for the periodic review process is for the county to formally adopt the finding of adequacy by resolution.

Periodic Review Process

The following is a summary of the periodic review process so far:

Initial Staff Review

- Staff completed the Periodic Review Checklist and consulted with Ecology staff in December 2020/January 2021, affirming that changes are not likely to be needed to the SMP and that the county and Ecology will conduct joint review.

Public Participation Program

- Staff developed a public participation program as required by WAC-173-26-090(3)(a).
- The plan includes public participation goals and opportunities, a list of stakeholders and interested parties, a public participation timeline, and provides for public comment periods and hearings. As part of this plan, the county is maintaining a project website at www.skamaniacounty.org/shorelineupdate.

Public Comment Period, Hearing, and Planning Commission Review

- Staff provided the Planning Commission with the Periodic Review Checklist and draft findings of adequacy.
- A joint 30-day public comment period occurred from February 3, 2021 to March 4, 2021.
- A joint local/state public hearing occurred on Tuesday, March 2, 2021 at 5:30 p.m.
- Staff evaluated the comments received and provided written responses to Ecology. The county determined that no changes to the SMP were required and submitted a proposed finding of adequacy for an initial determination of consistency with the SMA and state rules to the Department of Ecology on March 11, 2021.
- The county received an initial determination of consistency from Ecology on March 19, 2021.
- **The Planning Commission will vote to forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners on the proposed finding of adequacy.**

Final Actions

- The Board of County Commissioners will review the Planning Commission's recommendation and adopt a resolution with findings of adequacy.
- The county will then submit the resolution to Ecology, with evidence of notice, copies of any comments received, and a completed periodic review checklist.
- Ecology will send final letter approving Finding of Adequacy, completing the periodic review process.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission vote to forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to adopt the proposed finding of adequacy, Resolution no. 2021-09.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Ecology Initial Determination of Consistency

Attachment 2: Finding of Adequacy Resolution No. 2021-09

Attachment 3: Periodic Review Checklist

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Peters, Assistant Planning Director, Skamania County Community Development

CC: Jackie Chandler, Shoreline Administrator, WA Department of Ecology

FROM: Michelle McConnell, Regional Shoreline Planner, WA Department of Ecology

SUBJECT: Skamania County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review – Determination of Initial Concurrence

DATE: March 19, 2021

Thank you for your March 11, 2021 initial submittal of the periodic review 'finding of adequacy' documentation for the Skamania County Shoreline Master Program (SMP). Ecology is required under WAC 173-26-104(3)(b) to make an initial determination of consistency with applicable laws and rules.

This serves as Ecology's formal written statement of initial concurrence of your proposed finding of adequacy.

As described under WAC 173-26-104(4), the next step in the approval process is for your jurisdiction to formally adopt the finding of adequacy through resolution and send the final SMP submittal for formal agency approval as outlined in WAC 173-26-110.

Please let me know if you have questions or concerns.

RESOLUTION NO. 2021-09

**A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM
PERIODIC REVIEW REQUIRED BY RCW 90.58.080(4)**

WHEREAS, the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) requires Skamania County to develop and administer a Shoreline Master Program (SMP); and

WHEREAS, Skamania County adopted a comprehensive SMP update as required by RCW 90.58.080(2), which was effective as of December 29, 2020; and

WHEREAS, RCW 90.58.080(4) requires Skamania County to periodically review and, if necessary, revise the master program on or before June 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the review process is intended to bring the SMP into compliance with requirements of the act or state rules that have been added or changed since the last SMP amendment, ensure the SMP remains consistent with amended comprehensive plans and regulations, and incorporate amendments deemed necessary to reflect changed circumstances, new information, or improved data; and

WHEREAS, Skamania County developed a public participation program for this periodic review in accordance with WAC 173-26-090(3)(a) to inform, involve and encourage participation of interested persons and private entities, tribes, and applicable agencies having interests and responsibilities relating to shorelines; and

WHEREAS, Skamania County has followed a public participation program, including maintaining a project website, providing notices to stakeholders and the general public, and holding a public workshop and hearing; and

WHEREAS, Skamania County used Ecology's checklist of legislative and rule amendments to review amendments to chapter 90.58 RCW and department guidelines that have occurred since the master program was last amended, and determine if local amendments are needed to maintain compliance in accordance with WAC 173-26-090(3)(b)(i); and

WHEREAS, Skamania County reviewed the comprehensive plan and development regulations to determine if the shoreline master program policies and regulations remain consistent with them in accordance with WAC 173-26-090(3)(b)(ii); and

WHEREAS, Skamania County considered whether to incorporate any amendments needed to reflect changed circumstances, new information or improved data in accordance with WAC 173-26-090(3)(b)(iii); and

WHEREAS, Skamania County consulted with the Department of Ecology and solicited comments; and

WHEREAS, the Skamania County Planning Commission completed a review of staff

recommendations that no SMP amendments are necessary to maintain compliance with the Act or applicable guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Skamania County conducted a formal joint public comment period with the Department of Ecology in compliance with requirements of WAC 173-26-104; and

WHEREAS, Skamania County published a legal notice in the Skamania County Pioneer on February 3, 2021, and on February 24, 2021, and mailed said notice to interested parties for a public hearing on the proposed staff recommendation(s), including a statement that the hearing was intended to address the periodic review in accordance with WAC 173-26-090(3)(c)(ii); and

WHEREAS, the Skamania County Planning Commission took public testimony on the proposed staff recommendation at a public hearing on March 2, 2021 held virtually online via the Zoom platform; and

WHEREAS, Skamania County has determined that a Finding of Adequacy is exempt from State Environmental Policy Act review based on WAC 197-11-800(19), which covers resolutions or ordinances “relating solely to governmental procedures, and containing no substantive standards respecting use or modification of the environment”, or “text amendments resulting in no substantive changes respecting use or modification of the environment;” and

WHEREAS, the Skamania County Planning Commission reviewed the public testimony and written comments, and affirmed no amendments are needed to maintain compliance with the Act or applicable guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Skamania County provided Notice of Intent to Adopt to the Washington State Department of Commerce in accordance with WAC 173-26-100(5); and

WHEREAS, the Skamania County Board of Commissioners reviewed the record of Planning Commission review and affirmed no amendments are needed for compliance with the Act or applicable guidelines; and

WHEREAS, this completes the Skamania County required process for periodic review in accordance with RCW 90.58.080(4) and applicable state guidelines (WAC 173-26).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF SKAMANIA COUNTY

Section 1. **Review and Evaluation.** The Board of Commissioners hereby finds that the review and evaluation required by RCW 90.58.080(4) have occurred, as described more particularly in the recitals above, and adopts a Finding of Adequacy that the shoreline master program is consistent with the Shoreline Management Act and relevant sections of the Washington Administration Code.

Section 2. **Submission to Department of Ecology.** The Assistant Planning Director is directed to submit this Resolution adopting Findings of Adequacy to the Department of Ecology for final action. Once approved by the Department of Ecology, no further action is necessary for compliance with RCW 90.58.080(4) for the periodic review update due on June 30, 2021.

Dated this ____ day of _____ 2021.

ATTEST:

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SKAMANIA COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

T.W. Lannen, Chairman

Richard Mahar, Commissioner

Clerk of the Board

Robert Hamlin, Commissioner

Approved as to form only:

Skamania County Prosecuting Attorney

Aye _____
Nay _____
Abstain _____
Absent _____

SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM PERIODIC REVIEW

Periodic Review Checklist

This document is intended for use by counties, cities and towns subject to the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) to conduct the “periodic review” of their Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs). This review is intended to keep SMPs current with amendments to state laws or rules, changes to local plans and regulations, and changes to address local circumstances, new information or improved data. The review is required under the SMA at [RCW 90.58.080\(4\)](#). Ecology’s rule outlining procedures for conducting these reviews is at [WAC 173-26-090](#).

This checklist summarizes amendments to state law, rules and applicable updated guidance adopted between 2007 and 2019 that may trigger the need for local SMP amendments during periodic reviews.

How to use this checklist

See the associated *Periodic Review Checklist Guidance* for a description of each item, relevant links, review considerations, and example language.

At the **beginning of the periodic review**, use the review column to document review considerations and determine if local amendments are needed to maintain compliance. See WAC 173-26-090(3)(b)(i).

Ecology recommends reviewing all items on the checklist. Some items on the checklist prior to the local SMP adoption may be relevant.

At the end of your review process, use the checklist as a final summary identifying your final action, indicating where the SMP addresses applicable amended laws, or indicate where no action is needed. See WAC 173-26-090(3)(d)(ii)(D), and WAC 173-26-110(9)(b).

Local governments should coordinate with their assigned [Ecology regional planner](#) for more information on how to use this checklist and conduct the periodic review.

Prepared By	Jurisdiction	Date
Alan Peters, Assistant Planning Director	Skamania County	3/31/2021

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2019			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for building freshwater docks	Ecology-approved SMP (2020) updated SMP section 2.6(8) to provide examples of some of the most common exemptions. Reader is referred to WAC 173-27-040 for complete exemptions including dollar thresholds for freshwater docks.	SMP is consistent with this requirement. No update needed.
b.	The Legislature removed the requirement for a shoreline permit for disposal of dredged materials at Dredged Material Management Program sites (<i>applies to 9 jurisdictions</i>)	N/A – Skamania is not one of the affected jurisdictions; Ecology-approved SMP 6.3.4 Dredging & Dredge Material Disposal – Regulation 6.d requires compliance with WA DMMP.	N/A – no update needed.
c.	The Legislature added restoring native kelp, eelgrass beds and native oysters as fish habitat enhancement projects.	Ecology-approved SMP (2020) provide examples of some of the most common exemptions in Section 2.6(8) and provide a reference to WAC 173-27-040 for complete exemption language.	The SMP is consistent with this requirement. No update needed.
2017			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for substantial development to \$7,047.	Ecology-approved SMP (2020) Section 2.5 (8.a) Substantial Development Permits and Letters of Exemption includes the correct dollar threshold. Chapter 7 Definitions – Substantial Development includes the correct dollar threshold.	The SMP is consistent with this requirement. No update needed.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
b.	Ecology permit rules clarified the definition of “development” does not include dismantling or removing structures.	Ecology-approved SMP (2020) includes language in Chapter 7 Definitions - Development specifying that dismantling or removing structures is not considered development in the absence of other development or redevelopment.	SMP is consistent with this requirement. No update needed.
c.	Ecology adopted rules clarifying exceptions to local review under the SMA.	Section 2.3 of the Ecology-approved SMP includes the exceptions to local review included in wac 173-27-044 including for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remedial hazard substance cleanup actions • Boatyard improvements meeting NPDES requirements • Certain WSDOT safety and maintenance projects. 	SMP is consistent with this requirement. No update needed.
d.	Ecology amended rules clarifying permit filing procedures consistent with a 2011 statute.	Section 2.5(15) includes permit filing procedures consistent with WAC 173-27-190 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The date of filing occurs when all local appeals and reconsiderations are complete • Mailing and contents to be sent to Ecology • Date of filing is the date Ecology receives the permit materials. • For SCUPs and variances, date of filing is the date Ecology transmits its decision. 	SMP is consistent with this requirement. No update needed.
e.	Ecology amended forestry use regulations to clarify that forest practices that only involves timber cutting are not SMA “developments” and do not require SDPs.	Ecology-approved SMP Section 5.3.5 clearly specifies that forest practices that only involve timber cutting are not developments and are not subject to the SMP.	SMP meets this requirement. No update needed.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
f.	Ecology clarified the SMA does not apply to lands under exclusive federal jurisdiction	N/A – Skamania does not have any lands of exclusive federal jurisdiction; Ecology-approved SMP 1.4 Shoreline Jurisdiction; 1.5 SMP Applicability to Development	N/A – no update required.
g.	Ecology clarified “default” provisions for nonconforming uses and development .	Ecology-approved SMP Section 2.9 provides non-conforming use and development provisions consistent with the default provisions in WAC 173-27-080.	SMP is consistent with the optional default nonconforming development language. No update needed.
h.	Ecology adopted rule amendments to clarify the scope and process for conducting periodic reviews .	Ecology-approved SMP 2.13 SMP Periodic Review. The periodic review rule and procedures in RCW 90.58.080 and WAC 173-26-090 apply whether or not procedures are adopted into the SMP.	N/A - No changes required to the SMP to comply with the statute and WAC requirements.
i.	Ecology adopted a new rule creating an optional SMP amendment process that allows for a shared local/state public comment period.	Ecology-approved SMP 2.13 Amendments to the SMP. Section 2.13 does not address the optional local amendment process and is not required to. The County’s SMP amendment procedures do not conflict with and would allow for the optional review process in future periodic reviews.	No change required.
j.	Submittal to Ecology of proposed SMP amendments.	Ecology-approved SMP 2.14 Amendments to the SMP references WAC 173-26	No change required.
2016			
a.	The Legislature created a new shoreline permit exemption for retrofitting existing structure to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act .	Ecology-approved SMP 2.6 (8) Substantial Development Permits & Letters of Exemption provides examples of some of the most common exemptions. Reader is	No update required.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
		referred to WAC 173-27-040 for complete exemptions including this specific item.	
b.	Ecology updated wetlands critical areas guidance including implementation guidance for the 2014 wetlands rating system.	Ecology-approved SMP 3.4.6.2 Wetland Regulations – Delineation & Rating #2; 7 Definitions – Wetlands Rating System	No changes required. The SMP is up-to-date consistent with wetlands guidance.
2015			
a.	The Legislature adopted a 90-day target for local review of Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) projects.	Ecology-approved SMP 2.5(13) Permit Process contains language referencing 90-day reviews for WSDOT projects.	The SMP is consistent with this requirement. No update needed.
2014			
a.	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for floating on-water residences legally established before 7/1/2014.	N/A - There are no previously existing FOWRs in Skamania County. Ecology-approved SMP 5.3.3 Boating Facilities & Overwater Structures Policy #6 and Regulation #14 prohibit this use; 5.3.11 Residential Development Regulation #10 prohibits this use; 7 Definitions – Floating On-water Residence	N/A – floating on-water residences are prohibited.
2012			
a.	The Legislature amended the SMA to clarify SMP appeal procedures .	Ecology-approved SMP 2.11 Appeals addresses permit appeals but does not address Ecology SMP appeal procedures.	The procedures of RCW 90.58.190 apply regardless of inclusion in the SMP. No change required.
2011			
a.	Ecology adopted a rule requiring that wetlands be delineated in accordance with the approved	Ecology-approved SMP 3.4.6.2 Wetlands – Regulations – Delineation & Ratings. This section requires	No change required.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
	federal wetland delineation manual.	delineation according to the federal wetlands delineation manual and supplements.	
b.	Ecology adopted rules for new commercial geoduck aquaculture.	N/A – Skamania has no saltwater shorelines where geoduck clams grow.	No change required.
c.	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for floating homes permitted or legally established prior to January 1, 2011.	N/A - There are no previously existing floating homes in Skamania County. Ecology-approved SMP 5.3.3 Boating Facilities & Overwater Structures prohibits this use; 5.3.11 Residential Development prohibits this use; 7 Definitions – Floating Home	No change required since the SMP prohibits this use.
d.	The Legislature authorizing a new option to classify existing structures as conforming.	Ecology-approved SMP 5.3.11 Residential Development – Policy #6 includes this optional provision.	No change required.
2010			
a.	The Legislature adopted Growth Management Act – Shoreline Management Act clarifications.	Ecology-approved SMP 1.8 Effective Date; 3.4.2(1) Critical Areas – Policies	No change required. Skamania County completed its comprehensive SMP update providing separate shoreline critical area provisions effective December 29, 2020 (Ord. No 2020-07)
2009			
a.	The Legislature created new “relief” procedures for instances in which a shoreline restoration project within a UGA creates a shift in Ordinary High Water Mark.	Skamania County’s SMP does not include this provision. The allowances of WAC 173-27-213 only apply within Urban Growth Areas established under RCW 36.70A. N/A – There are no urban growth areas in Skamania County only “urban exempt	N/A – No update required.

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
		areas” designated under the National Scenic Area.	
b.	Ecology adopted a rule for certifying wetland mitigation banks .	Ecology-approved SMP 3.4.4 General Mitigation Requirements for all CAs; 3.4.4(5.c.ii) Compensation – Offsite; 3.4.6 Wetlands – Wetland Mitigation #1.a N/A –Skamania does not currently have a wetland mitigation bank program but place-holder provisions allow for such once established.	The SMP already allows for mitigation banks to offset impacts. No change required.
c.	The Legislature added moratoria authority and procedures to the SMA.	N/A – RCW 90.58.590 and WAC 173-27-085 apply regardless of inclusion in the SMP	The draft SMP does not discuss moratoria. Because it is not necessary to include these provisions, no change is required or recommended.
2007			
a.	The Legislature clarified options for defining "floodway" as either the area that has been established in FEMA maps, or the floodway criteria set in the SMA.	Ecology-approved SMP 7. Definitions – Floodway includes language referencing FEMA maps.	No change required.
b.	Ecology amended rules to clarify that comprehensively updated SMPs shall include a list and map of streams and lakes that are in shoreline jurisdiction.	Ecology-approved SMP Appendix A Shoreline Environment Designation Maps and Appendix B List of Shoreline Waterbodies	No change required.
c.	Ecology’s rule listing statutory exemptions from the requirement for an SDP was amended to include fish habitat enhancement projects that conform to the provisions of RCW 77.55.181.	Ecology-approved SMP 2.6 (8.o) Substantial Development Permits and Letters of Exemption references to WAC 173-27-040(2.p) for fish habitat enhancement exemptions consistent with RCW 77.55.181.	No change required.



Skamania County

Community Development Department

Building/Fire Marshal ♦ Environmental Health ♦ Planning

Skamania County Courthouse Annex

Post Office Box 1009

Stevenson, Washington 98648

Phone: 509-427-3900 Inspection Line: 509-427-3922

MEMORANDUM

TO: Skamania County Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Staff
DATE: April 6, 2021
RE: Recreation Facilities

BACKGROUND

Recreation is an increasingly important industry to Skamania County. The comprehensive plan states that "Skamania County is a focal point of year-round recreational opportunities" which include "boating, fishing, hunting, camping, hiking, snowmobiling, cross-country skiing, wildflower hiking tours, hot mineral springs day spas, golf courses, windsurfing, and kite boarding." The plan further states that "Skamania County should strive to improve recreational opportunities throughout the County including enhancing public access to the waterways."

While recreation development is supported by the Comprehensive Plan and the various subarea plans, the zoning code lacks clear guidelines for what types of recreational uses should be allowed and where. At the direction of the Planning Commission, Planning staff has prepared definitions for the following various distinct recreational facility types:

- Indoor recreational facility
- Outdoor recreational facility
- Campground
- Group camp
- Rural event center
- Retreat center

Staff would like the Planning Commission to review and provide feedback on these definitions. Then, with a better understanding of the various types of facilities that exist, Planning staff will work with the Planning Commission to determine where and under what circumstances these various facilities should be allowed throughout the county.

DRAFT LAND USE DEFINITIONS

Facility

A place, building or amenity provided for a particular purpose.

Outdoor recreational facility

A facility provided for outdoor recreation encompassing a varying range of activities pursued for purposes of physical exercise, general wellbeing, spiritual renewal, and education. Examples include, but are not limited to, camping, hiking, skiing, fishing, hunting, shooting, backpacking, picnicking, wildlife and botanical viewing, horseback riding, swimming, rock climbing, cycling, windsurfing, rafting, sailing and outdoor team sports such as soccer, baseball, tennis, basketball.

Indoor recreational facility

A facility provided for the purpose of indoor conduct, viewing, or participation in recreational activities. This term includes, but is not limited to, indoor archery or shooting ranges, driving ranges, volleyball courts, bowling alleys, ice or skating rinks, billiard halls, video game centers, soccer fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, and fitness centers.

Campground

A facility with two or more developed campsites for temporary occupancy of tents, trailers, campers, cabins, recreational vehicles, or similar devices, but not including recreational vehicle or mobile home parks. Campgrounds may include group campsites where two or more developed campsites are intended for use by a single party. The use of private property for incidental recreational camping by a single household does not constitute a campground facility.

Group camp

A camp facility operated by an organization such as scout, youth, or church group which offers a variety of active and passive recreational activities. Group camps may provide overnight accommodation facilities, such as cabins and designated campsites, and other amenities for site users, such as meeting and assembly spaces, food services, recreational facilities and equipment and medical/health stations. Group camps do not include establishments that have as a primary purpose the treatment of addictions, correctional or disciplinary training, or housing for homeless persons.

Rural event center

A facility that provides a venue for private parties to host social gatherings and events such as reunions, meetings, ceremonies, weddings, parties, and receptions. These facilities may consist of indoor or outdoor gathering spaces and are typically located to take advantage of special rural characteristics such as natural features, historic structures and landscapes, and scenic views.

Retreat center

A facility, which may include a lodge, series of buildings, or accessory facilities with a primary focus on relaxation, rehabilitation, religion, recreation activities, relaxation/spa uses, conferences, meeting, and event facilities are provided with or without compensation. Retreat centers may include temporary lodging and/or campsite facilities.

IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS

Once the individual last use terms are determined and defined, the Planning Commission will need to determine how these various land uses will be implemented in the zoning code. Staff has identified two alternatives.

Identify the various types of facilities as distinct land uses, and determine in which zones each use is appropriate.

This alternative would result in amending many of the use lists for the various zones in the county. Many zones currently identify "recreation facilities" as a conditional use. The Planning Commission could elect to list all of these individual uses as conditional uses in these zones, replacing one land use with six different land uses. More likely, the Planning Commission might determine that different types of recreational facilities are allowable in different zoning designations.

For example, indoor recreational facilities could be restricted to commercial zones, but outdoor recreational facilities could be allowable in most zones. Additionally, it might be possible that event centers would be allowed in Residential 5 and Residential 10 zones, but not Residential 1 and Residential 2 zones.

The Planning Commission should refer to the Comprehensive Plan and subarea plans to determine where each recreational land use would be appropriate.

Establish and adopt standards for the various types of recreational facilities.

Rather than list each individual type of facility separately and determine what uses would be appropriate in each zone, the county could instead maintain the existing allowances for "recreation facilities" and adopt standards for recreational facilities in the zoning code that would be applicable to all zones. This would mean that any type of recreational facility would be allowable in any zone where recreational facilities are currently allowed, subject to satisfying use-specific standards.

A new section on recreational facilities could be adopted into the zoning code's supplementary development standards that allows and establishes standards for each type of recreational facility. These use-specific standards could include requirements for minimum parcel size, maximum site capacity, or parking. For example, the county might determinate that an event center occurs on a property of at least 5 acres in size, or that a campground provides at least one parking space per campsite.

NEXT STEPS

Staff requests that the Planning Commission provide feedback and recommendations on the draft land use definitions and provide direction on the proposed implementation options.