

## Minutes

### Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee

Special Meeting, April 16, 2019

Attendees: Linda Hughes (LH) – At Large, Chair  
David Gellatly (DG) – CoC  
Tessa Pinckston (TP) – PRRVA  
Steve Wolff (SW) – PRTA

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to Order at 6:00 pm
2. Public Input on potential changes to WCC 20.72.

SW began by presenting documents prepared by the PRTA titled **Problems and Solutions, STC and a few other zones**. The document is attached to these Minutes as an exhibit. Mr. Wolff offered that this is a list to begin with but is not a comprehensive list of all considerations. The document prioritizes the problems (with suggested solutions).

It is the Point Roberts Taxpayers' Association position that by identifying problems that exist because of the current requirements of 20.72, and solutions gathered from public input, it might assist PRCAC, and ultimately the County in simplifying the task of revising the 20.72 overlay to benefit our community today and in the future.

A brief review of SW's presentation of the Taxpayer Problems and Solutions document is as follows:

First priority 20.72 codes to be discussed for revision are:

- Parking on Gulf Road
- Heavy equipment parking/storage restrictions, with suggestions for resolution being to potentially re-zone some areas as ILR or change the current zoning to allow for a specified number of heavy equipment vehicles to be stored at the residence of the business owner.
- Visibility of RV trailers, containers, etc.
- Forest setback, which current zoning does not make sense where the setback exists to preserve forest that does not exist
- Design guidelines restrictions restricts RV storage unless there is a home also on the property. PRTA wants to encourage RV usage in Point Roberts but wants to discourage lot ownership for the purpose of RV storage.

DG suggests that this meeting essentially pick up where the PRCAC Special Meeting of April 1<sup>st</sup> left off, wherein a number of 20.72 sub codes were identified as major topics for discussion and potential revision. He felt that tonight we should go through the list of sub codes and specifically identify the sub-codes that do not require discussion, in order to narrow future discussions to the sub codes deemed as requiring discussion for potential change.

20.72.010 DG read the Purpose. No changes required

20.72.020 DG read the Application. No changes required

20.72.022 DG read the Area and applicability. No changes required.

20.72.030 DG read the Review of permit applications by the Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee. There was quite a lot of discussion about this one. Ken Calder proposed that discussion of applications for permitted uses is redundant, untimely, and a waste of time to have PRCAC members review. After a great deal of discussion it was agreed that the language of .030 should stay the same, which essentially maintains local control over all permit applications. It is also noted that PRCAC needs to impress upon the County the importance of timely PRCAC review of all permit applications to avoid missing an opportunity for review as happened with the Radio Towers application that was very costly to rectify.

20.72.050 DG read the Permitted uses.. No changes required.

20.72.100 DG read the Accessory uses. No changes required

20.72.130 20.72150 and 20.72.200 are identified as requiring comprehensive review and potential changes.

20.72.250 DG read the Minimum lot size to protect critical areas. Discussion ensued. No changes required.

20.72.260 DG read the Maximum density. No changes required.

20.72.270 DG read the Subdivision requirements. No changes required.

20.72.350 DG read the Building setbacks/buffer areas. This item is identified as requiring comprehensive review.

20.72.400 DG read the Height limitations. Most of the discussion agreed that it is good as is, but some members of the public wanted it kept on the table for discussion.

20.72.650 DG read the Development criteria. No changes required.

20.72.651 DG read the Facility design. There was some discussion of the Design Guidelines addendum to this overlay code and some of the current non-confirming sites in Point Roberts, along with suggestions to alert the offending building owners for rectification.

20.72.652 DG read Archaeological resources. No changes required.

20.72.653 DG read Landscaping, screening, and tree canopy retention. This item is identified as requiring comprehensive discussion.

20.72.654 DG read Site Design/view corridors. No changes required but there was a lot of discussion on developing a “best practices” document to be shared with new building permit applicants that might help avoid neighbor discontent (ie temporary tape and scaffold structures to demonstrate the building position, height, location on property – to allow for neighborly input before construction begins)

20.72.655 DG read Public restrooms and trash facilities. Although the language was not deemed as requiring changes, a suggestion was made to add “recycling” to it.

20.72.656 DG read Vehicular access. It was deemed that we may need assistance to properly understand this code to determine whether changes might be possible.

20.72.657 DG read Nonvehicular access. No changes required, although this section generated discussion about the **requirement for roadway improvements** and the perception by some that Seabright had “refused” to consider roadway improvements after the storm damage of December 2018. George Wright offered a reason, saying that Seabright didn’t refuse to re-plant the area, they are prohibited from doing so by virtue of their permitted uses of the property, requiring them to maintain an absolutely “natural” corridor for the flora and fauna to thrive, meaning they aren’t allowed to “clean up” the forest but must leave it as nature dictates.

20.72.658 DG read Drainage. No changes required, although this clause generated some discussion, in particular from Donna Gillespie, detailing the County’s mismanagement of fast moving water runoff and drainage. Others disagreed with that position, with Annette Calder saying that fast moving water in ditches is being managed by water-slowing baffles.

20.72.659 This has been identified as requiring comprehensive discussion.

20.72.670 DG read Signs and Flagpoles. Identified as requiring comprehensive discussion.

There was some discussion of potentially adding overlay code to restrict light pollution. Alison Calder added that the State requires significant lighting for the safety of patrons at businesses, and suggests that any light pollution discussions be mindful of such regulations. The discussion from a number of participants indicated that there is strong support for dark sky initiatives, for astronomy enthusiasts and rural ambience preservation.

DG will forward the short list of the sub-codes deemed to be on the table for further discussion to the PRCAC members before the next Regular Meeting of April 18, so that members can identify each of their organizations’/personal priorities for future discussions. This will help the PRRVA prepare for their

series of educational seminars they are hosting on this issue (next one scheduled for May 2<sup>nd</sup>), and also help PRCAC identify which items will be discussed at each of the six remaining 20.72 Special Meetings, scheduled as follows:

Saturday, May 4<sup>th</sup> at 3 pm

Tuesday, May 21<sup>st</sup> at 6 pm

Saturday, June 8<sup>th</sup> at 3 pm

Tuesday, June 18<sup>th</sup> at 6 pm

Tuesday, July 9<sup>th</sup> at 6 pm

Saturday, July 27<sup>th</sup> at 3 pm

DG read the new short list for focus of discussions on the following 20.72 sub codes

.050

.130

.150

.200

.350

.400

.653

.656

.650

.670 and

the Design Guidelines Addendum

It was agreed that Public Meeting Notices for the remaining six Special Meetings scheduled for these discussion will include an itemized list of the codes to be discussed at each meeting.

There being no further business at this time, the meeting was adjourned.