I. Call to Order: Doug Mayo (Chair) called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm.

A. Roll Call: A quorum was present.
   1. Commissioners Present: Doug Mayo, Doug Miller, Jerry Craig, Joe Walsh, Mike Shuttleworth, Ashley Garza, and Jerry Mellen.
   2. Commissioners Absent: None.
   3. Yakima County Planning Staff Present: Phil Hoge, Bridget Pechtel, Olivia Story, Lynn Deitrick, Noelle Madera, and Jerry Brady.

B. Approval of Minutes: Joe Walsh moved to approve the September 11, 2019 meeting minutes and Doug Miller seconded the motion. The motion was approved with all in favor and none opposed.

II. Open Public Record Hearings

Doug Mayo: Tonight, we're here for a study session for three cases listed below. We'll have a separate study session for each item...one at a time. And I'm suspecting, perhaps I'm wrong, that most of the people are here for the RV stays. [Audience responds in the affirmative.] So, I suggest we do it first.

Ashley Garza: So, we want to do the study sessions after all these?

Doug Mayo: No, so we'll...we're gonna do...we'll go to the public hearings now...

Phil Hoge: You can do this study session first on RV's, then go to the hearing on RV's, and then come back to the others.

Doug Mayo: Okay. So, the study session on the text amendment pertaining to LRN2O19, four zeros, number five, Time Limits for RV Stays in Campgrounds. So, we'll open the study session. Phil.

Phil Hoge: I'll present this. I'm Phil Hoge with the staff of the Yakima County Planning Division. And...we didn't bring enough for everybody, so I hope maybe you got it from the website if you saw it.; but I'll...so, I'll briefly explain what this is as we go into it. The proposal is called Putting Time Limits on RV Stays in Campgrounds. And this is one of the amendments to the zoning ordinance that we were asked to look at because a lot of the RV...what are permitted as RV parks are really becoming more like manufactured, year-round housing, and to keep them open for...
[Unidentified Audience Member]: We can almost hear you.

Phil Hoge: . . . and if we can keep them open for RV and camping uses, we would need to put a time limit on the length of stay in RV parks.

And the way the land use laws work is, this proposal, if adopted, would not pertain to existing RV parks and campgrounds; it's only new ones, or one's that are expanding. So, if you either pre-dated the zoning ordinance that was adopted in '74, or you got a permit for your current RV park, these changes wouldn't apply to you.

So, you held your first study session on this proposal in . . . at your meeting in August, that was based on what we had drafted up for you was the State Parks model, which was like fourteen (14) days maximum stay in the summertime and I think it was a month in the wintertime or something. You felt that was too limiting, that the stays should be longer. So, we revised it, and presented it, I think, it was for thirty (30) day stays all year round. You heard that at your study . . . second (2nd) study session on September 11th. And at that point you had a consensus to open it up even more to have a tiered approach . . . two stays in campgrounds/RV parks, so that . . . if you were staying there a limited . . . shorter period of time you could meet existing . . . existing development standards, but if you were going to be there longer, and the time we established was more than thirty (30) days, then you would have to meet the standards of the . . . if it was considered a manufactured home park or a mobile home park which has more development standards because of the need for more infrastructure for longer stays.

So that's the . . . that's the basic underlying concept of the changes. And the changes are on the document on pages five (5) and six (6) were just added language. So we've added Section Q on page five (5) the duration of occupancy for thirty (30) or fewer consecutive days, and an additional paragraph R that goes . . . starts on page five (5) and goes over to page six (6) for up to one hundred eighty (180) consecutive days which would be six month. And if you're occupied . . . getting permitted for an RV park that goes up to a hundred . . . that allows for occupancy up to one hundred eighty (180) days, then you'd have to meet the standards . . . the development standards of the manufactured home parks which are currently in the code. And, so, that's basically the underlying concept, and some of the . . .

[Unidentified Audience Member]: That's a little bit confusing to most of us. Excuse me. I apologize.

Phil Hoge: The other thing you asked us to do at the September study session was to let the campground owners know about this proposal, and so we did find . . . we didn't find a list of all the campgrounds in the County, but we found ten (10) of them, and we found email addresses or webforms for seven (7) of them, so we were able to send out . . . I think that's how people found about it for tonight. So, I guess you might say we were successful in that approach.
Oh, and the other change is that we’re deleting language on page one (1) of... that currently requires an owner/operator of a campground or recreational vehicle park to obtain an annual operating permit from the building official. Well, we’re not doing that, so we are just proposing to eliminate ... delete that entirely, since it’s not being followed.

Ashley Garza: Oh, we’re not doing that currently?

Phil Hoge: We’re not doing that currently.

Doug Mayo: Phil, perhaps you could give them just a brief overview between the development standards for a park as opposed to a mobile home park. I think that was questioned. Maybe not concise, but some general overview.

Phil Hoge: Yeah, there were ... I may not have brought it tonight ...

Doug Mayo: You should be able to find it.

Phil Hoge: Yeah. It would be RCW ... can you get the internet? 19.18.24.

Bridget Pechetel: RCW or our code?

Phil Hoge: No; YCC, sorry. 19.18.280

So, what we’re pulling up here is the existing standards for mobile home parks which are year-round facilities; they’re intended to be for residential purposes as opposed to the RV parks which are intended to be for temporary or transient occupancy. So, the current standards then ... development standards: they have a minimum space size and width, that’s number A; B is they have street connectivity, so it’s a requirement to lay out the streets, to allow for future connectivity. And C is for internal street paving, so it would be a requirement that the streets internally be paved; D – off street parking, meaning that adequate parking would have to be provided. E – street lights would need to be provided; F – right of way dedication and frontage improvements, meaning the property along a public road would have to be approved and possibly dedicate additional right of way if the public road was substandard width or needed more width because of the impact of the mobile home park; G is street signage and internal directional signs would need to be included to help people get around inside; H is utilities, irrigation, domestic water and sewer would need to be installed, and it also additionally says you can provide cable TV, telephone, electrical distribution would need to be provided.

Doug Mayo: It says, “shall be”.

Phil Hoge: Yeah, shall be ... underground. It’s a requirement that utilities be underground, not overhead. I is a minimum unit separation, the mobile homes inside would need to be separated by a minimum of ten (10) feet. And then J is sight screening and landscaping around the perimeter of the park to screen it from adjacent property owners.
K is storm water drainage would need to be handled as approved by the County, and we
do have separate standards for that; and L is dumpsters and solid waste containers would
need to be provided for everyone’s common use; and the last one is M – there would need
to be a play area required assuming there would be children there I suppose.

So those are the basic outline of the standards that would apply if you were going to get
an RV park or a campground that was going to be occupied . . . if it was going to be
permitted to be occupied for more than thirty (30) days . . . up to one hundred eighty (180)
days would be the maximum, as the proposal is written.

[Unidentified Audience Member]: So, no more than one hundred eighty (180) days, no
matter what.

Phil Hoge: Right; that the way it’s proposed . . . written.

[Unidentified Audience Member]: So, there’s a lot of us folks that are living this year-
round and have been . . . I’ve been in this park for five (5) years . . .

Mike Shuttleworth: Can you wait just a few minutes until we have the public hearing?
Then you can have your . . . [undiscernible] . . . Thank you.

[Unidentified Audience Member]: I’m sorry.

Doug Mayo: Phil, anything more?

Phil Hoge: No, that’s a nutshell. Oh, one . . . there is one more thing. You mentioned the
Lewis County model as being . . . because the way they do it there, they have this tiered
approach, so we went and looked at Lewis County, what they’re doing, and so we basically
imported that; we’re kind of following what they did, but in the process of doing that we
realized that . . . and that’s the chart I handed out just before the meeting started. It’s
important to realize that RV parks are permitted in six (6) different zones in the County
currently; mobile home parks are only permitted in three (3) zones, and they’re different .
. . well there’s only one zone that they’re both permitted in, that’s the Suburban Residential
zone. So the effect of this as written would be that you wouldn’t be able to expand existing
parks that exist now except if they’re in the SR zone because you wouldn’t be able to meet
the requirements for manufactured home park.

Ashley Garza: So, the only way to expand an existing year-round campground then would
be to . . . well you can’t . . .

Phil Hoge: You can’t do the year-round . . . the way it’s written it’s . . . the maximum
occupancy is for one hundred eighty (180) days, whereas now there is no limit. If you’re
going to occupy it for more than thirty (30) . . . up to one hundred eighty (180), then you
would have to meet the manufactured home park standards. And the way it’s written is
you can only go into these three (3) zones that permit manufactured parks. Another way
to do it would be to, we would have to do some rewriting, but to apply these standards in
the six (6) zones where they're already permitted . . . RV parks are already permitted; that
might create a lot of longer term housing out in the rural areas and the resource areas,
which is . . .

Joe Walsh: So, this reflects Yakima County's zoning?

Phil Hoge: Currently, yes.

Ashley Garza: So we . . . they would be rezoned, we would do a rezone.

Phil Hoge: We wouldn't . . . this proposal doesn't rezone.

Ashley Garza: Yeah, right.

Doug Mayo: Because you can't have . . . you can't have existing and then the extension
in the same zone. So, unless you're in the SR zone, you can't expand and have the
hundred and eighty (180) day; you can only stay with the ninety (90) without rezoning, and
then you can't have the ninety (90) day anymore. Because it'd have to all be allowed . . .
you'd have to make it so everything is allowed for a hundred eighty (180), or rezone.

Phil Hoge: Well, there is no ninety (90).

Doug Mayo: Thirty (30) I mean.

Phil Hoge: Thirty (30), yeah thirty (30). Well that would apply to new parks or the
expanded portion of existing parks.

Doug Mayo: If you expanded an existing park . . .

Ashley Garza: You can't.

Jerry Mellon: Then that would apply.

Doug Mayo: Okay; any more questions from the Commission on the study session? And
hearing none, we'll open the public record . . . . Open Record Public Hearing for LRN2019-
00005 for RV stays.

Doug Mayo: Let me read the Public Record Hearing Rules.

All persons speaking to the Planning Commission shall stand, approach the rostrum and
microphone, if provided, and identify themselves by name, address and whom they
represent.
Testimony shall be kept factual and on the subject. The Chair is charged with the responsibility of discharging . . . discouraging and stopping irrelevant, unnecessarily long, repetitive, or abusive testimony, and at the onset may limit the length of testimony. Time permitting, an opportunity will be provided for additional public comment from previous speakers after everyone who so desires has had the opportunity to testify.

All comments shall be directed to the Chair, and interruptions, demonstrations, applause or other distractions during or at the conclusion of anyone’s testimony are not permitted. Anyone making “out of order” comments shall be subject to removal from the meeting, and the Chair may call a recess in, or adjourn, the meeting in the event of excessive disruption.

Speakers shall not question each other. Instead, questions from Speakers shall be addressed to the Chair. Upon request of a majority of Planning Commission members present, the Chair may allow direct questioning of an expert witness who has previously testified on behalf of an opponent or proponent, or on other business before the Commission.

If written statements are made, a copy shall be presented to the Planning Commission and to the Secretary.

That being said, we can . . . you can go forth. And go first.

Tom Durant: Okay, thank you. My name is Tom Durant; I'm the Planning Manager for PLSA Engineering and Surveying, 521 North 20th Avenue, Suite 3, Yakima. We have represented RV parks for development in the past and we have present clients and, obviously, future clients. I'm not here speaking on behalf of any particular client; I'm speaking for us in general to address this concern. I guess the main concern that we have is that thirty (30) days is . . . and I'm sure you're going to hear this from other people in this room, thirty (30) days is not realistic based on the kinds of cliental, the kinds of stays that are occurring in recreational vehicle parks today. They tend to be longer than that. The hundred and eighty (180) days is more realistic, although I think there are many who are staying longer than that. I pulled an article off of Wikipedia on what's called “Full-Timing”. Most of you are probably already familiar with this, but I'm kind of bringing it up because it will help illustrate some of my points which is that it's kind of a lifestyle. It's where people have chosen to stay . . . use their RV's and travel around and stay in different places. And they're doing it by choice; they're not doing it because they have to. And they're often staying at higher dollar camping resorts so they're not . . . these are prosperous people, it's just a lifestyle change. We need to be keeping in touch with these trends in our regulations. I'm glad to hear that you contacted the RV park owners around the community, although I think it might have been better to have consulted with them as part of writing this code, because I think you would have . . . might have had a little more realistic viewpoint of what they're dealing with and what kind of impact this is going to have on their business.
And then the second point that I'm going to make is, you know, in making them subject to
the requirements of manufactured home parks is not realistic because they're not
manufactured home parks. Phil mentioned some of the standards, he . . . the density
standards and the improvement requirements for manufactured home parks are not
relevant to RV parks. He didn't mention, for example, the minimum lot size in a
manufactured home park is six-thousand (6,000) square feet. Isn't that right Phil?

Phil Hoge: I'm not sure. It might depend upon the zone, but . . . I'm not sure.

Tom Durant: He did mention that it's limited to three (3) zoning districts in the County.
Those three (3) zoning districts are all urban zoning districts. They're all residential areas.
It would preclude RV parks from being located in . . . the kind of scenic parts of the County
which is where they would be more suited. And . . . you know, the question is, do you
really want to limit this type of use to residential areas?

Another question I have is that if a higher level of facilities and services are needed as is
stated . . . in doing some more research . . . then why is it that a federal agency, the
Bureau of Land Management, has a program in some states, what they call long-term
visitor areas, where they allow people to stay in their facilities for up to seven (7) months.
They don't seem to have a need for urban type residential facilities.
And that's basically the concern. It's not really fitting in with what people are doing in RV
parks today, and I think you need to be aware of the trend . . . the "full-timing" trend, and
kind of the realities of the business. So, I would encourage you to spend a little more time
on this, especially dealing with the people running these facilities and writing these codes.
S, I think I've asked all the questions and made all the points I wanted to . . . so, I'm going
to let somebody else talk.

Ashley Garza: Can I ask you a question?

Tom Durant: Sure.

Ashley Garza: You mentioned the long-term visitor stays that . . . you said by the BLM. I
don't know anything about those. Do they . . . what are they like? Do they have septic
systems, or are they . . .

Tom Durant: I don't know specifically. I was doing some research to prepare for this and
I saw that as one of the . . . as a program. I don't think there are any in this state; they're
in other western states that you have these. And they're . . . actually you get a permit to
stay . . .

Ashley Garza: And if somebody brings their own facilities . . .

Tom Durant: If you're RVing, you can stay in it for seven (7) months. That's a lot longer
than thirty (30) days. But my point is that if a federal agency can make that work . . .
Ashley Garza: I would just be interested in what kind of facilities . . .

Tom Durant: I don’t know the answer to that.

Mike Shuttleworth: Are those designated RV parks or are they just out in the BLM land area?

Tom Durant: I would say they’re probably campgrounds as opposed to RV parks. But, you know, again, we’re talking about the level of facilities. If you can stay in a campground for seven months, why can’t you stay in an RV park?

Doug Mayo: I’m not sure what the difference is between a campground and an RV park. I’ll be honest.

Tom Durant: I think an RV park is a little more [undiscernible], you know? In general.

Phil Hoge: I think of it as an RV park is a type of campground that has facilities for RV’s, but it’s not real clear. Our development ordinance merges the two terms into one term basically, so . . .

Tom Durant: Anything else?

Ashley Garza: Nope. That’s all for me. Thank you Tom.

Sarah Roege: Hi. My name is Sarah Roege. I live at Trout Meadows RV park. If you want to know about our RV park . . . our RV park has a laundry room facility, two washers, two dryers, with a handicap ramp. And we have lighting, and most people even decorate their yards, like with solar lighting. People in our RV park . . . we really like our community. It’s a . . . yes, it’s a new life . . . it’s a lifestyle I never thought I’d ever have. And actually it was kind of a by chance lifestyle, living in my RV, and, granted, I could probably go get a house I suppose, but I really like having less. And it’s like I don’t have to worry about my quarter acre yard to be mowed. I don’t have to do it . . . KJ comes and mows the yard. I have flowers; I have perennials that come up every year and I’ve lived there for a few years. And . . . we watch out for each other. If we had people coming and going . . . you don’t know the kind of people that you’re gonna have. And not everybody is just a “happy-go-lucky” camper. Since we have a lot of drug issues in this valley . . . there’s a couple parks that I know of that are farther out that do have drug issues. We don’t. We watch out; we have a great . . . what do you call it . . . neighborhood watch you might say. We watch our people; and there’s children that live there. A lady just had two . . . had another baby, and we have a great community. We get along; we don’t . . . We have septic tanks . . . we have our own propane power; we have a company that comes in and puts propane in. We get along, we pay our bills, we . . . and some people there are . . . social security and disabled and they really can’t go running and getting a new place to live. It’s not that easy for a lot of them. And putting them into a bind of where they would have to move in a hundred eighty (180) days . . . and, plus it’s very taxing on our people. If you want to make
more homeless people... I mean, we have a big enough homeless problem in this community as it is. And right now, we have a thriving community. We have barbecues in the summer, where we know each other. And if someone is having a problem sometimes... if someone's having a hard time getting their... they make their rent, but if they can't... they're running low on their food, someone else will cook them a meal and take it to them. I, for one, do that. I have no problems; I'm so used to cooking for a family and now it's just me and it's hard, so I always cook extra. I have no problem watching out for my neighbors. We have a great community at Trout Meadows. I don't hope this would... this situation does not include Trout Meadows as an RV park. I can understand if he wants to add on maybe another section, that might change that section, but I don't think it should change the section that's there because we get along, we have lights in our community. It's not like on... you know... and almost everybody has a dog. We love our dogs; we love our pets. We have a field our dogs can go... I have a Labrador retriever and I throw... toss her the toy and she runs and gets it... we have a pond there... and now the County's got something going on there, so... but I used to toss it in the water, and she would go jump in the water and bring it back to me. We have a great community. I don't want to lose our community. It's really... is a community you would be proud of. Granted, we do occasionally have some people there for short times when they're coming here to buy a house, or they're looking... like the local sheriff was there when he bought his house. And he still parks his trailer there in the parking section. And I see him all the time, and I say to him, "Why don't you stay? We like having you." You know? We have really respectable people in our community. Not every community is like that, but ours is. Which make ours really different because we know everybody. And so, I want to know, is this affecting those... this particular park; that we're going to have to move out in a hundred and eighty (180) days? What? Because I don't think it is realistic or fair to other people. We pay taxes too, you know. Maybe not property taxes, but we pay it in our rent, whatever. I also pay sales tax which pays for everything too. And I pay for other taxes. 'Cause I've paid them. I owned a house, you know. And I mean, I really think you should consider the value of this community. That's really key. If you've been there, you'd know. And so, I would really hope this wouldn't affect our community. Because you were saying something about it not affecting this community, unless... like I don't know... if he adds on. There is a section for... a large... it's like fifty (50) acres, so, if he adds on maybe that section has to be... accommodate that style or that particular formula so you would say; that you have set up. But not the current, existing. I don't know, but I really want to be informed and I want our community to know that we shouldn't be dissolved because of this. This is really a good community. I didn't think it would be... for me, but I've really grown to like the people. My dogs love it; we love it... It's comfortable; I can go out... one of our neighbors doesn't even lock his door at night because he trusts our neighbors, because he has his dog that goes outside, so he leaves the door open with those little flaps. The dog goes outside with a little fence around it. He feels secure enough to do that in our community. Probably not in other communities. I don't even know people on the street that do that. They... [undiscernible]... their homes; but we have a very good community. Sorry.
Ashley Garza: Sarah, I think we all understand; we do. I think we feel . . . we feel . . . that we understand that. But, do you want to . . .

Phil Hoge: Yeah; Mr. Chairman, could I address that issue? And let me reiterate that this proposal would not apply to an existing, permitted RV park. If it’s already existing, if it got permits . . .

Sarah Roege: But if he wants to add on though.

Phil Hoge: If he wanted to add on, then it would apply to future . . . it would apply to the future . . .

Sarah Roege: To the future section, no the current section.

Phil Hoge: Not to the current section, as long as you’re operating, as long as he’s operating within his permits, because he got a permit . . .

Sarah Roege: In this section. Would he have to get another, separate permit for the other section?

Phil Hoge: Yes, it would be a separate permit to expand.

Doug Mayo: Phil, what are the rules . . .

Sarah Roege: Because we have a [undiscernible] community.

Doug Mayo: What are the rules right now? I mean, if I understand, they’re not supposed to put siding around them . . . you don’t want them to be permanent. The rules on the books today . . .

Sarah Roege: Because some of us have decks. I just have stairs that I made.

Doug Mayo: . . . say what?

Phil Hoge: Well, it depends upon where you are. For instance, if you’re in the flood plain, you’re supposed to be ready to move out of there in case the flood comes. That’s a national, that’s the national FEMA.

Sara Roege: Now we have this big wall from where your construction is over there.

Tom Durant: Phil, I think you have the same rule for all RV parks in your code.

Doug Mayo: But . . . I mean, that’s one thing. What about skirting . . . what times . . . is there a time limit on them now?
Phil Hoge: There's no time limit on them now. I don't...I didn't see anything in our Title 19 that limits skirt. There may be something in the building code.

Sarah Roege: I saw something about skirt on there.

Phil Hoge: There may be something in the building code.

Doug Mayo: I don't see stuff on skirt.

Sarah Roege: Well, I've got mine skirted with...for insulation

Doug Mayo: It's my understanding from previous conversations that the overall thought of the County is that RV parks are supposed to be more of a transient thing, than a permanent thing because they want to have available places for transient people to stay. Is that my...[Phil Hoge: Yeah; that's the...] am I phrasing what I've heard from...

Phil Hoge: That's the impetus for this proposal that's being heard tonight, is that we don't have a limit on stays, and it was felt that we needed that to make campgrounds for the traveling public, rather than year-round housing.

Doug Mayo: Also, I've heard...you said that a concern is that the RV's don't meet energy code, don't meet codes for housing, and this type of thing as another reason that some people in the government don't think they should allow people to live year-round in RV's. I just want to...I'm not necessarily agreeing with any of this, I'm just trying to...this is what I've heard through the last public hearings...to try to get the people to understand why you brought this to us in the first place, is to open up spots for people travelling through, so people aren't living...they don't want people living in RV's year-round. They, not being this body...being the County Fathers.

Phil Hoge: Yeah, and some of it is in the building code and I'm not totally familiar with the building code, but a lot of the limitations on limiting year-round or full-time in an RV, if it's rated as an RV, it's not supposed to be for residential purposes. So that comes from the building code, and we're...I guess in a way trying to dovetail our Title 19, the development code, with the building code.

Doug Mayo: Is that County building code, or national building code?

Phil Hoge: Yes, International, which is what the County has adopted.

Mike Shuttleworth: Mr. Chairman, can I ask that we continue the public hearing and we can discuss this after, but I would like to hear what everybody has to say.

Doug Mayo: Well, I wanted them to [undiscernible].
Mike Shuttleworth: Well, we may be addressing them over and over and over again, and I would rather get all the questions and all the statements [undiscernible].

Sarah Roege: Well, with regard to the skirting part . . . a lot of us skirt them because it’s more economical; we lower our electronic . . . electricity usage which makes our RV’s more economical. [Undiscernible]. But generally speaking . . . and then I guess in some of the RV parks . . . the mobile homes, they do them because they don’t want to look at the wheels, they want the more visual . . .

Mike Shuttleworth: Okay, thank you.

Ashley Garza: Thank you.

Pat Shields: Hi, I’m Pat Shields. I’ve live my whole life here in Yakima County. Some things we haven’t thought about with the hundred and eighty (180) days . . . the hundred and eighty (180) day period . . . it sounds like a lot, and most of the transients . . . the snowbirds that come up here for the summertime, that works out well. They’re here for four (4), five (5), six (6) months and then they go back south for the winter. And I’m looking at developing an RV park . . . a large, nice RV park in the near future in Yakima County. But one thing we’re not looking at is . . . I found myself in a situation a few years ago that . . . I was looking at new houses . . . had a beautiful house I was living in, but it was . . . I wanted to be further out. Looked at all these houses for sale . . . “Hey, great; look at that.” . . . I’m not going to get into any of them until I sell my house first. So, I sold my house, but guess what? When it was time to buy a house, there was nothing out there on the market. I chose to move into my RV. It took me seven (7) months to find a house, which is about nine (9) months total by the time I was able to get in there. Thank God I was able to go to Suntides RV Park. Had a great time; great people live there. Met people from all over the country that were here in Yakima. It made for an incredible experience I will never forget; one of the best summers I’ve ever had. So, you’ve got to think about those type of people that . . .

Also, if you’re selling your house; most people are going to build or buy a house. They can’t afford to buy a house until they sell. Well, what are they going to do? It’s okay for them to take their RV out to their house, but do they really . . . that they’re building, do they really want to sit in a dust pile while they’re building a house? From the time you sell your house, you’re going up to close on a piece of property, then you have to work with the City or the County, that could take six (6) months, as we all know, to get your building permit. And then you start construction which is going to be another three (3) to six (6) months if you’re lucky. So now, they’re stuck only a hundred eighty (180) days in an RV park and then they have to move on. Well, you need to accommodate these people. They’re helping grow the economy; they’re not sitting around doing drugs or anything. And we need to think about these people. My RV park . . . yes, I’m going to accommodate for a lot of transients, but I do want to be able to have . . . when the snowbirds come up for the summer, they go back in the winter . . . well, guess what? We have the Alaska crowd that comes down to Yakima and hangs out here too. So, I’m going to accommodate the
transients, but also, we need to look at these people who do need to stay more than a hundred eighty (180) days, because they have . . . they can’t afford to go out and rent another house while they’re buying a house. So, they’re looking for another house, but the right one’s not on the market. So, there are other scenarios we need to look at as well at the same time . . . that the hundred eighty (180) days may still not be enough.

Ashley Garza: Thank you, Pat.

Joyce Wilkie: Hi; I’m Joyce Wilkie. I live in Trout Meadows. I just want to let you know that some people can’t afford to rent houses here, especially in the dope areas. I will not live there; I’ve never been around dope; I don’t like it. I have a son that lives in number ten (10) spot. He is in Seattle right now; he couldn’t be here because he has stage four (4) cancer and he can’t be moved, and they want to move him in thirty (30) days? I don’t understand it. We get . . . me and my husband get seven hundred dollars ($700.00) a month social security. Where do you rent a house for that, you know? And we’ve lived there for two (2) years . . . K.J. . . . he’s the only one who rented us a place. Four hundred ($400.00) a month is the most we have to pay, and that’s with our electric. I don’t understand it. And now they want to move us out of there. What are we gonna do, live on the streets like the rest of them out here? That’s why there’s so many on the streets, because they can’t afford housing. You know what I mean? I don’t understand it. Thirty (30) days . . . we can’t move out. We have no car, no truck to pull our trailer. When we moved there, we thought, “That’s a good place; we can stay there; probably ‘til we die.” Now they want us to move out. I don’t understand it. Just because of zoning. You know? I’m not getting on everybody about it, it’s just . . . it really gets to you after a while. We’ve been married fifty-two (52) years and we’ve moved and moved and moved and moved because of stuff like this. So, I just hope that we don’t have to move. Thank you.

Rick Wehr: Rick Wehr with PLSA Engineering and Surveying, 521 North 20th Avenue, and our company designed and laid out the Sun Tides RV Park; and it’s a park that is very nice. And if you were to go out there and look at it, it is not a junk pile. It’s paved and everybody has hookups for power, sewage, water, and everything on it. And I’m seeing a real problem with this new ordinance in that you’re limiting it to thirty (30) days for an RV park, when in today’s society, there are a lot more people that are living in RV’s, like has been said, and travel down south . . . I go down to Palm Springs in the winter and there’s people that are down there for five (5), six (6) months . . . don’t have to . . . you know . . . they’re not run out of there every thirty (30) days and have to go some place else for seven (7) days. Now, and I think, in this ordinance, when you do this, you need to take and . . . because right now we’re looking at an RV park that we’re trying to lay out and bring in to the County that if you’re going to do something like that, at least have a portion of it that can be a long term stay. And not everything is not . . . you’re there for thirty (30) days and then you’ve got to go . . . get clear off the site for seven (7) days. And it can be a real tough time for some of these people. You know, where are they gonna go? And there’s a difference . . . you know, there’s RV parks that are for . . . you know . . . you go up into the hills, you go camping or go to a lake, you know . . . over to Wanapum, Vantage, places like that. Those are RV parks for people . . . stay seven (7) days or, you know, maybe
thirty (30) days at the most. But those are recreational RV parks. You know, Sun Tides is
not a recreational RV Park and it does . . . you know the people that stay out there really
like it, and they don’t have problems renting their spaces. And I think, even, you know, like
I say, with a new park coming in here, you can make a portion so it can be long term
because there are just so many more people that are living in RV’s and traveling and want
to stay when they get some place for a longer term. So, I just think, you know, you just
need to broaden what you’re looking at there and include some other possibilities for
people to come into this and be able to stay. That’s all I’ve got. Thanks.

Ashley Garza: I have a question. Can I ask a question?

Phil Hoge: He’s the Chair.

Ashley Garza: Can I ask a question? I just have a quick question. I like . . . I think . . .
when you talk about two (2) different types of . . . within one design, of an RV with short
term and long term. Do you envision different types of . . . like services for long term and
short term? That kind of design?

Rick Wehr: Yeah, there can be some of those that are really short term where you don’t
necessarily have sewer connection. You know, you have power and water, or you can
even have some really short term where people come in there with their RV . . . they have
to keep everything on-site . . . you know, they’ve got a generator or whatever. Or you can
have a portion of it that way. But, you know personally, I would like to see you have sewage
and water and power so they can connect up to that. But it isn’t necessarily required in a
certain portion of it.

Ashley Garza: Okay; thank you.

. I see a lot of codes and paperwork and . . . has anybody ever been to Trout Meadows or
Sun Tides? So you can see what it’s like? I mean, it’s . . . you know, I used to be married,
I used to have a house, plenty of money, you know, but I am actually happier there, where
I’m at, and I’ve personally known Paul for thirty (30) years. I know what kind of man he is
and what kind of, you know, property he takes care of; and recently got to know KJ, and
he’s done more work there since I’ve been there than I think has been done in a long time.
I think you guys are forgetting the human factor when you’re coming up with all these rules
and laws and . . . I mean we don’t hurt nobody . . . I mean . . . I always say it’s probably
the safest place in Yakima, I believe, because, I mean, KJ runs a tight ship. If there’s
somebody that’s doing something wrong, they shouldn’t be . . . then they’re out, you know?
But you’re going to put limitation on everything, and I can bet my bottom dollar that if any
one of you were in our positions that you might see it a little bit differently, you know? A
lot of us, we have no choice . . . we’re just one month away from living on the street or the
sidewalk, like the ones we just passed, you know? It’s not all about rules and laws, and
what not. I just think you need to think about the human factor a little bit more, and actually
come out and view the property. I mean, it’s nice out there. So . . . thank you.
Ashley Garza: Thanks Damon.

Paul Cobliegh: Hi everybody. I'm Paul Cobliegh, co-owner/operator Sun Tides RV park, Yakima, 201 Pence Road. A lot of good things were said tonight. We actually, right, have daily, weekly, monthly rates and monthly rentals. We have about sixty (60) to seventy (70) percent are monthly people and monthly stays. We usually leave the other ones open for weekly, two weeks, things like that ... people coming in to handle the tourists, whatever, what have you. But if we were strictly have to do that, we would be out business. We would lose seventy (70) percent of our business if we can't have monthlies, where people stay three (3), six (6) months as snowbirds; you're going to put us out of business. You know, we've been in business a long time; we've been there for twenty-five (25) years and we have the full deal ... paved paths, paved roads. We have a laundry facility with four (4) washers, four (4) dryers, showers for men and women ... we accommodate everything ... dumpsters and full hookups and everything else, and stuff. And so, we have very, very happy people. All of our RV's that stay in there are 2005 or newer. So, they are probably better built than most of your houses in the County that are older than that, and probably don't meet up to the existing codes in the first place. So, you're talking about codes and all this. Most of those RV's with the tip-outs probably have more square footage and are better built and are better houses than most of the houses in this County. So, it's really not realistic. I could see possibly saying, "Okay, every park has to have a certain percentage available for daily or weekly usage. We do that already ... because we make more money off of that with our rates, but the security of having ... okay ... monthlies, because we only allow a certain number during the summer, we up that a little bit in the winter if people want to stay because we have loggers, things that come down to do logging up at the pass. So, we up that there because, obviously, the daily/weekly people in January aren't going to be here. They'll be here in June, absolutely. And stuff. So, there needs to be some flexibility and some forward thinking here that, okay, who are you going to hurt here by making a ridiculous law. Enough from me. Thank you. Questions?

Ashley Garza: I have a question. Of course I do. I always do. You mentioned that you have ... you have daily/weekly stays available in the summer. Do you ... do you fill those up? Like, do you feel like there's more need for those?

Paul Cobliegh: Actually, I have a waiting list for monthlies.

Ashley Garza: Okay. So, you can't quite accommodate that, we would need maybe ... 

Paul Cobliegh: I could actually fill it full monthlies. And, actually, if I had thirty to forty more spots, I could still fill them full with monthlies. And then, actually then, but most of the time they are full, but the thing is too ... okay ... I have eighteen (18) spaces for daily/weeklies, okay ... out of the thirty (30) days, those spaces are maybe occupied twenty (20), you see. But I could have it fully occupied if I was allowed to.

Ashley Garza: Okay. Thank you.
Pat Shields: There aren't a lot of options in Yakima to choose from on things like that in Yakima County.

Sarah Roege: And the trend is that it's a lifestyle.

Mike Shuttleworth: Let's let people [undiscernible] first please [undiscernible]. Thank you.

Doug Mayo: Yeah, if you'd like to talk, come on up to the podium. [Unciscernible]

Hailey Potts: Hailey Potts; I'm also from Trout Meadows. You've obviously heard that our community's one that tends to want to stay and loves our community. I just wanted to clarify because I feel like it was stated, and everyone kind of got confused with that. You said that didn't apply to our park . . . the new rule that's coming in.

Phil Hoge: It would not apply to your park because you're an existing park. It would only apply to new parks or parks that are expanding.

Ashley Garza: The portion that's . . .

Phil Hoge: The portion that's expanding and new parks.

Hailey Potts: I think the confusion was the permits that were prior to the 1974. I think that was part of why we were thinking that maybe it wouldn't apply to our park anymore.

Phil Hoge: Yeah; I know what you're talking about.

Hailey Potts: Okay. So, just . . . we're totally good with what's already :here?

Phil Hoge: Yes, if the park is being operated in . . . you're okay if the park is being operated in accordance with the permit that was received whenever it was permitted. I don't know all of the conditions that were in there. It could be that some of those conditions are not being met. But it wouldn't be this . . . it wouldn't be related to time limits. It wouldn't be limited. But there could be something in there. But I haven't . . . we haven't looked at the permit to see if every condition is being followed.

Hailey Potts: Depending on that, are you guys going go further into that after then . . . and then will we hear about that? What options do we have there?

Phil Hoge: Sign in . . . be sure to sign in. This Commission will discuss it after the . . . we close the hearing.

Hailey Potts: Okay. Thank you.
KJ Lim: This is KJ Lim, who is new owner of the Trout Meadows. Sounds like I already ask all my tenants to come out and speak. But anyhow, yeah. What I like to speak of today here is, I hope all the people who is in this room first consider the... our real life. So, most of things, and even though that is for the public safety and health and good for their own. To tell the truth, I do not know any kind of [undiscernible], but I am naturalized American citizen, so, but I still do my part of the life.

I took over the Trout Meadows two (2) and a half years ago but by that time, I’m not having any prejudgment on the people and RV Park, rich or poor, American or Korean, or Japanese, whatever their nationality. I only decide in my mind how I can develop this community as being my family. So today, I was very shocked. My tenants said we have a good community. I am very proud of today... tonight. Yeah, I had a lot of problems; some tenants is trying to take over... advantage over me, and is trying to misuse me, yeah. Lot of problem, but I am still trying to do my best. Myself and my wife work like a bee. We pick up... I pick up cigarette butts and trash on the road and put into the dumpster. I put reasonable rules and regulations, how we can respect each other. They don’t listen; they don’t follow it, some of them. But I think this kind of ordinance couldn’t change the human being, unless they are willing to change. But, we can change all the people by guiding and encouraging them to be in the high standard of positions. Staying there a year... some of my tenants, for example, they been staying there before me, but they are great citizens. They never cause any problem to themselves and their neighbor. They are communicating each other; they are helping each other. But the... some new people come in and they trying to destroy that kind of environment. I’m very... not tolerant that kind of behavior. They act like I’m the king, so I have to do whatever I need to do. Yeah, in some sense they can do that in the United States. However, I want them to refrain those kind of behavior in my RV park. I want... trying to build my RV park is a different community. I want everybody stay there and be happy and be proud of themselves. And they are also part of encouraging other neighbors to bring up to the next level which they are aiming for.

So, tonight, what I like to ask all the people here, of which I do not know anyone, but more likely trying to moving positively away from who you think you are to make it better than as it is.

And then secondly, some people are misconceived because people living in the RV park, they are poor, they are bad people, and such and such. No; somebody already told you they are changing their lifestyles. Even one of my tenants who live in my park. They have an extra RV. So, they live there, and once they want to go to some other place, they took their smaller one; and they do the kind of things, do the things, and then they come back and live there. I hope this not from my experience. Good luck; I don’t know. I’m trying to build a community barbecue area inside my park. When I tried to get the permit, it took me about three (3) and a half months. Just an awning attached to the existing building, but it took me about three (3) and a half months of permit time, and then charging me nine hundred fifty dollars ($950.00) for the permit fee. They bring their... feels like to me I got a little punishment from somebody did wrong in the past. All the area they’re trying to pick it up and give me the hard time. They keep doing... I didn’t... this building. Almost three
(3) months average and come help. What is next, I can visual, what is next? It was really hard. Rather than making this kind of ordinance, I suggest you guys trying to make your one standard example how RV park should be on this, and how . . . whatever you called RV park, mobile home park, manufactured home, should be on this standard for offering to the public . . . people who want to be in that park. So that would be much better than to just limit the time. I know; I used to work for the high tech and retired ten (10) years ago. I know how I making more money than, monthly. But I'm not seeking for the money; but like what I told you, I like to build a good community here. In the past we have many come and many go. But this time most people is want to stay there. They feel like they comfortable. That is not because of me, but they feel by themselves; they want to live there. That's their lifestyle. I respect them.

And also, the suggestion was saying about the skirting, like I heard you already to be discussing it little bit this one. I encourage it to my tenants because, as looking back to my experience, that would dramatically save heating bill, and also, that can be easily moved out when they have to move out. So, if this kind of wording . . . published in the paper as a code or enforcement place . . . person like me, I don't want to violate any rule, or regulation, or law while I am living here. So, that's why I have to follow that, no matter what. But yesterday, what I learned was even Washington County there is not clear definition of RV park and mobile home park and manufactured home park. Most people think there is three (3) different category, but what I learned was yesterday one of the tenants and the landlord that legal fighting in Bellevue . . . even the Attorney General . . . they meet the various contradictions understanding between those terms. So, they are trying to understand by combining two different sentences as one, and so in so. So that in our county, Yakima County here, then why proactively get involved in that, and trying to set the proper definition, and maybe I suggest, actually I personally want as a County you will have to present some standard model which you are expecting, and I think we may just follow that, then everybody were happy.

So, staying one hundred eighty (180) days, for example. What can I do? I have to follow the rules. But I know my tenants; they want to stay there. By making those kind of wording into the formal paper, unintentionally County driving innocent landlord and tenant make feel guilty, and they find extra way to work that out. So, why? Why County as a government, why they trying to get their citizen to get the extra burden of worry into their life, rather than helping them out living better. More likely, I think we . . . all the people should look into that living at the RV park or campground or whatever you call it, mobile home park, manufactured . . . one sense, you have to deeply consider that is a lifestyle change of the persons. I also want look into all the people visit the existing RV park. Especially mine. I dare said, our location is very segregated area from the other existing house and whatever. There is so many open acreage. If I can get the permit, then I like to extend to provide more day/nightly user and more monthly people, which they want to be in there. I usually got average of five (5), to six (6) calls, “Do you have any space available?” I feel guilty; I keep saying, “Sorry, I don't have it; Sorry I don't have it.” “Oh, when do you gonna have it?” “I don't know; I'm really sorry for that.” That is, those kind of calls is coming from not only this area, and Seattle area, and even Canada. They call me;
yeah. Rather then . . . how long they stay there is not, I don't think that is important things.
How we can provide better facility to the local people and the tourist into the Yakima area.
That is the way that even Yakima area we can build more living area and we can live little
better than now.
I think that's it. Sorry for my poor English, but I hope, everybody can trying to understand
it. But my concern is here, first of all we need to make everybody happy. Like a balloon, I
said, if we push a balloon in on this side, then this side is pushed in, but this other side is
pushing out. Rather than misconceptually . . . not rich people living in RV park, oh they
causing trouble, maybe it used to be. But as of today, I dare said, all of my tenants is great
people and they never make any problem and they do. But I have only one now, but still
working on it. But the . . . there is beyond expectation and beyond something else.
However, in general and in the normal people as a human being, I dare said, all I have . . .
, very fortunate to have all my great tenant. But the hundred eighty (180) days, I was very
much worrying about. How I can tell them to move out because of these things. I didn't
make these things, hundred eighty (180) days, but I have to follow. I don't want to get
myself in trouble. How can I tell them? You have to move out, no matter what, if you like
staying here, but I don't care, but you have to move out. That's the County . . . when you
do it that way. Should I speak that way? I think that is something different. So you might
consider that; and, also, yeah, like what I ask, once you put something into document
trying to think about the public safety and health first, and then how we make it better than
today, now . . . unless that will support you. Then, please reconsider that, yeah, if me as
an owner perspective, you guys make it hundred eighty (180) days, maybe I'm happy
because I can make more money, and also, I can legally screen out which is good tenant
and bad tenant. I hope, hey, here it the law says you have to move out, move out. Then
then next time you wanna come, oh, you were not in a good team. So why should I have
you again? There is lots of unexpected problem between the two. So please consider that
and trying to help every people. Then they can do their life better than now and trying to
inspire those kind of feeling and camping throughout Yakima County. Then Yakima
County will be the number one (#1) place to live in the United States. I hope that. Thank
you.

[Thank you's and applause from Commission members and audience.]

Doug Mayo: Anyone else? If not, we'll close the public hearing and move to deliberations.
I guess I wanted to clarify what I think I've heard. What we're looking at today would have
zero effect on any currently permitted RV park . . . Trout Meadows, Sun Tides. Has
absolutely nothing to do with what they're doing right now.

Phil Hoge: Correct. These would only apply to future . . .

Doug Mayo: . . . would only apply to . . . so if we had new developers coming in, we had
a couple who were looking for something to be permitted and built next week, next year,
whatever . . . that would, these would apply to those and, matter of fact, only in suburban
residential zones; they're not even going to be in the same zoning area as these are. [Phil
Hoge: Right.] So that, a lot of the concerns, and they're . . . I can see why people are
concerned...really, this won't affect that because it doesn't...if CJ wants to put in another fifty (50) acres, then that would...first you'd have to look at the zoning and then they would...the new stuff. And the other thing I think there'd be, maybe should look at Mr. Wehr was talking about where you have a...maybe a certain percentage, you know, if you put in x number of new spaces, that a certain percentage of them need to be reserved for...maybe the criteria you were talking about, and some could be for long term. So we do get some more; we can get some of both [undiscernible].

KJ Lim: Yeah, I think in the future, yeah, that would be the better way to go. Certain percentage of stays...[undiscernible]...and then certain percentage of stays should be excepted from the hundred eighty (180) days.

Doug Mayo: But, for...it wouldn't be...if somebody moved out and another person moved back in, that doesn't change the status of that space. If it's an existing space it's an existing space, whether it's a new trailer or not. It would only be if you expanded your lot, put in new spaces.

Sarah Roege: Would that change the old?

Doug Mayo: Nope...no.

Sarah Roege: We would be grandfathered in the other places, basically. That would change...[undiscernible]...you would have to follow all the guidelines for the new section.

Doug Mayo:...it's just the new stuff; it isn't built yet.

KJ Lim: Even...[undiscernible crosstalk]

Mike Shuttleworth: Mr. Chairman, you had...you closed the public hearing, so I think it's just discussion among...Sorry about that, but we've got to limit the time.

Doug Mayo: Anyway, comments from the Commission?

Jerry Craig: I have a question, and I think it's been partially answered, but I guess my end question, or my end comment is, are you talking about developing a third category of mobile home housing...one that is for residential, full-time, skirted, utilities; one that is temporary housing with thirty (30) day limits and a hundred eighty (180) days a year, and a third one that permits both? Because if it's an existing unit, people can stay there more than thirty (30) days, they can skirt their issues, they can make it a permanent home, along with visiting transient people. So, you're actually...are you creating a third category, and it just so happens that existing owners, like Sun Tides, he's gonna have two separate camps if he continues to develop and grow? One will be, you know, what he existingly has, and a new one that has these restrictions. So, he'll have two separate businesses operating, because we'll...we actually are creating a third category.
Sarah Roege: Within the RV park.

Doug Mayo: But if . . . only if it’s . . . they’re zoned that way. So, the zoning right now, the way it is, confuses the issue, is my understanding because only in suburban residential can you have . . .

Jerry Craig: But you already admit . . . you already allow that. You allow at . . . and I’m not picking on Sun Tides, but Sun Tides has people who live there permanently even though they’re not zoned to live there permanently.

Doug Mayo: I don’t know whether they are or not.

Jerry Craig: Well, no, they don’t meet these standards

Mike Shuttleworth: Well, they don’t have no . . . no, no . . .

Jerry Craig: Because they’re exempt. That’s my point

Doug Mayo: They’re already there.

Joe Walsh: They’re grandfathered in.

Jerry Craig: So actually you’re creating a third category.

Doug Mayo: There is a category now that has no time limit that we know of.

Jerry Craig: There is no category . . . for Sun Tides.

Mike Shuttleworth: They may have one; we don’t know that. Whatever their original permit was issued at would say what they have, and there may be conditions they’re not meeting today.

Jerry Craig: But they’re not . . . they’re not . . . again, for instance, Sun Tides is not required to move people out after thirty (30) days.

Doug Mayo: Correct.

Jerry Craig: And this does.

Doug Mayo: . . . only applies to new projects.

Jerry Craig: So, consequently, if he develops that other fifty (50) acres, it has to follow these standards.

Ashley Garza: Only in that portion beyond.

Doug Mayo: Not the whole thing, just the . . .

Jerry Craig: . . . his existing park . . .

Joe Walsh: . . . stays like it is.
Jerry Craig: ... can stay exactly like it is, but his new development must follow these standards. So, you have one owner with two standards.

Doug Mayo: Yeah.

Jerry Craig: That was my point. I question that ... whether that's a wise thing for us to do. I mean, we may not have any choice at this point because we're not going to go back and say, "I'm sorry, owner, you now have to throw everybody out of your park that's been living here for three (3) years."; we're not gonna do that. So, we're now developing a third standard.

Joe Walsh: Well, we're developing ... there will be two (2) standards. These people pre-exist. [Jerry Craig: Yes.] They don't have a standard.

Jerry Craig: But my point is there is no standard for them because they're operating . . .

Joe Walsh: What they're operating under is their standard.

Doug Mayo: They have existing permits.

Jerry Craig: Do they? Does your full-time people have a permit to be there full-time?

Paul Cobliegh: Actually, we have a permit of the top-rated parks . . .

Joe Walsh: It's the park.

Paul Cobliegh: The park has the permit.

Jerry Craig: Okay; does the park have a permit that they can be there full-time? Is that in lieu . . . or is that because of the lack of this policy?

[Undiscernible crosstalk]

Ashely Garza: Let's ask Phil.

Jerry Craig: Ok; thank you. Slow things down here, but I . . . good question in my mind.

Joe Walsh: I have a question for Phil in regards to the one eighty (180) days. We are proposing to identify manufactured housing . . . manufactured mobile home parks. I've visited many of these in other states and they're year-round. I'm beginning to think maybe we're going the wrong way here with the one eighty (180) days.

Doug Mayo: If you build to the standards of a mobile home park, what differentiates it from being an RV or a mobile home? Can you move the mobile home in there?

Joe Walsh: Is it just the unit itself, yeah?

Phil Hoge: Well, if they're permitted as an RV park, it limits . . . it only allows RV's. I guess it's all in how they applied for it and how it's permitted.

Doug Mayo: You still have to build it to mobile home standards.
Joe Walsh: Well, manufactured home standards, yes.

Doug Mayo: But it's just an RV park or... are RV's allowed there or RV's not allowed in mobile home parks?

Joe Walsh: Usually these park model parks have places for rolling stock to come in and stay for a period of time, but they have permanent structures as well... as permanent as a manufactured home can be.

Phil Hoge: We have, as was noted, we have all the old rules that existed before Growth Management, basically. We made a basic choice when we adopted the Comprehensive Plan in '97, not to have manufactured... mobile home parks in the rural areas anymore. That's why they're now only permitted in the urban areas. That was probably a Growth Management based decision not, you know, put denser housing in urban areas where they can get services.

Joe Walsh: You've got sewer, water, fire.

Doug Mayo: Just to throw another monkey wrench in it, would it be possible for someone to have a thirty (30) day limit RV park outside of the urban growth area that is, you know, strictly transient... [Interruption by text message sound: “You put it on mute and it still makes noise.”]... but to have, you know, just even a fourteen (14) day, twenty-one (21) day, thirty (30) day limit in other zones that are further out in the country, in the woods, whatever, as a whole separate thing than what we're talking about?

Phil Hoge: Well, we can currently, today, under our current rules, we can permit RV parks, campgrounds in six (6) different zones. There is no... currently there is no time limit on those parks. So, what this would do is... if you're talking about a thirty (30) day limit, this would impose a thirty (30) day limit on all future RV parks within those six (6) zones. That's the new paragraph Q. That would be a new requirement for all future and expanded parks. Wouldn't apply to the existing parks at all.

Ashley Garza: I think what I've heard is that basing a time limit is potentially a burden, but at the same time we have a lack of short-term stays. So, I don't know if it’s appropriate to make a motion, but I'd like to, to maybe revisit an option for both long-term and short-term.

Doug Mayo: That's what...

Doug Miller: Would it be appropriate to say to table this for further discussion based on the comments tonight?

Ashley Garza: So that's the motion I would like to make.

Mike Shuttleworth: Can I make a comment first? [Ashley Garza: Yes.] I mean... I appreciate the testimony, and I heard some things that gave me pause, and what it is, is RV's are not made for long term living. There are people who have said they've added decks and skirting and other things. They probably didn't get permits for those. And I heard the last gentleman talk about health safety, and that's my biggest concern. If you create these as long-term living units and they're not designed that way... you know when you
start adding decks, everything, that are not... that's the reason we have the building
codes. If you build a house, your deck is inspected, you have clearances, you have other
things that keep... and I don't know if anybody remembers in Florida not too long ago
there was an RV fire, when quite a few people died just because the RV's were so close
together they just... and if you've ever seen an RV go up it's [snaps fingers] like that. It's
not a slow burn; it's not, you know you open a door and that's it.

So, that's my concern, is that these are not long-term living units. And I think with the
hundred eighty (180) days, we're talking about designing to mobile home park standards,
ot making it a mobile home park. So, we're saying, "You're gonna have a water system,
you know, fire hydrants there in case there is a fire. We're gonna have other things that
we require of any housing development when you're gonna stay there for a while. So,
that's my point.

Doug Mayo: I think what Ashley was proposing is similar to what I was proposing,
which was what Mr. Wehr brought up, to allow some long-term... but with a... somewhat
of a percentage that has to be short term to allow more... because housing is... I
mean, try to rent a house around here, you know. You see ads all over the place; people
looking... the rentals are really tight; there's no place for people to live. Yeah, it's not
maybe the house everybody wants to have, and maybe it's not up to the codes; but it's
better than a cardboard box under a bridge. That's where my head's at.

Joe Walsh: I'd rather see the market determine what's... what the market demands are,
and design projects to meet those demands. We shouldn't be standing in the way to any
great degree with their creativity. You want to build... you know... what does the market,
whatever the market needs for that type of housing

Doug Mayo: Well, and then the question that Mike's talking about, do we, I don't know if
it would be so much encourage, but more RV parks, or do we say okay, the market needs
to be for trailer parks... for mobile homes. And are they better built and are they safer
than the, you know, RV's that are only ten (10) years old?

Mike Shuttleworth: Well, I think some of these will be answered in the next iteration of
the building code, and that they'll start... they have standards for tiny homes which are
similar to an RV, but they're... meet insulation standards, they meet safe... life safety
standards, escape window standards, they meet all these standards that a single that a
single family dwelling would have to meet and they're not, you know, much bigger than an
RV, but they meet safety standards. You know, and I think, for my mind, that's the
important thing is the safety of those people. I understand, you know, the cost and all that
stuff, but, still, if a person burns up, it's still a lost life.

Joe Walsh: So, I think we've got a little more work to do on this.

Doug Mayo: Agree. So...

Ashley Garza: I do; I feel like we need to know about what the market's asking for, but
how do we also make sure we... because it is the County's job to ensure the safety of
the public out there. So, I get the conundrum, and I'd like to spend more time maybe diving into that, figuring out a solution out that meets the safety of the public.

Doug Mayo: So, I hear that we want to table this for now and bring it back later with more information and hash it out more. And I think table ... I don't remember if that needs a vote or not.

Mike Shuttleworth/Phil Hoge: Yes.

Doug Mayo: Move to table.

Ashley Garza: I second.

[Commission members vote in favor of tabling the discussion; none opposed.]

Mike Shuttleworth: So, did you make the motion then?

Ashley Garza: I seconded.

[Undiscernible crosstalk]

Ashley Garza: I seconded . . . now everybody's motion.

Mike Shuttleworth: She made the motion and seconded.

Doug Mayo: She's multitasking.

Phil Hoge: Who motioned and who seconded?

Ashley Garza: I seconded and motioned I think.

Mike Shuttleworth: The Chairman did.

Ashley Garza: He did; I seconded.

Doug Mayo: I want to take about a five (5) minute . . . three (3) minute break quickly.

Doug Mayo: Alright, we will move to the study session for LRN2019, number three (3), sight-screening and landscaping study session.

Phil Hoge: That's' also mine. So, just to recap where we are because we've studied this before. Sight-screening and landscaping, you held your first study session on this last month . . . September 11th, and you didn't spend a lot of time on it because we had just gotten it out to you in writing. Study session . . . you wanted to continue the study session tonight. So . . . I actually emailed you a revised proposal on September 20th, and . . . sight-screening and landscaping . . . so, they were . . . so, in my email of December 20th I described what the changes were. It was basically just simplifying the English, eliminating redundancies, and trying to reduce the ambiguities, and just try to make it a little more understandable, and so it read a little better, and . . . so, that was . . . I could go over the particulars of that email if you want me to. Joe Walsh . . . Joe Walsh emailed me and had
some additional things that he thought should be clarified; I kind of worked on that, and a
couple of iterations later, we had what you were hearing tonight.

So, that was under 19 . . . section 19.21.030.01. We revised that; it was admittedly very
dense . . . very dense . . . we broke it up into short, choppy paragraphs and bullet points,
so I think it reads a lot better; so I appreciate Joe's input on that.

Joe Walsh: I do have a question on that though.

Phil Hoge: Okay . . . that particular code section?

Joe Walsh: Yeah, when you get down to E, you say "type one (1) uses" . . . are those four
(4) up above E also type one (1)?

Phil Hoge: Hold on here . . . I'm still in RV parks.

Bridget Pechtel: I do also have it on the screen.

Phil Hoge: Oh, you have it up there? Okay. So what's your question, sorry Joe?

Joe Walsh: Well, you don't say "other type one (1) use . . . type one (1) uses", so I'm . . .
are A, B, C, and D . . . are those type one (1) uses? If they are, then you should probably
say, "and other type one (1) uses generally not subject to project review."

Phil Hoge: Well, it jus: says "any proposed use" . . . single families . . . it depends upon
the zone. Single families might be . . . duplexes could be type twos (2's) in certain zones
I guess, or not allowed at all. Home businesses are usually accessory uses . . .

Joe Walsh: Okay. Are there any other type one (1) uses . . . are there any for D?

Jerry Mellon: Yeah; good question.

Phil Hoge: Any . . . any . . .

Jerry Mellon: We've got A, B, C, and D. Are there any other type one (1) uses other than
those four (4)?

Mike Shuttleworth: Isn't type one (1) a use that's allowed outright in that particular zone?

Phil Hoge: Yeah, as long as they meet development standards.

Mike Shuttleworth: Okay, so every zone is going to have a list of type one (1) uses, which
may be single family . . . may in another zone single family may be a type two (2), because
. . .

Doug Mayo: Could be a cemetery.

Phil Hoge: But if there are other type one (1) uses, the sight-screening standards would
apply to those. These are the ones that don't have to follow the sight-screening standards.

Joe Walsh: Okay; only those generally not subject to project review.
Phil Hoge: Well, A through F are the ones that don’t have to... well, C... well E are not normally... we don’t usually review those, they’re things like...

Noelle Madera: An ag building, like a barn, but not a commercial ag related industry, that's one specifically. Small utility structures that don’t require a SEPA, it’s a list of items... do you want to bring it up? It’s a list of items... like agriculture is listed on there, in the ag zones.

Doug Mayo: Of course, ag zone's not listed under sight-screening.

Noelle Madera: It’s not, I’m just rattling off a list I can think of off the top of my head. But single-family residence...

Bridget Pechtel: Where’s that list at again?

Noelle Madera: Nineteen-thirty (19.30).

Bridget Pechtel: Nineteen-thirty (19.30).

Phil Hoge: Yeah, I thought to add that because I realize that since we don’t... we won’t... planning department won’t even see those because we don’t even review those, so how can we require sight-screening on something we’re not even gonna review? So, it was intended to be helpful... clarifying.

[Miscellaneous background comments regarding the correct code section reference.]

Noelle Madera: So, that’s the list that we wouldn’t process that type one (1).

Doug Mayo: A lot of manufactured home here. Why would you need to sight screen forestry?

Ashley Garza: ... excavations... we have a lot of exceptions.

Phil Hoge: That’s one of those things that was ambiguous. When current planners got a project, they’d want to know, “Are we supposed to apply sight-screening standards to this?” Well, we just wanted to clarify they don’t.

Doug Mayo: Well, right now we’re in the study session, but the concern I have is what if there’s no water available on site?

Phil Hoge: Irrigation water?

Doug Mayo: Any water... for irrigation.

Phil Hoge: Then they’d better do xeriscaping, I guess.

Doug Mayo: Well, but... ok, literal sage brush or whatever xeriscaping is, I guess that's kind of... because there are businesses or lots that have not water, especially irrigation water... and if you’re requiring them to have trees... depending on what the code is there... how do you deal with it?
Ashley Garza: Have you ever had that happen . . . where they didn't have water available. . . and you required sitescreening?

Doug Mayo: Well, I had a guy out in Terrace Heights tell me they were running into that situation on the part of the land they were working on for this overpass project, part of a road relocation and a business over there required sight-screening and they had no water.

Mike Shuttleworth: The business had no water at all?

Doug Mayo: Well, depending on the type of business . . . maybe if you didn't have an office there . . . if it was, like, storage or something.

Phil Hoge: Well, if you look at the zones that sight-screening is required in, that's Table . . . there's a table on page four (4) . . . top of page four (4) . . . they're mostly urban zones, except for rural transitional and rural settlement, they're all urban zones. So, generally you would have water where development is occurring.

Doug Mayo: Generally doesn't mean always.

Phil Hoge: yeah . . .true . . yeah.

Doug Mayo: Does rural settlement need sight screening?

Ashley Garza: Because I think you have to have a fire line for most businesses.

Doug Mayo: So, between rural settlement and rural transitional you need a six (6) foot fence . . . six (6) foot trees.

Phil Hoge: I haven't heard, and I haven't spent a lot of time in current planning, but when I was in current planning doing permits, I didn't ever hear any push back about not having water, so . . . [undiscernible] . . . That doesn't mean . . . I may not have heard everything. I don't recall hearing that.

Mike Shuttleworth: So, are we ready to move to the public hearing?

Doug Mayo: Now a bunch of this . . . most of this is already covered . . . has been for years.

Phil Hoge: Yeah, right; it's only the strike through and underline that's . . .

Mike Shuttleworth: And your intention when you started this was to simplify it, not make it more complicated.

Phil Hoge: Yeah . . . yeah; although because there are so many changes, you almost have to read the clean version that accepts all the changes to realize that it's . . . works better, I think.

Ashley Garza: We're not really changing standards, we're just changing the . . .
Phil Hoge: Well, we're actually reducing standards in some cases, such that we had one case that prompted . . . one of the things that prompted this was that we required sight-screening and a fence . . .

Ashley Garza: That didn't make sense.

Phil Hoge: . . . and we didn't want to do that, so that specifically was removed.

Doug Mayo: Okay; we'll close the study session and open the public record hearing . . . the open record public hearing for LRN2019, number three (3), Sight-screening and Landscaping. Anyone in the audience wishing to speak . . . Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing and go to deliberations. Any further discussion?

Mike Shuttleworth: I make a motion that we approve the changes as presented by staff.

Joe Walsh: Second.

Doug Mayo: It's been moved and seconded . . . [undiscernible] . . . changes as approved . . . [undiscernible]. Mike, would you like to comment?

Mike Shuttleworth: No sir.

Doug Mayo: Whoever seconded over there want to comment? Does anyone want to comment? Nope? All right . . . all in favor (Aye) . . . opposed (None). Okay, moving right along.

Doug Mayo: We'll open the study session . . . Text Amendment for LRN2019, number fourteen (14), YCC Table 19-point-fourteen-dash one (19.14-1), Allowable Land Uses.

Olivia Story: Good Evening; my name is Olivia Story, I'm the new planner in Long Range Planning and I've met most of you, but if not . . . nice to meet you. So, for my first project Tommy gave me a pretty easy one, so we'll move through this quickly. And this is the Allowable Land Use Table. It's in the package there with the cover sheet, so it should be easy to find. What we're looking at is the Land Use Table, specifically convenience stores and how they relate to the small convenience center, large convenience center, and the general commercial zones on the Table. So, this problem started when the table was moved from Chapter 15A to Chapter 19.4. In the center of that first page you can see the original chart right there, and it kind of separates the different uses, the service stations and convenience stores, and has issues with the twenty-four (24) hour issues. When it was put into the new table, the twenty-four (24) hour issue was eliminated, and you can see service stations was put onto the table there, in those three (3) zones, highlighted in yellow. Unfortunately, convenience stores were left off and that was not the intent. So, the goal and the proposal tonight is to include the number one (#1), and you can look on page number two (#2) there . . . to include, number one (#1) on the small convenience center, the large convenience center, and general commercial table there to allow those uses . . . the convenience stores in those zones. So that's what the proposal is. Are there any questions on that?
Doug Mayo: So, we’ve got some yellow blocks that have nothing in them. Does that mean . . . [undiscernible]?

Olivia Story: Yes; so, on the second table down here, this is where it is currently today, and so we’re trying to fill in these blanks under these three (3) zones. That was the intent of the staff when they moved the table from one chapter to another.

Joe Walsh: So previously it was the first table, and now on the new code it’s the lower table.

Olivia Story: It’s the lower table

Joe Walsh: They left them out.

Doug Mayo: Talk slow; I’ll catch up.

Olivia Story: So, page two (2) has the three (3) blocks again, but now they’re filled in with the number one (1) like it should have been in the first place.

Doug Mayo: So, you got rid of the time constraints.

Olivia Story: The time constraints were gone, so now they can be twenty-four (24) hours in the zone. That was really the issue that was brought forth for this issue . . . for this correction.

Doug Mayo: So, that’s fundamentally what the change is . . . the original change was to get rid of the time constraints.

Olivia Story: That was one of the changes, yes. And that’s how . . . the service stations got put on there, but the convenience stores did not.

Doug Mayo: okay; so, when you don’t . . . so in the SCC, LCC, and GC, you’re not allowed to have a convenience store?

Olivia Story: Currently that true. So, you can’t have an AM/PM on the gas station site is what it’s saying, because AM/PM is a convenience store, and this prohibits an AM/PM next to your gas station.

Doug Mayo: Can a gas station have everything an AM/PM would have in it?

Ashley Garza: No; that’s what she’s saying. That’s why it’s a problem. You can get gas, but you can’t buy anything.

Noelle Madera: The definition for the service station limits it to just . . . how is it worded Olivia? Like . . .

Olivia Story: I forgot the exact wording, but oil, windshield wipers . . .

[Undiscernible crosstalk]
Noelle Madera: It’s worded in such a way that would be limiting. You can’t buy a chimichanga and laundry detergent.

Mike Shuttleworth: [Undiscernible] . . . wiper blade, spark plugs . . .

Noelle Madera: Air freshener.

Olivia Story: Whatever you can buy from the little stand where you buy your gas is what you can get for your car. But this would now allow . . . [undiscernible].

Ashley Garza: That would be like the car . . . the shell car . . . the shell station.

Noelle Madera: I think of it like the Safeway . . . the Safeway or Fred Meyer . . . where it’s a really tiny . . . you can get your oil and an air freshener, but you can’t get, like I said, a chimichanga and laundry detergent.

Olivia Story: Those little hot snacks next to the register when you buy your gas.

Ashley Garza: Or they sell candy bars.

Mike Shuttleworth: Are you looking for us to put numbers in these yellow . . .

Doug Mayo: . . . the second page . . .

Olivia Story: So, the second page here, the one you’re holding right here?

Doug Mayo: . . . puts the three (3) ones (1’s) . . .

Olivia Story . . . has those three (3) ones (1’s) highlighted, indicating that those are new.

Ashley Garza: She thought it would be an easy one.

Olivia Story: You never know.

Ashley Garza: She’d never met us before.

Doug Mayo: It’s past our bedtime.

Mike Shuttleworth: This may be for the older planners just because in the old code . . . under general commercial it looks like it didn’t allow convenience stores between ten (10:00) and six (6:00) AM.

Olivia Story: That’s true, and so that’s kind of when they adjusted the time frame allowing the twenty-four (24) hours or not, between the hours of ten (10:00) and six (6:00). Those were not allowed in those zones. But you can see in service stations, when it was put into the new table, those were allowed; down here you can see they were now all allowed in all the zones.

Mike Shuttleworth: If I remember right and I was part of that group, I think the thing was they were looking at service stations being like [undiscernible] and those other things, like twenty-four (24) hour service, but they’re not an active . . . you know . . . whereas a
convenience store you have people coming and going all the time. At a gas station, they get gas and then they leave; they wouldn't be hanging out, you know ... it's not some place you hang out. Whereas a convenience store, there'd be more people hanging out in the middle of the night and stuff like that. You can correct me, Phil, but I think that was kind of that conversation way back when.

Phil Hoge: Are you talking about when Title 19 was adopted, or . . .

Mike Shuttleworth: Yeah.

Phil Hoge: Yeah, I wasn't involved at all in most of those discussions.

Ashley Garza: I was involved in it, but I don't remember . . . I don't think I was part of that discussion.

Olivia Story: So, I only have one copy here so, sorry, I can't pass it around, but I'll show you. It's the large work group draft when this was put into place and the intent of it, and you can see here at the top, it has the three (3) zones that are in question. And then convenience stores are highlighted and with a P in each one of those. So, it is the intent of the original discussion to put it in there.

Ashley Garza: It was just a typo?

Olivia Story: It was just a typo, yes; but the discussion at this bottom shows that it was the intent.

Noelle Madera: Yeah, if you remember, we originally had this separate . . . land use tables and the separate zones, and then at the end we decided that doesn't really work very well. And we combined it all into one, and we missed some stuff when that happened because there was no master list. It looks like it was just dropped off because the records that we have, it was a . . . it was a permitted use when it was being moved forward, and when they combined it all into one table, it was dropped. Whether there was discussions about the twenty-four (24) or not, we wouldn't have any record of that, but . . .

[Undiscernible background talk]

Olivia Story: So, I also have the definition; I can read that as well.

Mike Shuttleworth: No, no; I was just trying to figure out what they add.

Olivia Story: That's just the definitions for a convenience store and I can read that if you like. Okay; and then this one just shows a service station is also intended to be permitted.

Noelle Madera: Yeah, there definitely could have been some discussion about that, but we wouldn't have . . .

Mike Shuttleworth: Yeah, because I think the large working group wasn't the Planning Commission; that was a separate . . .
Noelle Madera: No, it was; it's just this was the only one Tommy sent us from all of the files, and so that's the only record that we have . . .

Ashley Garza: I don't think I was a part of that discussion. And you're thinking that the intent of the working group was to keep that?

Mike Shuttleworth: Well, I think that in the general commercial zone . . . I'm trying to think where those were at; but having a twenty-four (24) hour convenience store might be an impact on surrounding residential if it's there. Maybe it needs a little bit more review than this.

Doug Mayo: But if it's in a commercial zone . . .

Noelle Madera: This came up because somebody . . . sorry to interject from the back . . . somebody called because they wanted to get a permit to put in a new gas station in Terrace Heights in the general commercial zoning with the big convenience store, and right next to them in the general commercial is a large convenience store with a gas station, and so they were surprised to hear they couldn't have the gas station, and they're both general commercial; and so . . .

Mike Shuttleworth: So, in your professional opinion, do you see, given where the general commercial zones are, that having twenty-four (24) hour facilities are not going to impact surrounding residential uses?

Noelle Madera: Do you have access to GIS? I mean we could always pull up GIS. Off the top of my head I would think there wouldn't be an impact, but . . . oh, Yakimap.

Lynn Deitrick: Also, too . . . general commercial, you have to remember, generally speaking, is not in residential neighborhoods. It's usually off arterials and major arterials and those locations. Most of those entrances and exits from those convenience stores would probably be out on to those, and they wouldn't be exiting out into residential neighborhoods. And then they'll have a landscape buffer as well that we just went through, that will help set those away from any residence.

[Mostly undiscernible, unrelated crosstalk among the Commission members while an attempt is made to open a mapping program.]

Doug Mayo: Alright, so . . . any further comments . . . okay, so . . . hold on. We're going to close the study session and open the public hearing on LRN2019 fourteen (14), Allowable Land Uses. Any public comment? Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing . . . back for discussion.

Jerry Craig: Move for approval.

Mike Shuttleworth: Second.

Doug Mayo: Been moved and seconded to approve the changes as presented. All in favor say Aye (Aye); Opposed? (None). Okay, it passed.
II. Old Business:
   A. LRN2019-00001: Cargo Containers – Title 19 Text Amendment (Phil Hoge)
      a. This text amendment was approved with modifications at the September 11, 2019
         Public Hearing. Phil Hoge presented the code changes, with the proposed
         modifications to the Planning Commission.

III. New Business:
   A. Facts and Findings for 2019 Text Amendments
         The text amendments were split into two documents, one that contained the Facts
         and Findings for LRN2018-00007, and the other that contained the Facts and
         Findings for LRN2019-00001, LRN2019-00003, LRN2019-00005, LRN2019-
      b. Bridget read into the record a portion of section of the Planning Commission Rules
         of Procedure (section 9.8), that allows the Chair, or Secretary in the absence of
         the Chair, to sign findings of fact that have been voted on by the Planning
         Commission, but not signed by all voting commissioners.
      c. Mike Shuttleworth made a motion to authorize the chairman to sign the 2019 text
         amendments Facts and Findings for the remaining Planning Commission
         members. Ashley Garza seconded the motion. The motion was approved with all
         in favor, and none opposed.
   B. Facts and Findings for 16A Repeal
      a. Ashley Garza made a motion to approve the 16A repeal Facts and Findings. Jerry
         Mellen seconded the motion. The motion was approved with all in favor, and none
         opposed.
   C. Mike Shuttleworth discussed an upcoming parliamentary procedural training presented by
      the Yakima Valley Conference of Governments that might be valuable to the Planning
      Commission.

IV. Public Comment:
   A. None.

V. Communications:
   A. Reports of subcommittees and study groups. None.
   B. Status report of cases before the BOCC. None.
   C. Secretary’s report. None.

VI. Adjournment or continuance to a date, place, and time:
   A. The Planning Commission discussed when to meet again to continue the deliberations of
      LRN2019-00005, which was tabled, following the closing the public record hearing.
      a. Doug Mayo made a motion to remove LRN2019-00005 off the table. Ashley Garza
         seconded the motion. The motion was approved with all in favor, and none
         opposed.
b. Mike Shuttleworth made a motion to resume the deliberations of LRN2019-00005 at the regularly scheduled meeting on November 13, 2019. Jerry Mellen seconded the motion. The motion was approved with all in favor, and none opposed.

B. The next meeting to be held on November 13, 2019, 5:30 pm. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.

Minutes approved by the Planning Commission on November 13, 2019.

Signed: [Signature]
Planning Commission, Chair