

YAKIMA COUNTY PUBLIC SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Planning Division, Long Range Planning Section

TO: Yakima County Planning Commission

STAFF CONTACT: Ted Demin – Yakima County Planning Division

DATE: July 8th, 2020

ISSUE: Title 19 -Table 19.13.030-1 Correction

INTRODUCTION / SUMMARY

Currently, Table 19.13.030-1 does not state a required setback from the rear property line for structural development located within the M-1 and M-2 Zoning Districts. Specifically, in the case that the rear is abutted by a right of way or vehicular access easement. The required rear setback should be equal to the front setback. This is supported by three instances within past and current code.

BACKGROUND / PROBLEMS

The Yakima County Code’s Zoning Districts have tables of development standards within each of their respective chapters. All but one two zoning districts establish their own specific rear setback for structures located on parcels that abut a right of way or vehicular access easement on both the front and the rear. The light and heavy industrial zoning districts (M-1 and M-2) do not mention a setback for that situation in their respective table of development standards, and the cells are left blank. Therefore, a conflict between the text and tables of Title 19 arises and it is necessary to correct the conflicting information.

SOLUTION TO PROBLEM

The discrepancy that the missing value poses can be remedied by issuing a required rear setback for structures in parcels whose rear property lines abut public right-of-way or vehicular access easements. The proper value to add to those fields would be the same value as the front setback.

Title 15A’s Urban Growth Area Ordinances Table 5-1 Note 6, states “The rear setback from arterials, collectors, and local access streets shall be the same as the front yard setback requirements from arterials, collectors, and local access streets, provided the required rear setbacks shall not be less than the required setbacks from the property line. (See also Note 3)” (Note 3 simply instructs how to measure the setback).

Title 15 County Zoning Ordinance 15.20.075(2) states “There shall be a minimum rear setback for all buildings or structures from the centerline of right-of-way or access easement as set forth in section 15.20.070 above.” Section 15.20.070 states the various front setbacks for structures on properties abutting right-of-way or easements.

YCC 19.11-19.13 Outlines the development standards of every zoning district. Every zoning district section (Except 19.13.030) requires the rear setback for properties abutting a “Right-of-way or vehicular access easement” must meet the same setback as the front setback.

YCC 19.10.040(6)(a)(iv) states “Rear setbacks from public and private roads shall be the same as the front yard setback requirement from public and private roads when the rear lot line abuts a right-of-way or vehicular access easement, provided the required rear setbacks shall not be less than the required setbacks from the property line.”

Requiring the same setback as the front setback for this instance would resolve the conflict between a 0’ setback and YCC 19.10.040(7). A 0’ setback could potentially encroach upon the vision clearance triangle for driveways accessing a county road or other vehicular access.

Lastly, the introductory paragraph of YCC 19.10.040 states that “Where text and tables conflict, the text shall govern” which means the code in 19.10.040(6)(a)(iv) supersedes the blank value found in YCC Table 19.13.030-1.

CONCLUSION

Based on previous Code Titles and the Development Standards of Title 19, the prudent solution to the missing value is to require the same setback as if the property line abutting a right of way were the front, mimicking the setback language found in other zoning district tables. Requiring the setback would avoid a discrepancy in prior and current regulations. It would also achieve consistency between the text and the tables within the Yakima County Code and conform to standards where the text governs. The edited table and references can be seen on the following page.

Subject	Zone		
	M-1	M-2	
Minimum lot area ⁽¹⁾ New parcels smaller than one-half acre are not permitted unless consistent with a binding site plan approval for the use	One-half acre	One-half acre	
Minimum lot width	60 feet	60 feet	
Maximum lot coverage	100 percent	100 percent	
	or less as required by Section 19.21.030 for sitescreening/landscaping		
Maximum building height Additional restrictions may apply within the Airport Safety Overlay. See Section 19.17.030.	60 feet	None	
Minimum vision clearance triangle at intersections, railroads, curbcuts and driveways	See Subsection 19.10.040(7)		
Minimum building setback ⁽²⁾			
Front/street side* ⁽³⁾	Classified road (arterial or collector)	50 feet from planned centerline	
	Roads with a right-of-way or vehicular access easement greater than 60 feet in width	25 feet from planned right-of-way edge	
	Turnaround or cul-de-sac		
	Local access or private roads ⁽⁴⁾	50 feet from planned centerline	
	Private, shared driveway or alley ⁽⁴⁾ (see Chapter 19.23)	10 feet from edge of easement	
Side (interior)*	Not adjoining an RT, SR, R-1, R-2 or R-3 district	0 feet	0 feet
	Adjoining an RT, SR, R-1, R-2 or R-3 district	One-half building height or fifty feet, whichever is greater	
Rear*	Right-of-way or vehicular access easement	Same as front setback	Same as front setback
	Not adjoining an RT, SR, R-1, R-2 or R-3 district	0 feet	0 feet
	Adjoining an RT, SR, R-1, R-2 or R-3 district	One-half building height or fifty feet, whichever is greater	
*Dwellings and other especially sensitive land uses (ESLU) adjacent to designated resource lands and/or activities are subject to additional setbacks	See Section 19.18.205		
Additional setback to conform to sitescreening requirements	See Section 19.21.030		

REFERENCES

YCC Title 15A-05 Table 5-1

YCC Title 15 Section 15.20.075(2) & 15.20.070

YCC Title 19 Tables 19.11.010-2; 19.11.020-1; 19.11.030-2; 19.11.040-2; 19.12.010-2; 19.12.020-2; 19.13.010-1; 19.13.020-1; 19.13.030-1