REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

- MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: May 9, 1997

TO: Building Services Division Staff

Land Use Services

Division Staff

Chris Ricketts Mark Carey
Pam Dhanapal Lisa Pringle
Terry Brunner Marilyn Cox
Ken Dinsmore Gordon Thomson

Greg Kipp, Deputy Director Chuck Maduell, Prosecuting Attorney's Office

FM: Sophia Byrd, Code Development Coordinator

Present: Sophia Byrd, Gordon Thomson, Ken Dinsmore, Pam Dhanapal, Terry Murray, Harold Vandergriff

1. In an RA zone, a veterinary clinic is allowed as a home occupation. What signage is allowable and could a fence be construed as a wall? Allowed signage for a home occupation in the RA zone (KCC 21A.20.080(A)(3), KCC 21A.06.465) (Pam Dhanapal)

KCC 21A.20.080(A)(3) allows for home occupation and home industry signs limited to wall signs not to exceed six square feet. KCC 21A.06.465 defines "fence" in part as: "a barrier for the purpose of enclosing space or separating lots, composed of masonry or concrete walls, excluding retaining walls..."

Although the definition of fence allows a "wall" to be defined as a fence, the group concluded that a fence could also be defined as a wall consistent with the purpose of enclosing space or separating lots. Therefore, the group determined that a fence mounted sign no larger than six square feet is allowed. A side issue arose regarding the need for a provision to allow for "directional" signs for home occupations. It was determined that a code amendment is necessary to provide for such direction signs. However, the group did not decide whether or not to pursue an amendment.

Regulatory Review Committee Meeting Date: May 30, 1997

Page 2

2. Chapter 21A.30.080A limits the area used for a home occupation to 20% of the floor area of the dwelling unit. Paragraph D of the same chapter only limits outside storage, automobile, truck and heavy equipment repair in the urban zones. Hence, in rural zones where one may conduct an activity as described in Paragraph D, it is unlikely one can meet the limitation in Paragraph A. Is this analysis correct? If so, is a code change desirable? (Ken Dinsmore)

The group determined that the activities enumerated in paragraph D do not constitute "goods" per se. Instead, they are activities or uses which are allowed as home occupations in non residential zones. The 20% floor area limit therefore applies regardless of whether the activities listed in paragraph D occur inside or outside. It was also determined that the intent of the provision was to expressly limit such activities as home occupations, and that a code amendment should not be pursued.

SB:sm

s:\projects\rrc\minutes.doc

cc: Priscilla Kaufmann, Code Development Planner Terry Murray, Permit Technician Harold Vandergriff, Zoning Technician