

Minutes
Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee
Special Meeting, August 29, 2019

Attendees: Stephen Falk (SF) — At Large
David Gellatly (DG) — CoC
Linda Hughes (LH) — At Large
Tessa Pinckston (TP) — PRRVA
Steve Wolff (SW) — PRТА

1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

2. Public Comment

The meeting opened with about 25 minutes of Public Comments, limited to 3 minutes per speaker.

- * Pat Harper — After attending PRТА’s board meeting to review the final proposed changes to WCC 20.72, Mr. Harper was concerned about the general permitting provision which does not allow for plumbing in accessory out-buildings without getting PDS approval. His concern is specifically about well houses that necessarily have both electricity and plumbing, though not plumbing like sinks or toilets that could make the space habitable. SW said he would check with Cliff Strong at PDS to confirm that they do not treat well houses as accessory structures with electricity and plumbing.
- * Samantha Scholefield — Ms Scholefield asked where she could get a copy of the proposed revisions to 20.72. She requested that the changes be posted to PAWS so that residents can see all the changes that are proposed.
- * Annelle Norman — Ms Norman wanted to know if any changes were being proposed to the tree retention requirements. She noted that if everyone took down all the trees that they are permitted to remove, it would make the harm the environment and feel of Point Roberts. SW noted that, in Whatcom County, only Point Roberts and Lake Whatcom have tree retention rules.
- * Erica Conlan — Ms Conlan agreed with Ms Scholefield’s comment that residents should have access to the changes to 20.72 being proposed by the PRCAC. She said it is essentially too late for the public to give input. LH noted that the process was not ending tonight. The PRCAC proposal would next go PDS for review. Further revision might be needed before the changes are considered for adoption. SW noted that the changes have not gone through legal review, which the County will now do.
- * Samantha Scholefield — Ms Scholefield commented that the zoning code should include language about enforcement against violations. She said that residents need education about what is permissible and what steps need to be taken before engaging in certain activities (e.g., the need for permit for fires and how to get such permits). LH noted that the zoning code does not include enforcement provisions. She did agree that educating the community was a good idea. SW noted that the public needs to alert PDS when code violations seem apparent. DG noted that PDS only has 3 employees for enforcement issues all over Whatcom County and that they do not come out to Point Roberts to look for issues. They respond to allegations of code violations.

3. Correspondence

The following correspondence was received concerning proposed changes to WCC 20.72:

Minutes
Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee
Special Meeting, August 29, 2019

- * Dennis Heimbecker — I am a small business owner in point Roberts on Gulf Road I don't think changing the ordinance would be a good idea I think I'll be a bad idea for Point Roberts And I will let the County know that thank you. Dennis Heimbecker owner of Dennis's auto repair.
- * Cara Hogan — It has come to my attention that you are contemplating removing the current restrictions in place along Gulf Road and part of Tye Drive for types of appropriate businesses. While I can understand that it could be more profitable to land owners along these roads to be able to use their land for the most profitable business possible, allowing these sorts of businesses could be seen as very short sighted and not of long term benefit to the community as a whole in the short and long term. I encourage you to read through the US Environmental Protection Agencies literature on „smart growth in small towns and rural communities“ for ideas on what can be done in Point Roberts. In the interest of the entire Point Roberts Community, please do not remove the current restrictions that are in place.
- * Gail Amundsen — I am sorry to have not been more involved but never the less here are my thoughts. I vision a downtown without vehicle repair and storage, without commercial storage or RV parks. I think we have enough of these already. It's important to put out a good first impression on our main streets and not be a cheap storage Center for Canadians. That's my two cents.
- * Marilyn Ross — RE post on Nextdoor can someone clarify for me the particular section that refers to “conditional uses” regarding the following prohibited activities *vehicle or equipment service, repair, washing or commercial storage or sale facilities.” Does this mean the existing businesses that are on Gulf Road will remain and not be forced to close their doors, ie: the vehicle repair shop; “Auntie Pam's”, the commercial storage, etc. Thanks for your help.
- * Dorothy & Martin Gurney — As residents in Point Roberts we would like to support the proposals put forward in your e-mail -- "Conditional uses" for sure and definitely agree with no used car lots, auto repair shops (Dennis' as an exception), nor paved lots for truck storage, etc. Thank you for alerting us.
- * Brian Conlan — PRCAC Members - Please do not modify the STC zoning rules. There are enough unattractive business operations along Gulf Rd the way it is. I am hoping that with the opening of Blackfish, it may spur interest in developing more business endeavors of the kind that make for a more interesting environment for PR overall. Future traffic to Blackfish will logically be routed along Gulf and frame the setting for our community. Thank you for listening.
- * Anita Jacks — I oppose changes to wcc 20.72 !! I do not want to see car lots, storage facilities etc along two main roads in Point Roberts what an eyesore that would be. I support our current character plan and wish to keep it an attractive business area. What happened to the poll results on next door regarsing these changes? Thank you.
- * Rick and Katherine Sande — Dear PRACC members, I would like to voice my opinion re possible zoning changes. I am in favor of business development along Gulf road, but I do not support light industrial in the area that is in effect our downtown. I do not support changes that would allow activities such as storage facilities or truck staging and parking. Thank you very much for your work on our behalf.
- * Harold Charlap — There is no need to change WCC 20.72.204. The restrictions are appropriate today as well as they were 20 years ago. There is no benefit to Point Roberts

Minutes
Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee
Special Meeting, August 29, 2019

residents to a mini storage facility on our main road as an example. As has been noted the only feedback you are receiving is from local businessmen who profit while we deal with the border waits and additional stuff like garbage that comes along with businesses lifting the restrictions would allow.

- * Mike Sturgess — I've lived in Point Roberts for 6 years (as a working-class renter) and I strongly oppose any new commercial development that is not locally (and/or cooperatively) owned unless it meaningfully contributes to our community and provides full-time, year-round living-wage employment for local residents. I applied for a job at Best Time RV when they opened in the former Brewster's building - apparently they had promised to bring good full-time jobs to Point Roberts when coming here. What kind of jobs were they actually hiring for? The usual corporate dead-end jobs -- irregular part-time hours, low-wages. Please don't turn Point Roberts into a parking lot with no benefits for the local community. "Development" and "growth" have destroyed many a town. I suspect most investors looking to come here have no more interest in living and participating in our community than the Chinese billionaires who bought the marina and other properties. Point Roberts belongs to those who live and work here, and who contribute to life here.
- * Louise Cassidy — I am not available to attend the meeting. Could you please forward me the document with proposed changes so I may read them and comment. I would hope that one of the changes is to mandate that developed property on Tyee & Gulf be clean and maintained so as not to give a "ghost town" appearance on our main roads.
- * Erica Conlan — PLEASE, do NOT remove the restrictions on 204 at this time. I would like to see a comprehensive plan for our business district, focusing on beautification efforts. The entry corridor and business district sets the tone for the Point as a whole. Let's make sure that tone is attractive. The proposed commercial usage does not meet my vision for an attractive gateway to our community. Consider adopting new zoning in a more appropriate industrial park type setting, at a more appropriate area for these businesses.
- * Kellie Ryan — Since the Thursday meeting is review of the document, is there some place that I can get a copy? I did have something residential that I was going to present, but I am happy to run it by you first to see if it is even relevant. Let me know.
- * Shauna and Tim Boyd — Tried to send this earlier this week but it did not go through despite repeated attempts. Please confirm if you do receive this. Thanks!: My husband and I moved to Point Roberts three years ago. We and others love to live (and visit) Point Roberts because it retains a very small town America feel. We have moved from other places that did not use forethought while planning future growth which resulted in a very uninviting and ugly town character and severely limited the town's desirability both as a place to live and a destination for visitors. We think the group that made the list of "prohibited" activities 20 years ago had this sort of thing in mind and hoped to keep Point Roberts a desirable place for people to live and to visit. Of course, there is always pressure to change these things from those who could profit from it but that does not protect our community, our citizens or our visitors. Once you go forward you can never go back and we think most of us have first hand knowledge of how this works and how catastrophic it can be. There is much value in the smart, forward-thinking actions that were taken 20 years ago. It is so important that their plans, forethought and good sense be respected and upheld. We need to protect this community for our children and grandchildren and for those who have brought generations of their families here to visit. Please protect our community and do not fall to the pressure to un-do the common sense guidelines that were set up previously. We do not want to see RV parks, storage facilities, vehicle repair, commercial storage, animal kennels and the like on our main roads

Minutes
Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee
Special Meeting, August 29, 2019

which represent our community now so well. We will become like many other communities who did not follow good guidelines. Point Roberts could become ugly, scarred, garish, uninviting and unattractive to possible residents and much less a destination for visitors. My family and I and others in the community are counting on you. Please stay with the past recommendations that have protected our precious, beautiful and unique Point Roberts. Do not allow any of the proposed “pro-development” changes which will open the flood gates in the future for increased ruination of our community. Please do not make that mistake. We are hoping that you will protect our community for our residents and the visitors who understand the true value in the small-town feel of Point Roberts. All of us are hoping you will help to protect us from the pressure for over-commercialism and ruination.

- * Kendra Ballendine — I would like to write to you in regards to changing the Maple Beach WCC 20.72 building code restriction for the potential of hotel or accomodation on the old Whalen’s property. My family has owned a cabin in Maple Beach for 4 generations. We have always had an issue in hosting as many people as we’d like to. We host family reunions and all of our family celebrations in Maple Beach and there are no other accommodations that are available to our guests’; so they tend to leave early and are reluctant to have a glass of wine with dinner as have to through the border. Our family, as would many, would find an absolute benefit to local accommodations. If there is anything else we can do further your support, we are happy to do so.

4. Review and Decision on Changes to WCC 20.72

Each provision of WCC 20.72 which the PRCAC has reviewed or which has been the subject of significant comments from PRRVA, PRTA, CoC or individuals, was read or described to the meeting attendees and further discussed. In addition to the notes included in the attached copy of revised WCC 20.72, the following comments came up during the discussions:

.010 — PRTA suggested additional language to add to the Purpose section. DG suggested this be reviewed at a later date.

.052 — DG suggested that the PRCAC approve the new provision for storage units and have it reviewed by PDS (Cliff Strong). LH reiterated her suggestion to remove “licensed business related” from the provision to allow greater flexibility. Samantha Scholefield asked why local businesses need more storage. Erica Conlan expressed concern about enforcement of this new provision. Martin Hogan commented that he has never seen businesses needing more storage space than their buildings provide, and wondered whether this was enabling mini-storage units. SF noted that this would not create small scale mini-storage facilities if the “licensed business related” language is retained. LH noted that Rawganique needed 14 additional storage units and that that need contributed to the business’ move to Blaine.

.053 — There was a question whether allowing two 200 sq.ft. storage sheds was permissible. PRCAC will seek feedback from PDS (Cliff Strong).

.130(5) — The change would allow for two 200 sq.ft. storage sheds for properties with RVs. They would have to be screened.

.151 — The question of permitting hotels in Resort Commercial zones was revived. It would allow up to 16-room hotels on properties in the few areas zones as Resort Commercial. The PRCAC voted 4:1 (SF “dissenting”) to approve this change. (In response, SF drafted a new section .157 to provide this option, in addition to revising .151 to exclude Resort Commercial from its scope.)

Minutes
Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee
Special Meeting, August 29, 2019

.154 — This change just removes specific redundant language.

.156 — This provision was added for the Conditional Uses formerly part of the Prohibited Uses of .204.

.202 — DG did not have a chance to reach the MBRA to ask their position on the prohibition of boarding houses, taverns and commercial parking lots. One resident wrote to LH to express support to allow hotels in Maple Beach. The PRCAC agreed to take no action at this time, pending input from MBRA.

.204 — PRCAC voted earlier (4:1) to make the Prohibited Uses dog kennels, vehicle storage, repair, cleaning and sales facilities and RV parts to be Conditional Uses (see .156). It was mentioned that requests for such businesses in the STC zone would come before the PRCAC for review and positive or negative recommendation to PDS. SF and LH disagreed on the significance of PRCAC as a potential roadblock to approval of such Conditional Use requests. Samantha Scholefield questioned why we would permit such businesses if a major business goal is to increase tourism. Martin Hogan questioned whether there would be sufficient public input against such uses (in comparison to the strong reaction to the radio towers). Erica Conlan commented that part-time residents have a hard time attending meetings to contest plans they object to. She further questioned how these proposed changes could be consistent with the vision for Point Roberts. Martin Hogan suggested that an economic development plan should be updated before significant changes like the one to .204 is made. Allison and Ken Calder commented that the change was being implemented to resolve Lorne Nielson's issue at 1480 Gulf Road.

.350 — It was noted that the parenthetical heading should be removed, as agreed earlier for other sections. PRCAC earlier agreed to remove the deeper treed setbacks along Roosevelt Road. The setback would revert to 25 feet on Roosevelt Road.

.400 — The "along Gulf Road" limitation would be removed to have the 45 foot height limitation apply in STC on Gulf Road as well.

.653 — In the section on screening ((2)(a)), in which PRCAC previously agreed to propose including "living walls", it was also agreed to add that screening be used to block the view of stored containers, trailers or vehicles. No change was made to tree retention provisions. A typographical error was corrected in (e).

.659 — In subsection (1), it was previously agreed to encourage parking at the rear of businesses in STC, but to allow alternatives when the parking requirement would prevent the project from proceeding.

.670 — There was further discussion about LH's proposal to remove the achromatic requirement for internally lit signs and the prohibition of moving signs. PRTA has reviewed these issues, but PRRVA and CoC have not yet had a chance to consider the issue. No action was taken at this time.

Design Guidelines — LH suggested that a change be made, if needed, to make sure that property "improvements", such as the total re-build of the store at the Chevron station, be required to come before the PRCAC during the permitting process. DG suggested that that particular project was slated to come before the PRCAC, but that that previous Chairperson did not get it on a meeting agenda at the time.

Minutes
Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee
Special Meeting, August 29, 2019

10.24 — On the plan to seek a change to the prohibition on parking along much of Gulf Road, Martin Hogan commented that the parking-free shoulders give a place for pedestrians and cyclists. PRCAC members noted that if parking on both sides of Gulf Road is not approved, parking on one side would still be an advantage.

5. Adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 pm. (Motion by DG; seconded by SF)

Chapter 20.72

POINT ROBERTS SPECIAL DISTRICT

Sections:

20.72.010 Purpose.

20.72.020 Application.

20.72.022 Area and applicability.

20.72.030 Review of permit applications by the Point Roberts community advisory committee.

20.72.050 Permitted uses.

20.72.100 Accessory uses.

20.72.130 Administrative approval uses.

20.72.150 Conditional uses.

20.72.200 Prohibited uses.

20.72.250 Minimum lot size.

20.72.260 Maximum density.

20.72.270 Subdivision requirements.

20.72.350 Building setbacks/buffer areas. (Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.)

20.72.400 Height limitations.

20.72.650 Development criteria.

20.72.651 Facility design. (Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.)

20.72.652 Archaeological resources.

20.72.653 Landscaping, screening, and tree canopy retention. (Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.)

[20.72.654 Site design/view corridors. \(Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.\)](#)

[20.72.655 Public restrooms and trash facilities.](#)

[20.72.656 Vehicular access.](#)

[20.72.657 Nonvehicular access.](#)

[20.72.658 Drainage.](#)

[20.72.659 Parking.](#)

[20.72.670 Signs and flag poles.](#)

20.72.010 Purpose.

Point Roberts is a unique area of Whatcom County because of its relatively small size, its mixed development character, its relative isolation and the constraints on normal growth patterns caused by the impact of access only via an international border crossing. This geographic isolation from the remainder of Whatcom County complicates the direct application of other zone districts within this title. Point Roberts is considered a limited area of more intense rural development, being clearly bounded by the border and marine environment. However, within these boundaries are zoning districts allowing a variety of development intensities. Proposed changes in uses or lots, and new proposed uses, must be consistent with rural land use as set forth in the Comprehensive Plan.

The Point Roberts Special District is an overlay zone which imposes additional controls and creates opportunities not available in the underlying zone districts to fit the needs of Point Roberts. This district is designed to protect the rural character of Point Roberts while allowing opportunities for community growth and self-reliance. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2011-013 § 2 Exh. B, 2011; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999).

Comment from PRTA — Section 20.72: 3.3.1 commonly referred to as the Point Roberts Sub-Area “Vision Statement” should be enshrined with the new 20.72.

PRTA suggested text to add to the Purpose section of 20.72 from the Revised Character Plan (Adapted from the “Vision, Economic Development Plan and development objectives” section of the draft revised Character Plan, dated July 25, 2015):

Point Roberts is a rural settlement that is safe, quiet and welcoming with unique history and geography that creates a diverse and harmonious international community of residents and visitors. Our history as a place of importance to the peoples of the Salish Sea laid the basis for our origins as a community of homesteaders physically isolated from the rest of the United States. These have formed the

foundations for our traditions of self-sufficiency, resilience and economic and social responsibility to each other.

Point Roberts celebrates its heritage of fishing, farming, homesteading and home-based and small industry. Community development in Point Roberts fosters a sense of belonging and liveability through a diverse economy of small businesses, self-employed professionals and creative individuals that support local residents, cottagers and tourists.

Above all, we cherish and honor Point Roberts' largely undisturbed natural assets including wildlife, forests, beaches and trails. Our magnificent natural setting offers an abundance of unrestricted outdoor leisure opportunities: biking, hiking, bird watching, boating, whale watching, golfing, kayaking, fishing, swimming, dog walking, sky watching, star gazing, gardening and just being.

Our land base is small and limited, so we strive to ensure that it is used in ways in which our economic and social activities can be in harmony with our natural assets.

Our rural "home town atmosphere" is based upon a network of neighbors and business people who care deeply about this place, our unique community and each other.

DG suggested this be taken up later, possibly as an update to 20.72 or in the Sub Area Plan.

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment.

20.72.020 Application.

(Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002).

20.72.022 Area and applicability.

The Point Roberts Special District is an overlay zone which covers the entire geographic area of Point Roberts. Any regulations contained herein which are more restrictive than those in the underlying zone districts or in the Shoreline Management Program shall apply. Opportunities, or lesser restrictions, shall also override the requirements of the underlying zone. However, if the provisions of this chapter conflict with the provisions of the Shoreline Management Program, then the most restrictive shall apply. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999).

20.72.030 Review of permit applications by the Point Roberts community advisory committee.

(1) The Point Roberts community advisory committee (PRCAC) is a local body advisory to Whatcom County through the office of the Whatcom County executive and of the Whatcom County council.

(2) The pertinent purpose of the PRCAC, as it relates to development permits, is to examine commercial and institutional permit applications in the Point Roberts subarea and make recommendations to Whatcom County planning and development services as to their compliance with this chapter and consistency with the Point Roberts design guidelines.

(3) Upon receipt of a permit application, planning and development services will forward the application to the PRCAC for review and comment. Permit applications are to be promptly examined by the PRCAC and a determination made, with or without recommendations, within 30 days of receipt of the application.

(4) Planning and development services will consider all pertinent comments received by the PRCAC prior to issuing a decision on the permit. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B)

20.72.050 Permitted uses.

All permitted uses in the underlying zone districts are permitted except as expressly prohibited or made conditional, or further conditioned by this chapter. In addition, the following uses are permitted:

.051 In the RC Zone, bed and breakfast establishments and bed and breakfast inns. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2009-033 § 1 (Att. A), 2009; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999).

[New] .052 In the STC zone, licensed business related storage of containers, wheeled trailers and other movable units provided such storage units are screened from view per standard Whatcom Screening Rules (and setback from the streets by 50 feet [TBD]). The number of such units shall not exceed two (2) per business unless approved through an application for Conditional use.

DG proposed that this be reconsidered by PRCAC as a second approach to dealing with businesses having storage units. This provision should be reviewed by PDS (Cliff Strong).

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

[New] .053 In all Zones under 20.72, two (2) 200 square foot storage accessory buildings are permitted.

This provision should be reviewed by PDS (Cliff Strong). In addition, PRCAC and the community needs to understand how the rules for accessory buildings not having both electricity and plumbing applies to well pump houses that have both electricity and plumbing (though not residential plumbing (sinks, toilets)).

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

20.72.100 Accessory uses.

All accessory uses in the underlying zone districts are permitted as accessory uses. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999).

20.72.130 Administrative approval uses.

All administrative approval uses in the underlying zone districts are permitted except as expressly prohibited or made conditional, or further conditioned by this chapter. In addition, the following uses are permitted subject to administrative approval pursuant to WCC 20.84.235:

.135 One private, noncommercial, recreational vehicle or park model trailer and one accessory guest RV per lot; provided, that the following minimum requirements and standards are met and/or followed:

(1) All recreational vehicles that remain on the site for more than 14 consecutive days shall be connected to a permitted on-site sewage system or public sewer.

(2) Maximum length of stay of any recreational vehicle on a lot shall not exceed 120 days per calendar year; provided, that no accessory guest RV shall remain on the subject lot for more than 14 consecutive days or more than 30 days total per calendar year.

(3) All recreational vehicles shall be screened from neighboring properties not using RVs and from public roads. Such screening may consist of landscaped buffer areas, native vegetation or a fence.

(4) Lots shall not be leased or rented out on a daily or overnight basis for recreational use.

(5) Accessory structures are limited to ~~one~~ two (2) personal storage buildings no larger than 200 square feet.

This provision should be reviewed by PDS (Cliff Strong).

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

Comment from PRRVA — Revert to 20.32.050 Permitted uses. 057 One one-story detached accessory storage building per lot; provided, that the floor area shall not exceed 200 square feet and shall only be used for personal storage and not for habitation or business; and provided further, that the storage building shall contain no indoor plumbing but may be served with electrical power for lighting.

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment.

(6) The locations of parked RVs on vacant lots shall observe normal building setback standards for a single-family residence.

(7) All recreational vehicles shall be supported by their own wheels or camper jacks, and not be fastened to accessory structures. Placement of a recreational vehicle on a foundation or removal of the wheels of a recreational vehicle, except for temporary purposes for repair, is prohibited. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2013-057 § 1 (Exh. A), 2013; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 2000-040 § 1, 2000).

Comment from PRTA — As long as within accepted county, state and federal health standards, restrictive and punitive language pertaining to RVs and trailers should be eliminated. This should include length of stay and/or necessity of permitting.

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment.

Comment from Pat Harper –

- * Trailers, RVs and boats shall have a current State of Washington registration.**
- * Trailers, RVs and boats not registered in Washington shall have a current registration from the point of origin.**
- * Trailers, RVs and boats not registered in Washington shall be removed within 7 months from Point Roberts port of entry or stored at an approved facility or marina in Point Roberts,**
- * Trailers or RVs shall not be modified in any way that would invalidate the UL listing of the unit. Invalid units shall be removed from Point Roberts within 90 days.**
- * All lots occupied shall have a Whatcom County approved waste treatment system and a county approved portable water supply suitable for the number of occupants habituating the premises.**

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment.

The comments from Pat Harper about trailers, RVs and boats should be reviewed by PDS (Cliff Strong) to see how this is or could be addressed (enforced) by Whatcom County.

20.72.150 Conditional uses.

All conditional uses in the underlying zone districts shall remain conditional uses unless expressly prohibited by this chapter. In addition, the following uses shall only be conditionally permitted:

.151 Outside of Resort Commercial District (RC) zones, Hotels, motels and time share condominiums.

PRCAC voted 4:1 to make hotels, motels and time share condominiums permitted uses in Resort Commercial District zones; see also [new] .157.

.152 Surface and subsurface mining including the extraction of sand and gravel shall be conditionally permitted in the Rural Zone under the provisions set forth in WCC 20.36.150.

.153 In the R5A Zone located west of the Point Roberts Marina and east of Marine Drive, an air park facility/subdivision and commercial activities incidental to aviation facilities may be conditionally permitted; provided, that:

(1) The proposed air park will comply with national, state and local aviation regulations and safety standards; and

(2) Residential development shall be subordinate to the primary airstrip operations; and

(3) An air park shall include a 50-foot vegetated buffer between the proposed facility/subdivision and adjacent parcels; provided, that the required buffer may be reduced or eliminated where such a buffer might otherwise interfere with site access; use of the airstrip and/or taxi way(s); health and safety of air park residents, visitors or operators; and/or FAA regulations. Any open space reserve tract(s) associated with the proposed air park shall be exempt from the buffer requirements of this section; provided, that the open space reserve tract establishes a minimum distance of 50 feet between the air park facility/subdivision and adjacent parcels; and

(4) If a proposed subdivision, binding site plan, or short subdivision is located adjacent to an existing airstrip, the developer and any subsequent purchasers or successors in interest shall agree to refrain from any legal action to restrain or collect damages from the owners or users, or from Whatcom County, arising out of normal operation or use of the airstrip. The agreement shall appear as a covenant or deed restriction upon the plat, tract or instrument of conveyance and shall run with the land.

.154 In the Rural District, private commercial sports facilities and clubs are permitted as conditional uses under WCC 20.36.165 shall include horse racing facilities and pari-mutuel wagering as regulated and licensed by the Washington State Horse Racing Commission, together with the usual accessory uses including club house, food and beverage service, restaurant and stables.

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

.155 In the Resort Commercial District, dry boat storage, including stacked storage, and boat trailer storage associated with a marina. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999).

Comment from PRRVA — County Code requires boat storage to be located in 20.65 Gateway Industrial (GI) District Zoning.

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment. We don't have a GI zone.

[New] .156 In the Small Town Commercial Zone District, the following are permitted as Conditional uses:

(1) Animal kennels not associated with a veterinary practice.

(2) Facilities for service, repair or washing of motorized vehicles and equipment, motorcycles, marine, farm implements, light and heavy equipment, and recreational vehicles.

(3) Facilities for commercial storage or sale of motorized vehicles and equipment, motorcycles, marine [vessels or equipment], farm implements, light and heavy equipment, and recreational vehicles.

(4) Additional recreational vehicle parks.

The PRCAC voted 4:1 to change these Prohibited Uses to be Conditional Uses in the STC District zone.

[New] .157 In Resort Commercial District (RC) zones, hotels, motels and time share condominiums are permitted.

The PRCAC voted 4:1 to change .151 to allow these uses in Resort Commercial.

20.72.200 Prohibited uses.

In addition to the uses prohibited in the underlying zone districts, the following uses are prohibited:

.201 Service stations in all zones, except expansion of existing service stations by adding additional pumps or hose dispensers.

.202 The following uses are prohibited in the Resort Commercial Zone District in the Maple Beach area of Point Roberts:

- (1) Rooming houses.**
- (2) Taverns.**
- (3) Commercial parking lots or garages.**

DG will check with representative of the Maple Beach Residents Association on their position on these restrictions. With only one resident comment, PRCAC agreed to take no action at this time.

.204 The following uses are prohibited in the Small Town Commercial Zone District ~~along Gulf Road only:~~

- (1) Mini storage facilities.**
- (2) ~~Animal kennels not associated with a veterinary practice.~~**
- (3) ~~Motorized vehicles and equipment, motorcycle, marine, farm implement, light and heavy equipment, recreational vehicle service, repair, washing facilities, commercial storage or sale.~~**
- (4) ~~Additional recreational vehicle parks.~~**

(5) Cemeteries. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2011-013 § 2 Exh. B, 2011; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999; Ord. 92-007, 1992).

The PRCAC voted 4:1 to remove (2), (3) and (4) from Prohibited Uses and add them to Conditional Uses under 20.72.150. (See, new .156). PRCAC voted 5:0 to remove the “Gulf Road only” limitation.

Questions for PDS (Cliff Strong):

- * How did Dr. Dower overcome the prohibited status of mini-storage facilities in STC in his action against PDS? (Was there a court ruling?)**
- * How can Lorne Nielson’s (formerly Dr. Dower’s) mini-storage facility expand to get the additional, previously approved storage units, if the facility was permitted as non-conforming use, which precludes such a change?**

20.72.250 Minimum lot size.

.251 Where the cluster subdivision option is used to protect a critical area:

(1) A parcel size reduction of five percent may be granted where average parcel size (except the reserve tract) is less than 10,000 square feet; or

(2) A parcel size reduction of 10 percent may be granted where average parcel size (except the reserve tract) is 10,000 square feet; or

(3) More of a reduction may be granted only if the resultant lots are able to meet the applicable development standards of this title and other county ordinances, including setbacks and minimum reserve tract area. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999; Ord. 98-083 Exh. A § 56, 1998).

20.72.260 Maximum density.

.261 Except as modified by this chapter, all residential densities in the Rural General Commercial, Small Town Commercial and Resort Commercial Zones shall not exceed 10 units per acre.

.262 For the purpose of developing an air park facility only, the parcels zoned R5A that are located west of the Point Roberts Marina and east of Marine Drive, including the airstrip property, may be developed as a cluster development at a maximum density of one dwelling unit per acre. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999).

20.72.270 Subdivision requirements.

.271 Lands within the Rural Zone District in Point Roberts shall be exempt from the provisions of the Agriculture Protection Overlay District, Chapter 20.38 WCC. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003).

20.72.350 Building setbacks/buffer areas. (~~Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.~~)

Due to the changed status of the Point Roberts Character Plan, the subtitle references “Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.” was removed at each occurrence.

(1) Building setbacks along Tye Drive and Roosevelt Road are increased to 50 feet and 40 feet respectively. In existing treed areas along Tye Drive and Roosevelt Road, a 50-foot/40-foot vegetative buffer comprised of existing trees shall be maintained for visual or aesthetic purposes except for necessary ingress and egress points. In open areas a 50-foot/40-foot planted buffer shall be developed as part of the normal landscape requirements for site development.

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

(2) Within the Small Town Commercial Zone along Gulf Road, commercial, institutional and mixed use building setbacks shall be reduced to 10 feet. Buildings oriented towards the street edge shall be encouraged and the front of buildings shall be designated for landscaping and pedestrian traffic.

This change allows 10 foot setbacks on the part of Tye Drive in STC.

Approved by PRCAC (5:0).

(3) The provisions of WCC 20.64.353 shall not apply to single-family residences in the Resort Commercial District at Point Roberts. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2013-057 § 1 (Exh. A), 2013; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999).

20.72.400 Height limitations.

.401 The maximum building height within the Small Town Commercial Zone along Gulf Road shall be 45 feet. Height of structures shall also conform to the view corridor provisions of WCC 20.72.654 and the general requirements of WCC 20.80.675.

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

.402 The maximum building height in all other zones shall be 25 feet unless further restricted by the Whatcom County Shoreline Management Program. Height of structures shall also conform to the general requirements of WCC 20.80.675 where applicable.

.403 Through the variance process established in Chapter 20.84 WCC, the maximum building height for any use outside of the Small Town Commercial Zone may be increased to 45 feet under the following conditions:

(1) The resultant higher structure will not unreasonably impede views from other properties any more than would a similar structure of the same mass which conforms to the 25-foot maximum building height.

(2) Building setbacks pursuant to this chapter and WCC 20.80.200 shall be increased by one foot for each foot of building height in excess of 25 feet as applicable to all setbacks. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999).

20.72.650 Development criteria.

(Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999; Ord. 96-056 Att. A § A1, 1996).

20.72.651 Facility design. (~~Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.~~)

(1) All commercial and institutional use structures shall be consistent with the Point Roberts design guidelines, which are herein adopted by reference as an addendum to this chapter.

(2) All commercial and institutional structures shall screen roof-mounted mechanical equipment so as not to be visible by surrounding uses or roads. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2016-035 § 1 (Exh. A), 2016; Ord. 2013-057 § 1 (Exh. A), 2013; Ord. 2005-079 § 1, 2005; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-073, 1999; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999; Ord. 96-056 Att. A § Q1, 1996).

20.72.652 Archaeological resources.

(1) Applicability. This section shall apply to regulated development activities within 500 feet of all known archaeological sites, including all recorded sites listed with the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. The provisions of this section shall also apply to any archaeological resources that are inadvertently discovered in association with regulated development activities pursuant to this title; provided, that the provisions of this section may be waived if the technical administrator determines that the proposed development activities do not include any ground-disturbing activities and will not impact a regulated archaeological resource.

(2) Archaeological Resource Protection.

(a) Upon receipt of application for a development permit on properties within 500 feet of a site known to contain archaeological resources, the department shall require an archaeological resources site assessment. The site assessment shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist at the expense of the applicant or project proponent to determine the presence of significant archaeological resources.

(b) If the archaeological resources site assessment identifies the presence of significant archaeological resources, an Archaeological Resource Management Plan (ARMP) shall be prepared by a professional archaeologist. The professional archaeologist shall solicit comments from the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Lummi Nation

Historic Preservation Office, and Nooksack Tribe. Comments received shall be incorporated into the conclusions and recommended conditions of the ARMP to the maximum practicable.

(i) An ARMP shall contain the following minimum elements:

(A) The purpose of the project, an examination of project on-site design alternatives, and an explanation of why the proposed activity requires a location on, or access across and/or through, a significant archaeological resource; and

(B) A description of the archaeological resources affected by the proposal; and

(C) An assessment of the archaeological resource and an analysis of the potential adverse impacts as a result of the activity; and

(D) An analysis of how these impacts have been avoided; or

(E) Where avoidance is not possible, how these impacts have been mitigated/minimized; and

(F) A recommendation of appropriate mitigation measures, which may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Recording the site with the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation;
2. Reinterment in the case of grave sites;
3. Covering the site with a nonstructural surface to discourage pilferage (e.g., maintained grass or pavement);
4. Excavation and recovery of resources;
5. Inventorying prior to covering of resources with structures or development; and
6. Monitoring of construction excavation.

(ii) The recommendations and conclusions of the ARMP shall be used to assist the technical administrator in making final administrative decisions concerning the presence and extent of archaeological resources and appropriate mitigating measures. The technical administrator shall consult with the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Lummi Nation Historic Preservation Office, and Nooksack Tribe prior to approval of the ARMP.

(iii) The technical administrator may reject or request revision of the conclusions reached in an ARMP when the technical administrator can demonstrate that the assessment is inaccurate or does not fully address the archaeological resource management concerns involved.

(c) Within 15 days of receipt of a complete development permit application in an area of known archaeological resources, the county shall notify and request a recommendation from appropriate agencies such as the Whatcom Museum, Western Washington University Anthropology Department, the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, the Lummi Nation Historic

Preservation Office, and Nooksack Tribe. Recommendations of such agencies and other affected persons shall be duly considered and adhered to whenever possible and reasonable. Notification shall include the following information:

- (i) The date of application, the date of notice of completion for the application, and the date of the notice of application;
- (ii) The date, time, place, and type of the hearing, if applicable, and scheduled at the date of notice of the application;
- (iii) A site map including the street address, tax parcel number, township, range, and section of the proposed project area;
- (iv) A description of the proposed project action and a list of the project permits included in the application, and, if applicable, a list of any studies requested by the county;
- (v) The identification of other permits not included in the application to the extent known by the county;
- (vi) The identification of existing environmental documents that evaluate the proposed project and, if not otherwise stated on the document providing notice of application, the location where the application and any studies can be reviewed;
- (vii) Any other information determined appropriate by the county;
- (viii) A statement indicating those development regulations that will be used for project mitigation or a determination of consistency if they have been identified at the time of notice;
- (ix) A statement of the limits of the public comment period, the right of each agency to comment on the application within a 15-day time period, receive notice of and participate in any hearings, request a copy of the decision once made, and to appeal a decision when allowed by law. In addition, the statement shall indicate that any agency wishing to receive personal notice of any hearings must notify the hearing examiner's office within 15 days of the date of the notice of application.
- (d) In granting development permits, the county may attach reasonable conditions to provide sufficient time and/or conditions for consultation with the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Lummi Nation Historic Preservation Office and Nooksack Tribe, and to assure that valuable information and materials are properly protected, or for appropriate agencies to contact property owners regarding purchase or other long-term arrangements. Provision for the protection and preservation of archaeological sites shall be incorporated to the maximum extent possible.

(3) Inadvertent Discovery.

- (a) Whenever historic, cultural or archaeological sites or artifacts of potential significance are discovered in the process of development, work on that portion of the development site shall be stopped immediately and the find reported as soon as possible to the county.

(b) The administrator shall then notify the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Lummi Nation Historic Preservation Office, Nooksack Tribe and other appropriate agencies and shall request that an immediate site assessment be conducted by a professional archaeologist pursuant to subsection (2)(a) of this section to determine the significance of the discovery. If a positive determination is not received within 14 days of receipt of such request, or if a negative determination is received, such stopped work may resume.

(c) On receipt of a positive determination of the site's significance, the administrator may invoke the provisions of subsection (2)(b) of this section. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999; Ord. 96-056 Att. A § A2, 1996; Ord. 93-028, 1993).

20.72.653 Landscaping, screening, and tree canopy retention. (~~Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.~~)

In addition to compliance with all other requirements of this title and other titles of the Whatcom County Code, development activities shall be subject to the following provisions:

(1) Landscaping.

(a) Where possible the removal of existing vegetation should be minimized in areas that possess a natural beauty.

(b) Special efforts shall be made to preserve existing stands of healthy trees throughout the area proposed for development.

(c) Long expanses of fencing should be broken up by the use of landscaping.

(d) The practice of monoculture shall be avoided. Plantings should have variety in their design.

(e) Attention should be given to the growth rate of the planting materials used and how they will relate to the site in the future.

(2) Screening.

(a) Dumpster and utility areas of businesses or other use buildings, and stored vehicles, trailers, or truck containers in commercial areas shall be screened, using earth berms, landscaping or building wall, or living wall (i.e., fabricated wall with vertical living vegetation).

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

Ask PDS (Cliff Strong) if the proposed changes to .653(2)(a) strengthens or conflicts with the other two related proposals regarding storage units ([new] .052 and [new] .156).

(3) Tree Canopy Retention.

(a) In the RC, RGC, and STC Districts, existing tree canopy areas (as defined by the dripline of the tree(s)) may be used to meet all or part of the open space requirements of this title. If existing tree canopy areas do not fully satisfy the minimum open space requirements of the applicable zone district, the remainder of the required open space shall be subject to the landscaping requirements established in WCC 20.80.300.

(b) In the RR, TZ and R Districts:

(i) Residential Development.

(A) Lots less than one-half acre may remove 100 percent of the existing tree canopy on site; provided, that 30 percent of the pre-existing tree canopy shall be replanted.

(B) Lots greater than, or equal to, one-half acre shall retain 30 percent of the existing tree canopy area on a lot. Trees may be removed within areas to be cleared for purposes of a building site, driveways, parking areas, and areas to be landscaped, but such areas shall not exceed 5,000 square feet or 70 percent, whichever is greater, of the total lot area.

Comment from PRTA — Language within 20.72.653 pertaining to Tree Retention should be clarified and tightened up, particularly the 30% baseline rule.

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment. (The current rule seems to cover the 30% tree retention already.)

(C) On lots greater than one acre, no more than 50 percent of the existing tree canopy area shall be removed.

(ii) Commercial, institutional and recreational development may use existing tree canopy areas to meet all or part of the landscaping requirements of this title.

(c) The following criteria shall be used to determine which tree canopy areas are to be prioritized for retention:

(i) Stands of mature native trees;

(ii) Trees on sensitive slopes, on lands classified as having landslide hazards, or high erosion hazards, as defined under the critical areas ordinance;

(iii) Trees within critical areas or their associated setback and/or buffer areas as defined under WCC Title 16 or 23; or

(iv) Trees with significant habitat value as identified by a qualified wildlife biologist or by the technical administrator, per WCC Title 16.

(d) A 200-meter protective buffer of existing trees and vegetation shall be maintained around the Heronry.

(e) Buffering which recognizes the need for safety and the unique features of Lily Point shall be required on the Lily Point. No development shall take place in such areas.

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

(f) The county shall require that tree canopy areas to be retained are identified on a site plan and clearly flagged, or delineated, on the site. A tree canopy area retention plan must accompany a project or clearing permit application and be approved by the technical administrator before clearing activity takes place. The plan shall contain the following components:

(i) A scaled drawing identifying the following:

(A) North arrow;

(B) Property boundaries;

(C) Existing structures;

(D) Site access;

(E) Tree canopy areas to be removed;

(F) The outer dripline of tree canopy areas to be retained;

(G) Critical areas including, but not limited to, slopes, wetlands, and habitat conservation areas;

(H) Protection measures to be utilized for areas that will be undisturbed; and

(I) Areas to be replanted pursuant to subsection (3)(i) of this section;

(ii) A planting schedule that indicates the time frame for replanting of trees as applicable; and

(iii) Provisions for maintenance and monitoring.

(g) Prior to any land clearing activity or development activity, any tree canopy areas designated for retention shall be delineated by temporary fencing, tape, or other indicators around the outer dripline of the trees. Temporary fencing, tape, or other indicators shall be clearly visible and shall be maintained for the duration of the proposed clearing or development activity. Any tree canopy areas designated for retention shall be field verified by the technical administrator before clearing activities begin. Trees within canopy areas designated for retention shall not be damaged by clearing, excavation, ground surface level changes, soil compaction, or any other activities that may cause damage of roots or trunks. Machinery, impervious surfaces, fill and storage of construction materials shall be kept outside of the dripline of tree canopy areas designated for retention.

(h) Tree canopy areas may be removed when limited to those canopy areas affected under the following circumstances:

- (i) Fire prevention methods when supported by the county fire marshal;
 - (ii) Hazard trees, as defined in Chapter 20.97 WCC, are identified (an evaluation and determination by a licensed arborist or forester may be required);
 - (iii) Encroachments where the trunk, branches or roots would be, or are, in contact with main or accessory structures; or
 - (iv) Where installation and/or maintenance of roads or utilities would unavoidably require removal or cut through the root system.
- (i) In the event that tree canopy areas in excess of the applicable threshold must be removed to facilitate reasonable use of the site, or to eliminate hazard trees, not less than two replacement trees shall be planted for every tree removed. Replacement trees shall:
- (i) Be of the same, or similar, native species as those trees removed from the site;
 - (ii) Be planted to re-establish tree clusters where they previously existed, or to enhance protected tree clusters;
 - (iii) Be planted in locations appropriate to the species' growth habitat and horticultural requirements; and
 - (iv) Be located away from areas where damage is likely.
- (j) If any trees within canopy areas designated for retention are damaged or destroyed through the fault of the applicant, agent or successor, the applicant, their agent or successor shall restore the site pursuant to a restoration plan approved by the county.
- (k) The county may require a bond or other security in an amount not to exceed 125 percent of the merchantable timber to guarantee retention of existing trees within designated tree canopy areas during construction. In the event of a dispute between the landowner and the county over the established value, an assessment will be made by a professional forester or arborist whose selection will be made by mutual agreement between the county and the landowner. The fee for the services of the professional forester or arborist shall be paid by the landowner or responsible party. In the event any trees designated to be retained are removed, the county shall require that sufficient trees be replanted to replace those previously in existence. In the event that replanting does not occur, the county may enforce upon any bond posted. Each tree removed or destroyed shall constitute a separate violation. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2013-057 § 1 (Exh. A), 2013; Ord. 2011-013 § 2 Exh. B, 2011; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003).

Comment from the PRТА — Language within 20.72.653 pertaining to Tree Retention should be clarified and tightened up, particularly the 30% baseline rule.

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment.

20.72.654 Site design/view corridors. (~~Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.~~)

Scenic views and open space shall be considered in all developments and the site plan designed to ensure view access is maximized while maintaining reasonable use of the development site. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2013-057 § 1 (Exh. A), 2013; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999. Formerly 20.72.653).

20.72.655 Public restrooms and trash facilities.

All new and redeveloped commercial establishments on Point Roberts that are open to the public shall make adequate provision for trash disposal and handicapped-accessible public restrooms. Establishments with less than four employees on premises at one time may utilize a unisex facility. Commercial complexes may provide common restrooms and/or trash disposal, or two or more establishments in one commercial area may jointly provide for such facilities, subject to appropriate agreements or covenants to ensure the facilities are available and properly maintained. Dumpsters within commercial areas shall be screened from public view using landscaping or building walls. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999. Formerly 20.72.654).

20.72.656 Vehicular access.

Driveways and curb cuts shall be minimized along all collector roads. Each existing lot shall be allowed only one driveway or curb cut; adjacent lots are encouraged to share access points. In new developments, lots or leased sites shall be oriented toward internal driveways, parking areas, or roads, with limited access to collector roads. These access points should normally not be closer than 400 feet apart. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999. Formerly 20.72.655).

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this section.

20.72.657 Nonvehicular access.

(1) Commercial development or redevelopment of any parcel along Tyee Drive, Gulf Road, Marine Drive and APA Road shall be required to install appropriate street improvements along the road frontage of the parcel which may include curbs, gutters, sidewalks, boardwalks, benches, lighting, and appropriate provisions for bicycle and equestrian facilities in accordance with applicable Comprehensive Plan policies, land use regulations and current road standards. Planting of street trees along the road frontage(s) of the subject parcel shall be required. These requirements may be waived if a local improvement district, road improvement district, or transportation benefit district is formed for the purpose of providing the aforementioned improvements.

(2) Commercial development of any parcel along a collector street shall require a no-protest agreement to participate in a local improvement district, road improvement district, or

transportation benefit district. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999; Ord. 98-083 Exh. A § 66, 1998. Formerly 20.72.656).

20.72.658 Drainage.

All development activities are subject to the stormwater management provisions of WCC 20.80.630 through 20.80.635. No project permit shall be issued prior to meeting those requirements. (Ord. 2019-013 § 1 (Exh. A), 2019; Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002; Ord. 99-044 § 1, 1999; Ord. 96-056 Att. A § A2, 1996; Ord. 94-022, 1994. Formerly 20.72.657).

20.72.659 Parking.

Parking shall conform to the requirements of WCC 20.80.500 unless otherwise specified in this section.

Within the Small Town Commercial Zone:

(1) When feasible, Pparking lots shall be provided only at the rear or side of buildings. However when necessary to allow permitting of the project, alternate parking lot locations may be permitted.

Approved by PRCAC (5:0).

(2) New parking lots shall connect with existing parking facilities and allow for connection to future lots where applicable.

(3) Minimum parking standards may be reduced if a shared parking agreement has been filed with the county auditor's office establishing a shared parking lot for land uses with noncompeting hours of operation, or for multitenant retail and commercial facilities; provided, the parking lot is not located further than 700 feet from any of the uses it is intended to serve.

(a) The minimum required parking in shared facilities shall be based on the land use with the highest parking demand.

(b) Mixed use development with similar operating hours may be required to submit a parking demand study to determine if parking can be combined.

(4) Minimum parking standards along Gulf Road may be reduced to the minimum required emergency, ADA, and/or service parking only; provided, that it can be demonstrated that a public benefit parking area or other similar consolidated parking concept will adequately serve the proposed use.

(a) A parking demand study shall be submitted which determines whether all land uses intending to utilize the consolidated parking area will be adequately served.

(b) Pedestrian walkways connecting the proposed use with a consolidated parking area shall be provided. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2003-052 § 1, 2003; Ord. 2002-019, 2002. Formerly 20.72.658).

From earlier discussion : Ask Whatcom County Public Works to eliminate 10.24 parking codes: 10.24.0304, .0404 and .0600.

Approved by PRCAC (5:0)

When submitting 20.72 changes to PDS, also ask CPW to change 10.24 subsections. If the parking restriction on both sides of Gulf Road cannot be removed, seek removal of restriction on one side of Gulf Road.

20.72.670 Signs and flag poles.

(1) Signs in the Small Town Commercial (STC), Rural General Commercial (RGC), Rural Industrial Manufacturing (RIM), and Resort Commercial (RC) Zones are permitted subject to the provisions of WCC 20.80.410 and 20.80.470, and subject to the following:

(a) Not more than one freestanding sign is permitted on a lot of record, and a freestanding sign shall have no more than two sign faces. Freestanding signs shall not exceed 12 feet in height and shall not exceed 40 square feet in area per sign face.

(b) Not more than 10 square feet of sign area per sign face may be internally illuminated. Characters within the internally illuminated sign area shall be achromatic and no larger than six inches tall. Signs may be externally illuminated.

LH proposed to remove the requirement that signs be “achromatic”. SF and SW opposed this change. Later, PRTA voted to remove the achromatic restriction. PRRVA and CoC representative members did not express a position and will review the issue with their groups. No final action taken at this time.

(c) Single-faced signs placed on walls or eaves of business establishments shall not exceed a total of 40 square feet per business establishment.

(d) Signs shall not rotate or otherwise be in motion, and copy or pictures on the sign shall not flash, scroll, or display a video or animated image.

LH proposed to remove the requirement that signs not rotate or move. SF and SW (and PRTA) opposed this change. PRRVA and CoC representative members did not express a position and will review the issue with their groups. No final action taken at this time.

(e) For purposes of this section, any sign erected or existing as of July 1, 2016, that has a valid permit from the department, but does not conform with the provisions of this section, is a nonconforming sign. A nonconforming sign may be maintained only by painting or refinishing the surface of the sign face or sign structure so as to keep the appearance of the sign as it was when the prior permit was issued. Any structural or other substantial maintenance to a

nonconforming sign shall render the prior permit void and shall result in the reclassification of such sign as an illegal sign. Where there are conflicts between this section and Chapter 20.83 WCC, the provisions of this section shall prevail.

(2) Flag Poles.

(a) The height of flag poles shall not exceed 20 feet.

(b) Flag poles on top of buildings shall not exceed 10 feet above the roof top. (Ord. 2017-026 § 2 Exh. B; Ord. 2016-035 § 1 (Exh. A), 2016).

Comment from the PRTA — 20.72.670 which references a unique foot height restriction for flagpoles should be scrubbed. Flagpole height should conform to the otherwise accepted 25 foot structural limit.

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment.

Design Guidelines

PRCAC voted earlier to leave the Design Guidelines as they are now, but are open to future discussions of revisions.

[old] Questions for Cliff Strong:

Have the Design Guidelines caused problems with any commercial developments in Point Roberts? **ANS: No , none.**

The Design Guidelines have 49 uses of “shalls”. Please discuss the impact of leaving all of these in the Design Guidelines if the PRCAC desires to maintain some leeway for builders? **ANS: The PRCAC can affirm the Design Guidelines for a Permit Application or advise a waiver.**

Comment from the PRTA:

a. All design reviews apply to any residential use structure in a Resort Commercial or Small Town Commercial Zone. Additionally, within the spirit of the Sub-area Plan, any and all Commercial development – regardless of zoning area – must adhere to accepted design guidelines within the new 20.72.

b. Clause 3.2 D-4 in the current Character Plan, “Parking areas shall be located at the rear or side of buildings” is recognized as a needless hardship and should be scrubbed from the revised 20.72.

c. References to “West Coast Modern” architecture and design should be maintained.

d. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of an “Affordable Housing” element within 20.72.

e. Any and all references to “Architectural Standards” should be scrubbed.

The PRCAC decided to take No Action on this comment.

Question for PDS (Cliff Strong): Do we need to change the wording of the PRCAC review parameters to make sure that building “improvements” come before the PRCAC for review?

The PRCAC did not review the ongoing changes taking place at the Chevron filling station on Tyee Drive. Was that just due to an oversight by the previous PRCAC chairperson?