2.c Comprehensive planning in and around urban areas should be mutually supported. Areas should be established as urban growth boundaries, defining limits or urbanization, and assuring that plans for these areas are mutually adopted to assure adequate provision of future facilities and service.

II-48 Government Policies: (New Action Recommended)

4. In order to facilitate intergovernmental coordination, Island County should pursue the development of "zones of influence" agreements around urban areas to clarify development objectives between planning officials and elected officials. Establishment of a review process should be considered to review future annexations for consistency with adopted objectives. (Exhibit 9 for the record)

A recommended change in further clarification is proposed at this time under II-1, Master Plan Concept (Amending P.C. Rec.) 1.a. to read:

"High density residential development is encouraged.....".

A further amendment proposed this date for consideration relates to "Amendments - Exhibit III, Proposed Non-Residential Policy Changes to the ICC 17.02 Zoning Ordinance, inserted on page 12 of the ordinance, as follows:

Section Changes c.1 h. Bed and Breakfast Rooms shall register with the Island County Health Department to assure that sanitation standards are met. (Exhibit 10 for the Record)

Companion with the newpaper published copy (specifically Exhibits III and III) Keith Dearborn, Planning Consultant, called attention to the Legislative Intent Statements for the Site Plan Review Process and the Zoning Ordinance (Marked for purposes of this record as Exhibit 11), recommending same be read carefully since it is new to Island County -- used first in terms of concept with the Short Plat Ordinance. Mr. Dearborn noted that the Zoning Legislative Intent Statement would continue to be expanded each month as another topic is added. Mr. Dearborn reviewed the newly imposed language to ICC 17.02 (Page 12) c-1 h-bed and breakfast rooms as requested per letter from Maxine Geisel, and referenced letter from Louise Harvey concerning the parking requirements for motels/hotels. That that regard, Mr. Dearborn brought the Board's attention to a letter in response to Ms. Harvey's concerns from Frank Spanjer, Civil Engineer, Island County Engineering Department, dated 2 April 1984 (Exhibit 12) essentially agreeing with Ms. Harvey, and suggesting wording to Section 17.02.080; 8(d):

8(d) Each individual parking space for standard size (large) cars shall typically have a minimum area of 162 square feet, and a min-
(9x18) imum width of nine (9) feet. When parking spaces are allocated for compact (small) cars, each space shall typically have a minim-
(8x16) um area of 128 square feet and a minimum width of eight (8) feet, providing that when both size spaces are utilized, the compact car parking spaces are separated from the standard car parking spaces in a manner acceptable to the Island County Planning Department. (Optional: larger parking space sizes are encouraged for those developments where higher turnover self-parking may be expected.)

There are not changes suggested for the Site Plan Ordinance; both the Site Plan Ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance have been under review for some two plus months.

Mr. Dearborn addressed an area related to the Interim Zoning Ordinance Changes, 17.01 ICC in response to a letter from G. Tim Martin (noted as Exhibit 6, reference Page 4) relaying a series of events which occurred at the Planning Commission Meeting. In this particular case, Mr. Dearborn pointed out that the proposed Interim Zoning recommendations were considered first in the informational meetings held, at two subsequent workshops, and finally at public hearing. At the second workshop held which preceded the public hearing, attended by only two individuals, the Planning Commission discussed Bed and Breakfasts' appropriateness of being a conditional use or an outright permitted use, and then asked Staff to prepare an amendment to make it a permitted use; it was not a proposal of the Planning Commission to make it a permitted use, but that the matter be considered at the hearing. Mr. Martin's comment in his letter, Page 4 next to the last paragraph is correct -- the Planning Commission, at the time it came to consider the Interim Code, moved to make it a conditioned use, voted on it and then asked for public comment; an unfortunate series of events, one which every member of the Planning Commission would probably like to take back, however, Mr. Dearborn pointed out they then asked for public comment and acted on it a second time. Mr. Dearborn stated he

did not believe it fair to conclude that the Planning Commission reversed itself, but in fact had not taken a formal position on the matter but rather had discussed it at a workshop -- when they did ask for staff advice, both Mr. Madsen and Mr. Dearborn advised to retain conditioned use rather than the permitted use for those reasons described at the hearing.

It was noted by the Chairman that the preponderance of conflict received thus far related to the Bed and Breakfast issue, appearing that because of the timeframe, it might be prudent to avoid those issues and go on to the other matters to be covered this date. Mr. Dearborn agreed to the appropriateness of separating issues in a logical manner and concurred that in the hours of testimony and information meetings and workshops devoted to non-residential probably 95% of the time was spent on the bed and breakfast issue. He noted it would appear to therefore benefit everyone if those matters could be separated, i.e., sections related to definition, and the last provision for conditional use -- in this way, it would enable those people who came for other subjects to express their concerns and allow those present for the bed and breakfast issue only to also get an effective opportunity to express their concerns and suggestions.

PUBLIC COMMENT - GENERAL. The Chairman opened the hearing for public comment of a general nature, other than related to the bed and breakfast issue at this particular time.

Tom Roehl, Planning Consultant, Freeland, expressed concerns with respect to home industries since small scale and agricultural rural uses now permitted in the Rural Zone would not be permitted uses but rather classified as "home occupations". Mr. Roehl asked consideration for amendments in definition of "home occupation", noting with respect to South Whidbey should agricultural and rural uses be included as home occupations, almost 20% of the economic base would be based on home occupations and home industries which would be onerous financially. He expressed concern over the continued effort to classify currently zoned Commercial/Residential properties as interim zone and asked that these zones be established as Residential and Commercial zones rather than interim. Mr. Roehl had concerns with regard to the Binding Site Plan Ordinance in those sections established as "criteria for preliminary approval" which he feels in general to be unnecessary, creating a great deal of difficulty in assessing the value of projects or getting projects "on-board" as far as establishing hearings, etc.

Rufus Rose, South Whidbey, gave his opinion that adequate attention had not been given to the economic impacts, in line with the clear desire to tighten up regulations. He generally supported this tightening up but did not support the absence of anticipated impact on the economy of the County -- subdivided into four regions: North Whidbey (from Dugualla Bay North); Oak Harbor; Central Whidbey; South Whidbey and Camano Island. Mr. Rose expressed concern, in the absence of economic development consideration, that there may be a diminished concern for "start-up" businesses (mom & pop businesses, auto parts stores, wood-working shops, etc.) He feels a need for less than sophisticated commercial/industrial park-quality economic sites, but substantially more than a home or cottage type industry. He sees a tendancy towards the "gutting" of private/ individual property rights with the series of complex regulations which tend to make the unsophisticated citizen feel a slave to the courthouse, and expressed his belief that the Comprehensive Plan was the root cause of this problem and needs to be redone to reflect today's society and economic interests.

Commissioner Dunlop pointed out that Mr. Rose, Mr. Roehl and twelve other citizens have and do serve on a committee for economic planning (terms do not expire until 1985) and by Resolution dated 19 July 1982, the County did provide "....shall give appropriate consideration to economic values in the rule-making process along with environmental, social health and safety consideration.". The County's Economic Development Committee proposed development of tourism and generally favored cottage industries. The Committee discontinued meeting, as outlined in a letter dated October, 1981, due to the lack of State and Federal funding (the Committee now in an ad-hoc status). Commissioner Dunlop stated his opinion that the greatest potential for economic development, present source of economic security, source of employment, and the entity most vulnerable to being restricted and ultimately diminished or moved is the Whidbey Naval Air Station. Island County's economic development and planning efforts seeks in part to assure that growth does not strangle good neighbors through creeping encroachment. The Economic Development planning is a long-term analysis and plan, not a short-term effort, and is a matter which Island County is not unmindful of.