Commissioner Caldwell moved to amend Section 16.15.020 Paragraph A, Public Review, to add a paragraph indicating that all institutional uses will require public review as part of the site plan review. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Koetje for purposes of discussion.

Mr. Smith confirmed the Planning Commission took public comment on changing this, and it was not that adverse to making provisions for administrative determination in certain cases, such as a small transformer station for Puget Power. He agrees with providing public notice in the papers for all cases prior to the Planning Director's administrative determination becoming final.

Commissioner Colby agrees that if public concern is indicated that it must go to a public review process; the key is making sure that the public is aware of the project.

Mr. Caldwell is concerned there is a process simply because it is for a governmental agency, since governmental agencies can abuse land use just as much as a private developer.

Mr. Granger, in looking through the list, noted that the only things that could be handled administratively would be the utility facilities; any of the institutional uses listed would have to be judged in accordance with relative size, where located, etc.

Bill Semple, Freeland, felt that administrative review should be limited to minor changes for an existing site, for example, the school building change Mr. Granger previously noted, but would not agree with an administrative review for such things as a transformer power station, etc.

Commissioner Colby feels the question is just as legitimately asked, should not governmental proposals at least enjoy a similar way of approval as non-governmental?

Commissioner Caldwell agreed. He noted that the control factor for non-governmental agencies in NR is the fact that the only time they can utilize the site plan review is if the area is already zoned Commercial. He could exempt minor changes to existing uses to existing facilities as appropriate for administrative review, but cannot conceive of any new institutional use that he could categorically say should be exempt from the public review process. The appropriateness of the siting has to be addressed in Site Plan Review, a public process. Probably expansion should also be required to go through that process because a significant expansion could dramatically change the impact on the community.

The motion was re-read: move to amend Section 16.15.020 Paragraph A, Public Review, to add a paragraph indicating that all institutional uses will require public review as part of the site plan review.

Commissioner Colby did not support the motion as made, but indicated he could with a caveat that certain types of things the Planning Director could work with. He feels that the motion thwarts the efforts which the Planning Commission went through to give flexibility to the administration of the ordinance, and negates what the Commission has come up with. Although he has some of the same concerns about review of institutional uses, he thinks that if the public is well notified that a particular institutional use is being considered and any public interest is evidenced, that is what should be used to indicate to the Planning Director that indeed this has impact and should go through public review.

Don Jewett, Langley, feels that defining institutional uses is difficult, and should not be handled administratively. He mentioned that a bigger over-riding matter is the fundamental question of how much does the County let the public into what is going on. He believes the County should lean towards letting the public in rather than keeping them out for the sake of expediency.

Mr. Granger asked the Board to consider one of the main purposes for some of the amendments: as much relating to the time savings to the public as it is the number of files and the amount of staff time it takes to deal with each.

Commissioner Colby favors the recommendation of the Planning Commission, with a caveat added to require additional public awareness of anything being considered administratively.

Commissioner Caldwell is open to language to exempt certain types of minor activities from public review process; however, that is not before the Board today and does not it can be developed at this time, and stands by his motion.

Commissioner Koetje has been in favor all along of being able to do more administratively, but is concerned because institutional use covers such a variety of things. He looks for a compromise; suggested tabling the motion to give the Planning Department an opportunity to come up with some uses that could be exempt.

A compromise was suggested by Ms. Lee similar to that as for a plat alteration; give public notice of the proposed change to property owners within the subdivision and within 300' of the proposal--if no public requests are received for a hearing within 14 days, that it be done through the administrative process. Both signs and notices could be provided (with continued right to appeal the administrative decision).

The motion made by Commissioner Caldwell did not pass; Commissioners Koetje and Colby voting in opposition.

Another motion was made by Commissioner Caldwell to amend Section 16.15.020 Paragraph A, Public Review, to add a paragraph indicating that all institutional uses proposed by or in conjunction with Island County or PTBA will require public review as part of the Site Plan Review. Motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Colby moved adoption of the proposed Non-Residential Zone Ordinance Amendments, with the amendment that public notice be required on any site plan review that is contemplated to be conducted in the administrative matter through newspaper advertisement and direct notification to property owners living within a radius of 1000 feet of the proposed project (defined as being from the boundary lines of the property). Motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Lee confirmed that a sign is already provided, along with a notice to surrounding property owners within 300'.

Commissioner Colby moved adoption of the proposed Non-Residential Zone Ordinance Amendments before the Board, amended with the language just heard, <u>including</u> a 14-day full public notification period, including newspaper advertisement, signing on the property, and direct notification to the property owners living within 300' of the boundary of the property in question. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Koetje.

Bill Van Almkerk, Camano Island, viewed the Planning Commission recommendation as having not been made lightly, and believed the County would be at fault it if did not allow the Planning Director some degree of latitude.

Earl Darst, Coupeville, discussed the feasibility of requiring a determination of significance; Bill Dorsey, Coupeville, requested clarification on the proposed 300' notification. Commissioner Colby clarified that the 300' would be from the boundary lines of the property.

Miriam Halsen questioned who would make the decision on how many complaints would be received before public review is required.