

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL  
**Planning and Development Committee**

November 5, 2003

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Committee Chair Seth Fleetwood in the Council Chambers, 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham, Washington.

Present:

Dan McShane  
Laurie Caskey-Schreiber

Absent:

None

Also Present:

Barbara Brenner  
Sharon Roy  
Sam Crawford

**COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

**1. RESOLUTION ADOPTING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OPEN SPACE  
TIMBER APPLICATIONS (AB2003-361)**

Elizabeth Olson, Planner, stated the first application is the Stargell application. Aubrey Stargell is a forester. She walked the property. He is planting several hundred trees. The property is prime for open space timber. The application received a good review of the timber management plan.

The second application is the Schoepach application. The Schoepach timber management plan is superb. The area is near the previous applicant's.

The third application is the Trillium application. The plan was superb. The land was formally owned by Trillium. One acre will be taken out, so it is just under the designated 20 acres. Ken Syre has a small nursery on the hill. The replanted trees are in beautiful health.

The fourth application is the Sterk application. The property is long and narrow. It borders open space/agriculture land. It is still in its original wooded state, and is between two agricultural parcels. It has a good timber management plan. The timber is as stated in the timber management plan.

The fifth application is the Moore application. The land is vacant, but is cut through by a stream. That acreage has been taken out. There is an area close to the road for a potential home site that has been taken out also. There is a good timber management plan that describes the parcel of land.

The sixth application is the Dettman application. The land was in designated forestry before it was divided. The property has fewer than the required 20 acres.

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1  
2 McShane asked how the actual tax designation amount works. Olson stated  
3 they won't know until it is approved and it goes through the point system.  
4 Ultimately it is approved and then goes to the Assessor's Office to a current use  
5 taxation. If taken out of this designation, the owner has to pay back taxes for the  
6 past seven years.

7  
8 The seventh application is the Anderson/Stern application. It's a superb  
9 place for timber.

10  
11 **McShane moved** to recommend approval of the resolution.

12  
13 **Motion carried unanimously.**

14  
15  
16 **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL –**  
17 **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

18  
19 **1. ORDINANCE ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE CHAPTER**  
20 **OF THE WHATCOM COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (CHAPTER 2),**  
21 **WHICH INCLUDES RURAL LANDS (AB2003-075E)**  
22

23 Kraig Olason, Senior Planner, stated the committee received an overview of  
24 the policy and made minor changes. The policies are good, in terms of the vision  
25 statement for the rural area of the county. He handed out his presentation (*on*  
26 *file*). He read from his presentation. The rural, one unit per five acres (R5A) zone  
27 allows one house per five acres. If they develop at that density, they will have a  
28 fairly divided up rural area.

29  
30 He compared the development patterns in 1996 with 2001. In 1995-1996,  
31 there were about 250 parcels in a four square mile area northwest of Ferndale. In  
32 2001, there are 328 parcels. Their options reduce rapidly as the divisions occur.

33  
34 Caskey-Schreiber asked if staff identified those R5A parcels in agricultural  
35 use for the purchase of development rights (PDR) program. Olason stated they  
36 have not. There was a lot of discussion about this area as a target area. It's so  
37 fragmented that it becomes difficult for someone who needs enough acreage to  
38 farm to get that acreage together at a convenient distance.

39  
40 Brenner asked if a lot of the property that has been parcelized will be used  
41 for agriculture. Olason stated they may not be used for agriculture already. One  
42 question is how much of this property that was parceled out is still getting  
43 agriculture tax benefits. As they go from larger to smaller lot sizes, the value  
44 someone has to produce to prove the property is in agricultural use goes up. When  
45 these convert, there's a lag time when they're not using the property for  
46 agriculture.  
47

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 Fleetwood asked if taking the designation away would increase the rate in  
2 which the property would be converted to something other than an agricultural use.  
3 Olason stated the designation doesn't go away until it's converted through a sale.  
4 The tax designation is a contract between the landowner and the county. When  
5 sold, the new owner might not be aware of the designation or understand what's  
6 required. Those properties are often identified when appraised during the four-year  
7 appraisal cycle.

8  
9 Caskey-Schreiber asked what the driver is for the development being done  
10 at the eight-square mile East Smith Road location northeast of Bellingham. Olason  
11 stated it is in the Lynden/Nooksack subarea. Five-acre zoning has been going on  
12 out there for 20 years. It's close to Bellingham. It has great views. These areas  
13 were farms that were marginal. They were the pastures, horse farms, and wood  
14 lots. Nothing stops R5A-zoned land from being divided into five-acre lots.

15  
16 He showed a series of aerial photographs of a farm on Smith Road, from  
17 1951 through the present date. When talking about existing development patterns,  
18 think about the impact to the lot, based on where the house is placed on the lot.  
19 Placing the house at the epicenter of the lot doesn't allow for many other uses. The  
20 property becomes just residential.

21  
22 Fleetwood asked the benefit to the public if designated as open space.  
23 Olason stated there isn't any benefit.

24  
25 Brenner stated that if there were trees, it could be used for eagle habitat.  
26 They can have open space and not provide public access, if there are certain  
27 significant things to protect.

28  
29 Olason stated the lots are big for residential use. If someone does not have  
30 agricultural water rights, they can only irrigate up to a quarter-acre. A lot of these  
31 areas won't have the water to have that kind of activity. Many of these areas don't  
32 have good soil. The soil is wet in the wintertime, and doesn't hold up if there is  
33 livestock on it.

34  
35 He showed aerial photographs of the Silverado long-plat. There are  
36 established one-acre building lots clustered on one end of the property. Those lots  
37 are selling for just as much as the five-acre lots. The complaint about this example  
38 is that it looks like they've dumped a subdivision in the rural area. Siting could  
39 have tempered that complaint a bit. The question of rural character is an issue.

40  
41 Brenner asked the source of water at that location. Olason stated they have  
42 two community wells. They're probably class B wells. When valuing farmland, they  
43 looked at cluster lots, which are required by the agricultural protection overlay  
44 regulations. When clustering, there is a question of who owns the reserve lot.

45  
46 McShane asked if it's too late to try and save the land in those areas, or if  
47 there are other areas where a change in policy would do better in retaining rural

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 character and maintaining agricultural land, however that's defined. Olason stated  
2 there are areas that are worth the effort. The policies are not necessarily creating  
3 the problem. There's a lag between the policy concepts and the regulations. Today  
4 they are looking at the policies. There's nothing wrong with the policies.  
5 Implementing the policies is always the hard part.  
6

7 Sylvia Goodwin, Planning Division Manager, stated she gave the  
8 councilmembers a map showing all the lot sizes. That map tells them a lot about  
9 the existing parcel areas. It shows which ones are five acres and the zoning is  
10 overlaid. There are still a few areas that are not subdivided as small as they could  
11 be. Those are the areas to preserve.  
12

13 **2. ORDINANCE AMENDING THE OFFICIAL WHATCOM COUNTY**  
14 **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP FOR 0.76 ACRES IN THE CROSSROADS**  
15 **COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION OF HINOTE'S CORNER (AB2003-075F)**  
16

17 Elizabeth Olson, Planner, stated this is an application for a rezone at Hinote's  
18 Corner. The acreage would have been an additional three acres of general  
19 commercial zoning. The existing parcel of land at the moment is totally flat. It has  
20 a long barn that was formerly used for agricultural purposes. The building has been  
21 re-roofed. It straddles the existing general commercial zoning line.  
22

23 Brenner asked if the current zoning is crossroads commercial. Olason stated  
24 the Comprehensive Plan designation is crossroads commercial. The zone is general  
25 commercial.  
26

27 Sylvia Goodwin, Planning Division Manager, stated the crossroads  
28 commercial also covers just the general commercial zone, and also cuts the  
29 building in half.  
30

31 *(Clerk's Note: End of tape one, side A)*  
32

33 Goodwin stated the crossroads commercial is just a Comprehensive Plan  
34 designation. It doesn't have specific allowed uses.  
35

36 Caskey-Schreiber asked when the area was designated. Olson stated it has  
37 been zoned general commercial since the 1980's. It was designated crossroads  
38 commercial in 1997.  
39

40 McShane asked if the general commercial zone is consistent with the  
41 crossroads commercial Comprehensive Plan policies for that area. Olson stated it  
42 is.  
43

44 McShane stated there are policies in the Comprehensive Plan for small town  
45 crossroad areas. He asked if general commercial zone would be consistent with the  
46 vision of a crossroads area or a small town, even if the general commercial zone  
47 allows for unlimited commercial-sized development.

1  
2 Goodwin stated all the small towns now have changed zoning to the small  
3 town commercial zone. The reason they left crossroads commercial areas in  
4 general commercial zone is mostly because of Nugent's Corner and the IGA located  
5 there. General commercial zone allows the larger buildings. They don't want to  
6 encourage Home Base or Wal-Mart in a rural area, but they don't want such small  
7 buildings that all they get are mini-marts.

8  
9 Caskey-Schreiber stated Nugent's Corner and Hinote's Corner are very  
10 different. Nugent's Corner is very rural. She referenced policy 2HH-3. Goodwin  
11 stated policy 2HH-3 is a proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan that has  
12 not yet been adopted. They are looking to make it more consistent with Growth  
13 Management Act legislation on areas of more intense rural development.

14  
15 Olson stated the staff report includes a description of and uses in the area.  
16 A major complication is the fact that the building straddles the zoning line. They  
17 would like to include the entire parcel, over five acres. Presently, there is just  
18 under two acres in the general commercial zone that fronts Hannegan Road. The  
19 area around it to north, east, and south is rural with houses. Staff looked at the  
20 fact that any changes would be to move the zoning line from straddling the building  
21 to go east of the building and go across the width of the lot, but no further.

22  
23 Caskey-Schreiber stated she would recuse herself from any further  
24 discussion because this is her neighborhood. She also assisted a neighbor who  
25 brought forth a petition they'll see later.

26  
27 *(Clerk's Note: Caskey-Schreiber left the meeting.)*

28  
29 Olson stated that in looking at the situation of pushing the entire parcel into  
30 general commercial, it would affect houses to the north, east, and south. There is  
31 no great necessity for all the acreage to be in the general commercial zone. Her  
32 recommendation is for one of four options. The Planning Commission decided that  
33 the best option would be to push the existing zoning line from 320 feet to 425 feet.  
34 It allows for truck turnarounds at the rear of the building.

35  
36 Brenner asked if it would affect any neighbor's property. Olson stated it  
37 would not. There are two small homes to the north. Only the subject property is  
38 affected.

39  
40 Brenner asked if there is a problem with making a straight boundary  
41 irregular. Olson stated there is no problem with it.

42  
43 McShane stated the staff recommendation was to move the line back to  
44 include the entire building, plus some distance more. The Planning Commission  
45 recommended the line be moved even further back.

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 Brenner asked if light industrial use is allowed in the general commercial  
2 zone. Olson stated it is not. The staff report notes that there has not been a  
3 specific business noted except for the fact that there could be a large building. In  
4 the Planning Commission meeting, they asked the applicant whether it would be a  
5 construction yard, which is not allowed in the general commercial zone. The  
6 applicant would use the front of the lot to build the building. It would have to be  
7 used for an approved general commercial use.

8  
9 Roy asked if the Council is certain it's not a light industrial use. Olson stated  
10 the use would have to be consistent with what is allowed in the general commercial  
11 zone.

12  
13 Fleetwood stated they'd hear from the neighbors if the use weren't allowed.

14  
15 Brenner asked what happens if the use is not allowed. Goodwin stated the  
16 County would issue a correction notice, then fines.

17  
18 Roy asked if they are sure it's not being used for light industrial use at the  
19 moment. Olson stated she has not seen inside the building.

20  
21 Lesa Starkenburg-Kroontje, 115 Front Street, stated she represents the  
22 Faber Brothers. This property was discussed by the Council in February. Since  
23 then, the applicant went through the Comprehensive Plan amendment process, as  
24 the Council recommended. The Planning Commission recommendation is to not  
25 accept what the applicant asked for, which is that the entire legal lot be moved into  
26 the general commercial zone. The recommendation alleviates some issues, but  
27 doesn't address the larger question of the split zone. With that in mind, the  
28 Planning Commission recommendation would be what this committee looks at.

29  
30 This building that is split in half by the zoning line has posed a big problem  
31 for the owner to design what can be in this site. They've been working on this for  
32 two and a half years. The eastern portion of the building has to comply with  
33 different codes than the western portion of the building. There is no plan for what  
34 will happen on this site because they don't know the zone. All the neighbors to the  
35 north, east, and south support the rezone and re-designation of the entire site.  
36 There are a number of different bumps in zoning lines throughout the county to  
37 follow legal lot lines. The Faber Brothers would like to use the entire site for  
38 general commercial use. The Planning Commission recommendation does alleviate  
39 the issue with the building, which also allows for access to the rear of the building  
40 in accordance to the development standards in the County codes, the required 25-  
41 foot landscaped buffer, and legal access. The building started out as a chicken  
42 building when it was built in 1950. There is an entire basement under it.

43  
44 McShane asked if the bay doors were part of the original building.  
45 Starkenburg-Kroontje stated she didn't know.  
46

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 Fleetwood asked how the building will be used. Starkenburg-Kroontje stated  
2 Faber Brothers is looking to put their design division in the building. It would be an  
3 office use. There will be buildings on the entire site for different uses. Once that  
4 plan was nixed because of the zoning issue, they put their plans on hold. They  
5 would still like to build a building on the front portion of the property that would be  
6 used for the design division. They would use the existing building on the site for  
7 storage related to the design division and also to lease out portions of the building.  
8 Those are tentative plans based on whether or not they can use the building.  
9

10 When looking at a rezone, the Council is to look at the impacts to the  
11 property and the surrounding area, based on the policies of the Comprehensive  
12 Plan and the rezone questions, not based on the uses. Uses can change over time.  
13 The use needs to be specific to the general commercial zone allowed use.  
14

15 Roy asked if the purchaser knew about the split zoning when he or she  
16 purchased the property. Starkenburg-Kroontje stated the line had never been  
17 designated to the level where it bisected the building. They found it out when they  
18 had their meeting with the Planning Department to do a remodel.  
19

20 Roy asked if the proposed use is design, not construction. Starkenburg-  
21 Kroontje stated they understand what the general commercial zone allowed uses  
22 are and that they must comply with those uses.  
23

24 Brenner asked if the owners are going to renovate the building, or destroy  
25 and build anew. Starkenburg-Kroontje stated they would not destroy the building.  
26 The building has been partially renovated, but even the required fire code is  
27 different for each end of the building.  
28

29 In the event that the councilmembers are just interested in resolving the  
30 question of the building, then she recommends moving forward with the Planning  
31 Commission recommendation, which allows two acres in the back to remain in the  
32 rural zone. If the councilmembers want to alleviate the split zone altogether, it will  
33 require a public hearing.  
34

35 Crawford asked if the applicant is willing to accept the Planning Commission  
36 recommendation or wants what they requested. Starkenburg-Kroontje stated the  
37 applicant wants a little of both. The applicant feels that this property was split, and  
38 shouldn't have been. However, the recommendation gives them relief for the  
39 immediate issue, which is the building.  
40

41 Tom Schreiber, 6879 Raspberry Drive, Everson, stated he is against the  
42 application. The land surrounding the area has open space and is zoned for rural,  
43 one unit per two acres (R2A) and agriculture. He listed the businesses that serve  
44 the community. Faber Brothers also built large commercial and industrial  
45 structures in addition to residential uses. They know the zoning regulations. Two  
46 and a half years ago, Rick Faber said he would build their new building and offices  
47 and warehouses there. This property is zoned general commercial and R2A.

1  
2 When the Lynden/Nooksack subarea was formally adopted, Hinote's Corner  
3 was on its way to being established as a commercial crossroads. There was a need  
4 for the County to think of adequate commercial coverage to serve the general  
5 community. At that time the County extended the eastern line delineating general  
6 commercial and rural zones 320 feet eastward. This created a straight consistent  
7 line. Thus, two zoning uses on this parcel was created. The building is a 60-year  
8 old chicken coop that has since received a makeover by Faber Brothers. It is used  
9 as a storage garage, according to the staff report.

10  
11 The Faber Brothers application was heard by the Planning Commission. They  
12 announced an intention to build office buildings for clerical use. There was no  
13 mention of warehouses, storage yards, or shipping and receiving. They also  
14 mentioned that the 5,000 square foot Quonset hut was for storage of employees  
15 personal recreational vehicles.

16  
17 He showed pictures of things going on at the location. There is now a  
18 Quonset hut that encases racks of building materials. Commercial trucks pull in  
19 and out of the hut and the yard. This is not the manner of storing a recreational  
20 vehicle, but of consistent daily use. This property is used as a construction  
21 company business site. This violates current county zoning ordinances. General  
22 commercial zoning does not permit construction contractors businesses, offices,  
23 storage, or construction yards. Only light impact industrial zones allow for such  
24 use.

25  
26 Approval criteria for Comprehensive Plan amendments shall find four  
27 conditions. The amendment must conform to requirement of GMA, the  
28 Comprehensive Plan, and countywide planning policies. This does not. It seeks to  
29 create an industrial park where none has been planned before. There must be a  
30 changed condition showing the need for an amendment. The only change was that  
31 Faber Brothers purchased land and updated the chicken coop. The Council is being  
32 asked to make good their speculative investment. The fourth finding that must  
33 occur is that an amendment must not be an illegal spot zoning, which this is. This  
34 request opens the door for all property owners at all four corners to make such  
35 applications. Deny this application. He submitted a petition of neighbors and  
36 businesses that oppose the request for the rezone. Hold the line on illegal spot  
37 zones, urban sprawl, and disservice to the public interest. He asked the purpose a  
38 construction company would have for a five-acre general commercial lot.

39  
40 John Goodland, 6885 Raspberry Drive, stated he signed the petition against  
41 the rezone. It won't do the neighborhood any good. In long run, the Faber  
42 Brothers' goals are to create a construction operation in that neighborhood,  
43 including materials storage.

44  
45 Brenner stated the pictures show a light industrial site, not commercial. She  
46 asked why.

47

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1           Crawford asked about option two, recommended by staff. Olson stated that  
2 recommendation was for an extension of the zoning line by 390 feet. The Planning  
3 Commission extended the staff recommendation to 425 feet.  
4

5           Starkenburg-Kroontje stated Faber Brothers understands this is not to be a  
6 general contractor site. A request for a spot zone to light industrial is not in front  
7 of the Council. One-third of this property is already zoned general commercial.  
8 There is general commercial zones on neighboring parcels.  
9

10           *(Clerk's Note: End of tape one, side B.)*  
11

12           Starkenburg-Kroontje continued to state it's not a spot zone. There's no  
13 intention to use the property outside the uses allowed by the zone.  
14

15           Crawford asked if the Planning Division received compliance complaints on  
16 this property, and if they've been checked out.  
17

18           Olson stated there was a complaint in the very beginning, a few years ago.  
19

20           Starkenburg-Kroontje stated the Faber Brothers has not received any  
21 correspondence from the Planning Department on compliance issues. The question  
22 of the Quonset hut was based on whether it was permitted. The Planning  
23 Department worked with Faber Brothers to say that was the structure they could  
24 put up. They could not do anything permanent until the zoning issue is resolved.  
25

26           Fleetwood stated a rezone request does not constitute illegal spot zoning. It  
27 does have to identify a changed public circumstance and public benefit. He asked  
28 what those are. Starkenburg-Kroontje stated they are looking at a Comprehensive  
29 Plan change and zoning amendment. Those are based on a mistake being made, or  
30 changed condition, or both. In this case, there is a building that was split up by a  
31 different zone. That takes away any value of that building that could be used for a  
32 legal use. It was not taken into account in 1986 and in 1997, which was a mistake.  
33 The changed condition is that the building is still being used for a legitimate  
34 purpose. The idea that a structure has to be torn down because Whatcom County  
35 chose to make that property worthless by placing a zoning line that runs through it  
36 is not fair and doesn't serve the public purpose. If the line is moved, the building  
37 can be used. The public benefit is that existing infrastructure can be used. By  
38 moving the line, they are still allowing what they would otherwise have, which is  
39 one house site and a general commercial site, without the need to demolish a  
40 structure. There is no public burden to moving the line 110 feet internally. She  
41 asked the detriment to moving the line internally. It should have been done in  
42 1997, or should not have happened in the first place in 1986. Both the staff and  
43 Planning Commission recognized in their findings that the recommendation is  
44 consistent with the necessary criteria.  
45

46           Fleetwood stated his inclination was to go along with the Planning  
47 Commission recommendation. The photos Mr. Schreiber presented are persuasive.

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 Starkenburg-Kroontje stated this isn't a hearing. The Planning Commission dealt  
2 with things at a hearing where Faber Brothers could attend and present  
3 information. This is a determination as to whether or not the Council wants more  
4 information. She cannot provide more information on the photographs that were  
5 just presented.

6  
7 McShane stated Ms. Starkenburg-Kroontje wouldn't have any more time to  
8 address the photos at a public hearing, either. The councilmembers are getting  
9 information now and taking input to make a determination. This back-and-forth  
10 discussion wouldn't happen at a public hearing.

11  
12 Starkenburg-Kroontje stated the \$400,000 photo shown in one photo is  
13 owned by a property who signed a letter of support for the entire acreage to be  
14 rezoned to general commercial.

15  
16 Fleetwood asked for more information on a proposed buffer. Starkenburg-  
17 Kroontje stated the County code requires a buffer.

18  
19 Brenner asked about the Quonset hut. Starkenburg-Kroontje stated it is in  
20 the R2A zone and would be in the R2A zone according to the Planning Commission  
21 recommendation. The County approved it only as a temporary structure.

22  
23 Roy asked if the buffer is visual. Starkenburg-Kroontje stated the code  
24 defines that it be an all-season solid barrier to separate incompatible uses or to  
25 protect adjacent roadways from unsightliness or visual distraction.

26  
27 Roy asked the definition of temporary. Olson stated it is subject to an  
28 administrative decision.

29  
30 Goodwin stated she would have to look at the conditions on the building  
31 permit.

32  
33 **McShane moved** to recommend to the full Council to schedule a public  
34 hearing on moving the zoning line 425 feet as recommended by the Planning  
35 Commission, but return it to the current zoning line 60 feet north of the building.  
36 Sixty feet allows for a buffer and driving. It resolves the immediate problem of the  
37 split building. They're addressing a mistake. There is value to the community to  
38 use that building to its best purpose. Beyond that, there is no benefit to the  
39 community and great benefit to the property owner.

40  
41 Crawford stated the motion is worth considering. When they look at the  
42 general commercial zones, there are lots of jags and corners in an attempt to follow  
43 property lines to some degree. Yet, that wasn't done with this line. He asked if  
44 Councilmember McShane's proposal is okay, in terms of not following the property  
45 lines. Olson stated that at the time the line was drawn, the building was a chicken  
46 coop. It was assumed that the building would be demolished or put to specific  
47 commercial uses.

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1  
2 Crawford asked if matching the property line was a concern at the time.  
3 Olson stated it was not.  
4

5 Crawford stated that other than this one property, the general commercial  
6 zoning line followed property lines. Olson stated it does, generally speaking. The  
7 commercial uses were on relatively small parcels of land. Even though the line is  
8 jagged, it does follow, but it included those particular commercial uses around the  
9 corner.

10  
11 Crawford asked if there is one precedent that they need to stick to, one way  
12 or another. Olson stated there is not.  
13

14 Brenner asked if they knew when the line was drawn that it bisects a parcel.  
15 Olson stated they did know that. At that time, the property was a homey chicken  
16 farm. It had a house that fronted onto Hannegan Road in the southwest corner of  
17 the property. General commercial uses don't require an enormous acreage of land,  
18 so they chose the 320 foot strip for general commercial.  
19

20 McShane stated they worry about uneven lines and lines splitting properties.  
21 That makes sense. He also looks at the way this line was drawn. When it was  
22 done, a fair bit of deference was given to creating a commercial zone in an area  
23 that may not have been commercial in the first place. The property immediately to  
24 the south is an apartment building. It's not commercial. The property to the north  
25 that jogs out again is because of immigrant cabins. There is also a Grange Hall.  
26 It's not like this area was already commercial in the first place. Staff at the time  
27 decided to run the line up the back of the properties, and the building was a  
28 chicken coop that probably would be torn down. He recalled that Faber Brothers  
29 realized that the building was useful. It comes down to what they should do with  
30 the old farm building. It makes sense to allow it to be commercial. It resolves the  
31 mistake, if it could be called a mistake. Adjust the line because the building has  
32 more value than they thought. The mistake that was made was in assuming it was  
33 a building that should be torn down. They have a rationale for fixing the mistake,  
34 which is the building, not the entire property.  
35

36 Roy asked the general timeframe of the photographs. Schreiber stated the  
37 photographs were taken during two weekends during June of this year.  
38

39 ***Motion carried 2-0 with Caskey-Schreiber absent.***  
40

41  
42 **OTHER BUSINESS**  
43

44 There was no other business.  
45  
46

**DISCLAIMER: This document contains the Whatcom County Council or Committee minutes, as approved. However, unless an attested signature page is attached, they are not the final approved minutes.**

---

1 **ADJOURN**

2  
3 The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:10 p.m.  
4  
5

6  
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 Jill Nixon, Minutes Transcription  
9

10 ATTEST:

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL  
WHATCOM COUNTY, WASHINGTON

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 Dana Brown-Davis, Council Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Seth Fleetwood, Committee Chair