

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
48
49
50
51
52
53

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL
Special Committee Of The Whole

July 13, 2010

CALL TO ORDER

Council Chair Sam Crawford called the meeting to order at 11:31 a.m. in the Council Chambers, 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Present: Barbara Brenner, Sam Crawford, Kathy Kershner, Bill Knutzen, Ken Mann, L. Ward Nelson and Carl Weimer

Absent: None

Council Conference Room

1. DISCUSSION REGARDING PENDING GMHB LITIGATION (AB2010-072)

Crawford stated that discussion of agenda item one may take place in executive session pursuant to RCW42.30.110 (1)(i). Executive session will conclude at no later than 12:15 p.m.

Knutzen moved to go into executive session until no later than 12:15 p.m. to discuss the first two agenda items, pursuant to RCW citations as announced by the Council Chair.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Brenner, Crawford, Kershner, Knutzen, Mann and Weimer (6)

Nays: None (0)

Absent: Nelson (1) (out of the room)

(Clerk's Note: The Committee went into executive session at [11:33:58 AM](#) and came out of executive session at 12:15 p.m.)

Council Chambers

1. RURAL ELEMENT - DISCUSSION OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT REQUIREMENTS AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS (AB2010-072) (12:22:48 PM)

Gary Davis, Planning and Development Services Department, submitted and read from a presentation (*on file*).

Discussion included mixed use in the Columbia Valley urban growth area (UGA); commercial zoning in the Chuckanut area, and; the location of residential-only limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRDs).

1 The following person answered questions:

- 2 • Wain Harrison, Planning and Development Services Department

3
4 Crawford stated he prefers option B for the LAMIRDs Adjacent to UGAs. He asked
5 how other councilmembers felt.

6
7 Knutzen stated he agrees. He asked why they would want to restrict themselves.
8 They need as much flexibility to get this done as they can have. Create as little impact as
9 possible to the property owners in Whatcom County. He still wants to become compliant.

10
11 Brenner stated some of these areas adjacent to cities are separate historic
12 communities and don't have a lot of commonality with the city. Leave the option open.

13
14 Nelson asked the origin of the one-mile spacing requirement. Davis stated it is a
15 Planning Commission recommendation for areas between LAMIRDs and UGAs and between
16 other LAMIRDs. There have been Hearings Board decisions that talk about the purpose of
17 LAMIRDs being to contain and minimize growth. If all in a row, it becomes a strip. That
18 was an argument in a case that resulted in noncompliance. That issue didn't come up in
19 Clallam County.

20
21 Nelson stated that if they eliminate the spacing requirements, they are laying out the
22 extension to the current city.

23
24 Crawford stated that if they call them LAMIRDs, they're specifically not doing that.

25
26 Nelson asked if the city would be able to put those into their UGAs.

27
28 Crawford stated a UGA is a 20-year area. It's hard to anticipate whether the cities or
29 county would say they want new urban growth areas that far into the future. That's
30 speculative to answer.

31
32 Nelson stated he tends to agree with Councilmember Crawford on option B.
33 However, the problem is whether the ideas identified on the map are being supplied with
34 services. Davis stated some are. The water district is not even city water. There's no
35 sewer.

36
37 Crawford stated the issue Councilmember Nelson brings up is specifically Britton
38 Road. That's where the LAMIRD touches the UGA. It may be more appropriate to designate
39 that as a rural area rather than a LAMIRD.

40
41 Nelson asked the process for doing that.

42
43 Crawford stated they've found that every time they think about specific examples,
44 they haven't done policies that allow that. The real question is whether they are going to
45 have a policy that allows LAMIRDs to be next to UGAs. He hasn't really thought about the
46 Emerald Lake area's common line with the UGA on Britton Road as needing a LAMIRD
47 designation. It seems to need a more rural designation.

48
49 Nelson stated he will support this because there will be a process to talk about the
50 rural definition.

51
52 Crawford stated the biggest impact to a specific area is Fort Bellingham. It's a fairly
53 densely populated area that shares a considerable common area adjacent to the City's UGA.

1 That may end up being a rural area instead of a LAMIRD. Give themselves as much
2 flexibility as possible. Because there are cases that weren't challenged, the question is why
3 they would impose that criteria.
4

5 Kershner stated saying yes to this isn't saying that they want all these specific areas
6 to be LAMIRDs. She asked what would have happened to the Chuckanut area with one-mile
7 spacing requirements. She asked if it would be downzoned if it were not a LAMIRD. Davis
8 stated it would. That was the recommendation.
9

10 Kershner stated allowing this option would allow this area to be a LAMIRD. Davis
11 stated it potentially does.
12

13 Kershner stated she supports option B.
14

15 Weimer stated he supports option A. All these areas look rural.
16

17 Davis described the options for two-acre zoning. (12:50:31 PM)
18

19 Crawford asked the councilmembers' preferences for two-acre and one-acre zoning
20 for current rural residential (RR) 1, RR2, and RR3 zones.
21

22 Knutzen stated impact the property owners as little as possible. He supports option
23 C, to have as many tools available as possible. It almost looks like option D is to retain the
24 zoning that existed prior to 1990, and say it's rural and leave it alone. Davis stated that is
25 option D.
26

27 Knutzen stated he would also like the option available in option D. Davis stated it
28 would work out that way anyway. Some areas could be taken care of as LAMIRDs. Most
29 properties could fall within a legal LAMIRD. That's a way to go for a lot of these areas.
30 Areas outside of those criteria have other options, such as the overlay or retaining the two-
31 acre zoning. The Wiser Lake Road area is a checkerboard, and it would be difficult to create
32 a LAMIRD in that area. Creating an overlay or retaining and arguing the rural could be
33 done.
34

35 Knutzen stated he prefers option C.
36

37 Mann asked if the Council has given direction on whether or not using water lines is
38 worthy of a sole criterion. Davis stated it is not a boundary criterion. It is a criterion of the
39 1990 built environment.
40

41 Crawford asked what councilmembers prefer on the issue of waterlines. Any water
42 line four inches or larger existing in 1990 should count as the sole criterion for a built
43 environment. Let's deal with this issue first.
44

45 Brenner stated she's not comfortable with it being a sole criterion.
46

47 Mann stated he also is not comfortable with it being a sole criterion.
48

49 Knutzen stated he doesn't want to limit their options.
50

51 Crawford stated it wouldn't limit their options. It would be one of many options.
52

1 Knutzen asked why they would limit themselves with a four-inch line. Davis stated
2 there was a Thurston County Hearings Board decision that they can't define a built
3 environment with any water line. A small two- or four-inch water line to serve a rural area
4 isn't necessarily a built environment meant for more intensive uses. An eight- or 12-inch
5 water line planned for more intensive development is something that could be counted as a
6 1990 built environment.
7

8 Crawford stated he suggests that he would like for staff to look at the 1990 built
9 environment as being four-inch or greater water lines. The City of Bellingham uses four-
10 inch water lines. If it's good enough for the City, it's good enough for a LAMIRD. As a
11 minimum threshold, look at least at four-inch lines as serving the LAMIRD level of more
12 intense rural development. He asked if the County could use those water lines alone as the
13 built environment criterion if that's the only criterion and they don't have other
14 development. He believes they could. Councilmembers Mann and Brenner don't believe so.
15

16 Brenner stated Councilmember Knutzen is saying that only water lines, without
17 power or roads, should be the only criterion. She doesn't believe it should be the sole
18 criterion.
19

20 Nelson asked if public utility districts (PUDs) do comprehensive planning. Davis
21 stated they have coordinated water plans from water utilities.
22

23 Nelson stated water utilities have to submit their planning documents. He doesn't
24 know if he'd go with a criterion of water line size. It's important to recognize service areas.
25 Water providers have to provide service area information to the County and State. Those
26 designated service area plans designate and plan or where more intense development will
27 go, because the providers have to pay for that service. He asked how to look at those
28 comprehensive plans. Some of these LAMIRD areas are serviced by water districts with
29 plans. Those plans are to pay for the upkeep and management of the systems. A change
30 to that service area would dramatically impact their plans as well as the County's plans.
31

32 Crawford stated he understood that it had to be about the built environment in 1990,
33 not the service area of a water district. Davis stated there is a Hearings Board case decision
34 on that issue. It's not about what was platted, vested, or within a utility service area.
35

36 Nelson asked if those comprehensive plans identify those service areas or built
37 environments. Davis stated it depends on the plan.
38

39 Nelson stated he doesn't know about water line sizes. He understands that all those
40 LAMIRD areas have water lines in the ground. It should be based on the current
41 infrastructure, supported by the providers' comprehensive plans.
42

43 Crawford stated the County Council has to evaluate LAMIRDs as a built environment
44 on July 1, 1990. It would be a lot to ask of the Planning Department to try and figure out if
45 a water provider had a plan on July 1, 1990.
46

47 Nelson stated he doesn't want to see that a Class A water system being implemented
48 with four-inch lines in the ground become a LAMIRD. They don't have a comprehensive
49 plan. He needs to check on that. He can't support a water line size. He's not sure that it
50 can be a criterion that can't be used to extend services to an area that would create a more
51 dense environment.
52

53 Crawford asked if Councilmember Nelson is not supporting the option.

1
2 Nelson stated he doesn't understand it.
3

4 Crawford stated they need to discuss the built environment as of July 1, 1990. They
5 have to decide the criteria that define the built environment as of that date.
6

7 Nelson asked where the Hearings Board would look for information on the built
8 environment on that date.
9

10 Crawford stated Mr. Davis will research that and find out where those water lines
11 are.
12

13 Nelson stated that has to be identified in some sort of a plan. That plan is the one
14 they should support. Davis stated they've been researching the records as much as they
15 can to determine where the water lines were. He can hopefully go back 20 years and get
16 people to tell them where the lines were. He will continue to update that information as
17 they go forward. That could potentially be a built environment if that's what the Council
18 wants. The boundary of a district may go well beyond that.
19

20 Crawford stated this concept of the built environment on July 1, 1990 is a flawed
21 way to do this. He doesn't like it, but it's what they have to do. Councilmember Nelson
22 would like to know the plans of the water district. However, that isn't a criterion the State
23 has given the County. The State says that if something existed on that date, they can
24 consider it. He suggests a four-inch water line as of 1990. He asked of Councilmember
25 Nelson supports his suggestion.
26

27 Nelson stated he will give tentative support. He has questions. In general, he can
28 go along with it. He wants to know if there is something in writing that goes to the State or
29 County that would support whether something was in the ground in 1990. Davis stated he
30 will pull from whatever source they can.
31

32 Nelson stated call the districts and find out their processes for planning expanded
33 service areas. Davis stated they can't put a LAMIRD in an area that may not have had
34 water lines at the date, even if they were planned for.
35

36 Kershner stated she completely supports using water lines of any size as a criterion.
37 She wants to harm as few people as possible when creating these LAMIRDs. The areas on
38 the Guide Meridian that have been developed and had water lines in 1990, but may not
39 have had buildings, should be included because of the water lines.
40

41 Brenner stated she agrees with using water lines as one of several criteria. The
42 Guide Meridian area has criteria in addition to water lines. Councilmember Crawford is
43 talking about being able to create a LAMIRD with only a water line. She doesn't support
44 that.
45

46 Kershner stated she doesn't support creating new LAMIRDs where there is no
47 development today.
48

49 Brenner stated she knows of places today where there are water lines and no
50 development. If they approve Councilmember Crawford's suggestion, they can make
51 LAMIRDs there today. If that is the sole criterion, they're saying that any place like this can
52 be a LAMIRD.
53

1 Crawford stated he never thought about this for proposing new LAMIRDs. He isn't
2 suggesting they task Mr. Davis with exploring every water line and turn it into a LAMIRD. If
3 there is a LAMIRD now, and the only rationale they can find for that area in retrospect is the
4 existence of a water line, then it's a good enough criterion for the built environment. They
5 should continue if they want to exercise that option. Some LAMIRD areas may be better-
6 designated as rural areas. It's not going to drive whether or not something will be a
7 LAMIRD. He is only saying that if it's the sole criteria, they are giving themselves that
8 option.
9

10 Weimer stated he is against using water lines as a criterion. He wants to do as little
11 harm as possible to the people of Whatcom County by encouraging rural development that
12 costs them all in decreased services.
13

14 Brenner asked the name of any LAMIRD they've designated that just has water. She
15 doesn't know of any. They haven't ever called something a LAMIRD that has only water
16 lines.
17

18 Knutzen asked if they were using it as one of the criteria for the LAMIRD at the Guide
19 Meridian and Smith Road.
20

21 Brenner stated that area has more than just water lines. It has roads and power and
22 some development. Councilmember Crawford is suggested it as a sole criterion.
23

24 Crawford stated Kershner, Knutzen, Nelson, and he said they support using water
25 lines as the criterion. In the Planning Commission saying it can't be used as a sole criterion,
26 he believes they were saying that they would like to see something more on the ground.
27 The water issue is a LAMIRD issue.
28

29 Knutzen stated don't limit themselves to anything. If this is the criteria needed to
30 maintain someone's zoning they currently have, he's in favor of it.
31

32 Brenner stated this has to do only with a LAMIRD. The Lake Whatcom watershed
33 properties should not be considered in any of this.
34

35 Crawford stated the next decision is the two-acre and one-acre zoning.
36 Councilmember Knutzen said he likes option C. He would like to retain much of the higher
37 density zoning. There is supporting text in the Comprehensive Plan that any density of one
38 unit per acre or less dense is rural in Whatcom County. They should retain R2A zoning as
39 outright rural. For one-acre, the County has a documented history that one unit per acre
40 constitutes rural living, such as in areas like Fort Bellingham. In areas that developed
41 around that density, this Whatcom County rural lifestyle should be preserved. (1:18:08 PM)
42 Thurston County has half-acre lots as part of their rural element. These half-acre lots are
43 not included in their LAMIRDs. They have withstood a challenge. Kittitas County also
44 allows higher density rural lots within its rural element and explains in its Comprehensive
45 Plan that it does so to prevent sprawl. This has also withstood judicial challenge. Retain
46 one-acre zoning based on established rural character of the areas. For RR2 and RR3, he
47 thought about Squalicum Mountain. It feels okay to go from two per acre to one per acre
48 feels okay. Davis stated that as they justify the character of a certain area being at a
49 certain established level, they would look at existing lot sizes to buttress the argument. In
50 cases like that, they would show their work to the Hearings Board, including average or
51 mean lot size in that particular area.
52

1 Crawford stated his first choice is option D for the two-acre and one-acre zoning.
2 They define rural based on historical uses. Keep rural one-acre and two-acre zoning in
3 certain situations, if that has been the development pattern. His second choice is option C.
4 Davis stated that in practice, it could be a combination of all options. He doesn't know if
5 people are interested in the overlay option.

6
7 Crawford stated he is not in favor of the overlay. It should only be used as a last
8 resort. Keep flexible. Put up their best effort to keep one-acre and two-acre rural zoning as
9 a defined rural character of Whatcom County.

10
11 Nelson stated he has a philosophical problem without the overlay. When they
12 originally looked at these years ago, they looked at the availability of services. He asked if
13 anything zoned RR2 or RR3 would revert to rural, one unit per acre.

14
15 Crawford stated that if they need to justify density of RR2 and RR3, they could use
16 the overlay.

17
18 Nelson stated he likes the overlay in other areas as well. They have RR1. There are
19 impacts with wells and septic systems they need to evaluate on a critical areas basis. Lake
20 Whatcom is an example. If they start putting in one house per acre without services, it can
21 have a dramatic impact. Davis stated there is some RR2 around Sunnyside.

22
23 Nelson stated they're all serviced by sewer and water. Other areas may not be. An
24 overlay would be something to look at in those areas with critical area impacts or water
25 impacts. They don't want to hammer the area with wells.

26
27 Crawford stated he agrees, however he would also like the flexibility to simply
28 designate RR1 or R2A, without an overlay. Do that if they can.

29
30 Nelson asked how they find that out, without an overlay. Davis stated he would look
31 at an area and consider if there is a well issue.

32
33 Nelson stated he can support it as long as his questions are unanswered about the
34 overlay issue. He asked if Mr. Davis will evaluate it and be able to say that they feel it's
35 safe for multiple wells or septic tanks. Davis stated it would help if he knew if the Council
36 wanted to start with an overlay, which would be the preferred option if it doesn't fit into a
37 LAMIRD. He asked if the preferred option is to keep the zoning as it is or to put it in an
38 overlay. Even within an overlay, the proposal is that the overlay can go from a base density
39 of five acres down to one acre, but not smaller than that. An alternative option is to take
40 those RR2 and RR3 areas and retain a one-acre zoning without the overlay.

41
42 Nelson stated he is more inclined toward that. (1:25:27 PM) Davis stated that would
43 be option D in the one-acre zoning item.

44
45 Crawford asked if Councilmember Nelson is opposed to keeping just rural one-acre
46 and two-acre zoning, without an overlay.

47
48 Nelson stated he is opposed to that.

49
50 Mann stated he is in the minority. It seems the intent is to allow these areas to
51 develop as much as possible. A density of one house per acre is urban or suburban, not
52 rural. He can understand the benefit of the density overlay as a strategy. He can see how

1 that would work. Councilmember Crawford's recommendation is to figure out how to define
2 one house per acre as rural. He doesn't see how that works.

3
4 Brenner stated she's been focusing on all this for areas inside a LAMIRD. She
5 doesn't support half-acre and one-third acre lots outside LAMIRDS.

6
7 Crawford asked if Councilmember Brenner thinks one-acre zoning can be rural in
8 Whatcom County, without a LAMIRD overlay.

9
10 Brenner stated she hasn't thought about it. The options are either a LAMIRD or
11 downzone to rural, one unit per five acres (R5A).

12
13 Crawford stated it's important to draw a line in the sand for Mr. Davis, so he knows
14 what the Council is willing to do. He is recommending the one-acre option, and not have it
15 as a LAMIRD. The County policies, which already defines rural as one-acre in some cases.

16
17 Brenner stated they aren't going to get this done today, and should schedule another
18 meeting.

19
20 Davis stated the option is to create a LAMIRD or do something else with them. If
21 they aren't LAMIRD, the option is to rezone or keep existing zoning. Practically, many of
22 these areas will be taken care of potentially by LAMIRD boundaries, especially the RR3 and
23 RR2 density. Therefore they can keep the existing zoning inside the LAMIRD boundary. A
24 question is what happens if it doesn't meet a LAMIRD boundary criteria.

25
26 Brenner stated she's not ready to answer the question for areas outside LAMIRDS.

27
28 Crawford stated he hasn't heard any support for the recommendation.

29
30 Knutzen stated they aren't trying to develop every property in Whatcom County into
31 one big city. They want to use the tools available to create the least impact on the property
32 owner of Whatcom County who purchased property with a particular zoning. Let them keep
33 what they purchased. Retain all the options available to the property when purchased.
34 He's not trying to create any more development. He's trying to retain the rights the
35 property owners have. Keep all options available. If they have to draw it at one acre, they
36 can use the density overlay tool to do that. He's okay with that. He wants to downzone as
37 few parcels as possible.

38
39 Crawford asked if Councilmember Knutzen will accept a density of one unit per acre
40 as rural zoning, without the overlay.

41
42 Knutzen stated that if they feel the rural character is at one acre, he knows of one-
43 acre property that seems rural. He doesn't know if it will pass the laugh test before the
44 Hearings Board.

45
46 Crawford stated they aren't going to speculate on that. He asked if Councilmember
47 Knutzen is in favor of a one-acre zoning designation in the rural portion of Whatcom County.

48
49 Knutzen stated that if they can do that, he will support it.

50
51 Kershner stated she supports an overlay and defining one- or two-acre parcels as
52 rural in Whatcom County. For the overlay, use the boundaries of the zoned area, not a

1 500-foot radius. Average out the properties within that zoned area. Someone on the
2 outside of the boundary should not be penalized for being next to a hay field.
3

4 Crawford stated that average may hurt the people in the denser areas. It's a
5 mathematical problem that will take a lot of analysis. For the most flexibility, it would have
6 to be an option. He asked if Councilmember Kershner supports defining one acre and two
7 acres in Whatcom County as rural, without an overlay.
8

9 Kershner stated she does.
10

11 Weimer stated he supports option A for one-acre and two-acre zoning, which is the
12 Planning Commission recommendation. His concern is about how the vast majority of
13 taxpayers in the county will pay for increasing levels of rural development.
14

15 Crawford stated he heard that Councilmembers Kershner, Crawford, and Knutzen
16 support one-acre and two-acre property as outright rural zoning.
17

18 Davis asked if the Committee prefers option C for the one-acre and two-acre zoning.
19

20 Knutzen stated he likes option C.
21

22 Brenner stated this is a different direction than they've talked about. It's brand new.
23 She's not willing to have staff take up time to do something that she is not ready to make a
24 decision on yet.
25

26 Kershner stated she is supporting this because Councilmember Brenner talked about
27 how all the areas in the county have their own histories. They should respect those
28 histories. This is one way to do that. Honor areas that have been developed at a density of
29 one- and two-acres.
30

31 Brenner stated that is supposed to be a LAMIRD. They can still cover it that way.
32 She doesn't know what acreage isn't being considered for a LAMIRD, except for one in Lake
33 Whatcom. She doesn't want to deal with that at Lake Whatcom.
34

35 Kershner stated the other option is to downzone all the areas that are already
36 developed and make them nonconforming. That is the option, if they don't try and define
37 one- and two-acres as rural.
38

39 Brenner stated she doesn't want to do that, but she still has questions before
40 agreeing to spend staff time doing this.
41

42 Crawford asked if the committee can support two-acre zoning as rural, without an
43 overlay. He supports it.
44

45 Brenner stated she does not support that at this time, because she has questions.
46

47 Mann stated he is opposed due to reasons he already stated.
48

49 Knutzen stated he's fine with it.
50

51 Crawford stated Councilmember Weimer stated is opposed and Councilmember
52 Kershner is in support.
53

1 Nelson stated he supports it in certain areas.

2
3 Crawford stated that is a majority. Mr. Davis will come back with information on the
4 specific areas.

5
6 Davis stated that is option D. The certain areas are those with established average
7 lot size around two acres. The density overlay strategy would not be the outright two-acre
8 zoning. It would be a five-acre zoning, with a calculation to get down to two acres.

9
10 Brenner stated these are areas that already have established development, but are
11 not in LAMIRDs. Davis stated that is correct. They wouldn't necessarily meet LAMIRD
12 criteria.

13
14 Crawford stated they have a majority that says they are okay with two-acre zoning
15 as being rural. He asked if they want to exempt Lake Whatcom from that density. He is
16 opposed to that. The current zoning around Lake Whatcom isn't a zoning issue where there
17 is sewer and water. He does not want to exempt Lake Whatcom from the potential of two-
18 acre zoning. He asked if other councilmembers want to exempt Lake Whatcom, so it's not
19 qualified for two-acre zoning.

20
21 Brenner stated she wants to exempt Lake Whatcom.

22
23 Mann stated the density shouldn't be two acres.

24
25 Knutzen stated he wants a transfer of development rights (TDR) program for Lake
26 Whatcom. He's not willing to downzone anyone at the lake, but he also wants to see a TDR
27 program. Keep the two acre zoning that exists, but they'd better extend the moratorium or
28 get a TDR program.

29
30 Crawford stated they can't go down to one-acre.

31
32 Nelson stated he is fine with two acre zoning in Lake Whatcom. He reserves his
33 ability to vote on an overlay.

34
35 Kershner stated she is fine with two-acre zoning in Lake Whatcom. Maybe those
36 people can pay for a stormwater system.

37
38 Crawford stated the result is to retain two-acre zoning, but not one-acre zoning in
39 rural, outside of LAMIRDs. However, they are keeping options open for overlays in some of
40 those areas.

41
42 Davis asked if the direction is to establish LAMIRDs that keep the RR2 zoning.
43 (1:43:50 PM)

44
45 Crawford stated it is his preference.

46
47 Davis asked if an area in the Lake Whatcom watershed should be put in a LAMIRD to
48 retain RR2 zoning, if it meets criteria for a LAMIRD. He's talking about the RR2 areas
49 around Northshore, the two-acre and one-acre zoning around South Bay. He asked if the
50 Council wants to put a LAMIRD where they meet the criteria or keep a constant two-acre
51 zoning.

52
53 Knutzen stated he is not willing to establish a LAMIRD there.

1
2 Crawford stated he is willing to do that. The question is whether they can allow a
3 LAMIRD designation in the Lake Whatcom watershed. He and Councilmember Kershner say
4 yes.

5
6 Davis asked if they should treat it the same as every place else, or differently
7 because it's in the watershed.

8
9 Nelson stated it has to have other protections if the zoning is RR1.

10
11 Crawford stated this is for RR2, half-acre zoning. If they are going to go more dense
12 than a RR2, it has to be a LAMIRD. He didn't hear four councilmembers in favor of that.

13
14 ***Brenner moved*** to adjourn the meeting.

15
16 The motion failed by the following vote:

17 **Ayes:** Brenner and Mann (2)

18 **Nays:** Crawford, Knutzen, Kershner and Nelson (4)

19 **Absent:** Weimer (1)

20
21 Davis described the options for commercial zoning.

22
23 Knutzen stated he is in favor of option B. Change the wording to "must not exceed
24 the scale, use, and intensity in the area."

25
26 Crawford stated he is in favor of option B.

27
28 Kershner asked the difference between the two options. Davis described the
29 differences.

30
31 Kershner stated she is in favor of option A.

32
33 Nelson stated he is in favor of option A.

34
35 Mann stated he is in favor of option A. It's not advisable to rush through these.

36
37 Davis described the options for the mixed use affected areas. (1:50:29 PM)

38
39 Crawford stated he is in favor of option B. If anything is zoned R2, he'd rather that
40 be kept rural. The Council did establish a line.

41
42 Davis asked if they want to establish the same thing they did for the one- and two-
43 acre zones.

44
45 Crawford stated that's right.

46
47 **2. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE STATUS OF THE COUNCIL'S PLANNING AND**
48 **POLICY ANALYST POSITION (AB2010-017)**

49
50 This item was not discussed.

51
52 **3. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING WHATCOM COUNTY**
53 **CODE 2.03, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (AB2010-143B)**

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

This item was not discussed.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:51 p.m.

Bill Niven - Minutes Transcription

Please contact the Council Office to obtain an
official, signed copy:
360-676-6690 or council@co.whatcom.wa.us

Dana Brown-Davis, Council Clerk

Sam Crawford, Council Chair