

MINUTES

Clallam County Planning Commission

Meeting of May 15, 2024, 6:00 PM

- A. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.
- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.
- C. ROLL CALL: Members present were Chair Steve Gale, Vice-Chair Ron Long, Tom Butler, Ken Reandeau, Katina Hester, Bonnie Booth, Jane Hielman, and Jeff Carter. Donella Clark, Principal Planner, Holden Fleming, Deputy Director, and Bruce Emery, Director represented staff from the Department of Community Development.
- D. WELCOME: Chair Gale welcomed all in attendance. Requested to amend the order of the agenda and put Addressing on as the first public hearing.
- E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Steve Gale requested an edit to the minutes. Ron Long motioned to approve March 20th minutes with the edit and Tom Bulter seconded. Motion passed with one abstention from Bonnie Booth. Ron Long motioned to approve the April 17th minutes and Ken Reandeau seconded. Motion passed with one abstention from Steve Gale.
- F. ANNOUNCEMENTS: None
- G. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: Three written comments are Two comments were made regarding Ag Accessory. One wanted to allow those farms in the UGA to have the same opportunities as those in Rural and Resource lands which the code is intended to affect. Second commenter suggested that the code allow ag accessory uses to place 20 square foot signs similar to the size of signs allowed in the ag resource zone.
- H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None
- I. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM: Staff presented the draft Addressing Ordinance following the requested changes from the County IT GIS department. The changes requested were minor and staff now requests to hold the public hearing and make a recommendation to the Board. Karl Hatton from Pencom requested that before the final adoption of this ordinance that an addressing authority be selected. Staff intends to bring this up to the Board of Commissioners in order to have them select the department or person within the County organization that should be the selected authority. Ron Long moved to approve the ordinance with the caveat that the Board of Commissioners decide on a single source of contact during their review. Katina Hester seconded the motion and the motion passed 7-0.

Staff presented their report and recommendation for a Type B amendment to change the rear yard setbacks from 15-feet to 10-feet and side yard setbacks from 10-feet to 6-feet within the CR-I, CR-II, and CR-III zones within the Carlsborg Urban Growth Area. Ron Long moved to approve the staff recommendation and Katina Hester seconded. Motion passed 6-0 with one abstention by Jeff Carter.

The record shall reflect that Katina Hester removed herself from this portion of meeting. Staff presented of the process and recommendation of the Type B amendment to provide development regulations in Rural and Resource zones, noting that the Comprehensive Plan does not provide the same standards regarding ag accessories in Urban Growth Areas. Staff feels that the draft ordinance is in line with the Comprehensive Plan, and since DCD will be updating their Comprehensive Plan we will continue the process and possibly expand the regulations in the near future. Planning Commission discussed the ordinance and the vast input from farmers, non-farmers, Planning Commission and staff in order to get a good balance. A minor edit was requested in the section regarding fires to remove "if applicable". Regarding

signs staff did not feel it appropriate to add language to circumvent the sign code. Three comments were made thanking staff for their efforts and understanding that everything was not incorporated, but that the support to ag was appreciated. Ron Long moved to forward the ordinance with the edit to the fire section. Bonnie Booth seconded. The motion passed 6-0 with one abstention.

- J. WORK SESSION ITEMS: None
- K. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: Commenter asked what the process is next for the Ag Accessory Code.
- L. DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS: Next steps for the ordinances will be to take them to the Board of County Commissioners for their process and public hearing.
- M. GOOD OF THE ORDER: Steve Gale suggested that code standards for Carlsborg be prioritized during the Comprehensive Plan review.
- N. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at __7:00__ p.m.

Fleming, Holden

From: CHIQUE ANTIQUES Owner <chiqueantiques@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 12:56 AM
To: Fleming, Holden; Johnson, Randy; Emery, Bruce
Subject: Ag amendment opens unrestricted use outside of Rural zoning
Attachments: By definition of ancillary uses, what are uses co....docx

MEMO FOR May 15th public meeting

As you are aware, Ancillary uses are allowed in all zoning for agricultural operations. Code doesn't clarify what Urban Ancillary uses are and your Type B only supplies a draft for Rural zones.

The amendment defines activities included as an Agricultural Ancillary activity allowed in Rural Zones.

Those same activities would be included in all zones as an ancillary activity now by inclusion since the amendment defines them as "Ancillary Activities".

The current zoning definition of Ancillary has no restrictions and no specific definitions of what an Ancillary activity is, leaving it up to interpretation. The amendment puts definition of activity names, such as farm tours, educational activities, farm stays, as an Ancillary Activity (definition) defined by the new County Code.

This makes no sense.

1. Agricultural activities are allowed in all zones.

2. Ancillary agricultural uses are allowed in all zones.

3. Ancillary uses in Rural zones are defined as Agricultural Ancillary Uses in the proposed amendment.

4. The amendment defines farm tours, educational events, farm stays, events farmers markets etc as an Agricultural Ancillary activity.

5. Ancillary Agricultural activities specifically are not defined under definitions for zoning.

6. The amendment now defines farm tours, educational events, farm stays, events, farmers markets as ancillary and under definitions of County Code are allowed outright in all zones but are being limited in Rural Zones.

Imagine the confusion that would happen if this amendment is codified in its current format. A way to prevent this is to rewrite definitions in zoning specifically that Ancillary Agricultural Activities are only allowed in Rural Zoning which conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan, or to rewrite the amendment to coincide with the Definitions of Ancillary Agricultural Activities to be "allowed in all zones".

The Comprehensive plan speaks specifically to Agricultural activities not agricultural activities in Rural communities only.

Please send a copy of this to all the Commissioners for planning as well as County Commissioners.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

March 20, 2024

Bruce Emery, Director
Department of Community Development
223 E 4th Street, Suite 5
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Re: Chapter 33.XX Agricultural Accessory Uses Draft Code 3-18

I have completed a review of the Revised Draft of the above referenced proposed Chapter of the Clallam County Zoning Code as attached to the Planning Commission Meeting Agenda for March 20, 2024.

In the following document, I have outlined comments and recommended revisions along with questions to be addressed by staff or the commissioners during the meeting as appropriate. This information is presented to assist the Planning Commissioners in their evaluation of this near complete draft.

1) General Comments:

The current draft as presented has addressed most all of the questions and issues that have been raised during the public input process of drafting the code revisions. It appears that the staff has responded to the public input and commissioner's queries in a way to allow the agricultural accessory uses necessary to comply with the intent and vision of the Clallam County Comprehensive Plan in most respects, but still in a restrictive way.

2) Educational Classes:

The language of the current draft leaves unclear how a class being presented at a farm related to the farm cultivation, production and equipment operation would be classified within the 8 separate categories listed under 33.XX.040. As an example, a private educational class for say 15 attendees on a specific aspect of farm product processing, such as lavender oil extraction. Would this be classified under the "Tours of the agricultural operations" under 33.XX.130, since this section clearly relates to "educational events" as stated by the Educational Exemption under Item a)? But this exemption is specifically restricted to specific public educational endeavors, not privately owner prepared and charged for classes. The addition of an additional subparagraph Item b) that allows private educational classes directly related to the agricultural activities and production occurring on the farm site under this 33.XX.130 would clarify this and would appear to fit with the educational element above, even though it is technically not a "tour" but is an educational event. While these type classes are generally smaller classes without the need of specific controls and would have no more impact on the community than a guided tour of the same size attendance, this sub paragraph could include a reasonable size limit of say 35 to prevent classes that might generate more significant traffic impacts.

If the simple classes that I am referring to are what is intended to be included in the broad reference as "agricultural demonstrations" included in the definition of "Other Farm Dependent Accessory Activities", then this is totally unacceptable in that this classification requires even farms of 5 to 9.99 acres to obtain a Conditional Use Permit for those simple agricultural process classes. The demonstrations that is believed to be intended in this "Other Farm Dependent ..." section is believed to be more intensive and "entertaining" public involved demonstrations more similar to the tractor rides, hay rides etc. Clearly defining the type of educational classes as belonging in the "Farm Tours" class and requirements appears to be

adequate to provide the necessary controls and not excessive for all farms wanting to pursue this type of customer pay for an educational event.

3) Building Code Reference:

I again ask why the continued reference to the International Building Codes? Those codes are not directly controlling anything in Washington State. They are only enforced to the extent they are adopted by reference and with modifications by Washington State. I recommend a more appropriate reference to the Washington State Building Codes be utilized throughout this Zoning Code revision that does not create a potential conflict in code requirements.

SPECIFIC CODE WORDING ISSUES:

The following discusses the proposed draft Chapter 33.XX in order of each Section as follows:

Section: Index --

Remove 33.XX.100 Additional standard for agricultural processing facilities. And renumber.

33.XX.010 Definitions.

(2) "Agricultural Processing" Remove and renumber.

33.XX.020 Purpose and intent. No comment.

33.XX.030 Applicability.

In the fourth paragraph of this section starting "For the Purposes of this Chapter, contiguous parcels..." discusses using contiguous parcels for review as "one farm when **determining the appropriate level of review** for the proposed agricultural accessory use". I recommend adding ", criteria and conditions" after "review".

It is not only the level of review that is impacted, but also the criteria such as the general requirement under 33.xx.030 that for any parcel to be allowed to have agricultural accessory uses, the criteria is that the "parcel" (not "farm") must have "a minimum of one acre of land utilized in the production of agricultural products." We have the barn and store on our 1.3 acre parcel with the residence, while all of our production is on the adjacent 4.3 acre parcel. By strict reading of this paragraph, this barn parcel does not have any land used in the production of agricultural products (ie lavender fields). Unless the contiguous parcels criteria includes not only the level of review (i.e. CUP vs COC vs Allowed Outright) but also the criteria and conditions, our store parcel would not be allowed to have any agricultural accessory use, even though it could be included to determine if a COC or CUP would be required for the farm evaluation of activities on the other parcel. Please amend this.

33.XX.080 Additional Standards for Onsite Retail Stores.

Under paragraph (1) a. change "...must have no than 1000sq.ft. ..." tp "...must have no more than 1000 sq.ft....

33.XX.110 Additional Standards for Farmers' Markets.

Renumber this section and all following sections.

Respectfully Submitted
Richard Olson
Lavender Connection
1141 Cays Rd.
Sequim WA 98382

Ancillary uses in an agricultural operation are those activities that are **secondary and directly support** the primary function of raising crops or livestock. They **add value** to the agricultural products or make the farming operation more efficient. Here's a breakdown of what qualifies as ancillary uses:

General Characteristics:

- **Secondary to Primary Agriculture:** The primary purpose of the land remains agricultural production. Ancillary uses should not overshadow the main farming activity.
- **Directly Supportive:** Ancillary uses contribute to the success of the agricultural operation in some way. They might help with production, processing, marketing, or farm management.

Examples of Ancillary Uses in Agriculture:

- **Value-added agriculture:** This involves processing raw agricultural products into finished goods with higher market value. Examples include making cheese from milk, turning grapes into wine, or processing wool into yarn.
- **On-site sales:** Selling farm products directly to consumers through farm stands, u-pick operations, or CSAs (Community Supported Agriculture).
- **Agritourism:** Offering educational experiences to the public like farm tours, workshops, or glamping (glamorous camping) on the farm.
- **Farm Support Activities:**
 - Equipment storage and maintenance facilities
 - Packing sheds for sorting and packaging produce
 - Greenhouses or nurseries for propagating plants
 - On-farm composting for waste management and creating fertilizer
 - Basic food or beverage processing for on-farm consumption during events
- **Limited on-farm renewable energy production:** Solar panels or wind turbines to generate electricity for the farm's operation.
- **Home occupations:** Small-scale businesses like farm consulting, offering farm-stay lodging, or craft production using farm products, conducted from a residence on the farm (restrictions might apply).

Fleming, Holden

From: CHIQUE ANTIQUES Owner <chiqueantiques@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2024 10:17 PM
To: Fleming, Holden
Subject: Accesory Uses in Agriculture only allowed in Rural Zonings

 You don't often get email from chiqueantiques@msn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

The current Comprehensive Plan for Clallam County states that "Agritourism and Agricultural businesses should be supported by the codification of Clallam County.

Agricultural activities and Accessory Uses are allowed in all current zoning codes in Clallam County.

The current amendment plan from DCD states "Agricultural Accessory Uses" are only allowed in Rural Zones.

This amendment should be to "All" Zones to parallel both the "Accessory Uses & Agricultural Activities". If the County's true intent is to "Clarify and promote agricultural businesses" why would farming Accesory Uses in Urban Zoning not be allowed. Counties and Cities like Thurston County, Seattle, & Portland's agricultural urban zoning uses are important parts of the Agricultural reforms currently.

How would this look otherwise?

Delete "Accesory Uses" as a definition of all zones, and replace it with "Agricultural Accesory uses" definition only allowed in Rural Zoning?

Add a definition only allowed in Rural Zones?

Or ADD it to an allowed use category in different zoning classifications, but still have Accessory Uses allowed in all Zoning?

If the County's intent is to support farming, then support farming in Clallam County.

Thank you

Rondi Smith
669 N. Lee's Creek Road
Port Angeles Wa 98362

Thank you for your intention.