

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 22, 2017

The Ephrata Planning Commission, Grant County, Washington met on June 22, 2017. The meeting was called to order in council chambers at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Joe Dennis.

Members present: Chairman Joe Dennis, members, Jo Maedke, Don Guillemette, Tom Moncrief and David Spencer

Staff present: Ron Sell, Community Development Director; Anna Franz, City Attorney; Bill Sangster, Public Works Director; Bill Cox, City Building Official; and Stacy Hooper, Secretary

Approval of Commission Minutes: Joe Dennis entertains motion to approve Minutes of May 25, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting, Jo Maedke, so moved, Don Guillemette seconds motion, motion carried.

Correspondence: No additions to packets.

Additions and/or revisions to Published Agenda: No additions or revisions to Published agenda.

Joe Dennis asked each Planning Commission Member the following:

- 1) Have you had any contact, including through written or other media, with any interested parties to this matter? If "yes", please disclose the nature and substance of the contact. Each member replied "NO"
- 2) Do you have a financial, material, or personal interest in this matter? Each member replied "NO"
- 3) Can you render fair and impartial judgment, without undue or improper influence, over this matter? All members replied "YES"
- 4) Does any member of the Public or Commission have a specific objection to any member of the Commission hearing this matter? Each member replied "NO"

Public Hearing opens at 7:05 pm.

Joe Dennis asks Ron Sell for Staff Report:

Ron Sell shows a picture of the location for the plat, he points out the boundaries, size and zoning details. Ron Sell also shows a picture of the plat, and gives development plan history, details of the changes being made from original submittal and some of the additional conditions including easement along sewer line.

Joe Dennis asks for comments from Public – Dusty Jones prepared drawings, he is in attendance to support the project and to answer questions.

Joe Dennis asks Dusty Jones if he is representing the owner, Dusty Jones replies yes.

Joe Dennis asks Dusty Jones if they have any questions or concerns regarding any of the plat conditions.

Dave Spencer questions the cul-de-sac Radius. Ron Sell explains the radius needs to meet the current code.

Joe Dennis asks if this is satisfactory to **Justin Kooy** have his concerns been met? **Justin Kooy**, still a little unclear of where the definition changes from homestay to vacation rental, wording is a little unclear. **Bill Cox** explains the difference and **Justin Kooy's** situation. **Discussion Ensues.** **Justin Kooy** asks if he interlocks fire alarms and applies for homestay will this exempt him from sprinkler requirement. **Bill Cox**, yes. **Joe Dennis** asks **Justin Kooy** although the language is a little bit fuzzy still, is he able to conduct business as is now. **Justin Kooy** says not as he is doing business now, but as he was doing business when cited by the City, **Dave Spencer** asks **Justin Kooy** what does it change: **Justin Kooy**, it changes the smoke detector requirements, as a homestay it does not require a representative, he would be the representative, **Dave Spencer** asks, representative, what is that, he just wants to make sure **Justin Kooy** understands what is being asks. **Discussion Ensues**

Justin Kooy says that it looks like being classified as a homestay the requirements of a vacation rental don't necessarily apply, the age limit the 3 contact phone calls, does that not apply to homestay, **Ron Sell**, correct, those do not apply. **Joe Dennis** says this is a moot point as **Justin Kooy's** situation is a homestay. **Discussion Ensues.**

Clarification of two room rental and occupancy/renter number is asked for. Vacation Rental, Short Term Vacation Rental, home stay and Owner Occupied. **Discussion Ensues.**

Joe Dennis asks if at this point are we still waiting for recommendation from insurance, **Ron Sell**, yes, **Joe Dennis** asks if as a commission are we at a point where we can move forward. **Jo Maedke** responds, she is not, would like more clarification. Sounds as if **Mr. Kooy's** issues have been resolved and he is happy with the work arounds, and he falls under the "homestay" umbrella. This is correct. **Jo Maedke** asks if she is understanding correctly: straight across vacation rental is different from homestay as there is not an owner on premises, you may have a home that you just purchased for the purpose of vacation rental only all year long and want to list as a B&B rental. With the vacation rental as well as the homestay, anything over 2 bedroom rentals have the sprinkler requirements. A vacation rental that the owner does not live or reside in regardless of size, will need to be sprinkled. **Dave Spencer** asks what code this is in. **Bill Cox**, IRC with no state amendments. **Discussion Ensues.**

Jo Maedke and **David Spencer** are not in favor of what is before them. **Discussion Ensues.**

Bill Cox, explains how the language leaves some lenience for jurisdictions, this is why we should wait to see the recommendation of the City Insurance. **Discussion Ensues.** **Jo Maedke** and **Dave Spencer** not in favor.

Anna Franz, understands the Planning Commissions concern about the interpretation of the building code, the ordinance amendment that is before planning commission does not specifically require the sprinklers, it just says it has to meet the building code requirements, **Anna Franz**, the question is, is planning commission ready to move forward of recommending the ordinance for the homestay and vacation homes as it is written so those uses that do not require sprinklers can be permitted under it, there are two different issues, the code amendments before commission are allowing modifications