

MEMO

To: BOCC
From: Neil A. Caulkins
Re: Supplemental response to comment on amendment to definition of gravel extraction and excavation
Date: November 18, 2010

Additionally to my previous response, it is important to remember that, contrary to the comment's assertion, our county's "R" zones are actually considered less industrial than the "ag" zones, not more so. This is because the purpose of the "R" zones is to "minimize adverse effects on adjacent natural resource lands." KCC 17.30.010; 17.30A.010; 17.56.010. The idea was to have these zones be less industrial, and contain fewer heavy uses, so as to reduce the possibility of, should this zone be placed adjacent to resource lands, incompatible uses that could eventually conflict with and threaten the resource land. This is why in the "ag" zones there are heavier uses allowed than in the "R" zones such as duplexes (as opposed to single family houses), public utility buildings, substations, pumping plants, cemeteries, airports, processing of products, home occupations including engine repair, and gas and oil exploration and construction all as outright permitted uses. Similarly the "ag" zones allow non-ag auctions, churches, commercial activities associated with ag, convalescent homes, farm labor shelters, feedlots, feed mills, kennels, livestock sales yards, log sorting yards, and stone quarries as conditional uses. KCC 17.28.020; 17.28.130; 17.28A.020; 17.28A.130; 17.29.020; 17.29.030. None of these uses, nor anything similarly intense or industrial are allowed in the county's "R" zones. One can see that the "ag" zones are actually conceived of containing more intense industrial uses, that such uses are not in conflict with the purposes of agriculture, and therefore that having all the necessary portions of a gravel operation be allowed in the locations where it is practiced, particularly when that is in the more industrial "ag" zone designation, is logical and consistent.