Those in attendance: Perry Huston, Chair, Vice-Chairman David Bowen, and Commissioner Alan Crankovich.

Others: Shannon Carlson, Deputy Clerk of the Board; Darryl Piercy CDS Director; James Hurson, Chief Civil Prosecuting Attorney; and approximately 15 members of the public.

At 4:00 P.M. CHAIRMAN HUSTON opened the special meeting to conduct a continued public hearing to consider changes to Kittitas County Subdivision Code Title 16, and related sections of the Kittitas County Zoning Title 17.

DARRYL PIERCY, DIRECTOR OF CDS gave his staff report. He gave a brief history of the current code and the changes that have been made. He reviewed the specific instructions that staff was given by the Board at the previous hearing of the changes that they wished to see. He reviewed the language that was omitted and some language that was added. Mr. Piercy admitted some examples to the record of maps were currently in their office with regard to the family farm split.

CHAIRMAN HUSTON OPENED THE PUBLIC TESTIMONY PORTION OF THE HEARING:

CHAIRMAN HUSTON went through the process and explained what he would like to hear when public testimony is given some ideas to help assist the processes. (i.e. Family Farm Split or Exempt Seg)

URBAN EBERHART REPRESENTING THE FARM BUREAU AND IRRIGATION DISTRICTS reviewed the irrigation chapter and commented on his concerns. He went over proposed language that still needs to be changed. He explained that it should be the irrigation entity’s determination where the water delivery should go since they are the ones that deliver the water. He made comments concerning the 80 acre minimum and was wondering if that number can be smaller.

FRITZ GLOVER congratulated the Planning Department for coming up with a good document. He agreed with increasing the public process and eliminating exempt segregations. He also commended the approach to boundary line adjustments and once again applauds the public process.
ROGER WEAVER testified that there needs to be middle ground with the exemptions. He compared the one time split to exempt segregations and gave some examples (estate planning). He explained the need for flexibility. There was a large group from the Upper County that participated in re-write of the code however the farmers in the lower county, due to farming at this time are not able to have the time to make their comments and therefore the Board should give more time on some aspects of the code before adoption.

PAT DENEEN explained that he doesn’t think that anyone is trying to stop the segregation process but stop trying to shuffle the process around. He suggested that a property owner would get a “free” boundary line adjustment and then have a five-year moratorium before a second boundary line adjustment can be done. He suggested that the Board should adopt some parts of the code and then have a review of the code in a year (similar to the road standards). He went through the chapters that he had some issues with and suggested some change in language. For example, start at 5 ft. contour lines under the existing conditions. Large lot sub-division make an administrative process. He complimented the Planning Directors willingness to fix problems and work with public on issues.

WAYNE NELSON went over some of the issues he had in some of the chapters and suggested language change. He agreed with the previous testimony on the zoning code issue. Under existing conditions referencing the contour lines he suggested taking out the one foot or less requirement. He suggested that the large lot subdivisions be processed administratively.

CHUCK CRUSE testified that he was surprised to see the 80 acre minimum. He didn’t think that the fee adjustment that was made for the segregations and then changing the requirements wouldn’t bring in the revenue. Minimum lot size contradicts the one time split for Ag-zone. Existing conditions comments, one foot contours are not realistic. He had some other questions and clarification of some of the other language listed through out the code.

DAVE DUNCAN stated that he agrees with Mr. Cruse and Mr. Eberhart’s comments on the one time split. He was not in favor of the elimination of the one time split, he believes that it would double the resource land and people won’t take care of them.

PAT DENEEN spoke on the liability with the undivided interest on roads should there be an accident. He suggested having a homeowners associations for road dedications. He felt having flexibility was important.

THERE WERE NO MORE CITIZENS WISHING TO GIVE TESTIMONY
COMMISSIONER HUSTON asked questions of Mr. Piercy. He explained that the road standards are driven by density. Road standards apply to all land that is subdivided in order to have a legitimate plat.

DARRYL PIERCY explained that road standards apply at the time the occupancy permit is applied for. Mr. Piercy explained the process to the exempt segregations and road standards.

CHAIRMAN HUSTON explained that in his thinking having a legitimate plat with roads is what the intent of the Board was when developing the road standards. The intent was by passing the road standards, no matter how a parcel was segregated it was to comply with the road standards and all other documents adopted.

CHUCK CRUSE explained the way the road standards were adopted. If there is access to a county road the road was to be bonded prior to plat approval. If you have a private road regardless how the parcel was conformed once someone has applied for the occupancy permit they have to show that there is an access that is up to county standards.

CHAIRMAN HUSTON reviewed the changes in language that he heard from testimony and from the Board. For the large lot sub-division he didn’t know how to respond specifically, to the philosophy in the creation of the magic number. He doesn’t have an issue with administration reviews. He would like the code to be reviewed in one year. He felt there needs to be a definition of serial platting, one time split, and exempt segregations. He doesn’t have a problem when a smaller parcel is pulled from a large parcel and the rest of the large parcel is left for open space.

COMMISSIONER BOWEN said most of his concerns were covered by Commissioner Huston. He also has the 80 acre issue, and thought there needs to be a more compelling number. He explained that he was not looking to eliminate the one time split. CHIEF CIVIL DEPUTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY JIM HURSON explained what he thought staffs reasoning was to putting in the minimum lot sizes in the code and that there were no intentions to remove the one time split.

COMMISSIONER CRANKOVICH asked that by creating large lot subdivision is it creating more of a barrier? DARRYL PIERCY explained the process and that the administrative review works well.

MR. PIERCY explained what he understood the intentions are through the sub-division code and what the Board was asking and what process they want in place.
COMMISSIONER HUSTON moved to continue the public hearing to August 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2005 at 4:00 P.M. in the Commissioners Auditorium to review the revised documents, record to be open to oral and written testimony. COMMISSIONER BOWEN second. Motion carried 3-0.

The Special Meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.