REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

- MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: March 22, 2000

TO: Building Services Division Staff
Division Staff

Land Use Services

Lynn Baugh
Nathan Brown
Beth Deraitus
Pam Dhanapal
Ken Dinsmore
Chris Ricketts

Mark Carey
Greg Borba
Lanny Henoch
Lisa Pringle
Gordon Thomson

Caroline Whalen, Deputy Director
Kevin Wright, Prosecuting Attorney’s Office

FM: Lisa Pringle, Planner IV (Interim Code Development Coordinator)

Present: Tim Barnes (PA), Greg Borba, Jeri Breazeal, John Briggs (PA), Mark Carey,
Pam Dhanapal, Ken Dinsmore, Lisa Pringle, Gordon Thomson,
Harold Vandergriff,
Susan Marlin (Recorder)

Issue:
1. Does a proposed sign within the Klahanie Shopping Center meet the definition of a directional sign? (Ken Dinsmore)

Discussion:
The Committee discussed the definition of K.C.C. 21A.06.1105 -- "Sign, directional: a sign designed to guide or direct pedestrian or vehicular traffic to an area, place or convenience, and may include incidental graphics such as trade names and trademarks." -- and the general sign requirements in K.C.C. 21A.20.060 E -- "Directional signs shall not be included in the sign area or number limitation of K.C.C. 21A.20.070 - .110, provided they shall not exceed six square feet in surface area and are limited to one for each entrance or exit to surface parking areas or parking structure."
The Committee further discussed that the intent of the rezone conditions noting only directional signs allowed on the rear of the building was to limit the impact on adjacent properties.

Conclusion:
The proposed sign does not meet the definition of a directional sign. The company (tenant) name is not incidental to the sign. The rezone limits the height of signs to 10 feet, which may negate the effectiveness of the proposed sign.

Issue:
2. Referring to the RRC meeting minutes of July 23, 1999, and the intent of the rezone conditions discussed (dated July 28, 1993), what is meant by a "service door?" (Greg Borba)

Discussion:
The discussion from the RRC meeting of July 23, 1999 was revisited. The conclusion at that time was to accept the Hearing Examiner's Condition #30, specific to the use of an "emergency exit" door at the rear of a building. As the intent of this condition was to limit the impact on adjoining properties, the Committee made the suggestion to have an alternative access to the daycare's play area.

After further discussion, the Committee agreed that the use of access during the day by the daycare facility would not cause nighttime impacts to the area. The door will not be used for deliveries or services, but is used during daytime hours only to access the daycare's play area.

Conclusion:
After further review to ensure the daycare meets all requirements, the Prosecuting Attorney agreed that the daycare is allowed to use the service door during daytime hours.

Issue:
3. Is a plant (horticultural) nursery a permitted use in an agricultural zone?
   Site Development Services has determined that conversion from an agricultural use to a plant nursery is not exempt from the Sensitive Areas Code or from the Clearing and Grading Code. Therefore, a new nursery would have to abide by the buffer requirements of the Sensitive Areas Code...Is this a correct interpretation? (Laura Casey)

Discussion:
Conclusion:
The Committee concluded that a plant nursery is allowed in an agricultural zone but not within setbacks to sensitive areas.

LP:sm

cc: Tim Barnes, Prosecuting Attorney's Office
    John Briggs, Prosecuting Attorney's Office