TO: Chuck Kleeberg          Gary Kohler
     Greg Kipp                 Lisa Pringle
     Terry Brunner            Lisa Lee
     Harold Vandergriff       Ken Dinsmore
     George McCallum

FM:  Jerry Balcom           3/1/94

RE:  Minutes of the February 25, 1994 Regulatory Review Committee Meeting

Present: Jerry Balcom, Terry Brunner, Lisa Lee, Ken Dinsmore, Gordon Thomson

1. Under what circumstances are surface water management facilities permitted as a primary use on a separate lot by the zoning code?

This issue was addressed in part in the minutes of the August 14, 1992 Regulatory Review Committee (RRC) meeting. At that time the RRC determined that, "Drainfields, septic tanks, and storm water facilities are not listed as permitted principle uses in any zone..." A subsequent RRC meeting (see October 8, 1993 minutes) determined that "all retention/detention facilities owned by SWM are 'public utility facilities' (see K.C.C. 21.04.695) and so are considered 'public or institutional uses'..." in the landscaping chapter (see 21.51.030.5). The consensus of the RRC at the February 25, 1994 meeting therefore was, to the extent that a zone allows public utility facilities as permitted principle uses, then SWM owned R & D facilities are permitted as a primary use on a separate lot. R & D facilities which are not owned and operated by a public utility are permitted as an accessory use only.

2. Does a conflict exist among certain P-suffix conditions in the East Sammamish Community plan, Uniform Building Code, Uniform Fire Code requirements, and King County Road Standards? If so, how is the conflict resolved?

The East Sammamish Community Plan (ESCP) area zoning requires that: 1) "Wherever walkways are provided, raised crosswalks or speed bumps shall be located at all points where a walkway crosses the lane of vehicle travel," and 2) "Blocks in excess of 900 feet shall be provided with a crosswalk at the
approximate midpoint of the block." Concern was raised that the first requirement might conflict with the accessibility requirements of UBC 3106 (d) 8, WAC 51-20, and UFC 10.205, and that the second requirement might conflict with the King County Road Standards. A related issue was also raised with regard to the absence of standards for raised crosswalks and speed bumps, and liability.

In reviewing the relevant code sections, the RRC determined that it was not clear if a conflict exists with the ESCP requirements. For example, UFC 10.205 requires that the width of a fire apparatus access road "not be obstructed in any manner..." It is not clear, however, if a raised crosswalk or speed bump constitutes an obstruction. Although raised walkways and speed bumps might not be preferred, they are common within unincorporated King County and within incorporated areas. Regarding UBC 3106 (d) 8, the curb ramp standard states that transitions shall be "flush and free of abrupt changes in height," and that slope shall not exceed 1 vertical in 20 horizontal. The requirement, however, does not explicitly preclude speed bumps or raised crosswalks. The issue therefore becomes one of applicable design standards. Although King County currently has no design standards for speed bumps and raised walkways, the RRC understands that such standards exist in other jurisdictions. A standard could therefore be developed for King County. The RRC recommended that a public rule be prepared to address design standards for speed bumps and raised walkways.

With regard to the second ESCP requirement, the RRC determined that no clear conflict exists with the King County Road Standards. Again, the RRC determined that this was to a large extent a design issue which, if needed, can be addressed through a public rule.

3. Legislative Update

Ordinance 93-817 amending SAO general exemption provisions and allowed alterations for steep slope, wetlands, and streams was given a "do-pass" out of the GMHE committee. A public hearing before the full council will be scheduled within the next two weeks.
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