

Exhibit C – Excerpts of PRCAC Minutes Regarding WCC 20.72 Amendments

February 20, 2019 — no 20.72 votes

March 9, 2019 (special) — no 20.72 votes

March 19, 2019 — no 20.72 votes

April 1, 2019 (special) — no 20.72 votes

April 18, 2019 — no 20.72 votes (STF not present)

May 4, 2019 (special) — no 20.72 votes (discussion; no votes) (STF not present)

May 16, 2019 — no 20.72 votes (STF not present)

June 8, 2019 (special) — 20.72 discussion:

- .135 (2) - Under .130 Administrative Approval Uses, section .135 (2) limits the time an RV can be parked on an otherwise undeveloped residential property to 120 days per year. There is a fee (not in this provision) of \$1200/year. PRCAC Questions: What is that \$1200 for? What are the funds used for? Is that fee necessary or appropriate when considering that the property owner would have paid for the property, paid to have septic installed and paid to have water and electric service installed. Just having an RV on a property is not a cheap or simple option. The PRCAC may propose that the fee be lowered, perhaps to \$300/year.
- .130 (5) - This section limits the property owner to one “Accessory” structure, namely a personal storage building no larger than 200 square feet. There was discussion of proposing a larger size, but the consensus was to propose permitting no more than two personal storage buildings, rather than just one.
- .154 - Under .150 Conditional Uses, in section .154, it was proposed to remove “shall include horse racing facilities and pari-mutuel wagering” [and presumably the rest of the same clause]: “In the Rural District, private commercial sports facilities and clubs permitted as conditional uses under WCC 20.36.165 shall include horse racing facilities and pari-mutuel wagering [as regulated and licensed by the Washington State Horse Racing Commission], together with the usual accessory uses including club house, food and beverage service, restaurant and stables.”
- .202 - Under .200 Prohibited Uses in Maple Beach, the suggestion was made to get input from the Maple Beach Residents Association regarding the prohibition on rooming houses, taverns and commercial parking areas in Maple Beach. DG will check with Olav Grabi and/or Paul Barrister on this.

- .204 - Under .200 Prohibited Uses in the “Small Town Commercial Zone District along Gulf Road only”, there was a proposal to remove “along Gulf Road only” so that the STC restrictions would also apply along the relevant section of Tyee Drive.
- .204 - Under .200 Prohibited Uses, in section .204 (1), mini-storage facilities are prohibited. There was a proposal to amend .204 (1) to add “no additional” (as suggested by George Wright) in view of the existence of such property uses currently in the STC district:
 - 204(1) “No additional mini-storage facilities.”
- There was a further proposal to add a percent limit on the number of properties in the STC district which could be used for mini-storage facilities.
- .204 - Under .200 Prohibited Uses, in section .204 (3), to make the restriction easier to understand, there were suggestions to separate the repair type restriction from the storage type restriction, and to re-write the provision as:
 - .204(3)(a) “Facilities for service, repair or washing of motorized vehicles and equipment, motorcycles, marine, farm implements, light and heavy equipment, and recreational vehicles” and
 - .204(3)(b) “Facilities for commercial storage or sale of motorized vehicles and equipment, motorcycles, marine [vessels or equipment], farm implements, light and heavy equipment, and recreational vehicles.
- .204 - There was a final proposal that each member send comments and proposed language for .204 to DG for him to review with Cliff Strong.

June 18, 2019 (special) — 20.72 discussion:

- .350 - Building Setbacks/Buffer Areas - The prior meeting ended with brief discussion about setbacks under section .350. **No changes were proposed.**
- .401 - Under section .400 Height Limitations, **no changes were proposed** to this section.
- .653(2) - Under section .650 Development Criteria, section .653 covers Landscaping, Screening, and Tree Canopy Retention. In part (2) Screening, at the end of “(a)”, LH proposed to amend (as struck out or underlined): (a) Dumpster and utility areas of businesses or other use buildings in commercial areas shall be screened, using earth berms, landscaping, ~~or building wall~~, or living wall (i.e., fabricated wall with vertical living vegetation).
- .653(3) - Under section .650 Development Criteria, section .653 covers Landscaping, Screening, and Tree Canopy Retention. In part (3) Tree Canopy Retention, in “(e)”, the reference to “the Point” seemed colloquial and/or vague, it was suggested to clarify the Point as being Lily Point: (e) Buffering which recognizes the need for safety and the unique features of Lily Point shall be required on ~~the~~ Lily Point. No development shall take place in such areas.
- .656 - Vehicular Access - LH suggested that we ask Cliff Strong about options for revising this provision.
- .659 - Parking - LH suggested that we notify the public that this section will be discussed at the regular meeting on June 20, 2019, to elicit more public input before any revisions are drafted by the PRCAC.
- In connection with Parking, Allison Calder suggested that 10.24.0304, .0404 and .0600 be discussed as well. These sections deal with on street parking, including on Gulf Road. It could be useful to ask Cliff Strong about modifying these provisions.

- Allison Calder raised an issue concerning .135 (discussed at the June 8, 2019 special meeting), suggesting that it be re-written to make clear that properties with a house can have an RV parked on the property.
- .670 - Signs and Flag Poles - LH suggested that this section be limited to the Small Town Commercial (STC) zone, and that its applicability to “Rural General Commercial (RGC), Rural Industrial Manufacturing (RIM), and Resort Commercial (RC) Zones” be removed.
- In connection with restrictions on lighted signs, Judson Meraw suggested that provisions be added to limit light pollution in Point Roberts. He proposed that there be no (new) signs that light up the night sky.

June 20, 2019 — 20.72 discussion:

The PRCAC members discussed the following sections of WCC 20.72:

- * .659 - Parking - In .659(1), in STC, parking “shall” be at the rear or side of the building. There was discussion of revising the language to make it preferred to have parking at the rear or side, but not an absolute requirement if that would destroy the viability of the project:

Within the Small Town Commercial Zone:

(1) When feasible, parking lots shall be provided only at the rear or side of buildings; however, when necessary to allow permitting of the project, alternate parking lot locations may be approved.

- In .659(2), SW questions the clarity of the terms “connect” and “connecting”. SW will ask Cliff Strong about his concerns.
- In .659(4), there is mention of sidewalks. SW has an issue about sidewalks on one side of Gulf Road that he will raise with Cliff Strong.
- In connection with parking, Allison Calder brought to the PRCAC’s attention that there are restrictions on Point Roberts in WCC 10.24.030 (Gulf Road), 10.24.040 (Front Street (gone!)), and 10.24.60 (Edwards Drive). There is a suggestion to delete these restrictions. Even though this is not part of 20.72, this will be raised with Cliff Strong.
- Design Guidelines - SW suggested having a high-level discussion about how to address the Design Guidelines which were incorporated by reference into WCC 20.72 in 2017. He noted that PDS treats the “guidelines” as law and they may contain too many mandatory provisions.
- Referring back to Judson Meraw comments that the June 18, 2019 special meeting regarding light pollution in Point Roberts, LH drew attention to the Lighting provisions of the Design Guidelines. There was discussion about incorporating the standards of the “Dark Skies Initiative”. SW agreed to find and share the language of the Dark Skies Initiative.
- LH raised the question whether any issues/problems have come up as a result of the Design Guidelines; whether is anything in need of “fixing”. There do not appear to be any issues that have come up at the PRCAC when reviewing recent projects. SW agreed to ask Cliff Strong if the Design Guidelines have caused problems with any commercial developments in Point Roberts.
- For now, LH moved that the Design Guidelines be left as they are. TP seconded. Approved.
- LH will prepare a draft of WCC 20.72 with proposed changes to provide to Cliff Strong before the July 9, 2019 special meeting, and to share locally. LH intends to prepare this by June 26, 2019.

July 18, 2019 — 20.72 discussion (meeting with Cliff Strong in attendance):

Administrative Approval Uses:

- .135(3) - Regarding screening, Isobel Brophy, asked how high screening needs to be; Mr. Strong noted that this can depend on the geography and distance from the road, but that in general the fence or screening should be high enough to obscure the item at issue, such as blocking view of RVs.
- .135(5) - The number of “accessory structures” could be increased from one, but allowing two or more would tend to encourage use of properties without homes and extended time with RVs; generally that is not what is favored and encouraged.

Conditional Uses

- .151 - Having “hotels, motels and timeshare condominiums” as Conditional Uses could be changed if there were community support to permit such uses more generally.
- .154 - Deleting horse racing and pari-mutuel betting facilities from “sports facilities” could be done, but those items would still be interpreted as being only conditional uses.

Prohibited Uses

- .202 - The prohibition of rooming houses, taverns and commercial parking in Maple Beach could be changed to follow standard code in Whatcom County if residents, particularly those in Maple Beach supported the change.
- .204(1) - There was considerable discussion about the prohibition of mini-storage facilities. The existing storage business on Gulf Road is “grandfathered in” as pre-existing non-conforming use. If there was some tolerance for such uses, they could be governed under “Conditional Uses,” for example, if permissible with appropriate screening.
- .204(3) - Separating the auto service and vehicle storage prohibitions into two provisions makes both provisions clearer.
- There was considerable discussion in connection with Prohibited Uses on the issues related to the compliance action regarding 1480 Gulf Road. There was no clear way to make the storage of commercial vehicles and truck containers permitted without opening up the entire Gulf Road commercial area to such uses.
- .350 - Regarding building setbacks, the applicability to Roosevelt Road could be removed if that was what the community wanted.
- On the Design Guidelines, Mr. Strong noted that they are guidelines. The mandatory “shall” usage in the Design Guidelines does not alter their status as only recommended guidelines. They provide a framework for property owners to use in their planning and for the PRCAC to use it is review of new commercial projects.
- .659 - Parking - The PRCAC had noted provisions of WCC 10.24 that should be changed. Mr. Strong commented that those limitations are under the purview of Whatcom County Public Works (CPW). Those provisions could be changed. Regarding covering ditches to install sidewalks, CPW would have practical concerns about maintaining draining ditches which could prevent such action.
- Mr. Strong suggested that the zoning change process should involve getting out a map of the community, drawing out what uses one wants where, and then making the rules fit those goals.

July 27, 2019 (special) — 20.72 discussion:

For the working session, the members present took up the compilation prepared by SW showing proposed changes, questions, and comments from PDS (Cliff Strong). The compilation included a new section .052 proposed in an e-mail from DG earlier that day.

New 0.52 in Permitted Uses:

In the STC zone, licensed business related storage of containers, wheeled trailers and other movable units provided such storage units are screened from view. The number of such units shall not exceed two (2) per business unless approved through an application for conditional use.

SW proposed some changes to the new provision:

In the STC zone, licensed business related storage of containers, wheeled trailers and other movable units provided such storage units are screened from view per standard Whatcom County screening rules and setback from the street by 50 feet. The number of such units shall not exceed two (2) per business unless approved through an application for conditional use.

The members present discussed the pros and cons of this provision. There was discussion about whether “licensed business related” should be removed from the draft section. There was further discussion about whether this change would effectively address the enforcement action regarding 1480 Gulf Road since, currently, the Potty Wagon business is not known to have an office at that location, and the storage containers are not believed to be connected to a business at that location. With respect to 1480 Gulf Road, these considerations were complicated by the point raised earlier by Pam Sheppard that 1480 Gulf Road is only permitted to have one business in the building on the property and it seems that the owner has not applied for a license to have multiple businesses operating from that building.

August 15, 2019 — 20.72 discussion:

Scheduled 2 more special meetings in lieu of discussion at this meeting.

August 24, 2019 (special) — 20.72 discussion:

The committee members reviewed all of the sections of WCC 20.72 which had been previously discussed at earlier meetings, as well as comments to those and other sections provided to the PRCAC by the PRRVA and the PRTA. Informal votes were taken on each section at issue, whether it was to be left unaltered, modified or deleted.

The results of the Working Session are set forth in the attached copy of WCC 20.72 indicating which sections were addressed (shown in bold type), with the outcome (no action taken, revisions, deletions). Changes to code provisions are in red and deletions are struck through. In all cases in which the vote was not 5:0, the “dissenting” vote was from SF.

August 29, 2019 (special) — 20.72 discussion:

Each provision of WCC 20.72 which the PRCAC has reviewed or which has been the subject of significant comments from PRRVA, PRTA, CoC or individuals, was read or described to the meeting attendees and further discussed. In addition to the notes included in the attached copy of revised WCC 20.72, the following comments came up during the discussions:

.010 — PRТА suggested additional language to add to the Purpose section. DG suggested this be reviewed at a later date.

.052 — DG suggested that the PRCAC approve the new provision for storage units and have it reviewed by PDS (Cliff Strong). LH reiterated her suggestion to remove “licensed business related” from the provision to allow greater flexibility. Samantha Scholefield asked why local businesses need more storage. Erica Conlan expressed concern about enforcement of this new provision. Martin Hogan commented that he has never seen businesses needing more storage space than their buildings provide, and wondered whether this was enabling mini-storage units. SF noted that this would not create small scale mini-storage facilities if the “licensed business related” language is retained. LH noted that Rawganique needed 14 additional storage units and that that need contributed to the business’ move to Blaine.

.053 — There was a question whether allowing two 200 sq. ft. storage sheds was permissible. PRCAC will seek feedback from PDS (Cliff Strong).

.130(5) — The change would allow for two 200 sq. ft. storage sheds for properties with RVs. They would have to be screened.

.151 — The question of permitting hotels in Resort Commercial zones was revived. It would allow up to 16-room hotels on properties in the few areas zones as Resort Commercial. The PRCAC voted 4:1 (SF “dissenting”) to approve this change. (In response, SF drafted a new section .157 to provide this option, in addition to revising .151 to exclude Resort Commercial from its scope.)

.154 — This change just removes specific redundant language.

.156 — This provision was added for the Conditional Uses formerly part of the Prohibited Uses of .204.

.202 — DG did not have a chance to reach the MBRA to ask their position on the prohibition of boarding houses, taverns and commercial parking lots. One resident wrote to LH to express support to allow hotels in Maple Beach. The PRCAC agreed to take no action at this time, pending input from MBRA.

.204 — PRCAC voted earlier (4:1) to make the Prohibited Uses dog kennels, vehicle storage, repair, cleaning and sales facilities and RV parts to be Conditional Uses (see .156). It was mentioned that requests for such businesses in the STC zone would come before the PRCAC for review and positive or negative recommendation to PDS. SF and LH disagreed on the significance of PRCAC as a potential roadblock to approval of such Conditional Use requests. Samantha Scholefield questioned why we would permit such businesses if a major business goal is to increase tourism. Martin Hogan questioned whether there would be sufficient public input against such uses (in comparison to the strong reaction to the radio towers). Erica Conlan commented that part-time residents have a hard time attending meetings to contest plans they object to. She further questioned how these proposed changes could be consistent with the vision for Point Roberts. Martin Hogan suggested that an economic development plan should be updated before significant changes like the one to .204 is made. Allison and Ken Calder commented that the change was being implemented to resolve Lorne Nielson’s issue at 1480 Gulf Road.

.350 — It was noted that the parenthetical heading should be removed, as agreed earlier for other sections. PRCAC earlier agreed to remove the deeper treed setbacks along Roosevelt Road. The setback would revert to 25 feet on Roosevelt Road.

.400 — The “along Gulf Road” limitation would be removed to have the 45 foot height limitation apply in STC on Gulf Road as well.

.653 — In the section on screening ((2)(a)), in which PRCAC previously agreed to propose including “living walls”, it was also agreed to add that screening be used to block the view of stored containers,

trailers or vehicles. No change was made to tree retention provisions. A typographical error was corrected in (e).

.659 — In subsection (1), it was previously agreed to encourage parking at the rear of businesses in STC, but to allow alternatives when the parking requirement would prevent the project from proceeding.

.670 — There was further discussion about LH’s proposal to remove the achromatic requirement for internally lit signs and the prohibition of moving signs. PRTA has reviewed these issues, but PRRVA and CoC have not yet had a chance to consider the issue. No action was taken at this time.

Design Guidelines — LH suggested that a change be made, if needed, to make sure that property “improvements”, such as the total re-build of the store at the Chevron station, be required to come before the PRCAC during the permitting process. DG suggested that that particular project was slated to come before the PRCAC, but that that previous Chairperson did not get it on a meeting agenda at the time.

10.24 — On the plan to seek a change to the prohibition on parking along much of Gulf Road, Martin Hogan commented that the parking-free shoulders give a place for pedestrians and cyclists. PRCAC members noted that if parking on both sides of Gulf Road is not approved, parking on one side would still be an advantage.

September 19, 2019 — 20.72 discussion:

DG reported that he had spoken with Cliff Strong of Planning and Development Services (PDS). Mr. Strong did not want to provide oral comments on the PRCAC’s proposed changes until after written comments have been completed. In addition, he noted that the changes are being reviewed by others in PDS (in Engineering and in Code Enforcement) and by County Public Works (CPW) (regarding the parking changes). It could be 2-3 weeks before review is completed and a response is provided to the PRCAC.

September 28, 2019 (special) — no 20.72 votes or discussion

October 17, 2019 — no 20.72 votes or discussion

October 24, 2019 (special) — 20.72 discussion:

Cliff Strong of PDS attended the Special Meeting to talk about the comments from his office and other County agencies on the changes to WCC 20.72 proposed by PRCAC in late August 2019. He noted that most of the changes were found to be acceptable, but noted three areas of particular concern:

Making vehicle repair, storage, etc. a conditional use in the STC zone, rather than being prohibited, is contradictory to the vision developed by the community and set forth in Subarea Plan. The zoning code must be consistent with the Sub Area Plan. If this proposed change is maintained, the Sub Area Plan must also be amended.

Allowing more than one storage unit on properties that do not have a “primary use” (e.g., a house) is a problem. This is not allowed anywhere within Whatcom County. Building Code Enforcement is concerned that storage units without a primary use on the property will eventually be used as a residence — which would be illegal and an enforcement issue. SW suggested that the provision could

be changed to require a primary use on the property. SW noted that allowing more storage units on a property could alleviate the need for more mini-storage units in Point Roberts.

The proposed parking changes were referred to WCPW which had objections. WCPW noted that parking on the prohibited areas of Gulf Road would create hazards for pedestrian traffic in the STC zone which is intended to be “pedestrian friendly”. SW asked how the PRCAC could make a case for the proposed change. Mr. Strong suggested that the request should be accompanied by drawings, plans, etc. to show how the proposed change would affect pedestrians, etc. [QUESTION: Was this plan to be about “regular” parking along Gulf Road, or about working to establish a shared parking lot somewhere in the STC zone?]

At this point, Mr. Strong reviewed each change in WCC 20.72 proposed by the PRCAC and the comments from PDS on those changes. At the conclusion of this part of the discussion, Mr. Strong said he would revise his earlier document with updates based on his better understanding of the PRCAC’s intentions behind those changes. When received, a copy of that update response from PDS will be attached to these Minutes.

November 23, 2019 — 20.72 discussion:

SW noted that discussion is needed on the Tree Removal rules (e.g., \$40 tree removal permit fee; Hazard Tree rules) and parking on Gulf Road, possibly on one side of the street. We should have one more special meeting to review WCC 20.72 issues. SW has asked for community feedback on the Tree Removal rules.

LH noted that we will have to have a special meeting on this topic.

December 19, 2019 — 20.72 discussion:

On November 8, 2019, Cliff Strong of PDS sent the PRCAC a second version of the PRCAC’s proposed changes to WCC 20.72 with updated changes and comments from PDS. SW and SF had reviewed the changes and comments from Mr. Strong and provided their comments to the other members; copy attached.

At the meeting, the members reviewed the latest version of proposed changes to WCC 20.72:

Section .010 — With removal of “Above all” from the start of the fourth paragraph, the new additional Purpose language was approved 4:0.

Section .051 — Regarding the PDS language of allowing hotels etc. of “any number of units”, it was decided to ask Mr. Strong why this open-end language was proposed. LH thought there could be problem setting a limit. SF was concerned that no stated limit could lead to maximal hotel structures (within the confines of other zoning or practical limitations (e.g., setbacks, septic)).

Section .102 — There was discussion to clarify the meaning of “two or fewer storage containers or other similar temporary storage units if accessory to a permitted business on the same lot”, with respect to a single property with more than one businesses. It is understood to mean that each such business can have up to two storage containers. Ms. Baxter asked that such containers be screened from view. SW noted that that is dealt with elsewhere in WCC 20.72.

Section .151 — PRCAC members had no issue with the conditional uses in Resort Commercial district.

Section .152 — PRCAC members had no issue with the conditional uses in Rural district.

Section .154 — On the new “Conditional Use” businesses in the Small Town Commercial district, there was again concern about the hotels etc. with “any number of units”. SF continued to question why the PRCAC was proposing to move RV parks and vehicle repair type businesses from “Prohibited” to “Conditional”. SW suggested that PRCAC ask that PDS inform the PRCAC of all conditional use requests so that more of the community can be aware of the requests beyond those required to be notified. LH suggested that a PRCAC member should make it their business to inquire regularly to learn about any such requests.

Section .204 — On the reduced scope of “Prohibited Uses” in the Small Town Commercial district, SF renewed his concern about the changes agreed to earlier by a 4:1 vote.

Section .350 — PRCAC members had no issue with the new provision at (3) regarding setback for storage containers. Vote 4:0.

Section .653 — Regarding the proposed Tree Canopy provisions at (3) and Hazard Tree provisions at (4), the PRCAC members preferred to strike these possible changes for possible reconsideration later. Vote 4:0.

Parking — It was noted that WCPW did not like the PRCAC proposal to allow parking along Gulf Road. Ms. Calder of the PRRVA earlier suggested seeking approval for parking on one side of Gulf Road. The PRCAC deferred this issue to 2020.

January 23, 2020 — 20.72 discussion:

Rather than go through a few final amendments to the set of changes to WCC 20.72, it was decided to do that in a separate special meeting. The special meeting will take place on Monday, January 27, 2020 at 6 pm in the Community Center. The meeting will probably end at 7 pm due to member availability.

January 27, 2020 (special) — 20.72 discussion:

The limited purpose of this special meeting of the PRCAC was to address WCC 20.72, including possible further amendments to WCC 20.72, and possible review of a description of the zoning changes for local publication.

On the first point, SW noted that there were some questions raised by Planning and Development Services (PDS) to the final set of changes to WCC 20.72 and SW suggested that the PRCAC promptly address those remaining issues from its 2019 work. The following issues were discussed:

- a) 20.72.010 – Purpose — Mark Robbins of PRTA had drafted language to include in the introductory portion of WCC 20.72 which the PRCAC earlier agreed to include. Cliff Strong of PDS suggested that this new language was more appropriate for inclusion in the Sub-Area Plan. The PRCAC members present voted 3:0 to withdraw this proposed change and to consider the language at some later time for inclusion in the Sub-Area Plan.
- b) 20.72.100 – Accessory Uses — PRCAC had noted that there is no limit on the number of under-200 sq. ft. storage sheds, if they meet all other code requirements, and asked PDS whether this should be directly stated somewhere in 20.72 somewhere. PDS’ comment was that it does not need to be said anywhere. It is based on the existing code for the underlying zones, which does not put a limit on them as accessory uses. The PRCAC members present voted 3:0 to accept the PDS recommendation.

In this context Heidi Baxter suggested that unpermitted sheds should be allowed even when there is no permitted structure on a property. She thought this could promote construction of tiny houses to provide low-cost housing in Point Roberts.

- c) 20.72.051 – Hotels in Resort Commercial — In response to earlier discussion when Cliff Strong of PDS was present, PDS proposed changing .051 to read: Hotels, motels, and timeshare condominiums “of any number of units” were permitted uses in the Resort Commercial zones. SF said that he did not think that the PRCAC had meant to propose having no limit on the number of units. Allison Calder commented that the Sub-Area Plan supports the presence of public accommodations in Point Roberts and that 20.72 must be consistent with the Sub-Area Plan. Ms. Calder also noted that WCC 20.64.050 limits the number of units to 16 or fewer. The PRCAC members present voted 3:0 to seek guidance from PDS on whether WCC 20.72.051(2) was redundant and unnecessary in view of other existing requirements.
- d) 20.72.102 – Storage Containers — The PRCAC had added to conditional uses in the STC zone the presence of two or fewer storage containers or other similar temporary storage units if accessory to a permitted business on the same lot. This led to a question whether that could be interpreted as only 2 for the whole property, or, as intended, as up to 2 for each permitted business on the property. To clarify, the PRCAC members present voted 3:0 to change the proposed language to read “if accessory to each permitted business”.
- e) 20.72.204 – Commercial Storage of Vehicles — Early on, the PRCAC had voted 4:1 to change the prohibition of having commercial storage of vehicles in the Small Town Commercial (STC) zone (.204) to, instead, be a conditional use in the STC zone (in new .154). PDS noted that this would contradict statements in the Sub-Area Plan. The PRCAC members present voted 3:0 to keep these uses as prohibited in the STC zone under .204.
- f) 20.72.670 – Signs — The PRCAC earlier considered removing the requirement that internally illuminated signs be “achromatic.” However, there had never been a direct vote on that issue once all the members had reached their final position on the question. SF reiterated his position that we do not need multicolored illuminated signs; that consumers can find all the local businesses just fine with current signage. The PRCAC members present voted 2:1 to remove “achromatic” from the internally illuminated signage requirement.

February 21, 2020 (special) — no 20.72 votes or discussion:

February 26, 2020 — no 20.72 votes or discussion:

SF noted that County Executive Satpal Sidhu commented when he was in Point Roberts that the PRCAC should pursue its current limited changes to WCC 20.72, but should also plan to take a much more comprehensive review with bolder changes as the outcome.

SW reported on a suggested from Cliff Strong at PDS that the PRCAC provide Mark Personius with excerpts from PRCAC Minutes which describe the rationale from the changes to WCC 20.72 being proposed by the PRCAC. Mr. Personius would use that information when he describes the proposed changes from PRCAC and the separate approach to WCC 20.72 proposed by the PRIBC to County Council at their March 10, 2020 meeting. SF will review the Minutes to identify such descriptions.

July 16, 2020

.102 (1) PDS wants to add: "Storage containers do not include truck trailers."

- *SW and SF felt that goes against our initial goal of allowing George's trailer as a storage container.*
- *PRCAC 07/16/2020 -- Reject ban on truck trailers VOTE 3:0*

.102 (2) PDS added this.

- *PRCAC OK*

.135 (4) "Lots or recreational vehicles shall not be leased or rented out for recreational use or permanent or temporary habitation, except in permitted recreational vehicle parks."

- *SBW and STF like it, as it means that only business owners' vehicles are allowed (e.g. no "rentals").*
- *PRCAC 07/16/2020 -- Reject the prohibition of renting or leasing said RV etc. -- VOTE 3:0*

.151 In the Resort Commercial District:

(1) Dry boat storage, including stacked boat storage, and boat trailer storage associated with a marina.

- *PRCAC 07/16/2020 – 1) Keep Conditional -- VOTE 2:1 2) QUESTION: PDS/Cliff Pros/Cons of Administrative instead.*

.154 In the Small Town Commercial District:

(1) Three or more storage containers or similar temporary storage units per lot if accessory to an approved commercial use on the same lot. Storage containers do not include truck trailers.

- *PDS was concerned that "3 or more" could allow, even under a CUP, a large number of storage containers thus creating a storage business which our vision doesn't want. SW and SF agree that "3 or more" is a loop hole under the Conditional Use flag. It could allow, if the applicant prevailed, to have many storage containers (a whole lot full?), defeating our goal of allowing some storage by businesses but not allow new open ended storage facilities. Perhaps say "up to 2 per business"?*
- *SBW and STF proposes eliminating "no truck trailers..." as that violates our vision.*
- *PRCAC 07/16/2020:*
 - *1) Use "not to exceed 3" and*
 - *2) remove "Storage containers do not include truck trailers" (also see .102 (1) -- VOTE 3:0*

.204 The following uses are prohibited in the Small Town Commercial Zone District

(1) Animal kennels, except as allowed pursuant to WCC 20.72.154(2).

- *SW and SF think this a needed change; limit it to "groomers" only.*
- *PRCAC 07/16/2020 – Approved -- VOTE 3:0*

(3) Facilities for commercial rental, sale, storage, service, repair, or washing of motorized vehicles and equipment, motorcycles, marine vessels or equipment, farm implements, light and heavy equipment, or recreational vehicles .

- *SW and SF think this is a good change.*
- *PRCAC 07/16/2020:*
 - *1) Approve adding “rental” -- VOTE 3:0:1(abstained).*
 - *2) Voted 2:2 Motion to discuss possible loss of repair biz in future.*
- *Subsequent PRCAC meeting (8/20/2020) discussed that the PR Subarea Plan may preclude eliminating the prohibition until we can agree on new (TBD) subarea Plan changes.*

20.72.350 Building setbacks/buffer areas. (Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.)

(1) In the Small Town Commercial district any storage containers or other similar temporary storage units accessory to a permitted business shall be set back 50 feet from any adjacent right-of-way.

- *PRCAC 07/16/2020 -- No comment needed*

20.72.653 Landscaping, screening, and tree canopy retention. (Adopted by reference in WCCP Chapter 2.)

(1) Screening.

(a) Dumpster and utility areas of commercial and institutional uses shall be screened pursuant to WCC 20.80.355 (Trash or garbage collection storage areas – Screening and placement).

(b) Commercial storage of vehicles, trailers, or truck containers shall be screened from public rights-of-way and adjacent properties to a height of 6 feet using earth berms, landscaping or building wall, or living wall (i.e., fabricated wall with vertical living vegetation).

- *PRCAC 07/16/2020 -- No comment needed*

20.72.659 Parking.

(1) Parking lots shall be provided at the rear or side of buildings, except, when infeasible due to site conditions, alternate on-site parking locations may be allowed.

- *PRCAC 07/16/2020 -- No comment needed*