Skagit County Planning Commission
Public Hearing: Permit Procedures Code Update
June 18, 2024

Planning Commissioners:	**Kathy Mitchell, District 1 (absent)** **Vince Henley, District 1** **Angela Day, District 1** **Amy Hughes, District 2** **Tim Raschko, Chair, District 2** **Joe Woodmansee, District 2** **Tammy Candler, Vice Chair, District 3** **Martha Rose, District 3** **Jen Hutchison, District 3**
PDS Staff:	**Tara Satushek, Senior Planner**
Others:	**Ryan Walters, Consultant**

Chair Tim Raschko: (gavel) Good evening, everybody. The June 18th, 2024, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission is now in session. Let's see, we are missing Commissioner Mitchell, I believe, and that is it. I guess so. Okay. Great.

We've got time for Public Remarks tonight. I have a preamble to read. As first, Tara, do you know if anybody is Zooming?

Tara Satushek: There's no one on Zoom right now.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Then unless Mr. Walters wants to address the Commission, we will dispense with Public Remarks and go directly to our public hearing on Permit Procedures, (Skagit County Code 14.06) Update.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony and written correspondence regarding the proposed update to Skagit County Code SCC 14.06, Permit Procedures. The purpose of the proposed code update is to improve permit procedures to expedite permits, improve readability and usability, and comply with new state legislation 2SBB (sic) 5290.

Written comments are also being accepted and can be placed in the box located on the staff table in the front of the room. The written comment period is open until Thursday, June 20th, 2024, at 4:30 p.m. Written comments are encouraged and are not limited in length or the number of issues that you may raise.

Does anybody wish?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right. Do you still want to make a presentation?

Ryan Walters: That's at your discretion. The presentation I have for you tonight is the same presentation you've seen twice before, although shortened and with one different, new slide talking about the land division process.

Chair Raschko: What are the wishes of the Commission?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: We'll definitely need to see the change.

Commissioner Jen Hutchison: The new slide.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: All right. Please.

Mr. Walters: Okay. I'll advance through all the slides very quickly and you'll get a taste of it.

First of all, the steps tonight are to review and then hold your public hearing. It sounds like that will be done quickly. Our objectives are, as the Chair just recently read, to expedite permits through improvements to the permit process; to improve readability and usability; and to comply with 5290 from two legislative sessions ago.

This proposal, as you might recall, evolves Application Levels into Types of Review. That's a very important summary level concept of what this proposal does. And it makes some changes in process and appeal rights, and that slide that I'm going to get to in a moment is the one about land divisions, which has changed since the last draft that you looked at. We try to improve language; we try to make it plain language; we try to put stuff into tables where that is possible, and checklists where it isn't; and then we're trying to cover all the bases, making sure that applications have expiration periods, that permits have expiration periods, that the various possible ways the permits might move through the system are accounted for in this procedures document. And as an example of that, we have added an escape route if, for example, a Hearing Examiner disappears and doesn't deliver a decision on a permit application – which is not a theoretical problem. And then we create various other changes for Title 14.

Now this is the big table that we went over before. I'm not inclined to go over it again. It really hasn't changed. But basically what we're talking about is changing from Application Level Roman numerals to Types of Review Arabic numerals. Application Level II becomes Type of Review 3 because there were two Application Level ones before. We're trying to make it more straightforward. And then the process largely doesn't change except that we expedite the appeal at the end. There would no longer be two levels of appeal for the lowest level of permit. They would only have one level of appeal.

And then finally, that Application Level IV, which previously was final plat approval, which is a ministerial decision but was before the Board of County Commissioners, would move to staff level. And that's been facilitated by a change in the state law from five or six years ago. Because it's ministerial it doesn't need to go before the Board of County Commissioners. And it's the last step before a property owner can subdivide their property and get permission to sell the lots.

Now with respect to the 5290 implementation, that bill from two sessions ago, we make some important changes – which I'm not going to go over all of those here – but the most important one is detailed, shortened – in most cases – time limits for how long it *can* take, for how long the Department can take to process a permit application. And this is a big part of the meat of this

code update. Permits that don't require public notice under previous law were allowed 120 days but there was no teeth to that state law. Now they will require – or they will be allowed – only up to 65 days. Permits that do require public notice come down to a hundred days from the previous 120, unless they also require a public hearing, in which case the time to review them goes up to 170. These are the defaults that are in the state law. We, in drafting this, just pasted the defaults into the local code, but obviously you do have the ability to change them, mostly in the downward direction. If you go up, there are some consequences. And then all of those review periods are subject to exclusions from the shot clock. So if staff receive an application and they need more information (and) they send it back out to the applicant for a review, the clock stops and we're not measuring time when the permit application is sitting with the applicant. Those numbers correspond here. It's that orange row at the bottom. So your Level I Application, which is now a Type 1 review, is a 65-day-to-decision type of application and then those others are 100 or 170.

What we anticipate in the future here is that next week you'll do your deliberations and issue a recommendation on this proposal. The Board of County Commissioners will then receive it and do their review. We may end up with another public comment period in front of the Board. We do have some staff comments that I have not yet reviewed. I don't believe we have any public comments, but if we need to make further changes then they will have to have another comment period. And then Board adoption. And our expected effective date for this chapter is not just immediately after Board adoption. We're currently targeting September 1. And that date may move further into the future if the permit software that the Department is working on is not yet ready.

Here's a screen I'll leave up in a moment because it's where people can go to get more information. I'm sorry that that first web address isn't shorter, but it is what it is.

And that slide that I promised you did not appear. So let me see if I can find it here. Yes. Okay. So a notable change since the last draft that you have reviewed twice now is that we simplified further the table for land divisions. At one point in an earlier draft, we had the possibility of land divisions inside or outside an Urban Growth Area having a different level of review; however, we did away with that distinction. We've retained this table because in the future the County could add that back in. State law allows for a short subdivision to be larger than only four lots inside an Urban Growth Area, but there are currently other problems associated with larger short subdivisions in an Urban Growth Area, mostly having to do with the cities. So until such time as that is worked out, we haven't included that here.

Also under current code there is a(n) expedited process for short subdivisions – well, for long subdivisions between five and nine lots. State law allows for those small, long subdivisions to be approved without a public hearing; however, it is – there are somewhat onerous advertising requirements and then anyone in the comment period can ask for a public hearing, at which time you've got to stop and pivot and switch to a process where you have to have a public hearing. And staff suggested it would be much simpler if we just didn't try to use that process. So this is more the default process that's allowed under state law where you only have one type of long subdivision and it does away with the special rules for between five and nine lots and __ we start at five and go higher.

Now in current code we also have a special set of rules for subdivisions of 50 units or more. We have done away with those because we expect, number one, there aren't going to be a lot of those, if any, but also because under current code a very large subdivision like that goes to Hearing Examiner review and then it goes to the Board of County Commissioners for approval, but then there's no appeal right because there's no one locally to appeal *to*. You can only appeal

to Superior Court. So what we did is ratchet that back down so that long subdivisions go to the Hearing Examiner for approval and then you have an appeal right to the Board of County Commissioners.

And then binding site plans are similar, but there's a little bit more affordance for a somewhat larger one, the one to eight lots in this chart. But that is existing code. That is the current process for binding site plans.

We're also looking at potentially another alteration to this chart to make alterations of long subdivisions a faster approval process, because kind of under a strict reading of the statute it's got to be Level IV, but that's a relatively simple process and if we could make it simpler I think everybody would prefer that. So we're looking at that. We have yet to determine that.

Commissioner Martha Rose: So unit lot subdivisions, which are townhomes that ___. My background is building them in Seattle, and there you build the thing on a parent lot and then while you're under construction you go in for the unit lot subdivision to draw lines down the party walls. Where does that fit in to this scenario?

Mr. Walters: It does not. I'm glad you asked. Unit lot subdivision code is required by state law. The County doesn't currently have a unit lot subdivision code. It's – by the way, Tara, it's on my list of recommendations for future work – it's not very useful in the unincorporated rural area because you're not –

Commissioner Rose: You don't build townhomes.

Mr. Walters: – doing townhomes. But it is a requirement to have that. So we haven't addressed it here because this is purely procedural. That would need to go into the land division chapter of the code. But because we have placed all of this in a table, it's a matter of adding a row when we do develop the substantive code to also put it into the procedural code.

Commissioner Rose: Okay, so in the Urban Growth boundaries, which doesn't include the outer-lying areas that we're addressing with this, you're saying that the state now requires unit lot subdivisions?

Mr. Walters: My understanding is – from looking at the state law – is that all jurisdictions are required to have a unit lot subdivision set of procedures in code.

Commissioner Rose: I see.

Mr. Walters: But we haven't addressed it.

Commissioner Rose: I see.

Mr. Walters: It's on a list of trailing issues.

Commissioner Rose: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Walters: Yeah.

Chair Raschko: Are you finished?

Mr. Walters: Yep.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Are there other questions?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question. This table here, does it reflect a change in what we've been doing or is it essentially the same as what we've been doing?

Mr. Walters: It is a change and that's why I highlighted. Under current code, a short subdivision is one to four lots, just as you see, so that's not a change. A long subdivision between five and eight lots currently gets this expedited but odd review system where there is no public hearing scheduled, but during the comment period anybody can ask for a public hearing and then you have to switch the process to include a public hearing. And that's what we've done away with for those sort of medium-sized land divisions or small long subdivisions. It only affects ones between five and eight lots inclusive.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So do we know how many five and eight-lot subdivisions we have compared to subdivisions over eight?

Mr. Walters: I asked staff that and they said that they don't do that many of those. But I can't give you an exact number.

Commissioner Woodmansee: And the reason I'm asking that is because what are we really affecting? I can't imagine there's very many that are over eight in Skagit County, in unincorporated Skagit County. And so that change is not really affecting anything. But if we have the majority of our long plats are five to eight, that would make a big change, you know. That affects a lot of land subdivisions, right?

Mr. Walters: Yeah. Yeah, and remember our objective here in the procedures chapter rewrite is to improve permit processes. There are other considerations as well in that the state law requirement for those expedited five to eight-lot provisions does require – I think it's five signs to be posted on the property and a very quick turnaround on the Notice of Availability, or maybe it's the staff report. And that was, I think, one of the things that staff were trying to get away from, is that required super-quick – an *extraordinarily* quick – turnaround on those. But we could check with staff in advance of your deliberations next week on just precisely how many historically have qualified for that provision.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, it'd just be interesting to know what we're really affecting. Like history, anyways – the history of long plats.

Chair Raschko: Anything else, Joe?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question on a different topic. In the – if that's okay?

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Could you pull this slide up that – yeah, that one right there. So if you have a project that requires a Hearing Examiner – oh, I might have read this wrong. So it's 170 days if you're required to have a Hearing Examiner. It was – Hearing Examiner *with* a public hearing, or Hearing Examiner *without* a public hearing? Is that two different options that you described earlier?

Mr. Walters: No. If the Hearing Examiner is involved, there *is* a public hearing.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. I misheard something that you obviously didn't say!

Mr. Walters: Yeah, the new state law rules are that permits that do not require public notice are 65 days. Permits that do require public notice are 100. And if you go to this chart, it's only Type 2s that end up in that hundred-day period, with a notice but not a hearing. And then everything to the right here does include a public hearing.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Gotcha.

Chair Raschko: Any other questions?

Commissioner Angela Day: So I know we discussed this once before about the level of appeal and the options for appeal. So Type 1 and Type 2, I'm thinking those have fairly little amount of discretion in the interpretation of an application. Is that – would you agree with that or is that not true?

Mr. Walters: Yes, and that's why they rest with staff. They are supposed to be – Type 1, especially, is supposed to be ministerial.

Commissioner Day: Right.

Mr. Walters: Meaning there is essentially no discretion – for instance, with a building permit, if you meet the requirements of the building code you should get that permit - versus a Type 2, where there is some level of discretion. So a Type 2 includes an administrative special use permit, and there staff are going to propose conditions on your special use in order to make sure it's compatible with the neighborhood and is consistent with the rest of the land use code. So there's some discretion there. But then more advanced special use permits – Hearing Examiner special use permits, for lack of a better term, but they are what they are – a more advanced level of review – move over into that third category where they go to a Hearing Examiner, not just staff, and they get a public hearing, not just a public comment period.

Commissioner Day: Yeah, thank you. I appreciate that. I guess I'm not sure what kind of guidance you've had from the Commissioners or if you're just proposing this based on the state code or the state law, but it does appear that you can have more than one avenue of appeal if one of them is a closed record hearing. So I'm thinking of an instance in the Type 2 category where there *is* some discretion. So you put in – an applicant puts in an application for something that has some amount of discretion. It's denied. They appeal to the Hearing Examiner and then once that's exhausted they only can go to court, which is lengthy, expensive. And so if they believe for some reason that the code was misapplied or misinterpreted or that level of discretion was not, you know, not appropriate to their application – that they believe they met it all, all the requirements – then they don't have that avenue of appeal. And so I don't know how other folks feel about that. I wish we could get some public comments on it.

Mr. Walters: Yeah, so under current code, a proposed Type 2 is an existing Level I with notice, and under current code it is decided by the staff, by the Planning staff, and then under current code there is an appeal to the Hearing Examiner. You can see this ink, right?

Commissioner Day: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Walters: Yes. Okay. I hope it's on. And then there's an appeal beyond the Hearing Examiner to the Board of County Commissioners. State law is not written very clearly on what the state expects, but it says that you can only have one closed record appeal and only one open record pre-decision public hearing. In this case, there is no pre-decision public hearing because public hearings start at Level III, or Type 3. Under the current code, the Hearing Examiner holds an appeal which is open record.

Commissioner Day: Right.

Mr. Walters: And an open record appeal is not discussed by the state law. State law does not mention it. The state law doesn't seem to envision it. So there's an argument that under current code you can have an open record appeal so long as you don't have more than one closed record appeal; however, there's also an argument that what the state meant was only one level of appeal and only one level of public hearing *before* an appeal.

So what we've done here, though, is delete one level of appeal – so that there's always only one level – for consistency but also for fairness to the applicant. Because it's generally not the applicant who is appealing. It's generally the neighborhood or some other interested party. And so especially because this is generally a lower level permit, my sense and our sense with Director Moore and everything was that we want to simplify this and we don't want two levels of appeal – which seems onerous – for a lower level permit. And so that's why we've deleted it there – as well as for ensuring that we are consistent with the state law, which we don't really know that that is mandated. I didn't find a case on point.

Commissioner Day: Yeah, I looked at your reference in the memo that you provided – the RCW – and it says "one open record hearing." But you can also have a closed record hearing, so you could have an appeal to the Hearing Examiner and then an appeal – closed record appeal – to the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Walters: And that's what the current code provides for.

Commissioner Day: Right. Right, but the new proposal is not – right?

Mr. Walters: Right, the proposal – as you can see, the green box to the blue, green describes Hearing Examiner review then Board of Commissioner review, both on appeal. And under the proposal it would *only* be Hearing Examiner review.

Commissioner Day: Right. I don't know what the right thing is. I'm just raising it as a potential concern that – you know, people might not be paying attention to the permit procedures changes, but somewhere down the road they would think, you know, I can't appeal this? Like, I have to go to court? This can't be heard by the Board of Commissioners. I don't know if that's a good thing or a negative thing.

Mr. Walters: Well, and you *can* appeal it; you can just only appeal it once.

Commissioner Day: Yeah. Exactly.

Commissioner Rose: I'd like to respond to that. As a builder, that second appeal or those appeals are often weapons used to shut down the ability to build a project and causes escalating costs in housing. And so I think that's the goal – isn't it? – of eliminating the second chance to appeal.

There's so many examples out there that – like, there're some projects in Seattle that would be tied up for seven years.

Commissioner Day: Yeah.

Commissioner Rose: And it's a strategy to kill projects.

Commissioner Day: Yeah.

Mr. Walters: And there's –

Commissioner Rose: So is that a good thing? We have a housing shortage, you know, and so….

Commissioner Day: Yeah, and that was definitely, I think, addressed in the staff memo as a concern, that the lengthy appeals processes raises costs and uncertainty, and ultimately the cost of housing.

Commissioner Rose: Yeah. Yeah, so you can follow the codes and design a building per the codes and then people that don't want it can drag it out in court – you know, in appeals and court.

Commissioner Day: Right.

Commissioner Rose: And so I guess the question is: Is that a good thing? Should that be allowed?

Commissioner Day: Yeah. It's a question.

Chair Raschko: Joe, please.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I get the feeling that you're talking more from the proponent's perspective, not from the opponent's perspective.

Commissioner Day: I am. Yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So that you can't get shut out from the administrative side.

Commissioner Day: Right. I feel like –

Commissioner Woodmansee: And so her angle's from the other direction.

Commissioner Rose: Right, but as Ryan said, the bulk pretty much – it's usually not used by the applicant. It's usually used by the public.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Right. Yeah. If you're only going to have one, you would want it to be a Hearing Examiner for sure, because theoretically the Hearing Examiner's going to be a third party and it's not going to be staff making this recommendation and the Board of Commissioners are put in this position to go against what staff has recommended.

Commissioner Day: Right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: At least you're in front of a party that, in theory, isn't predetermined based on relationship.

Commissioner Day: Right.

Commissioner Rose: I'd like to give an example. A lot of buildings have to go through a design review process, and the design review process – the inhouse – they might say, Oh, we want you to do x, y, and z, and as an applicant, you might think x, y, and z is too many demands so you might appeal that request. And that's that area of interpretation, like that's that gray area that – I've been in situations like that, right? And in fact, where the neighbors actually – this is an example where the applicant – you know, we appealed. The neighbors were behind us. They liked what we were proposing but the administrative department wanted some changes. And so I don't remember the outcome because that was a lot of years ago, but so it can happen both ways. But usually it's around things like design review where these things come up.

Mr. Walters: There are two other policy level considerations here that led us to put this in the draft.

Commissioner Day: Yeah?

Mr. Walters: First of all, the County doesn't have to provide a local appeal at all, but it' s a Best Practice to provide a local appeal to make sure that people that are aggrieved have an opportunity to be heard before it gets to court, because when it gets to court it may result in damages that the County might have to pay. And in some cases those can be very significant. So it's an escape valve that way if there is an actual error in the permit process that a county can identify. We want to make sure that there is an administrative appeal opportunity at the local level before it gets to court.

The other consideration, though, on the flip side is – and this is something Commissioner Day, I think, spoke about at the last meeting – we generally want to take lay people out of this process, especially local elected officials because of the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine. And they're not removed from the process here entirely, because for Level III and Level IV the Board of County Commissioners does have a role to play. But especially on a lower level permit, our sense – speaking with the Department – is that it makes less sense to have the Board of County Commissioners involved there and there's less value-add for the risk which is associated with not making the right policy in a quasi-judicial process. This Planning Commission doesn't get involved in quasi-judicial processes, but those processes mean you can't talk to people about it, you can't talk to your own constituents, your own voters – people who really expect to be able to talk to elected officials about it. There's a lot of potential for error because of the quasi-judicial Appearance of Fairness Doctrine rules, and it puts elected officials in a bad position. So that's a second policy reason that we constructed it the way we did.

Commissioner Day: Yeah, and I appreciate that and I think we talked about that at the last meeting. I just – you know, I was involved in a case as an opponent to a project and it ended up in Superior Court, and basically the judge said the Council – this was not this county; it was a County Council – has the ultimate authority for interpreting the code. That was the Council's decision and that stands. And so I think that's more important, as you were saying, for like a Level III type of project that is potentially going to have more impact and should be interpreted, I suppose, by elected officials. I think it's right that those lower level type of decisions are not best – their time is not best used on those – the Board of Commissioners.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question. Does the County utilize consultants for – let's say you get a 50-lot plat in. Does the County ever put that stuff out to consultants to do the review?

Mr. Walters: I've been out of the office for the last five years, so I can't speak to that. Tara, do you happen to know?

Ms. Satushek: I don't have any recollection of that happening anytime recent but it may have before my time. But generally a lot of – most of the review is inhouse, especially for long division – subdivision reviews.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah. I asked that question because I've experienced this, where I submitted a project. The City that reviewed it put it out to a consultant that they chose. The review came back very positive for the project but the people in charge at the City were unhappy that it came back positive and so they threw it out and made me start over with a new consultant, who was somebody that they had a really long-term relationship with. And so I was trying to drill into, If we did, where's the separation? Like if a consultant does review and then that consultant says a, b, and c; you know, here's my comments on this review. Where I was trying to get to is at that point would the County accept that review as the County's position or, like the case I was in, they completely rejected *their* third party person's review and made me start over because they didn't like – they didn't like – he reviewed it in a way that they were unhappy with his review. And so I was just curious if we utilized that much or whatever and how that relationship works, because my experience was I went through the whole process all over again. The project didn't change a whole lot but literally at that point the next person that was in line that I was told to work with was the guy who wrote the code for the City of Mount Vernon essentially. So it was not a – it really wasn't a third party situation.

Mr. Walters: I think this proposal doesn't address that, doesn't govern it. It doesn't provide any protections but also doesn't encourage external review. Speaking only for myself from the perspective of planning management, I think you do want to have that ability, because otherwise you could have one large project come up that could just consume –

Commissioner Woodmansee: Right.

Mr. Walters: – staff time, staff time that may not be familiar with that large of a project anyway and may not be best spent on that project. And if you can farm it out to a consultant, especially somebody on a roster that you can pick from, there are a lot of efficiencies that could be gained there. But I also don't see that happen from a lot of departments locally.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah. So is it fair to say that that is an option under our current code to do that? I mean –

Mr. Walters: There's always an option to do that.

Commissioner Woodmansee: – is it always an option to do that?

Mr. Walters: Nothing preventing that, yeah.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, okay. Thank you.

Ms. Satushek: I can just forward your question to Director Moore, too, just so he can get back to you at the next meeting.

Commissioner Woodmansee: It's more of a policy question.

Mr. Walters: And I do think there's a line in the fee schedule that supports that. You know, that would allow for billing the applicant for that work.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sure. Which I paid for twice!

Chair Raschko: Are there any other questions?

Commissioner Day: I have one more.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Day.

Commissioner Day: Thank you. I think part of what you're asking is partly what we discussed with the Guemes Island amendment, which is: What does staff do with information that they receive? The permit procedures and the memo that you gave us outlines the code in terms of the applicant's responsibility, but it really doesn't say anything about internal procedures, you know. It talks about the importance of streamlining and limiting the scope of review to certain aspects. And like you said, those Type 1 decisions don't have very much discretion. But what we don't know is, What are the internal procedures for making those decisions? I mean, I think that streamlining the review process and all those things are on the other side of this that we don't have access to. And so I don't know if that's part of this in parallel, this project. But it seems to me that that is a lot of what's taking all the time with the review, is perhaps staff asserting discretion or looking – you know, looking for things or, you know, not having a clear four-corners-of-the-application view of what they're viewing.

Mr. Walters: So that is absolutely correct. This proposal puts in new timelines, new shorter timelines to require the Department to process applications more quickly. It does not tell the Department how to get there. I have separately made recommendations to the Department on how to do that and specifically how to have a more holistic view of an application, rather than just passing it between specialties where *nobody* has the holistic view of an application. But this code doesn't – it doesn't try to force that, it doesn't try to limit it. It allows some bookends so that the applicant can have some certainty about how fast an application will make its way through the system. But it then allows the Department to figure out the internals of who you're going to pass it to, how many people you're going to employ and what specialty, and all of that. That we wouldn't want to try to prescribe in code. And then hopefully the code – not the procedures but the substantive chapters of code – is articulating what the standards are. You know, this type of application needs to be reviewed against these standards. But who does that review? Is it specialized? Is it something that a generalist can do? That kind of decision is the Director and the administration's decision to figure out and not something that we're trying to force through this code update specifically. We're trying to enable the Director to make those good decisions about how the Department is organized.

Commissioner Day: Thank you. It'd be nice if that information was more transparent.

Chair Raschko: Any other questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Walters.

Mr. Walters: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: And that concludes the public hearing. So Tara, could you kindly, in lieu of a staff report, could you just remind us of the June 24th Board of County Commissioners' meeting?

Ms. Satushek: Yes. There will be a meeting on Monday, June 24th, at 2:30 here at the Continental building, where the Board of County Commissioners will be having discussion, taking public comment, and having possible action on a resolution remanding the recently proposed agritourism code changes back to the Planning Commission. The Commission and the public are welcome to attend in person or Zoom. The link is available on the Commissioners' page and the draft resolution is available on the Planning and Development website under Popular Topics and then Agritourism.

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you. Are there any questions for staff? _____ reports. Okay.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: We'll go to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. Martha, have you anything?

Commissioner Rose: I don't.

Commissioner Hutchison: Nothing.

Commissioner Woodmansee : No.

Commissioner Vince Henley: No.

Vice Chair Candler: I have a question. We didn't approve our minutes from last week. Is that because there was too quick of a turnaround?

Ms. Satushek: Yes, because this was a special meeting, and so they will be for the 25th meeting, so next week for last week's minutes.

Vice Chair Candler: Okay.

Commissioner Day: I just wanted to say thank you to Mr. Walters. I found your memo was very helpful and all the changes that are presented and discussed in the proposed ordinance was really helpful. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Amy?

Commissioner Amy Hughes: I'll just support that comment.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, I have nothing myself. So thank you, everybody. Thank you for the report. And we'll stand adjourned (gavel).