

**COLUMBIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL SESSION**  
CITY HALL – 1840 SECOND STREET  
AUGUST 31, 2016 - 6:30 P.M.

**PLANNING**

**COMMISSIONERS:**

Kelly Niles, Chair  
Barbara Gordon, Vice-Chair\*  
Coralee Aho  
Dennis Capik\*  
Dana Marble  
Shelly Sandford  
George Fortier\*

\*Denotes Commissioner absent

**STAFF:**

Stacey Goldstein, City Planner  
Helen Johnson, Planning Administrative Assistant

**OTHERS:**

None

**MEETING TO ORDER:**

Kelly called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Kelly lead the pledge of allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

None.

Helen let the Commissioners know that the City Council just appointed a new Planning Commissioner, George Fortier who has not been sworn in yet. She also mentioned this would have been Dennis's last meeting if he had been able to make it. Helen said there was another application for Planning Commissioner turned in just yesterday and the position should be filled soon.

**CITIZEN INPUT AND REQUESTS:**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

None.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Kelly turned the meeting over to Stacey to discuss the topic of accessory buildings and structures and vision clearance areas.

Stacey presented the latest draft of the Accessory Buildings and Structures chapter. She said before she and Helen went on vacation this month they went over the draft, looked at the definitions and changed some of the formatting.

Stacey stated her goal for the meeting tonight is if everyone is comfortable is to get the draft finalized on the agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting. Then a formal recommendation can be made to the City Council. The next meeting would be September 20, 2016 and there should be enough time to provide adequate notice.

Some of the key items discussed regarding accessory buildings and structures were as follows:

- Added definition for accessory structure.
- Edited the portable storage structure definition making the height consistent with building permit requirements and removed the reference to poles and covered by vinyl or canvas, so metal could be used if desired.
- For submittal requirements, the question was added proposed structures and including asking about building materials and colors.
- The draft application for accessory structures and buildings was presented to the Commission. It was decided to change the form creating more of a checklist.

Helen discussed an example with the Commission about a resident who wants to add a metal carport to his property. The structure exceeds 200 square feet and would require a building permit. He plans to have the roof the same color as his home and he wants it located just outside the shop door to keep his classic cars covered as they come in and out of the shop to be worked on. What he proposes would not meet the 6 foot separation from the shop. When Helen mentioned this to him, he questioned if the distance was for fire code. She explained she thought it was. The resident then stated the structure is made of metal. At that time Helen said she would discuss the matter with the Planning Commission and let him know.

After discussing more with the Commission it was determined that just because the structure was metal doesn't mean that flammable items wouldn't be stored under it and could spread fire. Commissioners agreed that the cover would need to be attached to the shop and would need to meet the 6 foot separation between it and another structure. Otherwise if it was an independent accessory structure it must meet all the other required setbacks.

Stacey presented her memo discussing changes to vision clearance areas. She said it was brought to her attention that current requirements are inadequate. Specifically it doesn't take into account measurements being made from the right of way as opposed to the property lines, which can be problematic. Also the code doesn't address vision clearance as it relates to driveways.

Helen stated that the biggest change is the measurement would be taken from the curbline and not the property line. She referred to the diagram Stacey included with her memo. Helen, Stacey and the Commissioners discussed and looked at examples with the way the current code reads. It was discussed to use the term roadway, not curb or pavement. Also proposed was language for driveways to be measured at 10' from edge or roadway for the triangle. The Commissioners and staff also discussed that maximum height of anything within the triangle would be 3' except trees or shrubs could be trimmed up to at least 8'.

Helen mentioned that Leahnette asked about slopes in favor of vision, should there be something addressing those situations. The consensus from the Commissioners was that didn't need to be called out. Also in that section it was agreed to add; items including but not limited to, hedges, plantings, etc.

The Commissioners agreed with the proposed changes to the vision clearance measurements, section F. in Stacey's suggested memo could be removed. It was thought a variance process would be more appropriate rather than the City Administrator having the authority to modify the required vision clearance areas. It was agreed to also remove the wording about placement and avoiding light poles, tree trunks, etc. This is addressed earlier by stating except for an occasional utility pole or tree.

Stacey said she would have the revisions to the vision clearance areas reworked and ready to present at the same time as the accessory buildings and structures.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Commissioners and staff discussed the need to regulate drones and agreed it is a topic to be addressed, especially regarding privacy.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

---

Kelly Niles  
Planning Commission Chair

Attest by:

---

Helen K Johnson  
Planning Administrative Assistant