

Jefferson County Planning Commission  
October 13, 2015

The Jefferson County Planning Commission met on October 13, 2015, with the following Commission members present: Stephen Stolipher, President; Wade Louthan, Vice President; Gene Taylor, Secretary; Donnie Fisher, Mike Chapman, Dale Manuel, Dick Childs, Gary Phalen, and Peter Fricke. Staff members present included Jennie Brockman, Director of Planning and Zoning; David Simon, County Planner; Jonathan Saunders, County Engineer; Nathan Cochran, Assistant County Prosecuting Attorney; and Alexandra Beaulieu, Office/Project Manager.

Mr. Stolipher called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

1. Approval of the minutes from the following Planning Commission meetings:

- September 8, 2015

The minutes were approved with no objections.

- September 22, 2015

Mr. Stolipher requested that the minutes be amended to include the full recusal statement he read before Agenda Item #2. He provided staff with a written copy of his recusal statement. The amended minutes were approved with no objections.

2. Citizen Communications.

Mr. Bob Aitcheson spoke in reference to Agenda Item #6 regarding campgrounds in rural areas (see written comments submitted under Non-Actionable Correspondence of the agenda packet).

Mr. Doug Rockwell spoke in reference to Agenda Item #6 regarding campgrounds in rural areas (see written comments submitted under Non-Actionable Correspondence of the agenda packet).

Mr. Mark Dyck spoke in reference to Agenda Item #6 regarding campgrounds in rural areas and specifically addressed Mr. Aitcheson's letter addressed to the Planning Commission dated 10-13-15.

3. Public Workshop: Concept Plan Review for Shepherdstown Public Library (File #S15-05). The proposed project consists of the new construction of a 13,500 square foot public library building and associated parking. The property is located on Lowe Drive adjacent to the Clarion Hotel and Conference Center in Shepherdstown. Tax District: Shepherdstown (09); Tax Map: 8; Parcel: 11; Zoned: Residential Growth; Size: 4.33 acres (after proposed mergers).

Mr. Stolipher recused himself from this agenda item due to a conflict of interest. Mr. Louthan presided over this portion of the meeting.

Mr. Simon provided an overview of the staff report. He stated that based on the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations, staff had determined the Concept Plan to be complete. Mr. Simon stated that a few outstanding issues should be discussed during the workshop pertaining to landscape buffers, the extension of Lowe Drive, the extension of water and sewer utilities, stormwater management, and ADA compliance. He noted that the Planning Commission should provide direction as to whether the proposed project should process as a Minor or Major Site Plan based on the discussion during the Workshop.

Mr. Louthan opened the floor to public comment. There was no public comment. Mr. Louthan invited the applicant to speak.

Ms. Kristen Stolipher represented the applicant and provided an overview of the Concept Plan. Ms. Stolipher addressed Staff's concerns pertaining to the extension of Lowe Drive. She stated that Lowe Drive is not a DOH roadway but that there has been discussion to have Lowe Drive accepted in the

DOH roadway system. Ms. Stolipher also addressed Staff's concerns pertaining to ADA access. She noted that ADA access would be on the left side of the site as the other side was too steep.

Mr. Manuel motioned to approve the Concept Plan with staff's conditions. Mr. Phalen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chapman requested clarification regarding condition of approval #4, pertaining to whether the project would process as a Minor or Major Site plan. Ms. Brockman stated that if the applicant has to extend Lowe Drive and water and sewer utilities to their site, then they would be required to process as a Major Site Plan.

4. Public Hearing: Proposed draft redlined amendment to the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations RE: Subdivision and Site Plan Processes (File #STA15-05).

Ms. Brockman provided an overview of the proposed amendment. She noted that the Planning Commission appointed a citizen's based committee to draft an amendment that would align County processing regulations with State requirements. Ms. Brockman stated that the committee provided an overview of the proposed amendments at the September 22, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. She noted that the biggest change in their proposed amendment is to remove the public hearing process from the Final Plat stage of a Major Subdivision. Ms. Brockman stated that all public input would be provided at the beginning of the process during the Concept Plan and Preliminary Plat stages. She also stated that another significant change was the Committee's proposal to broaden what is considered a Minor Site Plan from a project that is 50,000 square feet to 250,000 square feet.

Mr. Stolipher opened the floor to public comment. There was no public comment.

Mr. Phalen motioned to recommend the proposed text amendment STA15-05 to the County Commission for consideration and approval. Mr. Louthan seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

5. Public Hearing: Request by applicant Amy Secrist (File #PCW15-03) for a waiver from Appendix B, Sections 2.5(M) and 9.5 of the Subdivision Regulations requiring off-street parking to be paved. The request is to utilize the existing gravel parking lot for the proposed reuse of the vacant building for a private school (Morgan Academy). Property location: the West side of Route 230 / Shepherdstown Pike in Shepherdstown and is formerly known as the Big Arm Bar & Grill. Tax District: Shepherdstown (09); Tax Map: 8; Parcel: 37; Zoned: Residential Growth; Size: 13.4 acres.

Mr. Simon provided an overview of the staff report. He noted that the applicant will need to meet the number of parking spaces as required by the Zoning Ordinance. He also stated that at least one ADA-compliant parking space would be required in compliance with the Engineering Department.

Mr. Saunders provided an overview of the Engineering report. He stated that in addition to Staff's recommendations, the applicant will also be required to show that a minimum of 6" of gravel exists on the school's proposed parking area.

Mr. Stolipher invited the applicant to speak.

Ms. Secrist provided an overview of her proposed project. She stated that she would like to renovate the site to allow Morgan Academy to occupy the building for use as a private school for 40 students. Ms. Secrist stated that she had ample space for parking and that 6" of gravel would not be an issue. as the property has a great deal of gravel in reserve throughout the site.

Mr. Fricke inquired as to how the applicant was proposing to address Stormwater Management.

Ms. Secrist stated that there would not be an increase in impervious area.

Mr. Saunders stated that as the project has been presented, no Stormwater Management would be required. However, if the applicant has to process a Site Plan, which would be required if any square footage was added to the building, then stormwater management would be required.

Mr. Stolipher opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. Stolipher noted for the record that a letter had been submitted by Mr. Richard Anderson.

Ms. Bernadine Somers, owner of Morgan Academy, spoke in favor of the proposed project.

Mr. Chapman motioned to grant the waiver request with the two conditions of approval as recommended by Staff. Mr. Phalen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

6. Discussion and possible recommendation to the County Commission regarding the public input received on the proposed text amendments to the Zoning and Land Development Ordinance and the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations regarding campground standards (File #STA15-04 and ZTA15-02).

Mr. Stolipher reviewed the comments matrix provided in the agenda packet item by item. The Planning Commission discussed the comments and requested that staff take the comments and implement them into a revised version of the draft amendment for discussion at the November meeting. See the attached matrix for a summary of the Planning Commission's comments regarding each item in the matrix.

Mr. Childs motioned to place the revised draft Campground text amendment (File #STA15-04 and ZTA 15-02) on the November 10, 2015 agenda for review. Mr. Phalen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

7. Discussion and possible recommendation to the County Commission regarding the proposed draft Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment RE: Mass Event Regulations (File #ZTA14-02).

Mr. Manuel motioned to postpone this item until the next meeting.

Mr. Stolipher recused himself from the discussion.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously to postpone this item. Mr. Louthan called for a five minute break.

The meeting reconvened at 9:32 PM.

8. Review and discussion of proposed draft redlined edits to Article 12 of the Zoning Ordinance RE: Zoning Map and Text Amendments (File #ZTA15-03).

Ms. Brockman stated that she and Ms. Lehman had met to discuss the amendment and that Ms. Lehman was researching a couple of topics related to State Code. Ms. Brockman stated that their intent would be to have a draft submitted to the Planning Commission for the November meeting.

9. Request for postponement.

Agenda Item #7: Discussion and possible recommendation to the County Commission regarding the proposed draft Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment RE: Mass Event Regulations (File: #ZTA14-02) was postponed until October 27, 2015.

10. Reports from Legal Counsel and legal advice to the Planning Commission.

- Far Away Farms: Report on legal action in Jefferson County Circuit Court, Case #11-C-325 Possible Executive Session

- Ms. Lehman prepared a handout to be distributed to the Planning Commission in her absence. Mr. Simon distributed the handout at the beginning of the meeting.
- Shiloh Citizens Association: Report on legal action in Jefferson County Circuit Court, Case #15-C-129 – Possible Executive Session
  - Mr. Cochran provided an update on Case #15-C-129. He stated that the Court dismissed the case against the Planning Commission.

11. Director's Report.

Ms. Brockman provided an overview of pending text amendments. She also reviewed upcoming Planning Commission meeting dates.

12. Planning Commission Exchange and Liaison Reports.

Mr. Fricke provided an update on behalf of the Historic Landmarks Commission.

Mr. Stolipher asked if any of the other Planning Commission members had reports. No one had any reports or updates.

Mr. Fricke motioned to schedule a special meeting on October 27, 2015 to discuss the proposed text amendment pertaining to Mass Event Regulations (File #ZTA14-02). Mr. Manuel seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Stolipher stated that he would recuse himself from the meeting. Mr. Chapman stated that he had a schedule conflict and would not be able to attend the meeting.

13. President's Report. None

14. Actionable Correspondence. None.

15. Non-Actionable Correspondence.

- Letter from Maral Strathearn, dated 09-18-15 RE: Campgrounds in rural areas
- Email from Cathy Vance, dated 09-29-15 RE: Campgrounds in rural areas
- Letter from Bob Aitcheson, dated 10-07-15 RE: Campgrounds in rural areas
- Letter from Doug Rockwell, dated 10-07-15 RE: Campgrounds in rural areas

Mr. Stolipher called to adjourn the meeting at 9:42 PM.

**Proposed Zoning Text Amendment regarding Campgrounds in the Rural District –  
Zoning and Land Development Ordinance and Subdivision and Land Development Regulations  
Public Comments Received at 09/08/15 Planning Commission Public Hearing**

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
	<b>ZONING ORDINANCE</b>			
1		Review and consider NFPA 1194 standards. County should certainly comply with national standards but no reason to exceed or modify them.	Reasonable suggestion.	Use as a reference for minimum standards.
2	Zoning Ordinance	There needs to be different standards in the requirements between Rural and the three commercial districts identified in the Zoning Ordinance where campgrounds would be permitted (GC, RLIC, and IC).	Staff concurs.	The PC discussed this item at length and determined that it would be best to differentiate guidelines for campgrounds in the Rural and Commercial districts. E.G.: developed campgrounds (KOA as an example) in the commercial district; primitive or semi-developed campgrounds (tent camping, minimum facilities such as bathhouse) in the rural district. Mr. Chapman referenced the NFPA definitions for developed, primitive, semi-developed, and semi-primitive campgrounds.
			*Note: the referenced "NFPA 1194" document as referenced by Mr. Chapman was purchased by an individual Planning Commissioner in his individual capacity. At this point in time, staff has not obtained a copy of the referenced document and cannot reproduce copies due to the document being copyright protected; however, it is available for review online at <a href="http://www.nfpa.org">http://www.nfpa.org</a> .	

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
3	<p>Section 2.2 Terms defined.</p> <p>Campground:            “An area of premises <u>in single ownership</u> operated as a commercial enterprise, generally providing space in the form of campsite pads for seasonal accommodations for transient trailers, self-propelled campers, tents, cabins and/or lodges. ...”</p>	<p>Questioned the use of the term “in single ownership”</p>	<p>The purpose of this provision was to require the campground development to be on a single parcel of land rather than multiple parcels with their own setback requirements. Single ownership does not preclude ownership by multiple investors and could be worded differently.</p>	<p>No objections. Staff will amend definition to clarify intent that campground occur on a single parcel rather than multiple parcels.</p>
4	<p>Section 2.2 Terms defined.</p> <p>Campground:            “An area of premises in single ownership operated as a commercial enterprise, generally providing space in the form of campsite pads for seasonal accommodations for transient trailers, self-propelled campers, tents, cabins and/or lodges. ...”</p>	<p>The intent of the committee was to allow permanent cabin structures in addition to cabins like the KOA has on their property. Consider adding definition of “Cabin” to the proposal.</p> <p>Proposed definition of Cabin:            “A temporary or permanent structure for the purposes expressly permitted in Article ___ of the zoning Ordinance and Article ___ of the Subdivision regulations. Cabins are intended for temporary occupancy, not permanent residency; and shall not sleep more than 8 people per cabin. Cabins shall not be sold separately from the parent parcel without further processing under the appropriate land use ordinances in effect at that time. This structure shall at least provide a sleeping and bathroom area with appropriate campground health department approval for water and wastewater services. A permanent structure shall be built to current applicable Jefferson County Building code with the issuance of a Building Permit. A cabin permitted under the Campground articles of the Jefferson County Ordinances, shall not need to be located on a</p>	<p>A definition of cabin is a reasonable request. It should be noted that many campgrounds provide a “camping cabin” which is in essence just a sleeping cabin replacing the use of a tent, but the sites still require camp stoves and outdoor meal preparation and the use of a common bathhouse. We may want to differentiate between these types of cabins.</p>	<p>No objections. Staff will add “Cabin” and “Camping Cabin” to the definitions.</p>

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
		separate parcel and multiple cabins can be located on the same parcel as the parent parcel.		
5	<p>Section 2.2 Terms Defined Campground</p> <p>An area or premises in single ownership operated as a commercial enterprise, generally providing space in the form of campsite pads for seasonal accommodations for transient occupancy or use by tourists occupying camping units such as trailers, self-propelled campers, tents, cabins and/or lodges. A campground shall be designed for <u>seasonal occupancy, as opposed to permanent year-round occupancy.</u></p>	Questioned whether this implied that permanent and year round were the same thing, noting that some campgrounds may be used year round by transient guest who are not permanent residents.	Staff believes that the current wording clearly differentiates between seasonal occupancy (which is temporary) and permanent occupancy. The term temporary could be added to the definition.	No objections. Keep proposed text as is.
6	<p>Section 2.2 Terms Defined Campground</p> <p>An area or premises in single ownership operated as a commercial enterprise, generally providing space in the form of campsite pads for seasonal accommodations for transient occupancy or use by tourists occupying <u>camping units such as trailers, self-propelled campers, tents, cabins and/or lodges.</u> A campground shall be designed for seasonal occupancy, as opposed to permanent year-round occupancy, and shall not be construed to mean a Mobile Home Park (as defined in this Ordinance). All campgrounds shall comply with the defined uses and regulations in Section 8.16 of this Ordinance and relevant sections of the Subdivision Regulations.</p>		<p>Recommend deleting “such as trailers, self-propelled campers, tents, cabins and/or lodges” from the definition of campground and developing a separate definition for “camping unit” such as:</p> <p>“individual units designed for temporary occupancy such trailers, self-propelled campers, recreational vehicles, tents, cabins, fifth wheels, pop-up campers, and/or lodges”</p> <p>Also suggest changing the term “tourist” to “guests” or “customers”</p>	No objections. Amend text to reflect staff’s recommendation.

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
7	Section 2.2 Terms Defined	Clarify that caretaker residence is clearly incidental to the overall campground use and does not set precedence for other permanent residences.	<p>Note that the Zoning Ordinance already includes a definition as follows:</p> <p>“Caretaker Residence: An accessory residential structure for the use of a caretaker or security guard.”</p> <p>This could be broadened to include the phrase “Permanent or temporary residential structure that is secondary or accessory to the primary use of the property.....” or similar language</p>	No objections. Broaden definition to include staff’s recommendation.
8	<p>Section 8.16.A.2</p> <p>“Campground residency shall be limited to 14 overnight stays in any 60 day period and a total of 30 overnight stays per calendar year.”</p>	It would be impossible for the County to keep track of the number of days an individual is using a campground in 4 or 5 different campgrounds around the County. Consider removing this standard.	<p>The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that campgrounds do not become permanent residential settings which lack adequate infrastructure for such use.</p> <p>FYI: The Flood Plain Ordinance defines a Recreational Vehicle and states that an RV may be placed in the Flood Plain only if it is fully licensed and ready for highway use and may be located on the site for less than 180 days to be temporary.</p>	Extend length of stay to 180 days, which is consistent with Floodplain Ordinance. (Staff will get the exact language from the Floodplain Compliance Officer.)
9	<p>Section 8.16.A.2</p> <p>“Campground residency shall be limited to 14 overnight stays in any 60 day period and a total of 30 overnight stays per calendar year.</p>	Include recreational park trailers as found in the national code. This is a strong growth area in the campground industry and parks within the county should not be restricted from meeting this modern market demand.		PC had no comments. Addressed above.

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
10	Section 8.16.A	No more than six individuals may use or occupy a campsite in a Rural District.		PC did not accept this public comment. They believe the business owner will monitor the number of people permitted on a campsite as part of their business model.
11	Section 8.16.A.4 & 5	<p>These sections need more detail as to the types of recreational areas that may be permitted and/or rented out to the general public --</p> <p>Accessory Uses to Campgrounds should be clearly incidental to the use as the campground and have restrictions to ensure events cannot be held on the site that exceeds the expectation of a traditional campground facility.</p> <p>Consider including retail stores and food service for the needs of the campers; trails; fire pits; pavilions; limited size amphitheaters; etc.</p>	Staff concurs that this needs to be clarified including additional uses that are permitted and limiting the size of some types of uses (or requiring separate approval)	<p>Add language to clarify that if a campground hosts an event or activity that meets the definition of “Mass Event” or falls under another provision within the Zoning Ordinance, campground would have to process as a “Mass Event” or “Seasonal Use”.</p> <p>Festivals/gatherings would not be an accessory use to Campgrounds.</p> <p>Discussion pertaining to primitive/Rural campgrounds came up again. The Planning Commission stated that there should be a restriction from permitting retail stores, food service, or amphitheaters in the Rural District. Fire pits and trails would be permitted in the Rural District. Such amenities would be permitted for a campground located in a Commercial District.</p>

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
12	Zoning Ordinance Section 8.16.B – Development Guidelines	<p>Proposed setbacks for General Commercial, Residential-Light Industrial-Commercial, and Industrial Commercial districts:</p> <p>“Perimeter of campgrounds shall be defined by fencing, posting, natural boundaries or other methods to prevent unintentional trespass.</p> <p>All campsites shall be located a minimum of 200’ from existing residential dwellings and if within 500’ of an existing dwelling shall be screened for visibility, glare, and noise.”</p>		<p>Change the term “private property” and “residential dwelling” to “property lines”.</p> <p>“When campsites or amenities are within <del>1,000’</del> 500’ of a <del>private</del>-property line, the perimeter of all campgrounds must be defined by fencing, posting, natural barriers, or other methods to prevent unintentional trespass.”</p>
13	<p>Section 8.16.B.1.a and b</p> <p>“When campsites or amenities are within 1,000’ of private property, the perimeter of all campgrounds must be defined by fencing, posting, natural barriers, or other methods to prevent unintentional trespass.”</p> <p>“All campsites shall be located a minimum of 200’ from existing residential dwellings.”</p>	Do the 200’ setbacks from dwellings and the 1000’ barrier requirement apply to hotels and other hospitality enterprises or just to campgrounds?	Setbacks would be different for facilities that are primarily indoors vs facilities which are primarily outdoors.	<p>“All campsites shall be located a minimum of <del>200’</del> 500’ from existing <del>residential dwellings</del> property lines and visually screened.”</p> <p>8.16.B.1(c) should be deleted because it is the same as (a).</p>

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
14	Section 8.16.B.1.a	<p>Proposed setbacks for Rural district:</p> <p>“All campgrounds shall be located at least 1000’ from adjoining property boundaries.</p> <p>All campgrounds shall be screened by a planting of trees, shrubs or other plant material, or a fence or both to serve as a barrier to visibility, glare, and noise.”</p>		See above comments.
15	<p>Section 8.16.B.2</p> <p>“All campgrounds shall have direct access from WV State roads or roads that meet the Jefferson County Subdivision Ordinance standards.”</p>	<p>Existing roads, driveways, easements, or rights of way can continue to be used to serve the farm, family lots, or the existing residences without being upgraded to the new standards. If a campground is only on a certain area of a farm, then it can share the access with the other activities along the farm lane or easement without the need for upgrading.</p>		<p>Amend text to read “All campgrounds shall have direct access from WV State roads.”</p> <p><del>or roads that meet the Jefferson County Subdivision Ordinance standards.”</del></p>
16	Section 8.16.B.3	<p>Restrict camping within 500’ of either river to tent camping only. No above ground structure, building or amenity, other than aforesaid tents, shall be erected, constructed or allowed within 500’ of the river. Campsites may only be used between May 1 and October 31. Other than by the forces of nature, no change or alteration of the topography is permitted within 100’ of the river.</p> <p>Campsites located within 500’ or within the floodplain of either river must comply with all applicable federal, state, and county laws, ordinances and regulations.</p>	<p>Staff met with Mason Carter, the floodplain compliance officer, who stated that floodplain regulations allow certain types of permanent structures to be built within the floodplain, but they have to be built to specific standards and certified that they meet floodplain requirements. It is reasonable to restrict the camping within a set distance of the rivers to tent camping.</p> <p>Mr. Carter also stated that per floodplain regulations, RVs can be in the floodplain, provided they are still on wheels and not on site for more than 180 days.</p> <p>Mr. Carter felt it was sufficient for the</p>	No objections. Use current language as proposed by committee.

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
			Subdivision Regulations and/or Zoning Ordinance to state that “camp sites may be located within floodplain areas, provided all floodplain regulations applying to permanent structures are followed” (Zoning Ordinance, Section 8.16.B.23)	
17	Section 8.16.B1.b “A campsites shall be located a minimum of 200 feet from existing residential dwellings.”	Change language to state that Also recommends that campsites shall be located a minimum of 200’ from any property line (no the dwelling itself).	Staff concurs	No comment. Addressed above.
18	Section 8.16.B	There should be a minimum of 200 feet between the property lines of campgrounds and the property lines of subdivisions.	This would be difficult to enforce; however there could be a greater setback requirement if adjacent to a major residential subdivision, if desired.	No comment. Addressed above.
	<b>SUBDIVISION REGULATION AMENDMENTS</b>			
19	Section 8.2.A Campground Requirements	Amend proposed language in Section 8.2 of the Subdivision Regulations to delete “All campground facilities shall be designed in a manner which meets the following standards:” and replace with the following language: “The use of these private facilities does not post a transferable risk to Jefferson County, whose primary responsibility lies in the requirement to ensure the following:”	It is difficult to balance public health safety and welfare with the desire for flexibility. Engineering should be involved in this discussion.	Change text to read: “...All campground facilities should be designed in a manner that complies with State and County Regulations, and meets the minimum requirements of NFPA 1194 standards.”  Delete the list of items 1-6

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
20	Section 8.2.A.1 Safe access and egress to state roads	Questioned whether this meant that campgrounds are only permitted with direct access to state roads	Staff interprets this to mean that the internal campground access road would have to have direct access to a state road.	As discussed above, this item will be deleted and the section will be amended to a concise statement as noted above.
21	Section 8.2.B.1 "Campgrounds shall be located on properties of 10 acres in size and shall meet the setback requirements in Section 8.16 of the Zoning Ordinance."	The 10 acre size limitation is proposed to be in the [Subdivision Regulations] and Zoning Ordinance. It should only be in the Zoning Ordinance so that [the BZA is] the only body that needs to grant the variance.  Clarify in the proposed amendments that properties less than 10 acres are not prohibited if the BZA grants a variance.	Minimum lot size is normally a Zoning provision. Section 8.2.B(1) of the Sub Regs could be amended as follows:  "Campgrounds shall be located and shall meet setbacks as required in Section 8.16 of the Zoning Ordinance."	Move "Campgrounds shall be located on properties of a minimum of 10 acres in size." To the Zoning Ordinance.  Amend the Subdivision Regulations Section 8.2.B.1 to read: "Campgrounds shall be located <del>on properties of a minimum of 10 acres in size</del> and shall meet setback requirements in Section 8.16 of the Zoning Ordinance."
22	Section 8.2.B.4, "Dimensional Requirements" "No more than 15 campsites per acre are permitted."	The maximum number of campsites per acre should be in the Zoning Ordinance, not the Subdivision [Regulations].	Density is normally a Zoning provision. This can be moved to Section 8.16B of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment.	No objections. Staff will relocate this requirement to the Zoning Ordinance.

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
23	Section 8.2.B.4 "No more than 15 campsites per acre are permitted."	County's proposal limits no more than 15 sites on an acre. Modern campgrounds provide larger sites for larger RVs and smaller sites for others.	The standard of 15 campsites per acre would be maximum number based the entire proposed campground and there could be larger and smaller site in different sections of the campground based on the needs to the campground facility. Again it may be that a different standard would apply in rural vs commercial zones.	Amend to read, "No more than 15 campsites per acre are permitted, which shall be averaged over the total acreage of the campground."
24	Section 8.2.B-O	There should be different standards for campgrounds for tents, RVs and cabins	This may address some of the public's concerns related to road adequacy and impact to adjacent uses.	No action; keep the proposed amendment as it is written by the Committee.
25	Section 8.2.B.5	NFPA calls for 10' between stands while County's proposal calls for a minimum of 20' apart. If a stand is 10' wide, then standards may be the same; however, County's standards call for stands to be 15' wide which is wider than the national standard.	I think it should be clear that this effort was intended to develop a provision for allowing for the development of campgrounds in the Rural Zoning district. Typically rural campgrounds would be lower density and smaller than those found in more commercial areas. Staff recommends considering two standards related to the zoning categories (Rural vs GC, RLIC, and IC).	Keep the proposed amendment as it is written. 20' is reasonable for the Rural district.
26	Section 8.2.C.2 "Campground roads that serve more than 300 vehicle trips per day.....15 foot minimum width....."	300 vehicles per day is excessive.  Pull-offs are not wide enough to accommodate RVs.	The purpose of the 300 vehicle trips per day standard is to differentiate between the design of the internal campground road that would need to be constructed. Only those serving less than 300 vpd allow a 12 foot road with three foot pull-off areas.	No changes. Keep the proposed amendment as it is written by the Committee.

#	Proposed Language in Draft Amendment	Public Comment	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Direction (10/13/15)
27	Section 8.2.D	Parking standards should remain flexible as proposed by the committee. Additional parking and/or surfacing requirements require more land and makes the area appear less rural.	Prior to the Public Hearing, staff had recommended including the language that required the public parking areas near the office or public facilities be required to meet parking standards. This language was included in the version for the Public Hearing but did not come from the committee. It is still staff's recommendation but it could be modified for campgrounds under a certain number of sites.	No changes. Keep the proposed amendment as it is written by the Committee.  8.2. D.2 to read "If parking is not provided at the campsite, 1.5 <del>one</del> spaces per campsite shall be provided in a common parking area."
28	Section 8.E.3 & E.4:  "A campground shall provide at least one sanitary sewerage dump station for every forty (40) or fraction thereof trailer or recreational vehicle hookups, one water refill station and one solid waste disposal collection facility."  "As a minimum, design capacities for centralized water and sewerage systems shall be based on the total number of campsites proposed plus capacity to accommodate any public buildings."	Requiring a garbage can at each site is excessive. The national standard is for a dump station for every 100 RV sites that do not provide a sewer hookup.  NFPA 1194 National Code for RV Parks states "one sanitary disposal station shall be provided for each 100 RV sites...."	The draft ordinance states that a campsite <u>may</u> include trash collection but otherwise sanitary covered trash receptacles must be provided within 500' of all campsite.  Consider increasing the number of RV sites per sewerage dump station.	Keep the proposed amendment as it is written by the Committee.  Change 8.E.2 to read "A campsite may contain any combination of water, sewerage, or electrical connection; or trash collection. If not provided at campsites, water and sewerage facilities and sanitary covered trash receptacle must be provided at convenient comfort stations within <del>500'</del> 250' of all campsite."
29	Section 8.2.F  "All power lines shall be placed underground in a campground. Overhead power lines may be permitted by the Planning Commission where such lines can be effectively screened from view by trees."	This should be a business decision of the park owner as to the aesthetics of his park.		No objections – remove the requirement from the proposed amendment.