

## Asotin County Subdivision Code Update Summary of Issues Addressed

Issue Identified	Where Addressed	Synopsis
<p><u>1. Extend Policy County-Wide.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Currently, Subdivision Code only applies to parcels within the urban area.</li> <li>➤ Subdivisions outside urban area only need to record plat under State record plat requirements without staff or public review.</li> <li>➤ Purpose of change is to provide oversight and review of subdivisions within the rural area. This will eliminate future road access and easement issues.</li> <li>➤ Subdivision creating lots over 160 acres should be exempt from Subdivision Code.</li> <li>➤ Identify road access and clearing/grading requirements in order to cause some review before people build a road.</li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 18.03.020 &amp; 18.04.020</p>	<p>Language within these sections of the subdivision code were removed which exempted the division of land located outside of the Urban Planning Area from the requirements of the Subdivision Code. Language within these sections was also modified to require any division of land in which the smallest lot created is less than 80 acres in size is required to conform to the Subdivision Code. The previous requirement was 5 acres.</p> <p>Roadway clearing and grading requirements have been addressed in Chapter 5 of the Road Standards. Language for on-site clearing and grading has been added to the Subdivision Code which requires compliance to the Asotin Stormwater Manual.</p>
<p><u>2. Address Flag Lots.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Currently two lots are allowed to access via one flag lot.</li> <li>➤ Access is required to be 20' wide with a turnaround required for accesses longer than 150'.</li> <li>➤ Multiple back to back flag lots are being developed to avoid building a public road.</li> <li>➤ Access roads are not being built to any standard and drainage is not analyzed.</li> <li>➤ County would like to limit the stacking of access points to flag lots.</li> </ul>	<p>Road Standards - Chapter 7.2</p>	<p>The creation of flag lots has been determined by staff to be a necessary way to provide infill to areas within the urban area. While the development of flag lots is acceptable, multiple back to back flag lots have created access issues along County Roads in the past. The management of the flag lot access (flagpole) has been addressed in the Road Standards and described as follows. Flagpoles are defined as narrow strip of land which provides direct private access from the public right of way to a parcel/lot. The new requirements restrict back to back flagpoles from being developed within the same subdivision or short plat and limits the number of flagpoles which abut an adjacent property to two. The design and construction of the flagpole must be in accordance with International Fire Code.</p>

Issue Identified	Where Addressed	Synopsis
<p>3. <u>Address Private Road Criteria (# of lots, etc.).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Current standard allows private roads for lots greater than 5 acres in size.</li> <li>➤ 15 lots are allowed to access one private road.</li> <li>➤ Gravel road standards need to be developed for private roads.</li> </ul>	<p>Road Standards - Chapter 7.2</p>	<p>Private road criteria and standards have been addressed in the County Road Standards in order to provide more flexibility for future changes or modifications. The current road standards allow a private road to provide access for up to 15 lots which are greater than 5 acres in size. The proposed Road Standards will limit the number of lots accessing a private road to 4 single family dwelling lots of greater than 5 acres in size with one access point and up to 8 lots with a second access point to a public right of way. Other additional requirements include: Private roads are permitted where connectivity to the County road system is not compromised, and where future connections are not possible; All new private roads must be approved by the county engineer; Private roads will not be approved if they land lock present or planned parcels; Private roads will be constructed to County Standards; Private roads shall have a permanently established tract or easement providing legal access to each lot served; A legally responsible owner or homeowners association shall be established to maintain private roads in perpetuity.</p>
<p>4. <u>Private road versus private driveway (Road Standards).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Identify difference between private road and driveway.</li> <li>➤ Set standards for private driveway.</li> </ul>	<p>Road Standards - Chapter 7.2</p>	<p>As identified in item 3 above private roads can provide access to 4 lots and up to 8 lots with a secondary access, are created on a permanently established tract or easement providing legal access to each lot served, and shall be constructed to County Standards. A private driveway or flagpole as described in item 2 above provides access to no more than two parcels and no more than 4 dwelling units. Private driveways are a narrow piece of land connecting to the lot it provides access to. Private driveways longer than 500 feet shall be engineered and meet the requirements of the width requirements for private streets. Private driveways longer than 750 feet shall only be allowed when approved by the Fire Department.</p>

Issue Identified	Where Addressed	Synopsis
<p><u>5. Administrative Plats.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Currently all short plats need to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.</li> <li>➤ Staff would like to set an administrative review policy for 2-4 lot short plats. This will speed up review process.</li> <li>➤ Approval process should be the same as a short plat regarding notice and review, only eliminates the planning commission approval.</li> <li>➤ Administrative decisions need to be appealable to the Planning Commission or Board of Commissioners.</li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 18.04.060</p>	<p>An administrative approval section was added which will give the planning administrator the authority to approve or deny a (2) lot short plat without Planning Commission or County Commissioners approval. All review process would remain the same as identified in the Short Plat chapter. All appeals of the administrative decision would be to the County Commissioners.</p>
<p><u>6. Develop Checklists for Various Approval Stages (Prelim &amp; Final Plat).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Review and update current checklist.</li> <li>➤ Identify clearly what is expected of the applicant.</li> <li>➤ Incorporate new policies.</li> </ul>	<p>-</p>	<p>This issue has not been addressed within this document, this checklist will be a separate document which incorporates the new requirements, as identified in the Subdivision Code, into the subdivision application.</p>
<p><u>7. Evaluation Process (interdepartmental reviews, public hearings, etc.).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Formalize interdepartmental review.</li> <li>➤ Address purpose of each review (Planning Commission &amp; Board of Commissioners).</li> <li>➤ Make consistent.</li> <li>➤ Define process for each type of application.</li> <li>➤ Identify # of hearings, timeline, etc...</li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 18.03.030 -110 &amp; 18.04.030-130</p>	<p>These sections were reviewed for content and consistency with minor modifications and reordering for clarification. These sections identify application time limitations, pre-application conference requirements, application requirements including required documents (environmental checklist, application form, plat map, etc...), staff review procedures, noticing and hearing requirements, preliminary plat approval process including the Planning Commission and County Commissioner review procedures, and final plat procedures.</p>
<p><u>8. Fees (administrative only).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Adjust fee schedule to include actual time spent to review application.</li> <li>➤ Application review should not be subsidized by the County, some departments are not being compensated for time spent for review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Review other jurisdictions administrative fees for comparison.</li> <li>➤ Review mitigation Fees as an option.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 18.03.040 &amp; 18.04.030</p>	<p>This issue was not addressed within this document, it is noted in Section 18.03.040(6) and 18.04.060(4) of the Code a fee schedule will be set by a separate county resolution and shall include the cost of processing, public works review, and legal newspaper advertisements.</p>

Issue Identified	Where Addressed	Synopsis
<b><i>Additional Issues Addressed in Subdivision Ordinance.</i></b>		
Bonding	Chapter 18.02 and Road Standards Chapter 9.13 - 9.14	This section was removed from the previous code as per changes to the Road Standards. The updated Road Standards has eliminated the option for bonding roadway improvements and replaced with a performance surety option. As a result all roadway improvements will need to be constructed before final plat approval or a performance surety may be submitted in lieu of actual construction of required improvements. Drawbacks on the surety are allowed as work is completed. No surety is required for work outside of right-of-way.
Binding Site Plan	Chapter 18.05	This chapter has been added to the Code. The binding site plan serves as an official land use control and provides an alternative to the conventional platting requirements of the State Subdivision Act. The purpose is to allow more flexibility in design and operation of manufactured home parks, RV parks, condominium development, multifamily developments, planned unit developments, commercial, and industrial developments.
Boundary Line Adjustment	Chapter 18.06	This chapter was added to provide procedures and criteria for the review and approval of boundary line adjustments. This process will allow the planning administrator to review all boundary line adjustment applications to assure that the following requirements are met; no additional lots are created, resulted lots meet setback and minimum lot size requirements per the zoning district. Currently all boundary line adjustment are reviewed and recorded at the County Recorder office with no review from the Planning Department to assure that the resulting boundary line adjustment does not create a non-buildable lot.
Relief of Violation to Purchaser	Chapter 18.07.020-030	The legality of these two sections needs to be reviewed by an attorney for verification. This issue was later reviewed by an attorney with the consultant team and deemed it is legal under state law, RCW 58.17.210 .
Violation Penalty	Chapter 18.07.040	The misdemeanor fee for violation was increased from 250 to 500 to be consistent with the zoning code.

Issue Identified	Where Addressed	Synopsis
------------------	-----------------	----------

*Additional Issues to be Addressed in Subdivision Ordinance.*

<p>Ag Land Cover Crop Requirement</p>	<p align="center">--</p>	<p><u>Ag Land Cover Crop Requirement</u> - The TRC requested that all subdivisions within the Ag land or rural area be planted with a cover crop of grass or alpha before the final plat approval. After discussion, two options could be available to address the issue. At this time no changes have been made to the Subdivision Code. Further direction is needed.</p> <p>1. <u>Condition of Subdivision Approval</u> - the issue could simply be addressed as part of the SEPA approval with a subdivision application and require that a cover crop be applied to the property before final plat approval. This option would not require any action at this time and the issue would be address with each subdivision and SEPA application. The general location where this would be addressed would be in the stormwater and erosion control/air quality sections.</p> <p>2. <u>Grading Permit</u> - another way to address the issue is to require a grading permit and add language to the grading standard regarding the re-vegetation of Ag Land with a cover crop and the re-vegetation of urban land with hydro-seed. This would both reduce the weeds after grading and allow for erosion control. If this option is pursued further review regarding how to integrate this language into the clearing and grading section will be needed. At this time the Road Standards has a Chapter the addresses clearing and grading, although it only pertains to work within the ROW.</p>
---------------------------------------	--------------------------	--