

ORDINANCE NO. 22-20

AN ORDINANCE of the City of Richland amending Richland Municipal Code Section 23.42.210 related to recreational clubs.

WHEREAS, the City has need, from time to time, to update the Richland Municipal Code (RMC) to improve its effectiveness; and

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2020, the Richland Planning Commission held a public hearing regarding modifications to the land use table found in RMC Section 23.26.210; and

WHEREAS, the Richland Planning Commission recommends amending RMC Section 23.26.210 to modify the parking requirements at recreational clubs as provided herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City of Richland as follows:

Section 1. Richland Municipal Code Section 23.42.210, related to Recreational clubs, as enacted by Ordinance No. 28-05, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Chapter 23.42 GENERAL PROVISIONS AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS

23.42.210 Recreational clubs.

The applicant for a recreational club shall submit facts to the administrative official showing the suitability of the site for the use; legal provisions insuring the maintenance of the use (both structures and open space) so as to prevent the use from becoming a public liability (such legal provisions shall be reviewed and approved as to form by the city attorney); further, the applicant shall submit a report indicating the club membership size and area to be served by the club. The following dimensional standards shall apply:

A. Minimum Lot Area. The lot size for a recreational club shall conform to that of the district in which the development is located.

B. Lot Coverage. Lot coverage shall be the same as the district in which the development is located. (This standard shall be applicable to building only.)

C. Minimum Side Yard Setback. All outdoor, intensively used recreational facilities, i.e., swimming pools, tennis courts, lawn bowling courts, and similar uses shall be set back 35 feet from all property lines not abutting a public street.

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one (1) space per ~~2,000~~ 5,000 square feet of designated and improved recreational area; plus one (1) space per 300 square feet of gross floor area for any building used for public assembly and/or for recreational purposes; plus one (1) space per 300 square feet of water surface area of a pool

(exclusive of hot tubs); provided, however, that 25% of vehicle parking spaces may be converted to bicycle spaces at a rate of three (3) bicycle spaces per one (1) vehicle space. ~~gross land area, plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

E. Sound Standards. No amplifiers or loud speakers of any kind shall be installed outside of any buildings.

F. Fencing – Screening. Fencing and screening shall comply with RMC 23.38.070(B).

Section 2. This Ordinance shall take effect the day following its publication in the official newspaper of the City of Richland.

Section 3. Should any section or provision of this Ordinance be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, that decision shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as a whole or any part thereof, other than the part so declared to be invalid.

Section 4. The City Clerk and the codifiers of this Ordinance are authorized to make necessary corrections to this Ordinance, including but not limited to the correction of scrivener’s errors/clerical errors, section numbering, references, or similar mistakes of form.

PASSED by the City Council of the City of Richland, Washington, at a regular meeting on the 4th day of August, 2020.



Ryan Lukson, Mayor

Attest:



Jennifer Rogers, City Clerk

Approved as to form:



Heather Kintzley, City Attorney

Published: August 9, 2020

STAFF REPORT

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION
FILE NO.: CA2020-102

PREPARED BY: MIKE STEVENS
MEETING DATE: JUNE 24, 2020

GENERAL INFORMATION:

APPLICANT: CHAD BETTESWORTH ON BEHALF OF PAHLISCH HOMES
CA2020-102

REQUEST: TEXT AMENDMENT TO RMC SECTION 23.42.210 (D) – OFF-STREET PARKING FOR RECREATIONAL CLUBS. THE PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT WOULD REDUCE THE OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENT FOR RECREATIONAL CLUBS.

LOCATION: CITYWIDE

REASON FOR REQUEST

Chad Bettsworth on behalf of Pahlisch Homes has filed an application for a text amendment to RMC Section 23.42.210 (D) – Off-street parking for recreational clubs. The proposed text amendment would reduce the off-street parking requirement for recreational clubs.

The specific action causing the text amendment request is the required number of off-street parking spaces that would be required and the amount of land area that those parking spaces take.

It does not appear that the off-street parking requirement has been consistently administered by the City as a number of newer recreational facilities do not appear to have the amount of parking required by this section of the code. As a result, the proponent has worked with the City in order to address the situation via the proposed text amendment. The current proposal includes three (3) different options for the Planning Commission to consider. A detailed explanation of the proposed code amendment has been provided by the applicant and is attached as Exhibit “1” to this report.

ANALYSIS

Off-street parking is necessary for recreational facilities as many of the people who will frequent them may choose to drive. In addition, private recreational facilities are often the site of larger gatherings such as birthday parties, graduation parties, anniversaries, etc. The issue comes down to how many parking spaces should be required. The

current code appears to be excessive in the number of parking spaces required, which is why the applicant has provided three (3) different options for the Planning Commission to consider.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission discuss the issue and agree on a text amendment that would still require off-street parking to be required for recreational clubs/facilities, but that better takes into consideration the fact that many of these recreational clubs/facilities are located within/adjacent to single-family neighborhoods or apartment complexes where many of the local residents will choose to walk, rather than drive.

PUBLIC NOTICE/ COMMENTS

Notice of the proposed amendment was provided to local and state agencies. Notice was also published in the Tri-Cities Herald, posted at official posting places and on the city's official website. Notice was provided to the Washington State Dept. of Commerce and other state agencies as required by RCW 36.70A.

No substantive comments were received from the public and/or governmental entities as of the date the staff report was prepared.

SEPA

The City of Richland has utilized the Optional DNS Process as outlined in WAC 197-11-355. The end of the public comment period was Friday, April 3, 2020. However, due to the postponement of the Planning Commission hearing, the City did not issue the Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) until June 17, 2020. It should be noted that no comments were received.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Over time the need for new uses changes within the City of Richland.
2. Chad Bettsworth on behalf of Pahlisch Homes has filed an application for a text amendment to RMC Section 23.42.210 (D) – Off-street parking for recreational clubs. The proposed text amendment would reduce the off-street parking requirement for recreational clubs.
3. RMC Section 23.42.210 (D) as currently written requires off-street parking in an amount that exceeds what would normally be considered necessary for recreational clubs.
4. The City of Richland has inconsistently applied the requirements of RMC Section 23.42.210 (D). As a result, numerous recreational clubs/facilities throughout the City have parking that does not meet the requirements of RMC Section 23.42.210 (D).
5. Notice of the proposed amendment was provided to local and state agencies. Notice was also published in the Tri-Cities Herald, posted at the official posting places and on the city's official website. Notice was provided to the Washington State Dept. of Commerce and other state agencies as required by RCW 36.70A.
6. No substantive comments regarding the proposed code amendment were received.
7. The Washington State Department of Commerce received the 60-day Notice of

Intent to Adopt Amendment and granted expedited review.

8. The City issued a SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-Significance on June 17, 2020.
9. The City of Richland utilized the Optional DNS Process as outlined in WAC 197-11-355. The end of the public comment period was Friday, April 3, 2020.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Planning Commission has jurisdiction to hold an open record public hearing and issue a recommendation on the proposed ordinance amendment to the City Council.
2. The proposed code amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission concur with the findings and conclusions set forth in Staff Report (CA2020-102) and recommend to the City Council adoption of a proposed code amendment to RMC Section 23.42.210 (D) which better suits the amount of off-street parking deemed necessary for recreational clubs/facilities.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Recommend approval of the amendment as proposed (Option 1, 2 or 3);
2. Recommend approval of the amendment, as modified by the Planning Commission.
3. Recommend denial of the amendment;

RECOMMENDED MOTION

I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed amendment to RMC Section 23.42.210 (D) based upon the above listed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

EXHIBITS

1. Application Materials
2. Draft Code Amendments
3. SEPA DNS & SEPA Checklist
4. Department of Commerce Notice
5. Public Notice and Comments Received

Exhibit 1



City of Richland
Development Services

625 Swift Blvd. MS-35
Richland, WA 99352
☎ (509) 942-7794
☎ (509) 942-7764

Code Amendment Application

Note: A Pre-Application meeting is required prior to submittal of an application.

APPLICANT		<input type="checkbox"/> Contact Person
Company: Pahlisch Homes	UBI#	
Contact: Chad Bettesworth		
Address: 219 SW Wilson Avenue, Suite 100, Bend Oregon, 97702		
Phone: 541.385.6762	Email: chadb@pahlisch.com	

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT
Proposed revision to the off-street parking requirement that applies to 'recreational clubs'. The current code language requires off-street parking at a rate that is in excess of actual need.

APPLICATION MUST INCLUDE:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Completed application and filing fee2. SEPA Checklist (if necessary)3. Other information as determined by the Administrator

ANSWER QUESTIONS AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE
Section(s) of code proposed to be amended (include code citation): RMC Section 23.42.210(D) Off-Street Parking for recreational clubs
Summary of requested code amendment(s): The proposed code amendment would reduce the off-street parking requirement for recreational clubs which is currently based on the size of the parcel and size of buildings. The proposed language includes several alternatives, which are listed in the attached supplemental sheets.
Reason(s) for code amendment(s): The proposed code amendment would reduce a requirement for off-street parking that is not needed. Existing recreational clubs in the City do not meet the existing standard and yet there is not a parking shortage. Similar types of recreational facilities such as those provided in apartment complexes, manufactured home parks and recreational vehicle parks do not have similar parking requirements. A more detailed explanation is attached.

Is the proposed amendment consistent with the applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan? Is a Comprehensive Plan amendment necessary to implement the proposed amendment?

The comprehensive plan contains no direct reference to desirable rates of off-street parking for these types of facilities. No amendment to the existing plan is required in order to implement the proposed code amendment.

Does the proposed amendment bear a substantial relation to the public health, safety, welfare and protection of the environment? Please explain:

Yes. The proposed amendment would eliminate a requirement for excessive parking, thereby reducing the amount of surface paving needed for these uses and reducing the amount of storm water runoff generated by parking lots. The current language discourages the development of new recreational clubs as the parking standard is excessive to the point that it makes projects unfeasible, thereby reducing amenities to residential neighborhoods that would otherwise be provided.

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the following is true and correct:

1. I have read and examined this permit application. The information provided in this application contains no misstatement of fact.
2. I am an owner(s), authorized agent(s) of an owner(s), or I am currently a licensed contractor or specialty contractor under Chapter 18.27 RCW, or I am exempt from the requirements of the Chapter 18.27 RCW.

Note: This application will not be processed unless the above certification is endorsed by an authorized agent of the owner(s) of the property in question and/or the owner(s) themselves. If the City of Richland has reason to believe that erroneous information has been supplied by an authorized agent of the owner(s) of the property in question and/or by the owner(s) themselves, processing of the application may be suspended.

Applicant Printed Name: Chad Bettsworth

Applicant Signature:  Date 3/3/20

Pahlisch Homes
Proposed Zoning Code Amendment Supplemental Sheet
March 3, 2020

Proposed Code Revision:

The applicant proposes to make the following change to Section 23.42.210 of the Municipal Code:

23.42.210 Recreational clubs.

The applicant for a recreational club shall submit facts to the administrative official showing the suitability of the site for the use; legal provisions insuring the maintenance of the use (both structures and open space) so as to prevent the use from becoming a public liability (such legal provisions shall be reviewed and approved as to form by the city attorney); further, the applicant shall submit a report indicating the club membership size and area to be served by the club. The following dimensional standards shall apply:

A. Minimum Lot Area. The lot size for a recreational club shall conform to that of the district in which the development is located.

B. Lot Coverage. Lot coverage shall be the same as the district in which the development is located. (This standard shall be applicable to building only.)

C. Minimum Side Yard Setback. All outdoor, intensively used recreational facilities, i.e., swimming pools, tennis courts, lawn bowling courts, and similar uses shall be set back 35 feet from all property lines not abutting a public street.

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per ~~2,000~~ 5,000 square feet of gross land area, ~~plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

Or

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per 300 square feet of gross floor area for any building used for public assembly and/or for recreational purposes, ~~plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

Or

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per 300 square feet of water surface area of a swimming pool exclusive of hot tubs, ~~2,000 square feet of gross land area, plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

E. Sound Standards. No amplifiers or loud speakers of any kind shall be installed outside of any buildings.

F. Fencing – Screening. Fencing and screening shall comply with RMC 23.38.070(B). [Ord. 28-05 § 1.02].

Background:

The applicant, the owner and developer of the plat of Westcliffe Heights, proposes providing a recreational amenity for the residents of that plat. This amenity improvement would consist of the construction of an outdoor pool and surrounding concrete deck, with a hot tub and two small buildings (totaling 2,281 square feet in area) on a 0.82-acre site and which clearly falls under the definition of a “recreational club” as listed below:

23.06.800 Recreational club – definition

“Recreational club” means an area devoted to facilities and equipment for recreational purposes, swimming pools, tennis courts, playgrounds, community clubhouses, and other similar uses maintained by a nonprofit organization whose membership is limited to the residents within the area in which it is located; provided, that membership shall not be denied to residents of the area based solely on race, creed or color. [Ord. 28-05 § 1.02; Ord. 59-19 § 3].

In applying the existing off-street parking standard for this proposal, 18 parking spaces would be required based on land area and 57 spaces would be required for the proposed buildings for a total of 75 parking spaces. The amount of land needed for a parking stall (typically 20’ x 9’) varies by configuration of the site, topography and location of the proposed improvements; however, a general rule of thumb is that approximately 400 square feet is needed per parking stall when the requirement for both an access drive and parking stall is considered. So the 75 required parking stalls would need approximately 30,000 square feet of the 35,719 square feet available on the site. With this existing code requirement, 84% of the total site area would be devoted to parking. There would be barely enough room for the proposed 2,200 square feet of building, let alone the pool or hot tub.

Rationale for Proposed Code Change:

While it’s evident that the current code language does not work in the specific instance of the Westcliffe Heights subdivision, there is ample evidence that the code requirement is excessive when applied to existing situations throughout the City. The following table provides summary data for five existing facilities that all meet the definition of “recreational club.”

Existing Recreational Clubs within Richland

Club	Location	Site Size	Facilities Provided
Rivercrest Swim Club	2305 Benton	.37 acres	Outdoor Pool Building 12 Parking Spaces
Clipper Ridge HOA	2498 Bay Court	6.09 acres	Outdoor Pool Recreation Center Tennis Courts Basketball Court Approximately 20 parking stalls
Northview Swim Club	Spring/Davison	.23 acres	Outdoor Pool 6 Parking Spaces
Indian Springs Swim Club	237 Indian Court	.56 acres	Outdoor Pool Buildings 13 Parking Spaces
Lynnwood Swim & Tennis Club	628 Lynnwood	.75 acres	Outdoor Pool Building Tennis Courts 13 Parking Spaces

The following table applies the current code language to existing facilities which in 4 of 5 cases do not meet the off-street parking standard. In most cases, the amount of available parking is substantially lower than the amount required under code. We do not assert that these existing facilities are operating in a manner that is inconsistent with the City code. There has been no analysis to determine when the facilities were developed and what parking standards were in effect at that time. Further, we do not assert that any of the facilities are in need of additional parking. To the contrary, we believe that there is adequate off-street parking available for each of these facilities. This data is presented to demonstrate that the existing parking standard needs to be amended.

Current Code’s Parking Requirements Applied to Existing Recreational Clubs within Richland

Club	Site Size (acres)	Site Parking Required* (under the current Code)	Building Size (sq. ft.)	Building Parking Required** (under the current Code)	Total Parking Required (under the current Code)	Total Parking Provided	Parking Deficit (under the current Code)
Rivercrest Swim Club	.37	8	500	13	21	12	9
Clipper Ridge HOA	6.09	133	4,450	111	244	20	224
Northview Swim Club	.23	5	0	0	5	6	-
Indian Springs Swim Club	.56	12	1,545	39	51	13	38
Lynnwood Swim & Tennis Club	.75	16	1,000	25	41	13	28

* One parking stall per 2,000 square feet land area

**One parking stall per 40 square feet building area

The key aspect of a recreational club, as defined in the City code, is that the membership of the club is *limited to the residents within the area in which it is located*. It is not intended to draw people from other parts of the City. In fact, if no on-site parking were provided, the only users of the recreational facilities provided within the club would be the residents of the neighborhood who could walk to the facility. This circumstance is recognized in other parts of the code as it relates to off-street parking requirements. For instance:

- Section 23.46.140 provides standards for manufactured home parks. It allows for community recreation facilities for the residents and guests of the park. Yet no additional parking is mandated under the code for these facilities;
- Section 23.42.220 provides standards for recreational vehicle parks and mandates that a minimum land area within the park be devoted to recreational facilities. But there is no parking requirement associated with those recreational facilities.
- Chapter 23.18 provides for apartments in the R-3 district and allows for semi-public pools, which are defined as being for the convenience of the residents or guests and for which the general public does not have access. Again, no additional parking requirement is mandated beyond those established for the primary apartment use.

In each of these cases, it is clear that since the recreational facility use is specifically designed for the residents of the park or complex, no additional parking is required. The residents' parking needs have already been accounted for in the parking standards that apply to apartments, mobile home parks and recreational vehicle parks. The same concept should apply to recreational clubs that are intended to serve local neighborhoods.

A further example that the parking requirement for this use is inflated is the George Prout Pool. The pool is a public facility located within a public park and is intended to serve the entire community. The pool is located on a 4.56 acre site and in addition to the pool includes a building of approximately 5,000 square feet. It also includes a total of 39 off-street parking spaces. If the recreational club parking standards were to be applied to this site, 99 parking spaces would be needed based on the land area and an additional 125 spaces would be needed for the building for a total parking requirement of 224 spaces. Yet the Prout Pool is intended to serve residents City-wide, not just within a neighborhood.

Finally, the standard for buildings is hugely inflated. At one space per 40 square feet of building, it is the highest parking standard in the City code. As a point of comparison, places of assembly, such as dance halls or exhibition halls require one space per 150 square feet of building area, restaurants require 1 space for 100 square feet of building area and a drive-thru restaurant requires one space per 50 square feet of building area.

Justification for Proposed Standard:

The intent of a recreational club is to provide recreational amenities for the residents of a particular neighborhood. Therefore, any off-street parking standard should account for the likelihood that a large percentage of the users of the facility would or could walk to the facility and therefore the demand for off-street parking would be lessened. As recreational clubs may include a variety of facilities including open space, recreational buildings, swimming pools, tennis courts or other similar amenities, the parking standard should be flexible to account for a variety of circumstances.

As a point of comparison, this analysis included a brief review of parking standards that are in place within other Tri-Cities communities. While there are no specific standards for recreational clubs, the following standards are somewhat similar in nature to certain aspects of a recreational club:

- The City of Kennewick requires one parking space for 250 square feet of gross floor area for entertainment/recreational facilities;
- The City of Pasco requires one parking space for every 200 square feet of water surface area for swimming pools;
- Neither the cities of Richland, Pasco or Kennewick identify an off-street parking standard for open space or public parks.

There are several proposed alternatives included in the application for the City's consideration because parking needs will vary based on the type of amenities that are provided within a given recreational club. A parking standard of one space per 5,000 square feet is suggested because it provides some limited parking while ensuring that the majority of site (90+ %) will be left in open space and/or recreational amenities and not covered over with an asphalt parking lot.

A parking requirement of one space per 300 square feet of recreational building area is similar to the 250 square foot standard in place in Kennewick with a discount provided for the likelihood of facility users who would walk rather than drive to the facility. Additionally, the proposed language ensures parking requirements would not be applied to small structures like pool maintenance buildings, storage sheds or restrooms which would not in and of themselves create a parking demand.

A parking requirement of one space per 300 square feet of water surface area for swimming pools is similar to the City of Pasco requirement with a discount provided for pool users who would walk rather than drive to the pool.

Any one of these standards would be a great improvement over the current code language. One final observation relating to recreational clubs is that these facilities would be operated by a non-profit organization for the benefit of the neighborhood. Typically, this duty would be assumed by a Home Owners Association. There may be some events held at a recreational club that could result in higher demand for parking than what is available on-site. Examples may be a member of the recreational club scheduling use of the facility for a graduation party or a family reunion. The HOA, as the operator of the facility could choose to disallow such events if they created a parking problem or choose to allow them on an infrequent basis if their community residents accepted this circumstance. In any event, the parking standard set forth by the City should be based on meeting the demand for the typical use of the facility, not the one or two occasions annually where a parking shortage could occur.

Conclusion:

The proposed code amendment would be a benefit to the City for the following reasons:

- It would eliminate the current disincentive that developers have in providing recreational clubs within their developments since installing parking in excess of need is expensive, wasteful of land resources and increases storm water runoff;
- It would make parking requirements for recreational clubs closer to on par with the parking standards applied to recreational amenities in other types of residential uses such as manufactured housing parks, apartments and recreational vehicle parks;
- It would encourage the users of recreational clubs to walk to their facilities rather than drive and would also discourage the use of the facilities by residents who don't live in close proximity to the club.

Exhibit 2

ORDINANCE NO. XXX-XX

AN ORDINANCE of the City of Richland amending Section 23.42.210, Recreational clubs, related to the amount of required off-street parking.

WHEREAS, from time to time the City has need to update its development regulations; and

WHEREAS, on April 22, 2020, the Richland Planning Commission conducted a public hearing regarding modifications to the land use table contained within RMC Section 23.26.210; and

WHEREAS, the Richland Planning Commission recommends that the following changes be made to RMC Section 23.26.210.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City of Richland as follows:

Section 1. RMC Section 23.42.210 of the Richland Municipal Code, as enacted by Ordinance No. XX-XX, and last amended by Ordinance No. XX-XX, is hereby amended to read as follows:

23.42.210 Recreational clubs.

The applicant for a recreational club shall submit facts to the administrative official showing the suitability of the site for the use; legal provisions insuring the maintenance of the use (both structures and open space) so as to prevent the use from becoming a public liability (such legal provisions shall be reviewed and approved as to form by the city attorney); further, the applicant shall submit a report indicating the club membership size and area to be served by the club. The following dimensional standards shall apply:

A. Minimum Lot Area. The lot size for a recreational club shall conform to that of the district in which the development is located.

B. Lot Coverage. Lot coverage shall be the same as the district in which the development is located. (This standard shall be applicable to building only.)

C. Minimum Side Yard Setback. All outdoor, intensively used recreational facilities, i.e., swimming pools, tennis courts, lawn bowling courts, and similar uses shall be set back 35 feet from all property lines not abutting a public street.

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per 2,000 5,000 square feet of gross land area, ~~plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

OR

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per 300 square feet of gross floor area for any building used for public assembly and/or for recreational purposes. ~~2,000 square feet of gross land area, plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

OR

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per 300 square feet of water surface area of a swimming pool exclusive of hot tubs. ~~2,000 square feet of gross land area, plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

E. Sound Standards. No amplifiers or loud speakers of any kind shall be installed outside of any buildings.

F. Fencing – Screening. Fencing and screening shall comply with RMC 23.38.070(B). [Ord. 28-05 § 1.02]

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect the day following its publication in the official newspaper of the City of Richland.

PASSED by the City Council of the City of Richland, Washington, at a regular meeting on the XX day of Month, 20XX.

RYAN LUKSON
Mayor

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Jennifer Rogers, City Clerk

HEATHER KINTZLEY, City Attorney

Date Published: _____

Exhibit 3



File No. EA2020-108

CITY OF RICHLAND Determination of Non-Significance

Description of Proposal: Text amendment to RMC Title 23, Section 23.42.210 (D), Off-street parking for recreational clubs. The proposed text amendment would reduce the off-street parking requirement for recreational clubs.

Proponent: Chad Bettsworth

Location of Proposal: City-Wide.

Lead Agency: City of Richland

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

() There is no comment for the DNS.

() This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for fourteen days from the date of issuance.

(X) This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

Responsible Official: Mike Stevens

Position/Title: Planning Manager

Address: 625 Swift Blvd., MS #35, Richland, WA 99352

Date: June 17, 2020

Signature _____

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the [SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS \(part D\)](#). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

A. Background [\[HELP\]](#)

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
Pahlisch Homes proposed zoning code amendment (RMC 23.42.210)
2. Name of applicant:
Pahlisch Homes
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
*219 SW Wilson Avenue, Suite 100, Bend Oregon
Contact: Chad Bettesworth 541.385.6762*

4. Date checklist prepared:
March 3, 2020
5. Agency requesting checklist:
City of Richland
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
Estimated processing time of the request is approximately 3 months.
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
No.
8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
None
9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.
No other applications are pending
10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
City of Richland approval of zoning code amendment.
11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)
Amendment to the Richland zoning code (RMC 23.42.210) to reduce the off-street parking requirements associated with recreational clubs.
12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.
Potentially citywide in any of the following zoning districts: Agricultural, Suburban Agriculture, Single Family Residential Districts (R1-12,R1-10, R-2, R2-S, Multi Family Residential, Commercial Limited Business, Central Business District and Waterfront.

B. Environmental Elements [\[HELP\]](#)

1. **Earth** [\[help\]](#)

a. General description of the site:

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.
- e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.
- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

2. Air [\[help\]](#)

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.
- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

3. Water [\[help\]](#)

- a. Surface Water: [\[help\]](#)
 - 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
 - 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
 - 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.
 - 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

b. Ground Water: [\[help\]](#)

1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

4. Plants [\[help\]](#)

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

- ___deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- ___evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- ___shrubs
- ___grass
- ___pasture
- ___crop or grain
- ___Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- ___wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- ___water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- ___other types of vegetation

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?
- c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:
- e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

5. Animals [\[help\]](#)

- a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.

Examples include:

- birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
- mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
- fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

- b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:
- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

6. **Energy and Natural Resources** [\[help\]](#)

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

7. **Environmental Health** [\[help\]](#)

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.
 - 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

 - 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

 - 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

 - 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

 - 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

- b. *Noise*
 - 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

 - 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

 - 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

8. Land and Shoreline Use [\[help\]](#)

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?
 - 1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

- L. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

- m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

9. Housing [\[help\]](#)

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

10. Aesthetics [\[help\]](#)

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

11. Light and Glare [\[help\]](#)

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

12. Recreation [\[help\]](#)

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

13. Historic and cultural preservation [\[help\]](#)

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers ? If so, specifically describe.

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

14. Transportation [\[help\]](#)

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).
- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?
- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

15. Public Services [\[help\]](#)

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

16. Utilities [\[help\]](#)

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:
 electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,
 other _____
- c. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

C. Signature [\[HELP\]](#)

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: _____

Name of signee _____

Position and Agency/Organization _____

Director of Land Development, Pahlisch Homes

Date Submitted: _____

March 3, 2020

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions [\[HELP\]](#)

(IT IS NOT NECESSARY to use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

A reduction in the overall amount of off-street parking would help to limit the amount of storm water runoff generated by asphalt parking lots. It would not have impacts to air emissions or result in the release of toxic or hazardous substances.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None are needed.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Reducing the amount of asphalt paving on a given site may result in a larger percentage of a recreational club site being left in a natural state, thereby potentially preserving native plants. The impacts of this action would be minimal but would be less than what would occur without the proposed code amendment.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

None are needed.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Some material and energy savings would result from construction of smaller parking lots.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

None are needed.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks,

wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Typically recreational clubs would not be located within environmentally sensitive areas. To the extent that a recreational club may impact a sensitive area, the footprint of the facility could be smaller, given the smaller parking lot that would be required to serve the use, so impacts would be marginally reduced.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

None are needed.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The reduction in off-street parking may provide some incentive for neighborhood organizations and/or developers to build recreational clubs to serve their neighborhoods, thereby increasing the recreational amenities that would be available to residents.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

None are needed.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

No increased demands on transportation systems or public utilities would result from the proposal. To the extent that recreational facilities would be provided for neighborhoods, the demand for city-wide park and recreational facilities could be slightly decreased.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

None are needed.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The proposed code amendment to reduce parking requirements would not be in conflict with any existing environmental regulations.



Department of Commerce

Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment / Notice of Adoption Cover Sheet

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106, the following jurisdiction provides the following required state agency notice.

<p>1. Jurisdiction Name:</p>	<p>City of Richland – Development Services Dept.</p>
<p>2. Select Submittal Type: Select the Type of Submittal listed. (Select One Only)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 60-Day Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Request of Expedited Review / Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Submittal for existing Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Final Adoption of Amendment.</p>
<p>3. Amendment Type: Select Type of Amendment listed. (Select One Only)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Plan Amendment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development Regulation Amendment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Critical Areas Ordinance Amendment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Combined Comprehensive and Development Regulation Amendments.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Countywide Planning Policy.</p>
<p>4. Description Enter a brief description of the amendment.</p> <p>Begin your description with “Proposed” or “Adopted”, based on the type of Amendment you are submitting.</p> <p>Examples: <i>“Proposed comprehensive plan amendment for the GMA periodic update.”</i> or <i>“Adopted Ordinance 123, adoption amendment to the sign code.”</i> (Maximum 400 characters).</p>	<p>Proposed amendment to RMC Sections 23.42.210 (D), Off Street Parking for Recreational Clubs.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to Section 23.42.210 (D) would reduce the off-street parking requirement for recreational clubs. The proposed language includes several alternatives for the Planning Commission and City Council to review.</p>



Department of Commerce

5. Is this action part of your 8-year periodic update required under RCW 36.70A.130 of the Growth Management Act (GMA)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
6. Proposed Dates: Enter the anticipated public hearing date(s) for your Planning Commission/Planning Board or for your Council/Commission.	Planning Commission: April 22, 2020 City Council: May 19, 2020 & June 2, 2020 Proposed / Date of Adoption: June 2, 2020
7. Contact Information:	
A. Prefix/Salutation: <i>(Examples: "Mr.", "Ms.", or "The Honorable" (elected official))</i>	Mr.
B. Name:	Mike Stevens
C. Title:	Planning Manager
D. Email:	mstevens@ci.richland.wa.us
E. Work Phone:	(509) 942-7596
F. Cell/Mobile Phone: <i>(optional)</i>	
Consultant Information:	
G. Is this person a consultant?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
H. Consulting Firm name?	
8. Would you like Commerce to contact you for Technical Assistance regarding this submitted amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

REQUIRED: Attach or include a copy of the proposed amendment text or document(s). We do not accept a website hyperlink requiring us to retrieve external documents. Jurisdictions must submit the actual document(s) to Commerce. If you experience difficulty, please email the reviewteam@commerce.wa.gov

Questions? Call the review team at (509) 725-3066.

ORDINANCE NO. XXX-XX

AN ORDINANCE of the City of Richland amending Section 23.42.210, Recreational clubs, related to the amount of required off-street parking.

WHEREAS, from time to time the City has need to update its development regulations; and

WHEREAS, on April 22, 2020, the Richland Planning Commission conducted a public hearing regarding modifications to the land use table contained within RMC Section 23.26.210; and

WHEREAS, the Richland Planning Commission recommends that the following changes be made to RMC Section 23.26.210.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City of Richland as follows:

Section 1. RMC Section 23.42.210 of the Richland Municipal Code, as enacted by Ordinance No. XX-XX, and last amended by Ordinance No. XX-XX, is hereby amended to read as follows:

23.42.210 Recreational clubs.

The applicant for a recreational club shall submit facts to the administrative official showing the suitability of the site for the use; legal provisions insuring the maintenance of the use (both structures and open space) so as to prevent the use from becoming a public liability (such legal provisions shall be reviewed and approved as to form by the city attorney); further, the applicant shall submit a report indicating the club membership size and area to be served by the club. The following dimensional standards shall apply:

A. Minimum Lot Area. The lot size for a recreational club shall conform to that of the district in which the development is located.

B. Lot Coverage. Lot coverage shall be the same as the district in which the development is located. (This standard shall be applicable to building only.)

C. Minimum Side Yard Setback. All outdoor, intensively used recreational facilities, i.e., swimming pools, tennis courts, lawn bowling courts, and similar uses shall be set back 35 feet from all property lines not abutting a public street.

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per ~~2,000~~ 5,000 square feet of gross land area, ~~plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

OR

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per 300 square feet of gross floor area for any building used for public assembly and/or for recreational purposes. ~~2,000 square feet of gross land area, plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

OR

D. Off-Street Parking. All off-street parking spaces shall be located on the same site as the principal use. There shall be provided one space per 300 square feet of water surface area of a swimming pool exclusive of hot tubs. ~~2,000 square feet of gross land area, plus one additional space per two employees. Should the development include an indoor recreational facility or assembly area there shall be provided one additional space per 40 square feet of gross useable floor area.~~

E. Sound Standards. No amplifiers or loud speakers of any kind shall be installed outside of any buildings.

F. Fencing – Screening. Fencing and screening shall comply with RMC 23.38.070(B). [Ord. 28-05 § 1.02]

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect the day following its publication in the official newspaper of the City of Richland.

PASSED by the City Council of the City of Richland, Washington, at a regular meeting on the XX day of Month, 20XX.

RYAN LUKSON
Mayor

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Jennifer Rogers, City Clerk

HEATHER KINTZLEY, City Attorney

Date Published: _____



THANK YOU

We have received your amendment submission. Please allow 1-3 business days for review. Please keep the Submittal ID as your receipt and for any future questions. We will also send an email receipt to all contacts listed in the submittal.

Submittal ID: 2020-S-1296

Submittal Date Time: 03/11/2020

Submittal Information

Jurisdiction City of Richland
Submittal Type Request for Expedited Review / Notice of Intent to Adopt
Amendment Type Amendment
 Development Regulation Amendment

Amendment Information

Brief Description

Proposed amendment to RMC Sections 23.42.210 (D), Off Street Parking for Recreational Clubs.

Yes, this is a part of the 8-year periodic update schedule, required under RCW 36.70A.130.

Anticipated/Proposed Date of Adoption 06/02/2020

Attachments

Attachment Type	File Name	Upload Date
Correspondence	City of Richland Zoning Code Amendment CA2020-102.msg	03/12/2020 02:24 PM
Development Regulation Amendment - Draft	CA2020-102 Referral Packet.pdf	03/12/2020 02:26 PM

Contact Information

Prefix Mr.
First Name Mike
Last Name Stevens
Title Planning Manager
Work (509) 942-7596
Cell

Email mstevens@ci.richland.wa.us

Yes, I would like to be contacted for Technical Assistance.

Certification

Entered by Linda Weyl on 3/12/2020 2:29:46 PM

Intake Received Date	03/11/2020
Full Name	Mike Stevens
Email	mstevens@ci.richland.wa.us



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
1011 Plum Street SE • PO Box 42525 • Olympia, Washington 98504-2525 • (360) 725-4000
www.commerce.wa.gov

03/12/2020

Mr. Mike Stevens
Planning Manager
City of Richland
505 Swift Boulevard
Post Office Box 190
Richland, WA 99352

Sent Via Electronic Mail

Re: City of Richland--2020-S-1296--Request for Expedited Review / Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment

Dear Mr. Stevens:

Thank you for sending the Washington State Department of Commerce (Commerce) the Request for Expedited Review / Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment as required under [RCW 36.70A.106](#). We received your submittal with the following description.

Proposed amendment to RMC Sections 23.42.210 (D), Off Street Parking for Recreational Clubs.

We received your submittal on 03/11/2020 and processed it with the Submittal ID 2020-S-1296. Please keep this letter as documentation that you have met this procedural requirement. Your 60-day notice period ends on 05/10/2020.

You requested expedited review under [RCW 36.70A.106\(3\)\(b\)](#). We have forwarded a copy of this notice to other state agencies for expedited review and comment. If one or more state agencies indicate that they will be commenting, then Commerce will deny expedited review and the standard 60-day review period (from date received) will apply. Commerce will notify you by e-mail regarding of approval or denial of your expedited review request. If approved for expedited review, then final adoption may occur no earlier than fifteen calendar days after the original date of receipt by Commerce.

If you have any questions, please contact Growth Management Services at reviewteam@commerce.wa.gov, or call William Simpson, (509) 280-3602.

Sincerely,

Review Team
Growth Management Services



Exhibit 5

CITY OF RICHLAND NOTICE OF APPLICATION, PUBLIC HEARING AND OPTIONAL DNS (CA2020-102 & EA2020-108)

Notice is hereby given that Chad Bettsworth on behalf of Pahlisch Homes has filed an application for a text amendment to RMC Section 23.42.210 (D) – Off-street parking for recreational clubs. The proposed text amendment would reduce the off-street parking requirement for recreational clubs.

Pursuant to Richland Municipal Code (RMC) Section 19.20 the Richland Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing and review of the application at 6:00 p.m., April 22, 2020 in the Richland City Hall Council Chambers, 625 Swift Boulevard. All interested parties are invited to attend and present testimony at the public hearing.

Environmental Review: The proposal is subject to environmental review. The City of Richland is lead agency for the proposal under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and has reviewed the proposed project for probable adverse environmental impacts and expects to issue a determination of non-significance (DNS) for this project. The optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355 is being used. This may be your only opportunity to comment on the environmental impacts of the proposed development. The environmental checklist and related file information are available to the public and can be viewed in the Development Services Division Office or City of Richland website www.ci.richland.wa.us.

Any person desiring to express his views or to be notified of any decisions pertaining to this application should notify Mike Stevens, Planning Manager, 625 Swift Blvd., MS-35, Richland, WA 99352. Comments may also be faxed to (509) 942-7764 or emailed to mstevens@ci.richland.wa.us. Written comments should be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, April 3, 2020 to be incorporated into the staff report. Comments received after that date will be entered into the record at the hearing.

Copies of the staff report and recommendation will be available in the Development Services Division Office or City of Richland website www.ci.richland.wa.us beginning Friday, April 17, 2020.

Please publish the following:

Type of Legal Ad:	Public Hearing Notice
Date(s) of Publication:	Monday, February 3, 2020
Richland's TCH Account:	450543
For Invoice Text Box on TCH Invoice (Richland MUNIS Description)	PC PHN – CA2020-101, EA2020-104
For PO Box on TCH Invoice (Richland Account No. - MUNIS)	D2586000 4401
Attention:	Jana Duncan (TF)

**CITY OF RICHLAND
NOTICE OF APPLICATION, PUBLIC HEARING, AND OPTIONAL DNS**

The City of Richland received an application for text amendments to RMC Section 23.30.020 – Public use districts permitted land uses and to RMC Section 23.06 - Definitions. The proposed text amendments would result in the following use as an allowable Special Use in the PPF (Public Use) zoning district: “Clinic, School-Based”.

The Richland Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing and review of the application at 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, February 26, 2020 in the Richland City Hall Council Chambers, 625 Swift Boulevard. All interested parties are invited to attend and present testimony at the public hearing.

Environmental Review: The proposal is subject to environmental review. The City of Richland is lead agency for the proposal under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and has reviewed the proposed project for probable adverse environmental impacts and expects to issue a determination of non-significance (DNS) for this project. The optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355 is being used. This may be your only opportunity to comment on the environmental impacts of the proposed development. The environmental checklist and related file information are available to the public and can be viewed in the Development Services Division Office or City of Richland website www.ci.richland.wa.us .

Any person desiring to express his views or to be notified of any decisions pertaining to this application should notify Mike Stevens, Planning Manager, 625 Swift Blvd., MS-35, Richland, WA 99352. Comments may also be faxed to (509) 942-7764 or emailed to mstevens@ci.richland.wa.us. Written comments should be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 18, 2020 to be incorporated into the staff report. Comments received after that date will be entered into the record at the hearing.

Copies of the staff report and recommendation will be available in the Development Services Division Office or City of Richland website www.ci.richland.wa.us beginning Friday, February 21, 2020.

From: [Rebecca Hiles](#)
To: [Stevens, Mike](#)
Subject: RE: City of Richland Zoning Code Amendment CA2020-102
Date: Friday, March 27, 2020 10:42:12 AM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[image002.png](#)

Mike,

KID has no comments on this matter.

Rebecca S. Hiles, E.I.T.
Staff Engineer

Kennewick Irrigation District
2015 S. Ely Street
Kennewick, WA 99337
[509-460-5442](tel:509-460-5442) [Direct Line]
[509-586-6012](tel:509-586-6012) ext. 138 [Business Line]
[509-586-9111](tel:509-586-9111) [Customer Service]
<mailto:rhiles@kid.org>



This communication is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510 et seq., which makes it a felony punishable by fines and up to five years imprisonment to intercept or use the information contained in this email. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us and return the original message to us and delete this message from your mailbox. Thank You.

From: Stevens, Mike <mstevens@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 11:10 AM
To: Anthony Muai <anthony.muai@ci.kennewick.wa.us>; Anthony Von Moos <anthony.vonmoos@co.benton.wa.us>; Ashley Morton <AshleyMorton@ctuir.org>; Badger Mountain Irrigation District <bmidmanager@badgermountainirrigation.com>; Benton County - Segregations <Segregations@co.benton.wa.us>; Webcsr PUD <webcsr@bentonpud.org>; Bill Barlow <bbarlow@bft.org>; Boring, Michael <MBoring@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Boshart, Thomas <tboshart@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Buechler, Ken <KBuechler@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Carrie Thompson <carrie.thompson@bnsf.com>; Catherine Dickson <catherinedickson@ctuir.org>; Clark Posey <clark.posey@co.benton.wa.us>; BCES Hamilton, Craig <c.hamilton@bces.wa.gov>; DAHP SEPA Reviews <sepa@dahp.wa.gov>; Darrick Dietrich <darrick@basindisposal.com>; Dean Kelley <dean.kelley@chartercom.com>; BCES Davis, Deanna <d.davis@bces.wa.gov>; Deborah Rodgers

<dxrogers@bpa.gov>; Deskins, John <jdeskins@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Eric Mendenhall <emendenhall@westrichland.org>; Florinda Coleman <florinda.coleman@co.benton.wa.us>; Ghbein, Briana <bghbein@ci.richland.wa.us>; Greg McCormick <gregory.mccormick@ci.kennewick.wa.us>; Greg Wendt <greg.wendt@co.benton.wa.us>; Gregory Goodwin <gregory.l.goodwin@ftr.com>; Gwen Clear <gcle461@ecy.wa.gov>; Hill, Kelly <khill@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; USPS Ina N. Beutler <ina.n.beutler@usps.gov>; Jason McShane <JMcShane@kid.org>; Jennings, Tyler <tjennings@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Jerrod Macpherson <Jerrod.Macpherson@co.benton.wa.us>; Joseph Cichy <joseph.cichy@ftr.com>; Joseph Cottrell <jecottrell@bpa.gov>; Junior Campos <junior.campos@charter.com>; Kelly Cooper <kelly.cooper@doh.wa.gov>; Kevin Knodel <kevin.knodel@rsd.edu>; Kevin Sliger <KSliger@bft.org>; Development <development@kid.org>; Brad Crawford <BCrawford@kid.org>; Lopez, Brandin <blopez@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; M. Deklyne <mjdekyne@bpa.gov>; BCES Map <map@bces.wa.gov>; Pasco99301 <99301PascoWA-Postmaster@usps.gov>; Paul Gonseth <gonsetp@wsdot.wa.gov>; Reathafor, Jason <JReathafor@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Rebecca Hiles <rhiles@kid.org>; Review Team <reviewteam@commerce.wa.gov>; Richard Krasner <richard.krasner@rsd.edu>; USPS Richland Postmaster <99352RichlandWA-Postmaster@usps.gov>; Rick Dawson <rickd@bfhd.wa.gov>; Rob Rodger <rob.rodger@bentoncleanair.org>; Robin Priddy <robin.priddy@bentoncleanair.org>; Roscoe Slade <roscoe@westrichland.org>; BCES Gates, Sarah <s.gates@bces.wa.gov>; Schiessl, Joe <JSchiessl@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; SEPA Center <sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov>; SEPA Register <separegister@ecy.wa.gov>; SEPA Unit <sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov>; Seth Defoe <SDefoe@kid.org>; South Central Region Planning <scplanning@wsdot.wa.gov>; WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife <lopezlal@dfw.wa.gov>; WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife <rittemwr@dfw.wa.gov>; West, Julie <jwest@ci.richland.wa.us>; Westphal, Nichole <nwestphal@ci.richland.wa.us>; William Simpson <william.simpson@commerce.wa.gov>

Subject: City of Richland Zoning Code Amendment CA2020-102

Attached to this email you will find a copy of a proposed zoning code text amendment. The proposed text amendment would reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces for facilities defined as "Recreational Clubs" by the Richland Municipal Code. The City is requesting Expedited Review by the Dept. of Commerce.

The City of Richland is utilizing the Optional DNS Review Process. As a result, this may be your only chance to comment on the proposed text amendment. Please review and respond back with comments by 5:00 PM, Friday, April 3, 2020.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,



Mike Stevens
Planning Manager
625 Swift Blvd. | Richland, WA 99352
(509) 942-7596

Disclaimer: Emails and attachments sent to or from the City of Richland are public records subject to release under the Washington Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW. Sender and Recipient have no expectation of privacy in emails transmitted to or from the City of Richland.

From: [Eric Mendenhall](#)
To: [Stevens, Mike](#)
Subject: RE: City of Richland Zoning Code Amendment CA2020-102
Date: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 1:32:09 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Mike,

The City has no official comment.

Food for thought: Have you considered implementing a max parking requirement? This would allow these uses to establish their need and not overbuild parking.

Regards,

Eric Mendenhall
Community Development Manager

From: Stevens, Mike <mstevens@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 11:11 AM
To: Anthony Muai <anthony.muai@ci.kennewick.wa.us>; Anthony Von Moos <anthony.vonmoos@co.benton.wa.us>; Ashley Morton <AshleyMorton@ctuir.org>; Badger Mountain Irrigation District <bmidmanager@badgermountainirrigation.com>; Benton County - Segregations <Segregations@co.benton.wa.us>; Webcsr PUD <webcsr@bentonpud.org>; Bill Barlow <bbarlow@bft.org>; Boring, Michael <MBoring@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Boshart, Thomas <tboshart@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Buechler, Ken <KBuechler@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Carrie Thompson <carrie.thompson@bnsf.com>; Catherine Dickson <catherinedickson@ctuir.org>; Clark Posey <clark.posey@co.benton.wa.us>; BCES Hamilton, Craig <c.hamilton@bces.wa.gov>; DAHP SEPA Reviews <sepa@dahp.wa.gov>; Darrick Dietrich <darrick@basindisposal.com>; Dean Kelley <dean.kelley@chartercom.com>; BCES Davis, Deanna <d.davis@bces.wa.gov>; Deborah Rodgers <dxrodgers@bpa.gov>; Deskins, John <jdeskins@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Eric Mendenhall <emendenhall@westrichland.org>; Florinda Coleman <florinda.coleman@co.benton.wa.us>; Ghbein, Briana <bghbein@ci.richland.wa.us>; Greg McCormick <gregory.mccormick@ci.kennewick.wa.us>; Greg Wendt <greg.wendt@co.benton.wa.us>; Gregory Goodwin <gregory.l.goodwin@ftr.com>; Gwen Clear <gcle461@ecy.wa.gov>; Hill, Kelly <khill@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; USPS Ina N. Beutler <ina.n.beutler@usps.gov>; Jason McShane <jmcsbane@kid.org>; Jennings, Tyler <tjennings@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Jerrod Macpherson <Jerrod.Macpherson@co.benton.wa.us>; Joseph Cichy <joseph.cichy@ftr.com>; Joseph Cottrell <jecottrell@bpa.gov>; Junior Campos <junior.campos@charter.com>; Kelly Cooper <kelly.cooper@doh.wa.gov>; Kevin Knodel <kevin.knodel@rsd.edu>; Kevin Sliger <KSliger@bft.org>; KID Development <development@kid.org>; KID Webmaster <webmaster@kid.org>; Lopez, Brandin <blopez@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; M. Deklyne <mjdelyne@bpa.gov>; BCES Map <map@bces.wa.gov>; Pasco99301 <99301PascoWA-Postmaster@usps.gov>; Paul Gonseth <gonsetp@wsdot.wa.gov>; Reathaford, Jason <JReathaford@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; Rebecca Hiles <rhiles@kid.org>; Review Team <reviewteam@commerce.wa.gov>; Richard Krasner <richard.krasner@rsd.edu>; USPS Richland Postmaster <99352RichlandWA-Postmaster@usps.gov>;

Rick Dawson <rickd@bfhd.wa.gov>; Rob Rodger <rob.rodger@bentoncleanair.org>; Robin Priddy <robin.priddy@bentoncleanair.org>; Roscoe Slade <roscoe@westrichland.org>; BCES Gates, Sarah <s.gates@bces.wa.gov>; Schiessl, Joe <JSchiessl@CI.RICHLAND.WA.US>; SEPA Center <sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov>; SEPA Register <separegister@ecy.wa.gov>; SEPA Unit <sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov>; Seth DeFoe <SDefoe@kid.org>; South Central Region Planning <scplanning@wsdot.wa.gov>; WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife <lopezlal@dfw.wa.gov>; WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife <rittemwr@dfw.wa.gov>; West, Julie <jwest@ci.richland.wa.us>; Westphal, Nichole <nwestphal@ci.richland.wa.us>; William Simpson <william.simpson@commerce.wa.gov>
Subject: City of Richland Zoning Code Amendment CA2020-102

Attached to this email you will find a copy of a proposed zoning code text amendment. The proposed text amendment would reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces for facilities defined as "Recreational Clubs" by the Richland Municipal Code. The City is requesting Expedited Review by the Dept. of Commerce.

The City of Richland is utilizing the Optional DNS Review Process. As a result, this may be your only chance to comment on the proposed text amendment. Please review and respond back with comments by 5:00 PM, Friday, April 3, 2020.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,



Mike Stevens
Planning Manager
625 Swift Blvd. | Richland, WA 99352
(509) 942-7596

Disclaimer: Emails and attachments sent to or from the City of Richland are public records subject to release under the Washington Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW. Sender and Recipient have no expectation of privacy in emails transmitted to or from the City of Richland.

This is an external email and did not originate from the City of West Richland's email system.