

**Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122**

Planning Commissioners Present: Mayor Rick K. Smith, Chairman Michelle Nelson, Vice-Chairman Joe Mozgai, Town Board Member Gabe Candelaria, James Sanders

Planning Commissioners Absent: Chris Rhodes, Pat Heyman

Staff Present: Chris La May (Town Manager), Marianne Jones (Town Clerk)

Media Present:

The meeting was called to order @ 7:04 p.m.

Minutes: Rick made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 13th, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. Joe seconded the motion. All were in favor, motion passed unanimously.

Public Input: None was offered so it was immediately closed.

**Action Agenda Item #: Discussion & Possible Action
Accessory Dwelling Units**

Chris went through and outlined the changes that were made at the last meeting.

Chris explained that he has gathered information from the Washington State Municipal Research Service and requested that the Commission review each additional item individually and decide on the language for the Ordinance.

9) Density Controls

Density controls place a limit on the total number of homes within a particular area (e.g., city blocks, census tracts, etc.) that can have ADUs. They are intended to prevent traffic, parking, and other density-related impacts that may result from an overconcentration of homes with ADUs. They are also intended to ensure an even distribution of ADUs throughout the community. Such requirements may limit the number of homes with ADUs that may be located within a certain distance of one another, or they may place a cap on the total number of ADUs that may be installed on a particular block without regard to proximity to other ADUs.

Density controls may serve as a useful reassurance for residents who are concerned about the possibility of numerous new conversions appearing in single-family neighborhoods. Since typical conversion rates are usually quite low, such restrictions may not actually prevent many conversions. Density controls can always be reviewed and possibly lifted at a later date after the community has gained more experience with actual conversion rates.

On the downside, dispersion requirements may be vulnerable to charges of inequity where homeowners who want to install an ADU are prevented from doing so simply because one or two other homeowners on the same block or within a certain distance have already done so. This may be particularly troublesome in cases where the existing units were formerly illegal units that have recently been legalized. Dispersion requirements may also discourage the owners of illegal units from legalizing them and encourage the creation of new illegal units in areas that have already reached their limit.

Chris La May proposed the following language regarding density controls.

- 1) The unit shall be included in calculation for the zoning districts density and dimensional standards.

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

Rick stated that there is frustration among the residents when building occurs on the entire lot. He thinks this is a needed requirement in order to keep density consistent throughout the Town.

The Commission agreed that the language is good as presented.

10) Age of Home

Some communities have adopted restrictions on ADU conversions based on the age of the home. Ordinances that restrict the ADU conversions to homes that are over a certain age (e.g., three years) effectively prohibit ADUs in new construction. Regulations of this type are intended to limit the number of conversions and to prevent developers from constructing and marketing new homes with accessory apartments in single-family zones. Such regulations are also intended to prevent new construction designed specifically for conversion at a later time.

Supporters of restrictions based on the age of homes assert that the goal should be to promote the recycling and better use of existing housing rather than to encourage the development of "duplexes" in single-family neighborhoods.

ADU proponents question the need for restrictions on ADUs in newly constructed homes. They argue that this type of restriction denies homeowners flexibility in the use of their homes to allow for changes in family size, economic status, or other life cycle changes. They also point out that ADUs can be more easily included in new construction with designs that more effectively address exterior appearance and parking issues. Many communities do allow ADUs in new as well as existing homes.

It is not clear that allowing ADUs in new construction will result in waves of ADU installations. Where there is concern over the potential numbers of ADUs, sunset provisions or reviews that are triggered after a certain number conversions may also provide reassurance to neighborhood groups, without restricting the ability of young homebuyers or others who may benefit from the opportunity to install an ADU in a newly purchased home.

Chris stated that he does not have any proposed language for this item but asked the Commission if they would like to include any of this information in the ordinance.

The Commission decided not to add any language regarding this item.

11) Length of Residence

Some ordinances limit ADU conversions to situations where the homeowner has lived in the house for a certain number of years (e.g., three years). These regulations are intended to prohibit conversions at the time of purchase and for a period of time after the purchase of both new and existing homes. Restrictions based on length of residence are also designed to prevent homebuyers from purchasing a home with the specific intent of installing an ADU. Such restrictions are usually based on concerns that legalization will result in large numbers of new ADU conversions.

ADU proponents argue that regulations of this type effectively remove the opportunity for first-time buyers to use the rental income from an ADU to help in qualifying for a mortgage loan and to offset a portion of their house payment.

Chris stated that he does not have any proposed language for this item but asked the Commission if they would like to include any of this information in the ordinance.

The Commission decided not to add any language regarding this item.

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

12) Recording Requirements

To ensure continued compliance with owner-occupancy and other ordinance requirements by current, as well as by any subsequent owners, many communities require that a deed restriction, covenant, or similar instrument be filed and recorded by the homeowner.

Deed restrictions run with the land and put prospective buyers on notice with respect to the requirements and limitations of the ordinance and, in some cases, inform them of the steps they must take to apply for ADU permits.

Whenever there is a transfer of ownership of the property, the title search turns up the document noting the regulations.

Some ordinances require homeowners to sign and file an agreement binding them to comply with all of the ADU ordinance provisions. The agreement may also provide an additional avenue for enforcement of the ordinance's requirements.

Chris La May proposed the following language regarding recording requirements.

- 1) ADUs may be approved for a period not to exceed two (2) years. The applicant or owner must reapply biennially for review no later than thirty (30) days past the original approval date.

Gabe stated that he thinks this would be a very difficult matter to enforce. He suggested that some type of deed restriction on the title work might be a better option.

Rick agreed that there needs to be some sort of notation on the title work documenting that an ADU has been approved on the property so that it is documented for any future owners of the property.

Chris stated that the Town doesn't currently record any documents when a "Use By Review" is granted to a property owner. It is just filed in the Town records that it was approved/denied.

Gabe thinks that it would be a good thing to have that kind of detail noted on the property so that the approval is never lost and it follows the property.

Chris suggested it might be a good idea to use the suggestion of having the homeowners file an agreement that they will comply with the ADU requirements and then the homeowner can decide to record it or not.

Gabe asked when the building permit process will be triggered.

Chris answered that ADU's will fall under the standard language of the International Building Code and will need a building permit per its requirements.

The Commission decided to add language stating that an agreement regarding the ADU will be executed between the homeowner and the Town and signed by both parties that binds the homeowner to comply with all of the ADU ordinance provisions. The owner will have the ability to record that document with the La Plata County Clerk & Recorder if they feel it is necessary.

13) Utility Service Requirements

ADU ordinances sometimes require applicants to get a permit approval affirming the adequacy of existing water and sewer service capacity. This may be important in cases where the principal and accessory units combined have more bedrooms than the original home or in rural areas where older septic systems may be near capacity.

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

In cases where the existing capacity is inadequate, the ordinance may require proof that provisions will be made for adding capacity.

Proponents point out that ADUs in most cases will not increase the number of people living in a house beyond the number for which it was originally designed and should not therefore cause any problems with respect to increased burdens on water and sewer systems. Instead of requiring new infrastructure, ADUs may actually result in more efficient use of existing underutilized service capacities.

Some ordinances also prohibit the principal and accessory units from having separate utility meters. Requiring service through single water and electrical meters is intended to reinforce owner-occupancy requirements and to avoid the "duplex look" of separate electrical meters.

Chris La May proposed the following recommendations regarding utility service requirements:

- (a) Two (2) or more premises cannot be supplied from one (1) and the same connection without providing separate shut-off cocks located at the public street right-of-way line, unless such line is an extended line from the main building to an accessory building on the same lot or parcel under common ownership, and approved by the Planning Commission.
- (b) Shared Sanitary Service Lines: A separate and independent service line shall be provided for each lot or parcel. The Town shall have no maintenance responsibility for any service line, including shared service lines. More than one building or unit may be connected to the service line provided it is of adequate size to serve all connections. The portion of the line which serves more than one building or unit shall be known as a "shared service line". In the event the lot or parcel is later subdivided, each new lot or parcel shall have a separate service line.

Rick asked what the code requires for an apartment building.

Chris stated that the staff is going through the Construction Design Standards right now and staff is recommending that there be a stipulation that there be a master water meter for an apartment building. This puts the requirement on the property owner how they are going to distribute the bill to the tenants.

Michelle asked if it's possible to make it optional for the property owner to purchase a separate tap & meter for each unit in the dwelling if they would like.

Joe asked if there will be a restriction on who can live in the ADU. He asked if they can be rented to anyone.

Chris answered that so far the Planning Commission has not decided to put any limitations on who can rent the ADU's.

Joe asked the Planning Commission for their opinion on this item.

The Commission determined that it would be very difficult to administer who is allowed to live in those units and decided not to put any restrictions on it.

Gabe stated that he thinks that the Town should charge a separate tap fee and require separate service lines for each unit if at all possible.

Chris responded that most utility companies (gas, electric, etc) have a single meter for each building and it is not standard practice to meter each dwelling unit individually. He also expressed concern that adding that kind of additional cost to a project could be very prohibitive.

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

Michelle suggested again that she thinks the homeowner should be given the option to choose one way or the other. She thinks that if they want to pay for a separate water & sewer tap, they should be allowed to do so.

Gabe stated that he still thinks that it should be required that each unit should have a separate water & sewer tap.

Rick and Gabe requested getting Public Works involved and have Ron give his opinion on the language.

Chris stated that he has spoken with Ron on this matter but he will reaffirm that this language works for Public Works and bring it back for further discussion.

14) Provisions to Encourage Barrier-Free ADUs

ADUs increase housing opportunities for handicapped persons by allowing them to live independently in a separate dwelling but close to any needed support. The community may want to consider including provisions to encourage the installation of barrier-free ADUs. One option would be to relax certain requirements where doing so would facilitate the installation of a barrier-free unit. It may also be helpful to add a statement in the ADU ordinance declaring the community's intention to increase affordable housing opportunities for the handicapped.

Chris stated that he does not have any proposed language for this item but asked the Commission if they would like to include any of this information in the ordinance.

The Commission decided not to add any language regarding this item.

15) Maximum Number of ADUs per Lot

Most ordinances impose a limit of one ADU per single-family lot, particularly in urban areas that may have smaller average lot sizes. This restriction is intended to minimize increases in neighborhood density resulting from ADU conversions.

Such limits may not be necessary or appropriate in some areas such as agricultural zones where multiple accessory housing units may be provided on large lots (e.g., housing for farm workers).

For most homeowners in single-family zones, the potential for adding more than a single ADU is not great in any event, in view of space requirements and the additional expense.

Chris La May proposed the following language regarding maximum number of ADU's per lot:

- 1) An ADU shall be limited to one (1) accessory dwelling unit (per lot).

The Commission agreed that the language is good as presented.

16) ADUs with Home Occupations

It may also be useful to consider what, if any, provisions there should be to regulate home occupations (e.g., bed and breakfast, home businesses, day care, etc.) in homes with ADUs. One option would be to prohibit all or certain types of home occupations in homes with ADUs.

Another option would be to allow home occupations in only one of the units, either the primary unit or the ADU, but not both. Many communities have already adopted regulations that are designed to control the impacts of home occupations. These regulations may be sufficient to control any impacts from residences that have both an ADU and a home business.

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

As an additional safeguard, the ordinance could include a provision requiring a review on a case-by-case basis of the cumulative impacts of a home occupation with an ADU, particularly with respect to parking and traffic. The reviewing agency may be provided with the discretion to modify ADU conditions or deny a permit where the cumulative impacts are deemed to be excessive.

Chris La May proposed the following language regarding maximum number of ADU's per lot:

- 1) Home occupations shall be allowed, subject to existing regulations, in either the ADU or the main building, but not both.

Gabe suggested citing the specific section of the Bayfield Land Use Code addressing home occupations.

Chris agreed that he could add the language citing the section.

The Commission agreed on the language with the one amendment citing home occupancies definitions in the code.

17) Periodic Permit Renewal

Some ordinances require periodic renewal of ADU permits to allow closer monitoring of ADUs over time and to ensure that any zoning requirements continue to be met. This type of requirement can serve to allay the fears of neighborhood groups concerned about enforcement of ordinance conditions for the period after the permit has been issued. Periodic renewal of ADU permits also requires more planning department resources for enforcement.

Proponents argue that, where they are adopted, re-approval procedures should be routine unless conditions are no longer being met. A less onerous requirement from the perspective of the homeowner would be to waive permit renewals unless neighbors specifically complain and request a hearing.

Another alternative would be to require renewal at longer intervals (e.g., two years), coupled with a survey of neighbors.

Of course, the community may decide not to include any requirement for permit renewal at all. Many communities simply rely on neighbor complaints (particularly those that require notice to neighbors at the time of installation) to ensure continued compliance.

Using less restrictive requirements for permit renewals will allow the jurisdiction to concentrate enforcement efforts where they are most needed while at the same time reducing the regulatory burden on ADU homeowners.

A related requirement found in some ordinances provides for the automatic expiration of the permit when changes occur causing the ADU to be out of compliance with the required development standards.

Chris La May proposed the following language regarding permit renewals:

- 1) ADUs may be approved for a period not to exceed two (2) years. The applicant or owner must reapply biennially for review no later than thirty (30) days past the original approval date.

Joe commented that this restriction will be impossible to enforce.

The Commission decided to remove this language from the ordinance.

18) Automatic ADU Ordinance Review

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

Some communities have adopted provisions that require an automatic review of ADU ordinances after a certain number of ADU permits have been issued. An automatic review based on the number of permits issued may be based on a certain number issued community-wide or the number of permits issued within a single area (e.g., census tract), or a combination of these.

Automatic review provisions may be useful to reassure neighborhood groups that any problems related to ADUs will be reviewed and dealt with at some point.

If this type of provision is adopted, it may also be useful to include a provision grandfathering any ADUs that have been constructed before the ordinance is amended or repealed. This may help to remove any doubts or concerns that homeowners who legally install ADUs may have about the legal status of their units in the event that the ordinance is amended or repealed at a later date.

Chris stated that he does not have any proposed language for this item but asked the Commission if they would like to include any of this information in the ordinance.

The Commission decided not to add any language regarding this item.

19) Periodic Reports on ADU Applications

Periodic reporting by the planning department on permit applications may be useful to monitor the impacts of ADUs in the community. Some communities have included such requirements to address concerns expressed by neighborhood groups that unanticipated large numbers of conversions could harm single-family neighborhoods without some mechanism for periodic monitoring and review. If the number of conversions is having disproportionate impacts on particular areas in the community, then, presumably, the city council could step in to correct the situation by amending the ordinance to either limit or even prohibit additional conversions.

Periodic reporting and monitoring requirements may give reassurance to neighborhood groups without hindering ADU installations, and may therefore be useful in communities where neighborhood groups are particularly wary of ADUs. Although experience around the country shows that actual installation rates will probably be lower than those predicted by many opponents, adoption of this requirement may be worthwhile to address neighborhood concerns.

Chris stated that he does not have any proposed language for this item but asked the Commission if they would like to include any of this information in the ordinance.

The Commission decided not to add any language regarding this item.

20) Illegal ADUs

What to do with existing illegal ADUs? Illegal units may be common in communities where there is excess demand for rental apartments, where zoning laws prohibit or tightly restrict ADUs, and where enforcement procedures are slow and/or ineffective.

So, depending on the circumstances, you may already have a substantial number of ADUs in your community. Some may predate the adoption of your city's zoning code and may therefore be classified as legal nonconforming units. Any ADUs built after the adoption of zoning codes prohibiting them would, of course, be classified as illegal units. Building and planning officials often have some idea of the number of illegal units in the community.

Safety is usually the most important concern of communities with illegal ADUs. When an ordinance allowing ADUs is adopted, many communities provide incentives for the owners of illegal units to legalize them and to bring them up to minimum fire and life safety requirements.

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

One option for encouraging legalization of existing illegal units is to waive any applicable fines for homeowners who apply for a permit within a certain period (e.g., six months) following adoption of the ordinance. Allowing a grace period for homeowners to modify illegal units that do not meet minimum health and safety standards may also be a useful incentive.

Owners of illegal units who apply for a permit within the grace period may also be given some leeway on minor violations of ADU size, lot size, setback, parking, and other requirements where full compliance would be impractical.

Imposing a stiff penalty on the owners of illegal units discovered after the grace period has run out may also serve as an effective incentive for owners to legalize their unauthorized units.

Chris La May proposed the following language regarding illegal ADU's:

- 1) That portion of a single family residence which meets the definition of accessory dwelling unit which was in existence prior to January 17, 1995, may continue in existence provided the following requirements are met:
 - a) An application for an accessory dwelling unit is submitted within eighteen (18) months of January 17, 1995.
 - b) The unit complies with the minimum requirements of the Uniform Building Code.

Joe asked if there are enough of these in Town to require this item.

Chris answered that there are several of these in Town and an illegal one spearheaded this ordinance.

Rick commented that if there is even one in the Town limits, there needs to be language to address it.

Gabe stated that he wants to make sure that dwellings like these are safe and built to building code. He asked if an application on an illegal unit will require inspections of the dwelling.

Chris answered that it will have to be brought up to the minimum building code specification.

Gabe said that he doesn't think that people that have illegal units are going to want to come in because it will be expensive to bring it up to code. But he thinks it is extremely important that there be something in the code that addresses these types of units when they do get brought to the Town's attention.

Rick said that he agrees that it has to be brought up to code regardless of the expense.

Gabe asked if the fire department will be able to inspect and comment on these types of projects.

Chris answered that generally the fire department does not inspect single-family residences.

Gabe stated that he wants to be sure that the building code official is involved & the fire department is involved when needed.

Rick thinks that the ordinance needs to address the units that are already in existence and outline the process for what needs to be done from here forward.

Gabe asked how the process will work for someone who buys one of the existing units. Anyone can buy a home in the Town that was built before the implementation of building codes and live in it without being required to bring it up to code. He wanted to know how that will work for these units and if they are going to be held to a different standard.

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

Michelle stated that while it is allowed for someone to move into a home without bringing it up to code, renting out an ADU as income is a totally different situation.

Chris mentioned that the building code states that if 25% of the building is being altered, the entire building must be brought up to code. Therefore, if they made any renovations or upgrades to the ADU and it was more than 25% of the home, the entire premises would have to be brought up to code.

Michelle recommended waiving the application fees for those people who bring their illegal ADU's in as required and give them an allotted amount of time to bring them up to code. She hopes this will help encourage them to come in and get them permitted.

Gabe suggested permitting the ones the Town knows exist right now and not require any changes to them because he doesn't think that anyone will come in voluntarily if they have to bring them up to code. The Town will then enforce the code on this item from here forward for any new ones.

Chris mentioned that just permitting everything that is in existence right now could set a precedent that it's okay to do things without getting the proper documents and approvals.

Joe mentioned that this is another enforcement issue that is going to be tough.

Chris responded that it isn't known how many of these are in Town right now and it could be difficult to enforce but he thinks that eventually they will all come to light as they sell or the homeowners try to refinance them because it will be discovered that they don't have the correct permits on file with the Town. This language will address what needs to be done to remedy those when they are brought to light.

Joe asked how this information will be given to the residents so that they are aware.

Rick answered that this ordinance will be published.

The Commission decided to leave this language as presented.

21) Administrative Permit or Use by Review

Chris stated that the discussion at the first meeting was not conclusive as to the Planning Commission's direction. Planning Commission needs to determine if an application for ADU should go through public review process (i.e. public notice, public hearing, and planning commission deliberation) or completed administratively similar to a building permit.

Rick stated that he thinks that if the ordinance is written well enough, this could be done administratively.

Chris said that the Use By Review does give the public the ability to comment on the project.

Gabe asked if administratively it could be required that the adjacent landowners are notified and able to mail their comments for consideration.

Chris asked what he does with the comments from the public once they are received if it is not being reviewed by one of the Boards.

Michelle commented that she doesn't think that it is necessary to notify the neighbors. She thinks it could be done administratively and if the project meets all the requirements, they are granted the permit. If it is out of the parameters of the ordinance, it should be noticed and presented in front of the Planning Commission for a Use By Review.

**Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122**

Gabe asked about a fine structure.

Chris said that there is a general offense noted in the Land Use Code that allows up to a \$1,000 fine and/or a year in jail.

The Commission decided that it is not necessary to put these requests through Use By Review if it meets all of the requirements.

**Action Agenda Item #2: Discussion & Possible Action
Temporary Use of Recreational Vehicles As Dwelling/Lodging Units**

Chris gave his staff report. He stated that at the November 8, 2011 Planning Commission meeting, the prohibition of recreational vehicles in the Bayfield Land Use Code is based on the absence of language rather than clear language prohibiting such activity. In an effort to provide clear language and aid staff in administering the Land Use Code, staff has prepared an ordinance that provides for use of a recreational vehicle as a lodging unit for seven (7) days in all zoning districts.

Chris stated that he has drafted ordinance attempting to address the temporary use of recreational vehicles for uses other than storage. He asked for the Planning Commission to review the following items in the ordinance and make recommendations on the language:

1) Allowed Use

The draft ordinance intends to allow the use of an RV for uses, other than storage, for a period of seven days, unless the RV is located in a campground or in mobile home district. The way it is currently written, this would include business and commercial zoning districts as well.

No recreational vehicle, as defined under Article 9-1, shall be used for a dwelling or lodging unit, accessory building, home occupation or other use allowed in any zoning district for a period in excess of seven (7) days, except when located in an approved campground, or when located in a land use district in which mobile homes are a permitted use.

Michelle stated that she doesn't have a problem with allowing RV's on commercial property.

Gabe commented that if the property owner doesn't want overnight parking on their property, they will put up signs prohibiting it.

The Commission determined that they do not think that business properties should be excluded and it should be allowed in the same way as single-family residences.

2) Permits

After discussion with Town staff, primarily the Town Marshal, the thought is that it would be easier to enforce the provision of the Code if there was a permit required. This will have some impact on the Town Hall administrative offices, but should not be overly cumbersome. The permit would enable staff to track the RVs, placement and time in place. To cover the cost of administration, the thought was to include a small administrative fee \$5.00 - \$10.00 dollars.

Such recreational vehicles shall apply for a permit from the Town for temporary occupancy not to exceed seven (7) days. The Town may establish a fee for such permit by resolution, which may be amended from time to time.

**Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122**

Rick stated that he thinks it's a good idea to require a permit.

Michelle suggested that it would be a good idea to tell them that they need a permit rather than just immediately writing a ticket if they are in violation.

Chris stated that it will be learning process and the Town will definitely try to educate people rather than penalize as much as possible.

Gabe thinks it's petty to charge people that are coming to Town and will be spending money in the community. He stated that he thinks the permit is a good idea but he doesn't think the Town should charge for it. He suggested that maybe it would be better to charge them in the event that the marshal has to go out and enforce it.

Chris commented that there are some administrative fees associated with the processing of these permits. Staff is suggesting a minimal fee that will cover these costs.

Rick concurred that he thinks the fee should remain in place.

Michelle asked if applicants could call in (rather than appear in person) if there wasn't a fee associated with it.

Chris responded that it would be better for them to come in and get a window placard that is visible to passers-by.

3) Compliance with other section of the Code (i.e. Building Code, Mobile Home)

Other sections of the Land Use Code cover the use of a recreational vehicle in the mobile home districts and the homes that are used on a more permanent basis do need to comply with the Building Code.

Recreational vehicles in land use districts where mobile homes are a permitted use shall comply with the Town Building Code, Section 7-15 of this code and 6-10 (18)(d), if applicable.

The Commission agreed with the language on this item as submitted.

4) Length of Stay

As discussed the length of stay would be limited to 7 days. Additionally, I have included language which provides for a 30 day rest before another 7 day stay can take place or be relocated.

Upon the expiration of the permitted seven (7) day period, the use of a recreational vehicle for dwelling or lodging unit, accessory building, home occupation or other use allowed in any zoning district shall be discontinued. The recreational vehicle shall not be utilized for those purposes, nor be relocated to another parcel within the Town for use as a dwelling or lodging unit, home occupation or other use allowed in any zoning district, unless thirty (30) has expired.

The Commission agreed with the language on this item as submitted.

5) Placement

The Town wants to ensure that the RV's are placed in appropriate location, so as to minimize impact to transportation. Additionally, the language does enable staff to permit the use of parks for RV use, when the need arises. Often during events, staff receives requests to use the skateboard park parking area and other

Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122

areas of Joe Stephenson Park for overnight camping. The proposed language does not include honoring existing setbacks, but that language could be included as well to prevent parking the RV directly on property line.

No recreational vehicle, unless otherwise permitted, shall be parked in public right-of-way, public park or public property.

Recreational Vehicles used for any use including storage shall be placed on private property so as to avoid obstruction to vehicular site distance and traffic flow.

The Commission agreed with the language on this item as submitted.

6) Utilities

One concern with the RV's is that the sanitary sewer becomes septic, and therefore, more challenging to treat. Town staff wants to ensure that no septic is dumped in sanitary sewer system, unless at appropriate locations where it can be monitored.

Recreational vehicles sanitary sewer facilities shall not be connected to the Town's sanitary sewer system by any means. Recreational vehicle sanitary sewer shall be disposed of at an appropriate dump station.

The Commission agreed with this language as presented.

7) Uses By Right

Staff wanted to include specific language to ensure that the storage of RV's is not prohibited, as I suspect this will be a common concern.

Nothing in this section is intended to prohibit the storage of a recreational vehicle on private property in residential zoning districts.

The Commission agreed with this language as presented.

Michelle asked what the next step in the process is going to be for approval of this ordinance.

Chris answered that he will have to do some public notification & public hearing on the ordinance and send it to the Town Attorney for review prior. Once that is done it will come back to the Planning Commission for public hearing & recommendation to the Town Board with final adoption happening by the Town Board.

Action Agenda Item #3: New/Unfinished Business

There was no new or unfinished business to discuss.

Joe made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Rick seconded the motion. All were in favor, motion passed unanimously.

**Town of Bayfield
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
January 10, 2012
1199 Bayfield Parkway Bayfield, CO 81122**

Minutes were approved as submitted on February 14th, 2012.

Approved:

Michelle Nelson
Chairman

Marianne Jones
Town Clerk