

League of Women Voters of Pullman Observer Report

Name of Agency: Pullman Planning Commission Date: 4/24/2019
Observer Reporting: Helen Catanese Length of Meeting: Adjourned 8:33pm Members Present/Absent: Bob Olsen, Stephanie Rink absent, all others present
Others Present (i.e., media, public): One member of the public and the observer

Meeting Content

Topics Discussed

1. Public hearing on the Critical Areas Ordinance.

Pullman is required to update our ordinance this year.

Changes to wetland buffers will mean development will need to be approximately an additional 50 feet from wetlands (from 100 feet to 150). Development within the buffer zone will need permission and to meet additional requirements.

John makes note of the absence of developers/contractors at the meeting. Pete clarifies that they were invited. Public hearing was closed with no comment.

Scott points out that the maps of wetland lack some areas around Milwaukee street. Pete agrees they need to be updated, but they aren't part of the ordinance themselves, so that can be done separately.

Outcome: The committee passes the revisions to the city council (I think), with a recommendation to accept without making further changes.

2. Revision of rules regarding fowl

Brent reports on the revisions he and Stephanie wrote up in subcommittee, basically classifying hens as household pets. The commission discusses how to refer to female chickens linguistically in the proposed revision.

Pete and Dave discuss the need to run the ordinance past the city attorney before passing anything.

There is also discussion of how pigs and other fowl are handled, but the commission seems to want to deal primarily with chickens for this revision.

Scott Hodge asks about other ordinances that will cover noise and smell problems with animals. Pete mentions that while that is the case, we have other rules to limit noise, even though the noise itself is prohibited (like a restriction on the number of unrelated people who can live in a house!).

Consensus seems to be that the commission wants to move the revision along, though Pete thinks realistically it will take 4-5 months. Marcia asks about people who might be affected by the ordinance while the revision is in process. Pete points out that while a code revision is being considered, enforcement is typically relaxed (except in cases of complaints).

Outcome: No action is taken, beyond putting the revision back in Pete's worklog.

Public Meetings of interest to League: *Were there any public meetings announced that you think League members may be interested in attending and/or becoming involved with that relate to League positions?*

None

Process & Protocol: (Observations about participants and procedures of the meeting)

e.g., Did the members appear to have done their "homework"? Were members courteous to each other and the public? Was access to materials for certain agenda items available to you?

An email regarding revisions to the COA were given. Proposed edits to the fowl regulation was not given.

Members discuss the frequency/content of meetings during the summer months, some may be cancelled.

Additional comments/opinions: