



**AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 26, 2023, 5:30 PM**

**COMMISSION ATTENDANCE IN PERSON
PUBLIC MAY ATTEND IN PERSON OR
REMOTELY VIA ZOOM**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85148763234?pwd=VWnvryJlc74ipgNNL29JTONjI2m4Wj.1>

Meeting ID: 851 4876 3234

Passcode: 335507

One tap mobile

+12532050468,,85148763234#,,,,*335507# US

+12532158782,,85148763234#,,,,*335507# US (Tacoma)

Find your local number: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85148763234?pwd=VWnvryJlc74ipgNNL29JTONjI2m4Wj.1>

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

If you wish to provide written public comments for the Planning Commission meeting, please email your comments to erodriguez@medical-lake.org by 2:00 p.m. the day of the commission meeting and include all the following information with your comments:

1. The Meeting Date
2. Your First and Last Name
3. If you are a Medical Lake resident
4. The Agenda Item(s) which you are speaking about

*Note – If providing written comments, the comments received will be acknowledged during the public meeting, but not read. All written comments received by 2:00 p.m. will be provided to the Planning Commission in advance of the meeting.

Questions or Need Assistance? Please contact City Hall at 509-565-5000



- 1) CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND ROLL CALL**
 - a) Excused Absences
- 2) ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**
- 3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a) September 28, 2023, Meeting minutes
- 4) INTERESTED CITIZENS: AUDIENCE REQUESTS AND COMMENTS**
- 5) STAFF REPORTS**
- 6) SCHEDULED ITEMS**
 - a) Revisiting Shipping Container Ordinance
 - b) City Branding Discussion
 - c) Education Packet for New Commission Members – Commissioner Mayulianos
- 7) PUBLIC HEARING – None scheduled.**
- 8) COMMISSION MEMBERS' COMMENTS OR CONCERNS**
- 9) INTERESTED CITIZENS: AUDIENCE REQUESTS AND COMMENTS**
- 10) CONCLUSION**

City of Medical Lake
124 S. Lefevre Street – City Council Chambers
Planning Commission Meeting
September 28, 2023, Minutes

NOTE: This is not a verbatim transcript. Minutes contain only a summary of the discussion. A recording of the meeting is on file and available from City Hall.

- 1) **CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, AND ROLL CALL**
 - a) Commissioner Hudson called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm, led the Pledge of Allegiance, and conducted roll call. Commissioners Jorgenson, Mayulianos, Hudson, and Mark were present in person. Commissioner Munson was present via Zoom.
- 2) **ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**
 - a) Motion to approve agenda as is made by commissioner Mayulianos, seconded by commissioner Hudson, carried 5-0.
- 3) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a) July 27, 2023, minutes.
 - b) Commissioner Mark suggested amending section 1, line 3 to read “Commissioner Hudson suggested,” since Commissioner Mark was absent and it was Mark Hudson who made the suggestion. Motion to approve as amended made by commissioner Mark, seconded by commissioner Mayulianos, carried 5-0.
- 4) **INTERESTED CITIZENS: AUDIENCE REQUESTS AND COMMENTS**
 - a) Tammy Roberson, resident of Medical Lake – see attachment A.
- 5) **STAFF REPORTS**
 - a) Elisa Rodriguez, City Planner
 - i) Provided an update on the Shipping Container Ordinance. City Council will be entertaining a first read on an ordinance related to non-residential zones at their meeting on 10/3/2023.
 - ii) Provided an update on the Official Zoning Map. City Council will entertain two ordinances to adopt an official zoning map that accurately matches the record related to the inconsistencies identified during previous Planning Commission meetings (May and June 2023).
 - iii) The Martin Street Wetland update. The owner limbed a tree before the silt fence was in place. The owner was contacted and the silt fence was installed. There has not been activity on the site since.
 - iv) Noted the November Planning Commission meeting falls on the Thanksgiving holiday and asked the Planning Commission to consider and identify if they want to meet the week before, the week after, or cancel the meeting that month.
 - b) Dave Yuhas, Code Enforcement Officer
 - i) Provided an introduction and presented information on Medical Lake Municipal Code, identified needed changes and new code considerations, and defined the process for making progress.
 - ii) Commissioner Munson asked about vagrancy and Mr. Yuhas explained how Code Enforcement works with Law Enforcement to address related concerns.

6) SCHEDULED ITEMS

- a) City Branding Discussion
 - i) Commissioner Munson: shared his desire to keep the conversation going and mentioned Enumclaw as another small city in Washington that attracts visitors.
 - ii) Commissioner Hudson: expressed how the Rusty Truck Ranch enjoys 8,000 visitors annually, which is a good draw. He also shared about Entiat as a community with an RV Resort that seems successful because they have a golf course that provides a reason to visit.
 - iii) Commissioner Mayulianos: reiterated a desire to see the City's branding build on the rich history of Medical Lake.
 - iv) Commissioner Mayulianos motioned to continue the discussion next month, seconded by commissioner Mark, carried 5-0.
- b) Education Packet for New Commissioners
 - i) Commissioner Mayulianos shared printed materials including A Short Course on Local Planning, conflict of interest materials, New to the Planning Commission? FAQ's, History and Geographic Setting of Medical Lake, and suggested Medical Lake Planning Commission Goals. She asked that commissioners read over the material and come prepared to discuss at a future meeting.
 - ii) Commissioner Mayulianos motioned to continue the discussion next month, seconded by commissioner Jorgenson, carried 5-0.

7) PUBLIC WORKSHOP

None

8) COMMISSION MEMBERS' COMMENTS OR CONCERNS

- a) Commissioner Mayulianos asked about groups hosting special events in the City and insurance requirements. Mr. Weathers shared that organizations such as the Blue Waters Bluegrass Festival are required to have insurance and name the City as an additional insured. She also asked about the need for a mission statement for the Planning Commission. Ms. Rodriguez highlighted that the Comprehensive Plan includes a vision statement that is highly related.
- b) Commissioner Hudson asked about the use of a vacant building in the Central Business District. Mr. Weathers was not aware of the current use and shared details on the draft Vacant Property Ordinance being considered by City Council, which would allow for inspection by city staff and ensure registration, maintenance standards, and encourage use.

9) INTERESTED CITIZENS: AUDIENCE REQUESTS AND COMMENTS

- a) Tammy Roberson, resident of Medical Lake – asked questions related to Martin St. Wetland.

10) CONCLUSION

- a) Motion to conclude meeting made by commissioner Mayulianos, seconded by commissioner Munson. Motion carried 5-0 and meeting concluded at 6:37 pm.

Date: _____

Roxanne Wright, Administrative Assistant

COMMENTS – 28 Sep 2023 (PC) Meeting

Good evening, Planning Commissioners and City Officials.

Did you know there is information available on how to fight wildfires and climate change with wetlands? City of Medical Lake is full of wetlands; although many are disappearing due to encroachment by development which is definitely preventable.

The following statements are from “*How to fight wildfires and climate change with wetlands*” article (dated/published 4 July 2019 4:12 EDT):

- 1) “As unlikely as it may sound, a new approach for fighting the destruction of wildfires may lie in unassuming wetlands packed with soaking wet layers of peat and topped with living moss...”
- 2) “These same humble wetlands can also play a heroic part in curbing the effects of global climate change, but only if we protect those that remain and bring back the ones we humans have already damaged and destroyed...”

Has the City considered hiring qualified professionals in post fire wetland expertise to research and evaluate the wetland conditions after the severe wildfire in order to restore physical and biological stability?

A quick question for our Code Enforcement Officer, Mr. Dave Yuhas just to ponder on:

Did you know that the City did not follow their own Municipal Code and by extension the Growth Management Act? Does the City get a warning or a citation (like the residents do) when not in compliance? I am just wondering on how the City can expect their own residents to follow all their required Codes especially when the City does not even set the example and comply? A factual example can be given if requested.

If the Commissioners have questions on any of the following statements, please contact the Dept of Ecology Wetland Policy Lead, Mr. Rick Mraz.

The following “Did you know” questions are given in order to correct any myths that the Commissioners and City Planner may have about Ecology being able to step in to save Medical Lake’s depressional wetlands from buffer encroachment by development.

- 1) Did you know most encroachments occur within the buffer itself since smart developers usually do not build in the “waters of the state”?
- 2) Did you know Ecology’s regulatory authority is triggered ONLY when there are direct (i.e., fill) impacts to wetlands or other “waters of the state” and NOT with buffer encroachments which is dealt solely by the City? (DOE’s email dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00)
- 3) Did you know that the City stated, “Ecology approved the plan and they are the regulatory agency...” was quite influential with the Commissioners and City Council members? Did you know this statement is totally false because according to Ecology’s Wetland Policy Lead, the **City is the regulatory authority** if the

mitigation plan involves the buffer and NOT the “waters of the state”? (DOE’s emails 08/17/2023 09:48:00 and check PC recording 25 May 2023 and City Council recording 18 Jul 2023)

- 4) Did you know that the City justified their approval of the mitigation plan based on this false assumption?
- 5) Did you know that Ecology is NOT the regulatory authority if the project deals with the wetland buffer and can only “generally concur” with the mitigation plan but more importantly, that they do NOT examine the rating for completeness or accuracy which the mitigation is based on unless specifically requested by the City? (DOE’s email dated 08/31/2023 12:55:31)
- 6) Did you know the regulation of buffer-only impacts and mitigation are the sole responsibility of local governments and NOT Ecology? (DOE’s email dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00)
- 7) Did you know according to the Wetland Policy Lead, that the wetland rating can affect necessary mitigation for wetland buffer impacts? Did you know according to Ecology, the higher the category of wetland, the larger buffer it should have? Did you know a higher category wetland may experience larger areas of buffer impact and therefore a greater amount of mitigation? (DOE’s emails dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00 and 08/31/2023 12:55:31)
- 8) Did you know that Ecology may not review the rating upon which the mitigation plan is based upon unless the City SPECIFICALLY requests that they do so? Did you also know the mitigation plan is based on the wetland rating? NOTE: City’s request sometimes has a limited scope (i.e., please review this mitigation plan). (DOE’s email dated 08/31/2023 12:55:31)

The following “Did you know” questions are from the latest activities involving the Brooks/Martin Category II Wetland.

- 1) Did you know that the owner/applicant started the construction process by taking down all the branches of one of the Ponderosa Pines without installing a silt fence as required by the mitigation plan and Ecology’s SEPA review of the proposed project? (DOE’s Letter dated 14 Jun 2023)
- 2) Did you know that the City (to include PC and City Council) and applicant stated that this Category II wetland would be protected as the City led us to believe? Did you know that this is NOT considered a good start in protecting this entire wetland or taking their environmental responsibilities seriously?
- 3) Did you know that it is reasonable to expect an applicant to fully describe impacts to wetlands and/or buffers to Ecology (i.e., removing three huge Ponderosa Pines versus just one)? Did you know this did NOT happen? (DOE’s email dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00)
- 4) Did you know Ecology’s Water Quality Program folks visited this site and stated that better BMPs are needed? (DOE’s email dated 09/06/2023 15:40:01)

Thank you for your time. God bless.



Tammy M. Roberson, MBA
SMSgt USAF Retired
Disabled Veteran (100% service connected)

HANDOUT – 28 Sep 2023 (PC) Meeting

(As Of: 28 Sep 2023)

Good evening, Planning Commissioners and City Officials.

Did you know there is information available on how to fight wildfires and climate change with wetlands? City of Medical Lake is full of wetlands; although many are disappearing due to encroachment by development which is definitely preventable.

The following statements are from “*How to fight wildfires and climate change with wetlands*” article (dated/published 4 July 2019 4:12 EDT):

- 1) “As unlikely as it may sound, a new approach for fighting the destruction of wildfires may lie in unassuming wetlands packed with soaking wet layers of peat and topped with living moss...”
- 2) “These same humble wetlands can also play a heroic part in curbing the effects of global climate change, but only if we protect those that remain and bring back the ones we humans have already damaged and destroyed...”

Has the City considered hiring qualified professionals in post fire wetland expertise to research and evaluate the wetland conditions after the severe wildfire in order to restore physical and biological stability?

A quick question for our Code Enforcement Officer, Mr. Dave Yuhas just to ponder on:

Did you know that the City did not follow their own Municipal Code and by extension the Growth Management Act? Does the City get a warning or a citation (like the residents do) when not in compliance? I am just wondering on how the City can expect their own residents to follow all their required Codes especially when the City does not even set the example and comply? A factual example can be given if requested.

For example: According to MLMC Chapter 17.10.090 (Wetlands), para D: “Wetlands shall be rated according to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) wetland rating system, as set forth in the *Washington State Wetland Rating System for Eastern Washington: 2014 Update* (Ecology Publication #14-06-030, or as revised). The rating system document contains the definitions and methods for determining if the criteria below are met...”

Washington State Wetland Rating System for Eastern Washington (2014 update) Manual states:

- 1) page 15: **a)** “The entire wetland has to be scored.” **b)** “Small areas within a wetland (such as the footprint of an impact) cannot be rated separately.” **c)** “DO NOT SCORE ONLY THE PART BEING ALTERED OR MITIGATED (Figure 1)”
- 2) page 17: “More detailed data are needed to adequately assess functions in only a part of a wetland.”

MLMC Chapter 17.10.010 (Purpose), para B: “As mandated by the Growth Management ACT (RCW 36.70A), this chapter provides protection for the critical areas of wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and frequently flooded areas.”

NOTE: Per Ecology’s Wetland Policy Lead, “The wetland rating system does require that the entire wetland be rated.” (DOE’s email dated 08/01/2023 13:54:41)

If the Commissioners have questions on any of the following statements, please contact the Dept of Ecology Wetland Policy Lead, Mr. Rick Mraz and please request your questions be proposed to their Wetlands Technical Advisory Group (if he cannot answer them).

The following “Did you know” questions are given in order to correct any myths that the Commissioners and City Planner may have about Ecology being able to step in to save Medical Lake’s depressional wetlands from buffer encroachment by development.

- 1) Did you know that the wetland rating system directs users to refer to mapped TMDL areas when answering rating system questions (for example question D3.3)? (DOE’s email dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00)
- 2) Did you know most encroachments occur within the buffer itself since smart developers usually do not build in the “waters of the state”?
- 3) Did you know Ecology’s regulatory authority is triggered ONLY when there are direct (i.e., fill) impacts to wetlands or other “waters of the state” and NOT with buffer encroachments which is dealt solely by the City? (DOE’s email dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00)
- 4) Did you know that the City stated, “Ecology approved the plan and they are the regulatory agency...” was quite influential with the Commissioners and City Council members? Did you know this statement is totally false because according to Ecology’s Wetland Policy Lead, the **City is the regulatory authority if the mitigation plan involves the buffer and NOT the “waters of the state”**? (DOE’s emails 08/17/2023 09:48:00 and check PC recording 25 May 2023 and City Council recording 18 Jul 2023)
- 5) Did you know that the City justified their approval of the mitigation plan based on this false assumption?
- 6) Did you know that Ecology is NOT the regulatory authority if the project deals with the wetland buffer and can only “generally concur” with the mitigation plan but more importantly, that they do NOT examine the rating for completeness or accuracy which the mitigation is based on unless specifically requested by the City? (DOE’s email dated 08/31/2023 12:55:31)
- 7) Did you know the regulation of buffer-only impacts and mitigation are the sole responsibility of local governments and NOT Ecology? (DOE’s email dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00)
- 8) Did you know if Ecology has independent regulatory authority over wetlands or other waters, they will issue separate approvals? (pursuant to RCW 90.48 (Water Pollution Control Act) and when applicable, RCW 90.58 (Shoreline Management Act)) (DOE’s email dated 08/08/2023 10:16:01)
- 9) Did you know according to the Wetland Policy Lead, that the wetland rating can affect necessary mitigation for wetland buffer impacts? Did you know according to Ecology, the higher the category of wetland, the larger buffer it should have? Did you know a higher category wetland may experience larger areas of buffer impact and therefore a greater amount of mitigation? (DOE’s emails dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00 and 08/31/2023 12:55:31)
- 10) Did you know that Ecology may not review the rating upon which the mitigation plan is based upon unless the City SPECIFICALLY requests that they do so? Did you also know the mitigation plan is based on the wetland rating? NOTE: City’s request sometimes has a limited scope (i.e., please review this mitigation plan). (DOE’s email dated 08/31/2023 12:55:31)

The following “Did you know” questions are from the latest activities involving the Brooks/Martin Category II Wetland.

- 1) Did you know that the owner/applicant started the construction process by taking down all the branches of one of the Ponderosa Pines without installing a silt fence as required by the mitigation plan and Ecology’s SEPA review of the proposed project? (DOE’s Letter dated 14 Jun 2023)
- 2) Did you know that when the silt fencing was finally installed late, it did not initially meet the required BMP’s minimum standards to prevent containments from entering the waters of the state?
- 3) Did you know without an ordinary high-water mark, for most of the year there will be no way for construction personnel to distinguish the buffer from the wetland?
- 4) Did you know that the City (to include PC and City Council) and applicant stated that this Category II wetland would be protected as the City led us to believe? Did you know that this is NOT considered a good start in protecting this entire wetland or taking their environmental responsibilities seriously?
- 5) Did you know that the City of Medical Lake does not require any clearing, grubbing, grading or any similar permit (which includes tree-removal of three large Ponderosa Pines) for a single-family home (regardless if it is entirely located within the buffer); although silt fencing is required? (City of ML’s emails dated 08/31/2023 13:44:01 and 09/14/2023 15:41:45)
- 6) Did you know that it is reasonable to expect an applicant to fully describe impacts to wetlands and/or buffers to Ecology (i.e., removing three huge Ponderosa Pines versus just one)? Did you know this did NOT happen? (DOE’s email dated 08/17/2023 09:48:00)
- 7) Did you know Ecology’s Water Quality Program folks visited this site and stated that better BMPs are needed? (DOE’s email dated 09/06/2023 15:40:01)

Thank you for your time. God bless.



Tammy M. Roberson, MBA
SMSgt USAF Retired
Disabled Veteran (100% service connected)
Concerned ML Resident

2nd COMMENTS – 28 Sep 2023 (PC) Meeting

I have about five questions regarding the Brooks/Martin Category II wetland:

- 1) Has the City heard from Ecology's Water Quality Program folks regarding BMPs? No (per City Planner)
- 2) Has the City required any new protections during Construction? No (per City Planner)
- 3) Will the City be requiring an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan? This does not exist within the MLMC (per City Planner).
- 4) How often does the City check out the site to make sure everything is done properly? City Planner answered this question earlier during her staff presentation. The answer was daily initially but now since the owner does not seem to be doing anything, she is only checking in on the wetland weekly.
- 5) Has the City heard when the owner will resume cutting down the Ponderosa Pines? No (per City Planner)
- 6) Once the owner applies, will his building permit go to the bottom of the pile since he was not a fire victim? It will be prioritized (although, not necessarily going to the bottom of the pile (per City Planner). Fire victims will have a higher priority.

In my viewpoint, maybe now is not the right time to discuss future City branding due to the recent wildfire but again, this is only my viewpoint.



Tammy M. Roberson, MBA
SMSgt USAF Retired
Disabled Veteran (100% service connected)
Concerned ML Resident



City of Medical Lake Planning Department
124 S. Lefevre St.
Medical Lake, WA 99022
509-565-5000
www.medical-lake.org

Dear Planning Commissioners,

At the October 3rd City Council meeting, the Councilmembers voted to send the proposed text amendment for shipping containers back to you. This application (LU 2022-004) was submitted in October of 2022 and the applicant asked to change the municipal code to allow shipping containers in the C-1 Zone. In March of 2023, after holding a public hearing, you voted to recommend denial of the proposal to the City Council. You cited the aesthetic of the containers not being compatible with the desired image of Medical Lake.

The City Council held a public hearing in May where there was testimony from shipping container owners asking the Council to expand the code language to allow containers in other zones, including residential. As a result, the Council asked staff to write new code language that included all zones and had more standards controlling the aesthetics of the containers.

Staff provided new language and the City Council held a public hearing in August. There were several concerns from Councilmembers about allowing shipping containers in residential zones. As a result, they asked staff to remove residential zones from the new language. At the following meeting, Councilmembers expressed additional concerns over allowing containers on any property in a non-residential zone. For this reason, they requested the proposed code change to be limited to mini-storage facilities and schools and be reviewed again by the Planning Commission.

The new language for the code amendment is attached. While reading the language, please consider if the new proposed standards adequately address those concerns you had with the original proposal. I will be going over the proposal in more detail at the meeting. You will not be asked to make a decision at this time. But it is a good time to ask questions, express concerns, and make suggestions.

Sincerely,

Elisa Rodriguez
City Planner

Proposed amendments to municipal code to allow shipping containers to be placed on lots with a mini shipping facility or school.

Section 1. Amendment. There is hereby added to the MLMC, Chapter 16.03 – Zoning Permits as follows:

Chapter 16.03 – ZONING PERMITS

16.03.010 – Purpose

The purpose of a zoning permit is to provide a permitting process for development that does not require a building permit, yet still necessitates approval per Title 17 – Zoning.

16.03.020 – Applicability

Development that is exempt from the building code shall be reviewed by the Planning Official for conformance with Title 17 – Zoning.

16.03.030 – Fees

Zoning permit fees will be set by the City Council.

16.03.040 – Application

The owner or agent of the property shall submit two copies of a site plan and any other plan or documentation necessary to demonstrate how the regulations of Title 17 are being satisfied.

16.03.050 – Approval

When the proposal is deemed compliant with Title 17, the Planning Official shall issue a permit.

16.03.060 – Inspection

The Planning Official will conduct one or more inspections to verify the development meets the approved plans. For each inspection, the Planning Official will provide, in writing, the status of the development in relation to the approved plans.

16.03.070 – Final

When the approved development is complete, inspected, and found to meet the standards of Title 17, the Planning Official will issue a letter stating the permit is completed.

16.03.080 – Expiration

An approved zoning permit is valid for 180 days. If the approved development is not commenced within such time, the permit is considered expired. If the work has commenced, but is not finished, the Planning Official may issue one or more extensions to the permit.

16.03.090 – Enforcement

If a property owner or agent commences work without the benefit of a required zoning permit, the Code Enforcement Officer will provide, in writing, a stop work order. The property owner or agent will be given the option to undo any unapproved development or apply for a zoning permit. If the property owner or agent does not comply, procedures of Chapter 1.01 – Code Adoption, will be followed.

Section 2. Amendment. There is hereby added to the MLMC Chapter 17.08 – Definitions as follows:

17.08.081 – Development.

All improvements on a site, including buildings, other structures, parking and loading areas, landscaping, paved or graveled areas, and areas devoted to exterior display, storage, or activities.

17.08.220.1 – Planning Director.

The Planning Director, or designee.

17.08.220.2 – Planning Official.

The city official(s) appointed or retained by the city to administer and enforce this title and associated regulations and other such codes and regulations as the city may so designate.

17.08.240 – Storage Containers.

Self-contained structures that are standardized, reusable, and portable. They are meant for the storage of personal or commercial goods. They are available in a variety of sizes and made from a variety of materials. For the purpose of this Title, storage containers are further defined as Shipping Containers or Moving Containers as described below.

Shipping Containers are storage containers that are built as standard sized boxes made of steel, used to store and transport goods from one place to another via cargo ship. These are also referred to as cargo containers or Conex containers.

Moving Containers are storage containers meant for temporary storage of personal items. These containers are typically made of a light metal or wood.

Section 3. Amendment. Section 17.39.015 – Signs of the MLMC is hereby amended to add (e.1) as follows:

(e.1) “Logo” means a symbol or other design adopted by an organization to identify its products, uniform, vehicles, etc.

Section 4. Amendment. Section 17.42.030 of the MLMC is hereby amended to read as follows:

17.42.030 STORAGE CONTAINERS

- A. Purpose. These regulations are to allow for economical, secure storage of dry goods while addressing potential aesthetic impacts on the City.
- B. During Construction. One or more storage containers may be placed on a site in any zone for storage of materials, construction tools, and equipment, only during an active building permit.
- C. Moving Containers. Moving Containers may be placed on site without a permit for up to 30 days.

- D. Shipping Containers and similar storage containers. Schools and mini-storage facilities may have storage containers for the sole purpose of dry storage. Schools may have up to four (4) shipping containers. Mini-storage facilities may have up to 15% of the total number of storage units as shipping containers. Prior to placement, containers must be approved through a zoning permit, per Chapter 16.03 – Zoning Permits. The following standards must be met.
1. Each container shall not be more than 200 square feet.
 2. A container shall not be closer to the street of address than the primary building.
 3. No utilities shall be connected to the container.
 4. All containers shall be screened from neighboring residential uses by a fence or hedge. Fences shall be solid or chain link with slats of no less than six (6) feet in height. Hedges shall be evergreen with a mature height of no less than six (6) feet. No screening is required when the shipping container is placed greater than 200 feet from a property line. If a site is composed of multiple properties, the screening applies only to the outermost property line.
 5. All containers shall be in good condition, with no rust, peeling paint, or damage.
 6. All containers shall be the same or similar color to the primary building.
 7. Each container shall meet the standards of the zone in which it is located.
 8. Each container shall meet all other standards for an accessory structure.
 9. Containers shall not be placed in any required parking or landscaping.
 10. Containers shall not violate any building code or fire code regulation.
 11. Containers shall not be placed over a septic tank or drain field.
 12. Containers shall not be used as living space.
 13. No signs or logos may be placed on top of, attached to, or painted on any container.
 14. No containers are allowed in the Central Business District.
 15. Containers shall not be stacked.