

## Jeff Watson

---

**From:** Chad Bala <bala.ce@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 21, 2016 8:39 AM  
**To:** Jeff Watson; Doc Hansen  
**Cc:** Doc Hansen; Michael Flory; Holly Myers; Matt Webb; Josh Hink; RichElliott; russell.mau@doh.wa.gov  
**Subject:** Re: CU-16-00001 Webb Findings, Conclusions, and Conditions  
**Attachments:** Webbcu-16-0000\_condresp.pdf

To all,  
Please see the attached response to your email dated September 15, 2016. Within the attachment I have responded to the draft conditions for everyone's review in order to clarify conditions and identified conditions that seem to be outside the scope of this specific proposal.

I will also drop off hard copy this morning.

Hopefully we can get this proposal moving forward and a decision issued soon.

Best Regards,

Chad Bala

On Sep 16, 2016, at 8:40 AM, Jeff Watson <[jeff.watson@co.kittitas.wa.us](mailto:jeff.watson@co.kittitas.wa.us)> wrote:

Understood and recognized; I will wait to hear from you and others... to discuss alternatives if warranted.

Jeffrey A. Watson  
Planner II  
[Community Development Services](#)  
411 North Ruby  
Ellensburg WA 98926  
[jeff.watson@co.kittitas.wa.us](mailto:jeff.watson@co.kittitas.wa.us)  
509-933-8274

---

**From:** Chad Bala [<mailto:bala.ce@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 16, 2016 8:37 AM  
**To:** Jeff Watson  
**Cc:** Doc Hansen; Michael Flory; Holly Myers; [webbpowersports@fairpoint.net](mailto:webbpowersports@fairpoint.net); Josh Hink; RichElliott; [russell.mau@doh.wa.gov](mailto:russell.mau@doh.wa.gov)  
**Subject:** Re: CU-16-00001 Webb Findings, Conclusions, and Conditions

We will be reviewing and getting back to you.

With the Webb 8 event only admin. Cup and with a dramatically less of an impact than the McIntosh cup and their ability to operate 365 days of the year (the possibility of events every day), adding requirements from a proposal not consistent with Webb's (8 event only cup) will need to be discussed further.

Chad

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 15, 2016, at 4:00 PM, Jeff Watson <[jeff.watson@co.kittitas.wa.us](mailto:jeff.watson@co.kittitas.wa.us)> wrote:

So..., many of the parameters placed on this during pre-app and comment period were variable (“if.... then...”) Which is why I’m sending this around for some discussion before we commit it to stone. I felt it important that we stay consistent with parallel parameters found in the McIntosh decision. The water system and restroom language may need some tweaks... what’s there is the basics I could glean based on Mike’s recent email and other comments from state and local Health (group A required?). I am not married to the 300 attendee peak level we put on McIntosh before requiring a Title 5 Event Permit, but I need to put a ceiling out there somewhere (part of that on McIntosh came from the discussions about possible rodeo events horse trailers backing up on 97 etc...), let me know what you think. Applicant’s responses were verbatim; if you want anything modified let me know. I haven’t added any language with respect to overnight accommodations/camping; if we are going to allow it, it’ll be cinched pretty tight. I didn’t load anything with respect to food and beverage permits; figured those were a given but...? Drop me a line if ‘n...

Jeffrey A. Watson  
GIS Technician/Planner II  
[Community Development Services](http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/CommunityDevelopmentServices)  
411 North Ruby  
Ellensburg WA 98926  
[jeff.watson@co.kittitas.wa.us](mailto:jeff.watson@co.kittitas.wa.us)  
509-933-8274

---

Notice: All email sent to this address will be received by the Kittitas County email system and may be subject to public disclosure under Chapter 42.56 RCW and to archiving and review.

message id: 38eb45916c6dcbdac24bb8719d004a14

<CU-16-00001 Webb Finding of Fact .docx>

CU-16-00001

I would like to thank you for the time to respond.

First we would like to make clear that the Webb CUP is clearly different from the McIntosh CUP in one major way; The Webb CUP is considered an administrative cup that specifically allows for a maximum of 8 events within a year per Kittitas County Code. The McIntosh CUP is a standard conditional use permit that can operate everyday throughout the year. The impact is much greater than the Webb's proposal. The Webb's administrative cup for a special event facility of 8 events only should not be burden with conditions from a project that was approved to operate full time 365 days out of the year as the intensity of the use is dramatically less and different.

Condition #9. This condition should be removed as this eliminates any possibility of the Webb's having an immediate family function not associated with this special event facility.

Condition #11 & 12 Water system and Septic and Waste Disposal system (Public restroom language).

The Webb administrative Cup states that these events will be catered therefore not having to provide water at the immediate time. The Webb's agreed to the condition to develop a Group A transient-non-community water system due to the occupancy of having 200 guests that required a public restroom that in turn requires the Group A water system. Again the Webb's are ok with a condition but when the use of the Barn changes then the Public Restrooms are required, which in turn requires the Group A Water System. With that said that is why we proposed to the building department that we use a tent facility/ lean to/outside covered area as the immediate area for occupants therefore allowing the use of portable toilets until the Webb's construct the public restroom, which again triggers the Group A water system approval and development and upgraded septic system, then the Webb's will be allowed to start using the Barn.

Condition #13, Associated Structures (garages). This is an inappropriate condition. The Webb's should be allowed to use any and all structures that are on site as they see fit.

Condition #14, Barn classified as an A-2 structure. Per the 2015 IFC the barn would not meet two out of the three criteria to be classified as a Group A-2. The barn is less than 5,000 sq. ft. and the fire area is located on the same floor as the exit areas for occupants. The Webb proposal does meet the second criteria since it proposes a 200 occupancies. But it must be noted that the barn is pushing meeting the second criteria as it will be difficult to get 100 or for that matter 150 people inside of the barn. The Webb's proposal of 200 occupancies means the complete facility (inside and outside).

Conditions #15 & 16 Sprinkler requirements.

Per the 2015 IFC the barn would be considered a Group A-2 (IFC 903.2.1.2) though it may not fully meet the three criteria. The barn is less than 5,000 sq. ft. The Webb proposal does meet the second criteria since it only proposes 200 occupancies. But it must be noted that the barn is pushing the limit meeting the second criteria as it will be difficult to get 100 or for that matter 150 people inside of the barn. The Webb's proposal of 200 occupancies means the complete facility (inside and outside), and the final criteria the fire area is located on the same floor as the exit areas for occupants. Furthermore, the building that is 36' wide by 64' long (2,304 sq. ft.) contains three doors all of which meet or exceed the opening dimensions and access requirements per the 2015 IFC (903.2.11.1.1 & 903.2.11.1.2). With the Barn being less than 5,000 sq. ft. and the fire area located on the same floor as the exit areas for occupants, along with 3 egress locations that are 8' by 25' (200 Sq. Ft.), 16' by 12' (192 sq. ft.), & 15' by 8' (120 sq. ft.), and proposed two sliding doors to remain open and locked open during events and two existing frost free hose bibs at both ends of the barn should provide sufficient reasoning to not require fire sprinklers in such a small barn facility. With the additional conditions requiring a annual fire and life safety inspection every year, and a requirement a security guard (non licensed etc.) directing parking, looking for fire hazards and crowd control, we feel that sprinklers should not be required.

Condition #17. 300-attendee peak level;

The Webb 8-special event facility proposal is dramatically different than the McIntosh CUP. It must be noted that the Webb's proposal is specifically for an administrative conditional use permit for a 8-special event facility with 200 people attending. The Event permit under KCC 5.20 is different as it applies to a single event proposal under KCC 5.20. Under the Event Permit (KCC 5.20) the Webb's could apply for this type of application with the BOCC and not have to go through this administrative conditional use permit process. KCC 5.20 doesn't apply here and this condition should be removed.

Condition 18: Restroom. The agreed upon condition with Mike Flory was to allow the Webb's to use a tent facility/lean to/covered area (not the barn) with portable toilets until the Webb's construct the public restroom, as required by Mike Flory (KC Building Dept.) which triggers the group a water system and upgraded septic system. The way this condition is written requires it up front therefore needs to be removed or rewritten.

Condition 19. The doors located on the barn are two sliding doors and one-man door. As proposed earlier the two sliding doors will remain open and locked open during events providing continued ingress and most importantly egress at all times. It must be noted that not all doors swing outwards on the barn.

Condition 25. Storm water. We feel this condition isn't warranted. The site and structures currently exist on site. The Driveway is already paved and the surrounding area is graveled. Per the DOE storm water regulations a storm water permit is only required when there is a disturbance of 1 acre or more. Nothing is being disturbed and the future construction of the public restroom will not exceed 1 acre, therefore this condition is not justified and should be removed.

*Chad Bala*

Chad Bala  
Terra Design Group