CITY OF OKANOGAN
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Public Hearing Meeting Minutes
Wednesday October 28, 2026
at 5:30 P.M.

NOMINATION OF CHAIR

The Board of Adjustment Meeting of the City of Okanogan began at 5:30 p.m. Previous Chairman has vacated position and is now on City Council, need to nominate new Chairman.

Member Armstrong motioned to appoint Robert Garrison as the new Chairman. Torres seconded. No objection motion carried

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by Chairman Garrison at 5:31pm

Present: Chairman Garrison Members: Abel Torres, Brad Armstrong and Jeremy Patrick

Also Present: Building Official/Permit Administrator Bryan Forbus and Clerk 1 Kaylee Beetchenow

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA and MINUTES

Member Patrick moved, seconded by Member Torres to approve the Agenda for the meeting and the minutes from January 5th 2026. Chairman Garrison asked if there were any objections. Seeing none, the motion passed without objection.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Board is conducting an open record hearing on the application for a zoning Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to develop a Recreational Vehicle Park located along Elmway in the C-2 District of the City of Okanogan. File ID# OKDACUP 26-01

Chairman Garrison opened the hearing at 5:32 p.m. by stating that the purpose of the hearing is to take testimony relevant to a decision to

DRAFT

approve, conditionally approve or deny an application for a zoning CUP for the property described in the application to develop a Recreation Vehicle Park located along Elmway in the C-2 District of the City of Okanogan. File ID# OKACUP 26-01

Chairman Garrison asked if there were any challenges to the Board's jurisdiction. Mr. Bob Eubanks went to podium and began his public comment. Chairman Garrison informed him that the question is to challenge jurisdiction, and that the portion of public comment has not started. Mr. Eubanks sat down and there were no challenges for jurisdiction.

Chairman Garrison asked if any members of the Board wished to excuse themselves for conflicts of interest or appearance of fairness issues. No Members wished to be excused.

Chairman Garrison asked if any members of the Board wished to disclose any ex-parte communication, such that everyone will have the benefit of the information. There was none stated.

Chairman Garrison asked if there was anyone present who wishes to challenge any of the members for conflicts of interest or appearance of fairness issues in conducting this hearing. There was none presented.

Chairman Garrison opened the testimony portion of the hearing by the presentation of the Staff Report. Building Official/Permit Administrator Forbus asked to enter the following documents and exhibits into the record:

THE PROPOSAL

The proponent is requesting approval of a CUP to create 8-10 Lots for rentable/leasable RV parking; to include water/sewer/power hook-ups to each lot. The location of project proposal is described under *the findings of fact* section of this report.

BACKGROUND

In July of 2026 the proponent reached out to the building department with questions about converting the vacant lot of the North Elmway and River Ave. into a series of RV lots. After discussion with the proponent and research of the Okanogan Municipal Code, staff directed proponent to file an application for a CUP. The proponent filed the application in August of 2026. During the months of August and September the proponent provided additional information and on the 14th of September

DRAFT

2026, a notice of completed application was issued and the permit processing procedures outlined in Chapter **18.100** of the OMC began.

DESIGNATIONS

Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation: The area is designated as "Elmway".

Zoning District: The property is zoned Commercial Two (C-2).

Flood plain Zone: The entire property is within the designated 100-year floodplain.

Shoreline Designation: The City of Okanogan shoreline code does not apply to lands outside the boundaries of the shoreline. The entire property is not within the shoreline designation.

SEPA

Actions: The applicant submitted a SEPA checklist in August, 2026. The City of Okanogan completed a review of the applicant's State Environmental Policy Act Checklist (SEPA) and issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) in accordance with WAC 197-11-340(2) on September 30th, 2026. Public notice of the SEPA DNS was posted on October 7th, 2026. The 15-day public SEPA comment period ended October 22nd, 2026, and the SEPA appeal period will close on November 6th, 2026. No comments or appeals have been filed to date.

ACTIONS ON OTHER RELEVANT PERMITS

The proponent has filed a building permit application for the install of the new utilities to the individual lots. Staff has put the building permit on hold until the Board concludes and renders a decision on the CUP. If the Board approves the CUP these permit applications will then be processed.

FINDINGS OF FACT

• The proposal is to be developed at undeveloped lot southeast of the intersection of Elmway and River Street of Okanogan, WA; also know as Parcel #: 5400350000; Legal: W 200FT Lot 35 Gregory Tracts of Section: 03, Township: 33-N, Range: 26 E. WM, Okanogan. This parcel is within the city limits of the City of Okanogan thereby Chapter 35A.63 of the Revised Code of Washington establishes the City of Okanogan as the authority with jurisdiction on local land use decisions.

DRAFT

• The Subject Property is within the Commercial Two (C-2) Zoning District.

• Section 18.36.030 of the OMC provides the use of “Recreational Vehicle Park” use in the Commercial Two district of the City of Okanogan requires the approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

• Section 18.92 of OMC specifies the procedures for approval of all Conditional Use permits in the City of Okanogan.

• Section 18.92.020 OMC empowers and directs the Board of Adjustment to hear and decide on CUP applications.

• Section 18.92.060 OMC specifies specific elements of the Findings of Fact & Conclusions the Board of Adjustment shall make on all CUP applications.

• The applicant has vested a completed application.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions have been separated for each of the following:

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The proposed development is consistent with the stated goals of the comprehensive plans to recognize differing neighborhood characteristics within the urban growth boundary and to provide adequate guidance and control to enhance each area's uniqueness. This realizes that each neighborhood in the city has its own character and that upcoming development should be sensitive to that character to ensure that all development proposals and public policy are considered within the broad framework of the comprehensive plan. This helps ensure that development proposals are reviewed for compatibility with the comprehensive plan, not just in conformance with zoning or subdivision standards. This helps new projects advance the spirit of the plan, not just the letter as conveyed in supporting ordinances.

Another goal is to ensure that the City grows at a rate which can be adequately served by municipal services without compromising or lowering levels of service for existing City residents. In conjunction with similar statements in the Capital Facilities element, this land use goal reminds us that growth beyond current service boundaries comes at a cost and that any extension of city services may not lower the level of service now enjoyed by city

DRAFT

residents. Additionally, to develop a spectrum of land use categories that adequately reflect current development within the City while providing for flexibility, creativity and redevelopment in the future. This guides the development and subsequent creation of land use districts that accommodate creativity in mixing land uses while preventing incompatibility and that ensure that build-out levels are consistent with the City's capability to provide services.

Lastly, direct and time public investment to best take advantage of the City's development authority to boost local economic development and advance community design and housing objectives. Staff feels the proposal is found to conform with the Comprehensive Plan's goals and objectives.

ZONING

The proposed is located within the Commercial Two (C-2) zoning district. The zoning code allows development of "Recreational Vehicle Parks" use on the property through the approval of a CUP. The proposed use is in conformance with the zoning requirements established for the C-2 zoning district.

OVERLAY

The project site is not part of any specific zoning overlay district.

FLOODPLAIN

The entire portion of the property is within the AE (100-year) flood zone. The City's Flood Damage Prevention regulations (Chapter 15.28 OMC) does apply to this project.

SHORELINE

The entire portion of the property is not within the Shoreline designation and therefore, The City's Shoreline Master Program SMP regulations does not apply.

DOMESTIC WATER

The City currently has adequate rights and capacity to provide domestic water access to the development. Currently, the lot has a city water main in River Street for access to city water. Upon submission of utility applications, a change in the unit use and

DRAFT

number of water units will be required to update the water rates for the property with the new RV use.

Comments from the utilities clerk and Public Works Director were relied upon to draw this conclusion.

FIRE FIGHTING – Access and Water

The proposal provides adequate roadways and access for emergency vehicles for firefighting, and the property has 1 fire hydrant currently at the intersection of Elmway and River Street that fronts the property.

Comments from the Public Works department and Fire department were relied upon to develop this conclusion.

WATER - SEWER

The City currently has adequate capacity and access off Elmway to provide domestic wastewater service access to the development.

Comments from the Public works department was relied upon to develop this conclusion.

OFF-STREET PARKING

The proponent has designated a common area space on the property per site plan. Proponent shall ensure that all parking for lots is located within the boundaries of the property.
Discussion with the proponent and the building official was relied upon to develop this conclusion.

STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Approved to standard, as filed by the proponent with the following specific conditions.

1.) The Applicant shall draft and provide a written contract/lease agreement for the rental of the lots and provide a copy to the City for filing with the application to define the specific use of the RV Lots as transient use. All Lots' lease agreements shall not exceed 90-day stay intervals.

PURPOSE: To ensure RV lot use does NOT allow for non-transient units to be installed.

DRAFT

BASIS: OMC Flood Damage Preventions requires development of housing units in the 100-year floodplain to be in compliance with the Flood Damage Prevention code. Since RV's can be readily removed from the property upon flood conditions this will satisfy the requirement of the code if the RV's stay in a readily movable condition.

2.) The Applicant shall be required to provide and maintain one off-street parking space for each RV Lot and shall be required to monitor the parking from exceeding parking availability. Furthermore, the applicant shall maintain and monitor the property to ensure proper ingress/egress into the property does not hinder street traffic on Elmway, River street, or the intersection there of.
PURPOSE: To prevent the potential for parking to grow outside the property's boundaries and setback requirements. To ensure the property does not become a nuisance to the public and surrounding right-of-way to excessive overflow parking or traffic.
BASIS: Section 18.80.070 of the OMC requires owners of properties to maintain the minimum parking standards according to the use.

3.) The Applicant shall be required to only allow RVs to lease spaces that have a 1997 or more current manufacture sticker. Furthermore, the RVs must not be altered in any way unless the RV has been inspected and approved by the State Department of Factory Assembled Structures.
PURPOSE: to ensure that the RVs placed on the property have a more appeasing look and meet the current code standards for Factory Assembled Structures and Recreational Vehicles.
BASIS: section 15.24.030 of the OMC requires that all Factory Assembled Structures (including recreational vehicles) meet the state's WAC code standards for use, maintaining, and alteration requirements.

4.) The Applicant Shall be required to abide by the setback requirements outlined in the Okanogan Zoning Code.
PURPOSE: to ensure that the park provides adequate privacy and potentially hindering the rights of the owners for neighboring properties.
BASIS: section 18.60.020 of the OMC outlines the setback standards of the zone along with the specific exceptions.

DRAFT

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board of Adjustment make and approve a motion in the manner of:
"I move to adopt by reference the Staff Finding of Facts & Conclusions and approve as applied OKACUP 26-01 to standard subject to the applicant satisfying all conditions as recommended by Staff."

Synopsis of Returned Comments

(Staff rebuttal for each comment are in italic font)

Returned comments are attached herein as attachments to this staff report with staff comments for each.

Parties of Record:

Public & Agencies

To date no agency or public has requested Party of Record status other than the proponent.

Returned Comments:

Public

1. Comment received 10.22.2026 from resident at 2304 Elmway. (see comment sheet for Ref.)

Comment:

"My Concern about this project is the potential increase in drug activity including trespassing, theft, and discarded paraphernalia. If the RV spaces are leased to high-risk populations, long-term rentals could turn into semi-homeless encampments. I understand that this business could be good for the city and the owner, I just want to stress the importance of careful planning, screening, and safeguards to prevent the project from becoming a danger to the neighborhood."

Staff's response to comment:

Staff understands the concern for potential criminal activity associated with past experiences with Recreational Vehicle Parks in other areas of the city. Staff agrees that careful planning and safeguards should be considered to assist with preventing opportunities for criminal activity to happen on any property within

DRAFT

the city. The conditions recommended by staff aids in assisting the proponent in policing the property of all matters voiced in this comment and feels the burden ultimately resides in the proponent's control to maintain control of the conditions of the property.

Chairman Garrison provided for public testimony to be received starting with the applicant. Proponent would like the BOA to approve the CUP and goes through reasons.

Other public comment:

Richard Waters: Is opposed to this RV Park. Lists several reasons including a well on the property that is for his residence.

Bob Eubanks: Opposed. Believe RV Park draws the wrong people. Have an RV Park north and south of town and everyone is aware the state those RV Parks are in. He has contacted Ecology and the Health Department and states they were not aware of this RV Park proposal. He feels there needs to be more time and research done on this issue.

Nancy Eubanks: Has a feasibility document with her to show BOA. She believes that this is a fire hazard and a parking issue. She stated there is no need for an RV Park and listed several other RV sites around our area.

Sheryl Curtis: Family bought property near the proposed site in the 1960's. This would devalue surrounding properties and parking is limited. Will likely increase garbage in the area. Questions who is going to be inspecting these RV's. She would like the BOA to oppose.

Jordan Wells: Has home across the road from this proposed site. He has the same concerns that have been raised with everyone speaking before him. Does not feel that this RV park will be used by professionals.

James Brannon: Lives on Burton and has a shop near the proposed RV Park. Says there are too many issues and things that have not been discussed to approve this.

Board has no questions.

Board discusses amongst themselves.

Board questioned Forbus regarding the Well and its use.

Curtis stated it is used for drinking and irrigation.

DRAFT

Proponent Anthony stated the well is on his title report, he was aware.

Brief discussion.

Curtis stated that in 1972 there was a flood and there were many issues with water and septic systems during that time. If this is approved the Dept of Ecology can require the well be capped and force Mr. Waters onto City services.

Brief discussion amongst the Board Members.

Torres motioned to deny the application for the CUP. Patrick seconded.
Torres-aye, Garrison-aye, Armstrong-nay, Patrick-aye
3-1 vote motion carried

Chairman Garrison concluded public hearing at 6:34 pm.

Continued with Agenda

Public Comment.

Curtis mentions the capping of wells in the city when there are services available.

No further business. Meeting adjourned at 6:36

Minutes taken and prepared by Kaylee Beetchenow, Clerk 1

APPROVED:

_____

Robert Garrison, Chairman

ATTEST:

_____

Kaylee Beetchenow, Clerk 1

DRAFT