REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

- MINUTES -

MEETING DATE: November 14, 1997

TO: Building Services Division Staff
Lynn Baugh
Chris Ricketts
Pam Dhanapal
Terry Brunner
Ken Dinsmore
Priscilla Kaufmann

Land Use Services Division Staff
Mark Carey
Lisa Pringle
Marilyn Cox
Lanny Henoch
Gordon Thomson

Greg Kipp, Deputy Director
Michael Sinsky, Prosecuting Attorney's Office

FM: Sophia Byrd, Code Development Coordinator

Present: Pam Dhanapal, Sophia Byrd, Lanny Henoch, Nestor Magat, Betty Salvati

1. May a home occupation employ more than one non-resident if they work off-site? If so, may these employees visit the site daily to pick up and return equipment? (Harold Vandergriff, Nestor Magat)

K.C.C. 21A.30.080 (C) states that "No more than one non-resident shall be employed by the home occupation."

The committee could not reach consensus on whether this section was clear on its face. Several committee members argued that Code Enforcement cannot enforce limitations on employees who work entirely off-site thus the code limitation should apply only to on-site non-residential employees. Others argued that, while highly restrictive and perhaps unenforceable, the code language does not distinguish between on-site and off-site employees and limits home occupations to one non-resident employee, regardless of where this employee performs his or her job.

The committee agreed, however, that the purpose of the restrictions on home occupations is to limit the scale of the business and its impacts on the residential neighborhood, and the committee agreed that employees of a home occupation who never visit the site of the home occupation have no impact on the neighborhood. Thus the committee supports a code amendment that would allow additional employees as long as their activities are performed completely off-site. They would not be allowed to visit to pick up vehicles or materials, because that activity would impact traffic and parking in the neighborhood. Such an amendment would recognize and make reasonable provision for the rapid proliferation of low-impact work activities that may be done completely off-site, e.g. telecommuting activities.

2. Does the committee still support a code amendment regarding golf course accessory uses? (Gordon Thomson)

Most members had to leave before the committee reached this agenda item. It was suggested that Gordon contact Pam Dhanapal and Ken Grubbs to review the matter.

SB:sm