

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes
July 6, 2004**

(Note audio tape (#3) dated July 6, 2004
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

(This document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript)

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Dewey at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bill Dewey, Steve Clayton, Terri Jeffreys, Mark Drain, and Bob Sund. Diane Edgin and Wendy Ervin were excused.

Staff Present: Bob Fink, Darren Nienaber, Allan Borden.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0020) Bill Dewey: Tonight's meeting is a special meeting outside of our regularly scheduled meeting for the PAC for review, discussion and recommendation to the BOCC on the Belfair Urban Growth Area plan and draft development regulations. Just for clarification for those that are here in the audience tonight the public testimony portion has been closed so we won't be taking any comments tonight. At the opening of our last hearing on the Belfair Urban Growth Area Plan Bob read some comments and handed out this sheet that might give us some structure to go through discussion tonight on this plan. It's a June 21, 2004 memo from Bob Fink to the PAC on the Belfair Urban Growth Area Plan.

(#0085) Bob Fink: I have some information to pass out. One is Steve Clayton has organized his thoughts and put it in writing and sent it to me so that I could make copies for you. The question has sometimes been raised what the GMA requirements with regards to sewers in urban areas so I have a short handout that refers to the GMHB decisions to you could refer to that.

(#0150) Mark Drain: You've given us the GMHB thoughts for the sewers in urban areas. What is called an urban area?

(#0160) Bob Fink: They're urban areas that are designated urban areas under the GMA. Belfair is a designated urban area under the GMA.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#0165) Mark Drain: But not the whole sub-area that's mapped on the map?

(#0170) Bob Fink: Yes, the entire area here is the designated urban area.

(#0175) Mark Drain: So if at some point it becomes a city then there would be an urban growth boundary or is that incorporated in that sub-area plan?

(#0180) Bob Fink: The urban growth boundary is the boundary of the area. The urban area is the area within the urban growth boundary. When cities expand or are incorporated they have to stay within the boundary of the urban growth area. The urban growth areas themselves are designated by the county and then if the county does a job that the city doesn't agree with there's an appeal process in the ACT and they can challenge that designation. Some communities have designated urban reserves but those are not areas that are usually designated urban area. There's nothing defined in statute to how you use that term. Urban reserve might be an area outside the UGA boundary today in which future expansion of the boundary is expected to occur and so you have a lower density in that area so you prevent non-urban development from expansion.

(#0230) Bob Sund: Shelton has an urban area and the area outside of Shelton is not all rural. There is this reserve area.

(#0236) Bob Fink: Right. When you have a city the boundary of the city and the boundary of the UGA do not need to be the same. If you have an existing city that was there when the GMA was adopted the existing city boundary was automatically a UGA boundary. All of the City of Shelton is in the UGA automatically by law but you can also designate an area outside the current city limits as UGA and your ability to do that is based on the calculation of the demand for urban area within your 20 year time horizon. So you plan out 20 years and try to figure out how much land you need to meet the capacity of the expected growth in that 20 year time. So if you're expecting 10,000 people and so many acres of commercial and industrial activity that goes along with that expansion and then you can calculate what the land demand is to serve that 20 year allocated growth or expected growth. One of the things that affects your calculation is how you determine the land use within the urban area. The current existing designation in this county has all one urban area and that's considered the no action alternative.

(#0325) Mark Drain: When it mentions inclusion of the Union River Valley in the UGA it's not included on that map.

(#0333) Bob Fink: If you consider the valley to the ridge it is included. But what they meant is principally the flood plain area and the lowlands associated with the floor of the valley. That change was approved by the GMHB as complying with their requirement that we examine having the Union River Valley in the UGA.

(#0375) Bill Dewey: In that similar discussion where the flood plain was found to be inappropriate to be included in the UGA and with a considerable portion of the CARA in the UGA and a lot of the existing urbanized development that's in Belfair sitting within that is that an issue that was looked at or was challenged?

(#0388) Bob Fink: The CARA's were challenged and their designation was challenged and resolved. If you look at Shelton most of the city is within the CARA as designated. It's pretty typical. What you really want to do in most cases it's adequate to deal with the CARA by prohibiting ... generally you don't designate industrial areas and other uses that are typically causes of groundwater pollution that you wouldn't want on top of the CARA and so that's essentially the way our CARA protections are written. They don't address whether it's urban or not urban but they have standards that have to be applied that are intended to prevent pollution to groundwater.

(#0425) Bill Dewey: It seems like in one of the public comments there's reference to a dry cleaners business in that area.

(#0428) Bob Fink: Is that regarding the existing dry cleaners or allowing dry cleaners in one of the zoning districts? I think it was probably allowing dry cleaning in one of the zoning areas that overlaps with the CARA.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

You have to distinguish between dry cleaners that are drop off sites and dry cleaners where they do actual chemical processing. Not all store fronts where they accept dry cleaning actually do dry cleaning on site.

(#0452) Bill Dewey: Is that a distinction that can be made in the DR's?

(#0455) Bob Fink: It has been made. There was confusion about it.

(#0460) Steve Clayton: The language says drop off only and there was a dry cleaners that was cited in our CARA and they actually processed the chemicals so there have been a few folks that have been upset that there was question in the RO what that meant.

(#0475) Bob Fink: We were actually going to clarify what drop off meant. Drop off means no chemical processing of clothing on site. That would actually be a good addition because I don't think it's written that way in this code. You do have a lot of general commercial areas and mixed use areas. The alternative to not allowing dry cleaning there at all is to allow only the drop off without chemical treating and then there would be no hazard to the CARA. That would be a good addition to make.

(#0498) Steve Clayton: It's already listed in the RO under d) dry cleaners excluding drop off only operations as prohibited. I think this just slipped through the cracks and some people were concerned that the staff who permitted it didn't realize it was in the CARA and permitted the operation. I think with the new Belfair plan that's come out and with staff putting in the CARA it's really going to help both the realtors and the rest of the community know a lot more about what's going on.

(#0520) Bob Fink: I would also clarify that. That protection is worded that way in the critical area but I think it would be good to put it specifically in the plan and to clarify that drop off be used and no chemical processing on site. I think that ambiguity should be addressed.

(#0528) Bill Dewey: Is there an appropriate place we should be looking to put that?

(#0535) Terri Jeffreys: If you were to overlay the zoning over the recharge area what districts would be affected?

(#0542) Bob Fink: You obviously have residential but if you come down here you have mixed use and you catch some of this general commercial including where the Safeway is and then there's more mixed use down here. So it's in mixed use, general commercial and festival retail that are overlapping the CARA. It's our understanding what it means to the CARA's and it's out intent to tighten that up.

(#0588) Steve Clayton: It seems like it would be difficult to write in because dry cleaners and laundries not including laundry mats are an allowed use in the general commercial. If we were to limit it to drop off only then we're not allowing dry cleaners to be in an area that's not in a critical area because it falls in both zones.

(#0600) Bob Fink: One approach to dealing with an issue like that is to just leave it to the critical resource regulation to control that.

(#0630) Bill Dewey: Maybe just to get a sense for where we're at we should go around and hear from each to you as to the comfort level as far as what's been presented to us and where we're at as far as any kind of proposed actions. Steve has provided us some written comments to his thoughts. Could you walk us through that, Steve?

(#0655) Steve Clayton: My intent is not to change the recommendations from the Belfair group. These are more kind of clean up issues. In the first case I agree with the conclusions in the Transportation Technical Report and the Belfair committee made recommendations and worked with Heffron on what was ultimately the recommended transportation improvements and I don't have any qualms with that. The only problem with the technical report is there are some factual errors and I will cover those in a while after we've gone through this. We've not been successful in getting either Makers or Heffron to address them and it's been presented over the course of quite a few months. There were some other issues that I brought up to them and eventually were fixed but these are some issues that have not been addressed and my intent is that we

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

recommend that the BOCC not accept the report but that they do accept the recommendations that the Belfair group agreed to. I'm just looking to clean up the details in the sub reports and have them accurate. There have been a couple of consultants that I have come across that have actually made presentations with some of that data that I consider erroneous.

(#0715) Bill Dewey: I'm assuming that Heffron has probably been paid for that contract?

(#0718) Steve Clayton: Right. Heffron had two masters to deal with. The Belfair group, which they were responsible to provide a plan to us and work with us and I believe they came three times, and they were also funded by Public Works Department for a total of \$20,000.00. Public Works never came to a Belfair planning committee meeting although they were invited and requested to be there. They came to one sub-group meeting although the former head of Public Works lives in Tahuya and passes through Belfair. He was requested and never came so Heffron made a recommendation ultimately that came out in the Belfair plan that the group overwhelmingly endorsed and they also made a technical report which I think is pointed in a little bit different direction. Regarding the draft zoning development regulations, again, trying not to change what came out from the group, but in the Belfair plan on page 27 they're talking about they actually request the county to site adult businesses. The direction we've heard as a PAC and also from the Mr. Fink at the planning department is that we can't eliminate them; everybody would like to eliminate them and not have them permitted at all. They need to be in urban areas so Belfair group did not make a recommendation on where in the UGA to put them. Specifically on that page it asks for the county to do something. So I put a proposal there. Perhaps some staff input would be appropriate. I tried to give Bob some thoughts that those businesses shouldn't be in a residential area and shouldn't be near schools or bus stops. The next item in the zoning DR's there's a problem with the retail shops. In the Belfair DR's that came out other retail uses had wording saying retail shops not otherwise named. So we had grocery stores, etc., and it also had a clause in there saying retail uses not otherwise named. Staff added last month to the end of that a size limitation of 10,000 sf. That was not a recommendation that came from the planning group. That's not a recommendation that was brought forward to us. It just appeared and I talked to Bob about it after our last meeting and there's good reasons why he brought it forward but I think it should be brought out and it does not appear in the documents to be the intent of the group. Unfortunately the permitted uses do not include department stores, etc., specifically but that appears to be the rationale so a Target, a Costco, a PetsMart is not an allowed use with the change of wording that staff did last month. I think that dramatically changes the intent of the group.

(#0902) Bill Dewey: We got into some good discussion during the public hearing on this list and trying to make it all inclusive you're going to miss some things. Do we want to revisit that conversation of whether we want to include this list or go to something more generic and descriptive of the types of businesses as opposed to a specific list of all of them?

(#0924) Steve Clayton: It appears this was a generic; retail uses not otherwise permitted.

(#0926) Bob Fink: It said more than that. It said retail uses not otherwise listed as a similar size, character, and impacts. I did point out in the e-mail I sent to the members that I did change those things and in the attachment it was underlined as one of the changes there. The purpose for addressing that is just that the language that allows similar uses gives too much discretion to the Administrator so we've been removing that from our regulations. I attempted to replace it with just a straight forward standard of 10,000 sf because I had in mind, I wasn't thinking of the big box retail, but of most of the other retail activities like bakeries, kite stores, and other things that aren't listed there. I was thinking small and I wasn't thinking about the big box so I agree with Steve that it was the intention of the group to allow general commercial, particularly in the northern part where there's room. You have to realize that the big box nowadays would be over 100,000 sf. That wasn't what I was trying to address so that's essentially how it got there.

(#0986) Steve Clayton: The group originally saw as a very last permitted use that 'uses not listed and found to be substantially similar in character, functions and impact'; as Bob said, staff deleted that because we're cleaning up the county regs and they found that to be unenforceable. In addition to that in one of the uses above, we changed the retail shops and knocked it down to 10,000 sf.

(#1055) Bob Fink: I basically concur with Steve that it should be retail uses not otherwise listed. You're simply

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

allowing retail uses.

(#1070) Steve Clayton: On the sign provision the Belfair group made sign recommendations but they did not make a recommendation to grandfather or have a sunset clause. I do agree with it but my only concern is on that sunset clause if we're rebuilding the highway that may take more than five years and I'd like to put a provision in there that those people that are on that section of highway don't have to take their sign out in five years while construction is going; that they have a grace period after that construction is done.

(#1102) Mark Drain: I'd simplify it and just extend it for everybody. I imagine those people that are going to be affected are a large part of the community and to figure out who is affected and not may be tough. There might be detours through part of it that don't have any road work being done on it. Are those people affected, too?

(#1120) Steve Clayton: I think the construction area is a mile of the two mile corridor.

(#1125) Bob Fink: Right, the road construction but there's also utility work being done. The project is stormwater, utilities and sidewalks and trails; all of those things are being looked at as far as under the Perteet contract so you run into problems in defining the project.

(#1145) Bill Dewey: Steve raised a good point. There's some significant potential for controversy there if you give people so much time to change their sign and then they come through and rip it up with the construction.

(#1150) Mark Drain: You're saying that a conforming sign might be removed or if they change to a conforming sign and then construction destroys it?

(#1158) Steve Clayton: Right, because this project may take more than five years and so you have to put a new sign up and then move it because the shoulder got changed.

(#1170) Bob Fink: I thought Steve was trying to address the issue of people who had nonconforming signs who had to remove them because they were displaced by the actual construction and they would then have to automatically have to replace those signs and I thought he was giving them a grace period of six months to replace those signs with something conforming. The way the regulation is written now if they move the sign they have to bring it into conformance immediately rather than in five years.

(#1200) Terri Jeffreys: We heard testimony that contradicted the sign ordinance language that said that the Belfair Sub-Area group did not have a height limit of ten feet; they set a fifteen foot limit and pole signs are still allowed. I'm confused about what was the desire of the group regarding height limits on signs and whether pole signs were allowed.

(#1220) Bob Fink: The testimony that I remember came from Brian Petersen and he said he thought they did that but I don't remember them doing that. If they did that prior to the approval of the plan it was a change that the consultants didn't pick up and integrate into the plan. I haven't had a chance to look at the minutes to see if the committee did that prior to the approval of the plan or maybe at the last meeting.

(#1250) Bill Dewey: It sounds like we've got some good discussion on signs so that's an area that we need to spend some more time on.

(#1258) Steve Clayton: Okay, the next one is bulk and dimensional standards for density. At 10 units per acre that are allowed in the R10 areas and we have an unlimited amount of development and density allowed in our corridor of mixed use; staff used 10 units per acre in their calculations both in the DEIS and in the materials they presented us they have estimated that in the corridor of mixed use there should be roughly 10 units per acre. I feel that rather than leaving it open ended the other residential districts have a cap on the number of units per acre we should be specific otherwise our growth factor that staff has presented us is speculation. We already have numbers that are in dispute by the realtors board and by Mr. Diehl's group so I believe there should be a cap that matches the maximum density in other areas. There's also another clause that is not in the corridor mixed use density section that applies in the rural density section. In a rural parcel if you have designated wetlands, landslide hazard areas, lakes or ponds you can't count that area and it's listed

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

in the DEIS as far as you can't squeeze all those parcels into just a small part of the parcel. You can't take one acre that's half wetlands and put all ten units on the other half of the acre. That's the way it's worded in the residential districts. We have residences allowed in this corridor of mixed use and we don't put that limitation on them. So now we've got ten units here and ten units on an adjacent parcel abutting the same stream with different development regs. It would give staff headaches and heartaches trying to figure it out. The draft supplemental impact statement that staff produced inferred in the residential areas that we weren't going to accommodate these lakes and critical areas. We were going to take them out of the development area risk but we actually didn't do it for one of the residential zones. We just need to be consistent through our residential areas.

On long term ag we have some county defined ag lands in the UGA that are not designated on these maps. If we have a long term ag district, which is on this map, then ag lands that the county recognizes should be in that district and that will also reduce our population projections.

(#1418) Mark Drain: They're shown as something else on the map?

(#1422) Steve Clayton: They're shown as residential; R3.

(#1425) Mark Drain: How much area?

(#1427) Steve Clayton: I believe it's 28 acres.

(#1435) Mark Drain: Is the reasoning behind that because the ag area of long term commercial significance should be more of a blocked sizeable area?

(#1445) Bob Fink: The minimum size for ag is 10 acres so even if it's free standing, a 10-acre piece could be long term commercial ag. My understanding of that as far as the zoning goes in Belfair is that it was requested by one of the citizens. It's adjacent to a working farm that's designated long term commercial ag and it was seen as a way of addressing his concerns.

(#1488) Steve Clayton: So my thought is if it's designated as ag by the county it should be in the ag that's in the Belfair UGA. The other concept that's also met resistance by staff in some ways is this CARA. This zone here, as Mr. Dewey has mentioned, there are county resource ordinance in the critical area on things you can't do there. It isn't a real long list; it's more of a watch kind of list but the determining factor is that density on septic is limited to 1 unit per acre. We're allowing R3's and R5's in this area. Once it's on sewer that gives good protection but a large portion of this area is not designated to be on sewer in the initial phase. The initial phase for sewer will hopefully be in three to five years making the second phase in five to ten years. If we designate this area as urban reserve that would enable people to say that when we get sewer here we'll be able to build out at reasonable densities and we can't build out at reasonable densities right now.

(#1555) Bill Dewey: I think that's a good approach.

(#1558) Steve Clayton: We have an overabundance; we need to knock down these population numbers to be in line with the GMA as far as our population forecast. We aren't going to build that density there so let's take it out and put it in as an urban reserve. Mr. Fink said we don't have an urban reserve definition; if we allow density at 1 unit per 5 acres in that area and put that kind of a definition in so that those people that have 20 acre lots they can still divide their property up somewhat. If we allow people to develop that whole area at 1 unit per acre and then we bring it into the urban area ... if you've got a 1 acre parcel and you've got a house on it it's hard to put 3 or 5 houses on that parcel. The urban reserve, my understanding, is something that you hold in reserve and then when you open it up it fills out to urban densities.

(#1610) Terri Jeffreys: Is that possible without actually having solid numbers for population projections?

(#1615) Bob Fink: There's a number of issues there. It's a real interesting question that he raises. There are a number of issues related to it. One is if you designate it as urban reserve, are you going to remove it from the urban area and put it outside the UGA boundary which would require a subsequent amendment to incorporate it? The reason for that is that even though the current zoning may not allow higher densities that

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

itself is an issue ... the GMHB and the ACT require urban densities in the urban area. The point is that you have a twenty year time horizon. Just because the land can't be developed for five or even ten years doesn't change it's ultimate build out. If sewer becomes available it will still have the possibility for building out at whatever the zoning is. What Steve is suggesting won't change the basic analysis as far as build out. What it can address is kind of the truth in an advertising issue which is people in that area know that they can't divide their land or develop their land in an urban fashion until sewer is provided.

(#1666) Terri Jeffreys: But if the sewer is not sitting in a capital facilities plan even on a six year plan and no plans for funding yet ... but it's intended to accommodate the growth projected ...

(#1675) Bob Fink: You don't have to provide sewer to the entire UGA in six years.

(#1680) Terri Jeffreys: But if that's in the intended area of growth ... if that line was drawn there even as a reserve or vice versa, especially if you're taking it out ...

(#1685) Bob Fink: Drawing it like an urban reserve if you're leaving it within the UGA means that within twenty years you will develop that land, setting aside a market factor, you expect to develop that land to urban densities within that twenty year time horizon. That means that your analysis would remain the same; you would have some expectation for what densities would be allowed in the future at time of build out.

(#1700) Terri Jeffreys: Then you still need it on a utilities plan.

(#1705) Bob Fink: The capital facilities plan is a six year plan. In the Comp Plan, and it was an issue that was referred to in this decision, sewers were particularly looked at and the GMHB required the county to put in its plan a transition approach to go from a non-sewered area to a sewered area. That's in the Comp Plan; that was approved by the GMHB. What that provides for is some development now on sewer with provisions to prepare a binding site plan that shows how you're going to provide for urban services and where you're going to provide urban services. You have to make accommodations for future urban development of that site and having done that then you're allowed to develop. In the residential subdivision there's really two approaches that can be followed to allow development while waiting for sewer. One approach allows for platting in small lots that would then be grouped together in clusters of two or three or four that could not be developed except for one house until such time as sewer is available. If you're in a CARA and you're only allowed one house per acre you would group five lots or six lots together. If you had over an acre you could sell those together as a group and someone could build on one lot and the remaining lots would remain vacant as far as houses until such time as sewer was available. When sewer was available then the lots could be sold separately and would be built upon. The other alternative that's laid out in the plan for creating subdivisions prior to sewer in urban areas is to create a few small lots and then keep a large lot in retainage; so basically you have a few small lots that then you make sure you have adequate provision for on-site septic, which may be on an easement on the large lot, and then the balance of the property is one large lot. That also would allow someone to develop their land or divide their land prior to having sewer in the urban area compatible with urban development. So you build into your approval system a design so that you don't preclude urban development when sewer becomes available. Those are the existing provisions in the plan.

(#1830) Terri Jeffreys: Where is it in the plan?

(#1832) Bob Fink: It's in the urban policies chapter. You'll also find discussion about the sewer issues in the capital facilities element.

(#1848) Steve Clayton: In conversations with Bob it appears that if you're going to develop on a CARA to have sewer on it is perhaps one of the good ways to protect it. But to have sewer on it you need to have a certain amount of density so if we were to continue to allow one unit per acre then we aren't going to get to a density that's going to enable financing for sewer. If we can limit the development until such time as we can finance sewer ... if we're looking to reduce land capacity or urban growth area population capacity, which we were looking at last time on changing some of those R10's down to R5's, it looks to me like we're changing the intent of the Belfair group. They picked out good places for high density and if we're going to change those to R5, we're changing it permanently. You're not going to take out a duplex you built to match the R5 and put in a set of apartments.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#1920) Bob Fink: This map here is what the sub-area group approved in December. This is what they show in the plan and what they approved. In this other version, in order to address the build out numbers and to address the question of whether the number of people that you expect to choose to live within the Belfair area within the time period ... this one is significantly high in this and this one is low and it was seen as the best way to do it was to remove some this multi-family and change it to R5. The analysis that went into the SEPA came up with those options and it was developed as an alternative for consideration in the SEPA. There's another good reason why you want to reduce some of the R10 and that's the demand for multi-family housing. If you look at the amount of multi-family housing that you'd have to have to build out these areas it's well above foreseeable demand. It's many, many times what the current demand for multi-family housing is in the county. The expectation was about 15% multi-family and it's several times more than that 15% multi-family. If you look at the statewide average for multi-family the end result of this plan is much more than the current statewide average for multi-family. Also, you have to ask how realistic it is to have whatever percentage that is for people living in multi-family.

(#2060) Terri Jeffreys: So at some point we would need to decide which of these two maps would be adequate?

(#2065) Bob Fink: It doesn't necessarily have to be either of these two maps. This was laid out as an alternative and the reasons why is this is current platted at a lower density. One of the things you have to look at when you look at multi-family is why it is being established. It is being established within walkable areas of your commercial centers. I don't know that you should feel locked into this alternative; this is just what we laid out as being one of the ways of reducing the total population build out. It's good we had the discussion of urban areas in the beginning because the boundary contained in the urban area has to be sized so that the number of people for that land demand is equal to that area. That means that you do allow for things like a market factor, which is allowed to be 25%, so you don't actually expect every piece of land to be built on at the time that your twenty year time horizon is up.

(#2180) Terri Jeffreys: If somebody wanted to build at a lesser density than R10 they're not kept from that in the DR's, are they?

(#2190) Bob Fink: No, people can build at lower densities than what's the maximum allowed.

(#2198) Terri Jeffreys: But they can't build higher than the R5 so it seems to me you have less flexibility if you down zone it.

(#2205) Bob Fink: You have to look at the economic incentive of the people and what they're going to do. You could say that people aren't going to build out the R5 to the maximum because there's not the multi-family demand to do that. Do you want to over provide that land and under provide other types of land that should be available. What you're trying to do is match as closely as you can reasonably do the types of land that you need and their availability so that you keep them approximately in balance. You want to have an adequate supply of land for the types of areas that you're planning for and want to see built. If there's not a market for the higher density development and some people build lower and some people build higher then you're not getting the character of the community that you were trying for.

(#2265) Terri Jeffreys: Say people don't want multi-family housing because it's not a marketable thing in this area but they want small lot housing ...

(#2275) Bob Fink: Twenty years is a long time ... you have to draw the plan up based on expectations for twenty years. As a practical matter you revisit the plan much more frequently and you should expect to revise the plan as you go along. The plan will have to be revisited next year and after that every seven years and the UGA boundary itself will have to be re-evaluated every ten years.

(#2295) Terri Jeffreys: It seems like we're addressing the size of the UGA by down zoning as opposed to maybe looking at the size of the UGA. If the reason to make these changes is to address the fact that maybe we're not going to get the population we thought, down zoning, I don't think, provides the flexibility that's needed in the UGA. It restricts the flexibility that's necessary in the UGA. By keeping the R10 you provide

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

more flexibility for different types of housing products.

(#2330) Bob Fink: You don't necessarily want flexibility in the sense that you don't necessarily want a single family house on an acre and then over here you have a high rise of four stories and then over here you have another single family and then over here you have a duplex and over here you have a garden apartment. That kind of flexibility is allowed but it makes predictability for providing services very difficult. People aren't necessarily required to build out to the maximum but they tend to do that as long as it pencils out. Once you zone it, what will happen, rather than people building single family they're more likely to simply hold it on speculation and any housing that might have been in that area they tend to rent out and not invest in it because they plan to tear it down. So you're actually providing an incentive to disinvest from the property based on speculation because it's zoned to an intensive use and it's not in demand at this point in time but it may be in demand five years from now so I cut my expenses and I hold onto that land on speculation. So if you don't have the demand you're actually holding that land out of development which otherwise might be developed if it were more accurately zoned. So you don't want to mismatch between the types of zoning.

(#2405) Bob Sund: Would you forbid somebody ... say an area that is designated to have ten units per acre and somebody came in and said there's not the economic ...

(#2425) Bob Fink: Everything is connected to everyone else. The regulations as written do not prevent somebody from building less than the maximum number of units. There are implications of that. You asked about sewer. Right now the county is in the process of trying to design the sewer and the phasing for the sewer for the entire UGA and they're going to design that system based on the densities allowed under the plan and those densities are going to be the maximum densities because the people acting on their economic interests are going to want to build the maximum. So if you're impractical then you're over designing your system. You'll put it in the wrong place or you'll over design it because you'll never have the demand for it so you want to try to be realistic about what your demand is. You can't put off zoning until we have the sewer design because the sewer is being designed to go with the zoning. You don't design sewer and then zone it according to where you put the sewer. You designate the UGA, you do the zoning and then that gives you reasonable parameters in which to design your public utilities, roads and sewer and water systems. How big a line do you need to build on the sewer? How big it is depends on what service area that sewer line is going to serve and what the intensity of use is in that area. Without that information you can't design that sewer system. So zoning is a precursor to adequate capital facilities designing. You have to know what the zoning is and what to expect to size your systems accurately otherwise you end up under designing, which is expensive because then you have to rip them up and replace them, or you over design in which case you've just wasted money. The phasing of the sewer is going to control development opportunities to a large extent. It will provide an opportunity for people to expand the system ahead of schedule. There will be a schedule, and this is under development right now, for how the sewer will be expanded. How it will be phased in. If someone is in a service area and they're not going to run the line out to them for another four years but they want to develop now this can be set up. There's different options for how you set it up. One way to set that up is to allow them to expand that system; if it's a service line that serves other people then they can recapture that cost through latecomers fees or they may have to eat the cost if nobody else wants to develop within the parameters of the regulations. All that is based on zoning and where you intensity of use is. Then you look at the topography and land conditions and you can design your system in a realistic way. So to overzone areas that aren't going to reasonably develop that way you've done nothing but mislead yourself.

(#2600) Steve Clayton: In the R10 in particular on your draft environmental impact statement the former map had 49% of the population dedicated to R10 zoning. The state average is 28% and Shelton is 22% so based on those numbers it's extremely long. The new version is 14% devoted to R10, which if we're going to compare it to either state or Shelton is short.

(#2638) Bob Fink: I was shooting for 15% because I had that logic in my mind as being a target.

(#2645) Steve Clayton: It says in the EIS that the State of Washington had 28% in multi-family and in the city multi-family is R10 and not R5. If that's an accurate number ...

(#2655) Bob Fink: Some R5 would be multi-family because you're talking about the structure in buildings. R5 is easy to fit single family houses on but I think it does allow townhouses and small apartments. It's all

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

general information for guidance on the scale of how much you want to say is going to develop in multi-family. Those numbers aren't gospel.

(#2685) Terri Jeffreys: I think it's a misnomer to think that R10 is strictly multi-family. That's where I'm having such issues is that a whole new product is coming out that is going to address the needs of the empty nesters and the down sizers of small lot housing which are around R9 is your average. So by saying that we're talking only about apartment buildings I think we're limiting our vision of what could possibly be built there.

(#2730) Bob Fink: There are developments that sometimes reach densities of 8 units an acre ...

(#2738) Terri Jeffreys: That's what I'm saying. By making the assumption that R10 is strictly apartment building only and R5 ... we've lost a place to put this type of development. You're down zoning to the point that it's not going to pencil out for a developer to do that kind of housing. I think that's a demographic that needs to be addressed.

(#2765) Steve Clayton: Don't you think that the 50% is too long and the 15% is too short?

(#2770) Terri Jeffreys: Yes, I agree.

(#2775) Steve Clayton: It's just a matter of figuring out where in there ...

(#2780) Terri Jeffreys: We're needing to match population numbers to the zoning but we're also cutting the ability to be flexible with the type of housing product that you're putting in to a higher density because for that type of development you're going to have to set aside for open space.

(#2796) Steve Clayton: With the EIS that's already calculated in. He's calculated in the market factor and also wetlands.

(#2812) Terri Jeffreys: I'm talking about a part of the amenity of that type of development.

(#2815) Bob Fink: I don't think recreational space is factored in. There is 20% for roads and the unsuitable areas such as the wetlands are factored out. The recreational set aside isn't calculated and it tends to be pretty small as far as gross acreage. It is a factor but not a considerable factor. There are more standards on page 63. Recreational set side is not an exclusion; wetlands are an exclusion. Open spaces that you provide as an amenity are not excluded from your density. So if you have 75 acres and you put 75 houses on that then you have to have a half acre of open space but you don't lose any houses because you provide that half acre of open space.

(#2950) Steve Clayton: So this all came about as a tangent to the CARA and the zoning there and my thoughts of trying not to change the densities from the original projection which, based on Bob's presentation, are probably a bit long. However, probably the 15% is a bit short. We can come back to that. The next item I have is the open space areas. What the GMA recognized in a couple of spots is that we're supposed to have open space areas within an urban area and between them. We have the corridor running from Allyn and Shelton northward along the utility lines and in some of the critical maps we have what could be considered open space areas along some of the important streams. Whether that will meet the GMA requirements I'm not sure. My thought on continuing the corridor along the railroad lines through the UGA is not a real positive thought based on the topography. The railroad line runs up on a plateau and next to it there's actually some buildable parcels. Right here we have a 15% slope which is getting real tough to build on through this entire corridor and as a thought we might think about identifying that either currently or in our next Comp Plan update. Instead of doing the utility corridors do actually these steep hillsides.

(#3080) Mark Drain: Did the committee look at that?

(#3082) Steve Clayton: No.

(#3088) Bob Fink: There is a specific recommendation for trail systems.

(#3095) Steve Clayton: But we never specifically defined any open space corridors and if I understand the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

GMA we need to define them.

(#3104) Bob Fink: There are corridors already adopted for this area between Allyn and Belfair and running from Allyn to Belfair.

(#3120) Mark Drain: What about within the sub-area plan?

(#3225) Bob Fink: I think those corridors apply to within the urban area as well.

(#3134) Steve Clayton: No, we specifically excluded within the UGA's. We can come back to that but that was my thought in rather than doing a utility corridor it might be more developable up on the plateau.

(#3170) Bob Sund: Isn't David Overton getting back to us pertaining to that open space?

(#3175) Steve Clayton: That's a different area. That's outside the UGA. His concerns were on the summit by Allyn. On the last page I had some comments on the DSEIS. On the first page it says there's a 30-day comment period ending July 14th and staff had requested us to make a decision tonight before the comment period had expired. Then I forwarded on some comments on the water. There's some errors on the water calculations so staff can address that.

(#3250) Bill Dewey: Well, Steve, you've certainly done your homework on this. The PAC thanks you.

(#3275) Steve Clayton: Well, there's oodles and oodles of details that should be changed and corrected. My personal thoughts are we should get the big stuff done and approve and work with the BOCC to develop a yearly update from the community rather than having individuals go to Bob and say they want this or that and it comes to us as a Comp Plan amendment and we have no feeling for what the community actually thought. Shelton has a city structure that if they want to change their area there's a process there and then it will come to the us and the county. Allyn has a group that somewhat speaks for it but there is no group in Belfair.

(#3325) Bill Dewey: Because it's been disbanded.

(#3327) Steve Clayton: Right, and my push to the BOCC is to either reband it or make some sort of group that next year and the year after and the year after that initial proposals from individuals go to the group and then come to us so we'll have a feel for what the community wants. Also, Mr. Diehl brought up in his letter and we've discussed it before about having stormwater standards the county currently recognizes ... they're 1998 or 1997 standards ... Mr. Diehl brought up the concept of having a district, because the Hood Canal is having troubles, that we draw tighter standards around. I was trying to find a place in these DR's to put in that this area will be subject to 2001 or the more current stormwater standards. In particular those that apply to the Hood Canal.

(#3440) Bill Dewey: We've raised this stormwater question a number of times and Darren brought to my attention that in Title 14, 14.48.100, the title is 'Stormwater Management Manual Adopted'. It says specifically that the latest edition of ecology stormwater management manual with the exception of the minimum requirements chapter is adopted by reference and is hereafter referred to as 'The Manual'. 'The use of other manuals or methods shall be preapproved by the Director or his designee'. Darren, Steve has raised the question of stormwater management and thinking that it may be appropriate ... he raised the concern that the county hasn't adopted the latest version of the stormwater manual.

(#3500) Darren Nienaber: I think that's more appropriate county wide. I don't think that's anything specific to Belfair. My reading of it is it's adopted except for what the exceptions are.

(#3555) Steve Clayton: We got a summary sheet from Mr. Fink last year saying that we were still abiding by old stormwater standards.

(#3600) Darren Nienaber: I don't know that that's a discussion you need to have with reference specifically to Belfair.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#3640) Bill Dewey: In reference to your comments, Steve, I've been having the same thoughts particularly about the CARA within the UGA and whether we shouldn't be looking at even going further than the stormwater manual and recommending low impact development practices for that specific part of the UGA.

(#3665) Bob Fink: I don't know how far this conversation can go without getting some representative from Public Works to address these issues because it's beyond my expertise and they're the proper body to field your questions on what they're doing and what the implication is of what they could do. So you should defer that discussion.

(#3700) Darren Nienaber: The last comments from Jerry Hauth when he was Director he was firmly against the stormwater manual and I think he said that his position was that it would substantially increase the public road construction costs because you'd have to have significantly larger retention and detention ponds and so you get a lot less road for your county road dollars. At that point he had also said that no county was using the stormwater management manual. Now, the last I've heard there is one county and that's Jefferson County who is using it. King County has sort of a partial implementation. I did speak with a land use attorney for Snohomish County who actually has sued DOE themselves on behalf of Snohomish County with respect to the stormwater management manual because they never adopted it as an official guideline. In fact, page 3 of it says it's not a regulatory document. The reason why they did that was because it never went through administrative rule making.

(#0005) Bob Fink: I'd just complete discussion of what we do know. Many of the larger counties, such as King County, the law provides that they can adopt their equivalent manual and so they've not actually adopted the DOE manual but a manual that they created and modified from the information from the DOE manual and that's what they ended up adopting

(#0020) Darren Nienaber: If the PAC wants to recommend that to Belfair specific I don't think there's any harm so if that's the majority of the PAC that's okay.

(#0030) Steve Clayton: I had trouble finding a place to put it. Under the premise we were going by two different manuals I was attempting to put the drainages that didn't go into Hood Canal under the more lenient regs and the drainages did go into it under the more restrictive.

Break in meeting.

(#0085) Bill Dewey: Terri, you've shared some of your concerns while we were talking. Is there something we haven't touched on that you'd like to comment on?

(#0105) Terri Jeffreys: In our previous work session I had talked about a 30 foot buffer requirement in the Multi-Use district about perhaps considering reducing that and I have a reference to the DR number. It's 17.23.265. By reducing it to 15 feet it would meet the requirements of the General Commercial. It would be consistent.

(#0125) Steve Clayton: So that would make it consistent down the Highway 3 corridor.

(#0142) Terri Jeffreys: Using the old numbers under allowed uses for Long Term Agriculture I wondered if an allowed use perhaps would be retail associated with production of the crops. Some counties are saying either on that land or some counties are saying with items produced in that county to just kind of diversify. So you might not necessarily grow corn on your property but that would be a possible type of retail going on.

(#0205) Mark Drain: Or maybe limit it to a percentage of things that you can sell that compliment what you're raising. You might be able to have 30% or something of things that didn't come from your farm.

(#0215) Bob Sund: What do you think is restrictive about that? I don't follow you.

(#0217) Terri Jeffreys: There's a move from farmers state wide and organizations to try to help make the small gentleman farmer agricultural areas more economically viable.

(#0225) Bob Fink: It was actually an amendment this year in the statute regarding agricultural activities. I

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

agree with the concept.

(#0244) Steve Clayton: Under Accessory uses we have Home Occupations. Would that fit for the farmer who wants to sell produce on his LTA property?

(#0252) Bob Fink: It would but it would probably require a Special Use Permit because to qualify as a home occupation one of the standards is you don't have parking and that your structures are essentially residential in nature. You can vary from those standards and have parking places for your customers if you go through a Special Use Process.

(#0275) Steve Clayton: So Terri's concept is under the Accessory Use? Could we put some verbiage in there to allow ag product retail sales? Or do you want to limit it to products produced on the property?

(#0288) Bob Fink: It's very difficult to regulate something like that. You would have to do an audit of what they were selling.

(#0298) Allan Borden: What about under the Allowed Uses? Under Horticultural nurseries, whole sale and retail; why couldn't you put ag crops and orchards and small scale retail?

(#0310) Steve Clayton: The LTA district is to do farming. Maybe we should put it under the Accessory Uses and that focuses down the line that eventually that parcel doesn't just become a retail parcel for farm products. It's primary use is to grow them and under Accessory Uses you have an accessory use to sell them.

(#0328) Bill Dewey: That's a good point, Steve.

(#0330) Allan Borden: You could put in small scale retail associated with allowed use.

(#0335) Terri Jeffreys: I like that language. I do want to have some discussion about the pedestrian access and amenities requirements. It's intention is to make it a pedestrian friendly community and it says on page 33 under G) what is required for all new development. To me it seems like a lot of requirement in all the districts. I'm just wondering if this needs to be zeroed in on areas where we really intend a lot of that pedestrian to happen, like multi-use and festival districts. Would that change what the plans intentions were if we were to limit these requirements to the very specific pedestrian oriented areas?

(#0415) Bob Fink: There's not just the pedestrian oriented area but there's also the network of trails and pedestrian connections with either the neighbors or the bus stops or the roads so you're supposed to provide internal circulation within your parking lot, for instance, so you have to provide pedestrian access so people can walk from their car or neighboring business or from the street to your business. That's all kind of included in this. There's guidelines rather than requirements for most of these standards. The significant exception to that is probably for developments greater than 30,000 sf.

(#0455) Terri Jeffreys: Which we have now determined are allowed in this General Commercial, correct?

(#0460) Bob Fink: That's correct and they were never intended to be not allowed. It says '30,000 sf of gross commercial are required to provide pedestrian oriented space at a ratio of 100 sf for every 10,000 sf of gross floor area'. Smaller developments are encouraged to do that but the larger developments are required to do that. Then the remainder of this section talks about what pedestrian oriented space is and there are certain minimum things you must provide to be pedestrian oriented space. Then there are other activities that are encouraged and then there are certain things that are not allowed for the pedestrian oriented space. That's how that's structured. This is intended to encourage people to consider the pedestrian when they lay out their site plan and they're encouraged to provide pedestrian oriented space like a sitting area and other pedestrian oriented amenities and then if they're large enough they have to provide at least the minimum of pedestrian oriented amenities. That's the intent of this section.

(#0510) Terri Jeffreys: So a 30,000 sf warehouse in an industrial is required to have a pedestrian oriented amenities?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#0518) Steve Clayton: It doesn't say for industrial.

(#0520) Terri Jeffreys: But it doesn't limit the districts; it just says if you have 30,000 sf of gross floor area...

(#0525) Steve Clayton: My interpretation of commercial doesn't include industrial.

(#0527) Bob Fink: That's right. There is an exception if you look under standards on page 30 under 17.25.020 it specifically says that the Director of Community Development may waive one or more of these standards where the applicant can demonstrate that such pedestrian access and/or amenities are not applicable or desirable due to the nature of the use (industrial or mini-storage) and/or incompatible with adjacent properties'. So these standards can be waived. Some industrial properties may benefit from these standards. Some may have visitors, if they're in an area where they have pedestrian traffic they even have to provide stormwater management and they use the ponds to provide a nice little park area. These can be nice amenities to attract tenants because they can take advantage of that amenity.

(#0578) Terri Jeffreys: We still need to figure out where we're going to put car lots, car washes, gas stations, towing services, marine repair and real estate offices. I also have a comment regarding in the plan on page 30 under Alternative North-South Route. It says 'Due to the community's concerns for downtown Belfair, at no time should the construction of this route be moved in front of Action T-1'. I don't know how that fits here.

(#0618) Bill Dewey: So what you're saying is that the public testimony we've gotten calls that into question?

(#0622) Terri Jeffreys: Yes. And I don't really know how this looks. Does it all go verbatim into the county plan? So by adopting this plan it means we're adopting it verbatim. Do we go in and strike out certain things in here? I just don't know that that's appropriate to be in here given the public record. That's all I have.

(#0645) Mark Drain: I didn't pick up exactly when you were discussing newly accepted development that might not quite fit between the R5 and the R10. Specifically, what kind of zoning would you want?

(#0650) Terri Jeffreys: I think R10 works fine for that because generally those types of developments as they're being done other places in the Puget Sound area are around 9 to 12 per acre and you're talking about 1200 sf homes with shared front yards but they're detached and it serves a certain market need. Whether that need exists here now I don't know because that kind of market research hasn't been done.

(#0668) Steve Clayton: But we need the property available to do it.

(#0670) Terri Jeffreys: But you need the zoning available to do it.

(#0682) Mark Drain: I don't have any big concerns. I'm ready to get on with it.

(#0685) Bill Dewey: Okay.

(#0690) Bob Sund: I don't see any major conflicts within the plan itself. I think there's maybe some clean up things that should be done that Steve brought up. I guess my concern revolves around the major issue of the transportation component. I have a concern that you have two very vocal groups that are somewhat in opposition to each other and I've had some experience on the state level with the state legislative committee that I was on with a pretty large group that had sub groups within that group and when that group would go to the state for funding, for instance, unless they were unified they weren't listened to. They just pushed it aside. One of the lobbyist that we had said as a group you've got to make sure that you're all on the same page so my recommendation to the Belfair group is that they figure out a way they can put these two components together. There may be some give and take there but they need to be unified and they may even propose, and it has been proposed, that these projects go on concurrently and I would strongly recommend that those factions get together and figure out some kind of concurrent movement. I think both projects have their strong points to stand alone but I think that, as a front, if they can move concurrently and simultaneously as a group they're going to get further in the long run.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#0777) Mark Drain: I agree with everything you said. There's a lot better chance for them getting either one or both accomplished if they can be on the same page.

(#0785) Steve Clayton: Along those lines I think the county has hired this Perteet group and I think that's their scope of work to figure out how much it's going to cost and that will give both groups something to work with.

(#0795) Mark Drain: They're complicated and there's a lot of issues with each one and one of them might be the state of the waters in the canal that might press one in front of the other. Funding for either one of them has got to be a big issue. There's a lot of things that have to fall in place for them to happen and maybe one will happen at one time and it will be some time before the other one happens but I do think they're both very important.

(#0815) Bob Sund: We had some pretty strong testimony that indicated that a simultaneous effort would be beneficial.

(#0820) Bill Dewey: Did we hear simultaneous or did we hear one ahead of the other?

(#0822) Mark Drain: I heard one ahead of the other and there were good reasons for that.

(#0825) Bob Sund: Pat McCullough, the engineer, wrote an extensive letter and also testified here and he was one that was recommending a simultaneous movement.

(#0832) Bob Fink: Right, and I think there was one other person who suggested both.

(#0835) Bill Dewey: I thought I heard Pat saying that SR3 improvements first and then the bypass but they both definitely needed to happen.

(#0850) Steve Clayton: That was my impression, too, that he thought the SR3 project is more practical to be funded.

(#0855) Bob Sund: I think the funding part is outside of those two groups and if you make a push to the state they're going to make the ultimate decision. They may say they'll do this or that or we'll finish this but we'll go ahead with the planning on this and that's where your simultaneous movement comes in. The actual funding may come down a little bit differently and he's recommending if it does that the waters of Hood Canal be protected to the utmost.

(#0885) Bill Dewey: Anything else, Bob, besides the transportation issue?

(#0888) Bob Sund: No, I can live with most everything else.

(#0900) Mark Drain: So we would agree with the way this is written that T-6 would not be placed on front of T-1?

(#0902) Bill Dewey: Terri's saying the public comment maybe doesn't support that any longer and Bob is saying he's wondering about it, too.

(#0905) Mark Drain: I'm just wondering if we need to make a broader statement and not be that specific and say that we support both actions when they happen and someone else can determine that.

(#0915) Terri Jeffreys: Funding is part of what Perteet is looking into so I just feel like in a way the jury is still out.

(#0920) Bill Dewey: We could just qualify that we've heard a lot of conflicting testimony on this that calls the timing into question that's recommended in the plan ...

(#0930) Bob Fink: What Pat said was 'the planning and the design of the Belfair Bypass should proceed concurrently with planning and design of Route 3. Construction of the Belfair Bypass on the Overtons

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

property should begin as soon as possible after or concurrently with the construction of SR3. However, based on my experience as consultant working in other communities on transportation infrastructure financing it would be very unusual for Mason County to pay for all or even the majority of the cost of the facility as currently planned'. So he said concurrently or as soon as possible. The recommendation of the Belfair sub-committee was that the bypass would follow as soon as possible after the Route 3 improvements were done.

(#0992) Steve Clayton: To address Terri's comment on page 30, 'Due to the community's concerns for downtown Belfair, at no time', etc., perhaps we should change that wording to reflect that 'the Belfair Sub-Area planning group came to an agreement that, etc'.

(#1015) Terri Jeffreys: I'd say strike it altogether. I think the T-1 through T-6 speaks for itself as far as what the recommendations of the group were.

(#1040) Bob Fink: That's something that wasn't updated. The recommendation of the sub-area group, as I remember it, is reflected in the notes on page 30, 'Notes on the Timing of T-1 and T-6 Improvements'. It says 'the alternative north/south route timing should be moved up to start construction within three to five years of the completion of SR3 (T-1) or sooner if warranted'. T-6 on Table 2 under Summary of Recommendations, were unmodified from what the transportation consultant had recommended, which is ten to fifteen years or when warranted. So the recommendation of the sub-area group, if this table is not simply what's in the transportation study is, that probably needs to be changed to reflect the timeline that the sub-area group discussed.

(#1080) Terri Jeffreys: So change that ten to fifteen years to three to five years.

(#1085) Steve Clayton: Or immediately after T-1.

(#1088) Bob Fink: I should go back and look at that language but I know I'm pretty close. There's clearly a conflict between the text and the table.

(#1100) Terri Jeffreys: In the next paragraph seems to explain the conflict.

(#1120) Bill Dewey: Steve, is it conflict with the two paragraphs? Or are you talking about the table to the paragraphs?

(#1128) Steve Clayton: The table to the paragraph.

(#1130) Bob Fink: The completion of SR3, although Steve said five years, I think they're looking at a shorter timeline than that; as short as three to four years to begin construction. Maybe the last effort won't be done for five years. So if you assume it were five years and you add three years to that you're at eight years so that's shaving two years off the construction start date.

(#1150) Terri Jeffreys: That's based on that meeting that they just had up there or what you've been hearing as a result of your position?

(#1156) Bob Fink: That's my understanding. They haven't actually developed the detailed timeline. That's within the scope of what Perteet will be addressing so all that is pending their investigation and if you aren't aware, in addition to reviewing existing information they're out collecting information in right-of-ways, trying to figure out lands where new right-of-ways might be required, where buildings are located. That's just for the SR3 improvements; they aren't looking at the alternative route.

(#1180) Terri Jeffreys: Aren't they also addressing another alternative for where they can locate the sewer lines?

(#1186) Bob Fink: They'll look at various alternatives for locating sewer lines. When they say SR3 improvements actually the transportation improvements are a small part of the project. Although the numbers aren't precise the estimates I understand are about three million dollars in transportation improvements. The project is much bigger than that and the sewer is the largest part of it and then stormwater is probably just a little bit less than the transportation. Those were the estimates in the open letter that the BOCC released.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#1245) Steve Clayton: Looking through the committee meeting minutes from 10/21/03 it's been moved and seconded that we had a discussion that we changed the table from ten to fifteen years for the bypass to three to five years and that motion failed, 11-6. So the group agreed the final chart is the one that shows with the ten to fifteen years.

(#1268) Bob Fink: I thought there was an amendment proposed.

(#1270) Steve Clayton: According to the minutes here it did not pass.

(#1275) Bob Fink: I thought they passed an amendment on the timing of the bypass that shortened it from that ten to five years.

(#1296) Bob Sund: That issue, since October 21st, has really turned into a very divisive thing for the community, as I see it. Back in October I don't think there was near as many people involved but there's really a split occurring in the community and I'm concerned about that. I think they're going to be a lot further ahead if they can coordinate their efforts and figure out some way they can come together.

(#1233) Steve Clayton: A lot of people came together in a group and were pretty well informed. As an example, Mr. Petersen was one of the original people who wanted the bypass and now he's changed 180%. The group overwhelmingly supported doing the corridor first and that perhaps is based on gaining information through the process. A number of people who have concerns now weren't part of the group and there are some that were. There's also a lot of information out there that's not accurate. The key item is that 42% of the traffic will use the bypass. That number has been in the newspaper, it's in the report but the fine print there of 42% of the traffic that doesn't turn off on the other roads will use the bypass and that whittles it down to maybe 10 or 15% of the traffic might use the bypass but that's not what some of the promoters of build a bypass first ... they want to see less traffic downtown. If it would take 40 or 50% off then I think a lot more people that were on the planning committee would agree with it. The impression I have is that the people who actually studied and sat through and did the figures realized that.

(#1382) Terri Jeffreys: So where are the correct figures if they aren't to be gotten from Heffron? You said they're from the original connector 101 study? So you're saying that the old connector 101 numbers are the ones that should have been drawn from to determine what the traffic impact would be?

(#1395) Steve Clayton: If you read Heffron's report it says that 42% of the traffic that does not turn on 300 or Highway 106 are estimated to use the bypass. However, the chart shows 42% of the entire traffic count. You have to look at Heffron's numbers. It says 42% that don't turn off the road ... but what they did was gather all the numbers for the 42%.

(#1450) Mark Drain: We can get all wrapped up in this issue and I just think that the state has the numbers and those statistics and the road will be upgraded when it sees fit to do it.

(#1490) Bob Sund: Did they do a survey here of cars that were ...

(#1500) Steve Clayton: Anywhere along here you can put a counter and count how many cars are there. If you put a counter here and it includes all these people that are going this way and all these people that are going this way but they aren't ever going to use the bypass because to get to the bypass you've got to run up the hill and double back. So the question is, how many people come in this side of town and go out this side of town? There's only one quantitative report that I've been able to come across. There's a lot of estimates but only one report that actually did the number and for the 101 corridor Public Works hired somebody to record license plates here and he sat and recorded all the license plates here and they ran it through motor vehicles and basically it came out that 15% of the cars that come through that point came or went to this area. The other 85% all went down 106 or 300 or were local customers. So 85% of the traffic is not going to use the bypass. That sends people up the wall that say we want to fix downtown and the way to do it is to do the bypass and if you do a quantitative study it would be nice if Heffron or some other agency would update it to a real quantitative study and find out how many people come in this side of town and go out this side of town and would use it.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#1555) Bob Sund: You'd almost have to do a survey, wouldn't you?

(#1565) Steve Clayton: The license plate study was a good idea. They literally recorded the license plate and ran it through DMV and found out that some people live in Shelton, some live in Oregon, some live in Belfair so you wouldn't be using it. Another concept that some of us has kicked around is sit with a video recorder at each end of town and actually record cars going in and do some sample studies and see how many people come in one side and go out the other side. If you read through the WSDOT report from 1992 or 1993 on enhancing the corridor and in that report they recommended doing both the bypass and enhance Highway 3 and to do Highway 3 first. In that report they estimated that 80% of the traffic would use the bypass but then you read it again and it said that 80% of the morning commute hour out of Allyn would use the bypass. If you get 100 cars out of Allyn and you get 1000 cars out of 106 it works to be roughly 25% of the morning commute hour. That's kind of leading things that a lot of the community keys in on.

(#1650) Bob Fink: If I could return for a moment to the numbers. The county hasn't made an estimate but we do have an estimate that was prepared by the Engineering Services Association under the auspices of the Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group and they totaled the State Route 3 improvements of eighteen million, one hundred and forty eight thousand and change ... that's comprised of the SR3 widening of three million, two hundred and sixty six thousand and change, the sanitary sewer at twelve million, plus, the storm and water and sewer at one hundred ninety eight thousand dollars, plus, and the trail system at three hundred and eighty two thousand dollars and then there's also the Belfair creek restoration at five hundred thousand dollars so that's their total. The county did hire Gray and Osborne to do an estimate for the sewer portion only and their estimate with the initial phase was twelve million, nine hundred and fifteen thousand, six hundred and thirty seven, which is basically about a million different from the estimate that ESA did. Those are the numbers that are there; they're preliminary and we'll be working on better numbers over the rest of the year.

(#1720) Bill Dewey: So how would you guys like to proceed on this?

(#1725) Steve Clayton: Did you have any other concerns?

(#1728) Bill Dewey: Nothing specific. I guess the general comments I would have is that I think it's important to go forward and recommend something to the BOCC. We need both zoning and DR's because I think with Allyn we'll see worse environmental degradation on the Hood Canal out in that area. I'm concerned about lack of detail on stormwater. I think we need some information from Public Works about what is being done with stormwater both in the county and specific to Belfair. I still share a thought that at least in the CARA that we be looking at low impact development regulations in those areas. I also think we need to address the signage issue and the transportation issue. I had a question on concurrency and I'm just trying to understand ... cart and horse here ... what has to come first under GMA and it sounds like for sewerage there had to be some pretty specific planning done and when it's going to happen. Is there similar planning for other types of infrastructure? Some of the things I haven't seen addressed in the public comments are as far as sheriff and other services if it's going to put demands on the county. Those burdens fall on the rest of the taxpayers of the county instead of the UGA, I assume, because it's not unincorporated. I haven't seen how the schools, libraries, and the like about whether that's being planned for and whether that's required to under GMA.

(#1865) Darren Nienaber: For the purposes of adopting this plan I don't think you have to do everything under the sun all at once. You'll never get done, I think. There is a cart before the horse problem because you're absolutely right. The zoning comes first and then all your urban service planning comes after that. You don't know how big the pipe is going to be for sewer until you know what kind of zoning is going to be allowed. You don't know what kind of police services are going to be needed, library services, ambulance services; you can name any service and you don't know what's going to be needed for that area until you adopt some zoning. Counties and cities are allowed to phase their development of their Comp Plans but the zoning comes first.

(#1945) Bill Dewey: I can't help reflecting on this process and all the reading and all the material and all the work that's gone into this. I'm just a lay person totally unequipped to provide very good advise on this so I really have to rely on the planning professionals and the people that have put 2 ½ years of their time to really learn the issues. I just feel it would be really unfair, based on my lack of knowledge and lack of experience, to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

recommend any major changes to it. I'm fascinated to learn about it; I'm fascinated to learn everything that's gone into it and peoples commitment and dedication to it has been great and to see Mason County being this responsible about growth and Belfair in particular is good stuff and it needs to happen.

(#1975) Terri Jeffreys: I'm a little bit sad that so much of what's contained in here did not get the public comment it deserved because of the over shadowing of the transportation element and I kind of wish we could take it section by section and map zoning and DR's.

(#2010) Bob Fink: They're all pieces of a whole. To a large part your projections for population and zoning and how you accommodate the population and the critical land use decisions that shape other investments and improvements. The county has allocated a population projection of high, medium and low for how many people will move to the county but it's up to the county to allocate that population to the urban areas. The allocation being a combination of the projection and a target so one of the goals of the GMA is to encourage people to go to the urban area. That's the target aspect; how do you make it a desirable place for people to go to. One of the ways is providing amenities and another way is to provide necessary services. As we discussed earlier, to design those services you need zoning to tell you where people are going to go and how intense the use of the land is. The water system is another thing that will benefit by having zoning established. The water system plan is very general in the sense of addressing of future development because they don't know what the zoning is. In Belfair, the county doesn't provide the water; water is provided principally by the Belfair Water District #1 as well as a number of smaller systems and individual wells. The Belfair Water District is the major provider and in their discussion of future provision they talk about many of the smaller systems already are struggling to meet the regulatory and financing requirements of maintaining their operation so it's quite possible that at some point they will merge. There's been a number of changes to the water law recently that will probably encourage that kind of activity. The county doesn't plan water; the water district plans water but the water district needs the county to make it's decisions so they can do their planning. The school district has to serve people whether they're in the urban or rural area so they're not necessarily heavily impacted by whether people are in rural or urban areas or whether they live in apartments or single family housing. They're affected perhaps by the transportation costs but most of their other expenses are related simply to the number of children they have to educate which is not something the county is controlling. You asked about concurrency ... the only concurrency that's required in the GMA is specifically transportation. Transportation requires you to establish a level of service. In the urban area the level of service is D) on state routes. Actually concurrency doesn't apply to state routes. So it doesn't apply to SR3; it would only apply to the county roads. There's a recent change in statute there, too, that says that DOT at least has to establish levels of service standards. Two other requirements of GMA as far as building permits is to have potable water and septic provisions at place in time of issuing the building permit. So concurrency doesn't take you very far unless you decide you want to adopt additional concurrency standards. That's a general framework in response to your general question.

(#2230) Bill Dewey: That's very helpful for me to have a broader understanding of the cart and the horse.

(#2238) Steve Clayton: A comment was raised about whether this plan can be implemented being that we currently have a plan in Belfair and you can only update your Comp Plan once a year.

(#2255) Bob Fink: There was a statement made that I heard that the county has already done its annual amendment for this year and as far as a Comp Plan amendment we can't identify any amendment to the Comp Plan since March of 2003. So whether you go by calendar year or a year since your last action the county has not, to my knowledge, amended the Comp Plan for more than a year. That's doesn't seem to be a valid complaint.

(#2295) Darren Nienaber: Was that last amendment a response to a remand?

(#2298) Bob Fink: That's correct. It's quite possible the last amendment wouldn't even count because it was in response to the remand of the GMHB and that's an exception to the once a year amendment. You can also amend your Comp Plan to update your capital facilities element on a more than once a year basis. There's another exception which allows you to adopt a new sub-area plan outside of the once a year amendment.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#2340) Steve Clayton: The contention was that this wasn't new.

(#2342) Bob Fink: I think that would be a hard argument for the county to make because we previously adopted a sub-area plan by reference and incorporated the initial 1996 plan into the Comp Plan and we adopted the 1999 plan by reference into the Comp Plan. So I don't think this is a new adoption of the sub-area plan but this is certainly a major amendment of one. What we would want to consider is if we amend the Comp Plan to address open space as has been requested by the Overtons we would have to adopt this plan at the same time concurrently to avoid that issue of a once a year action.

(#2395) Steve Clayton: If the BOCC adopts the interim Allyn plan that doesn't count?

(#2400) Bob Fink: I don't think you adopt plan amendments on an interim basis. It's only regulations that you adopt on an interim basis and that's an exception and not covered under the once a year adoption requirement.

(#2440) Bill Dewey: So what do you want to try to tackle? Steve and Terri had fairly specific recommendations.

(#2455) Bob Fink: I did bring in the open space map to address the questions that came out earlier so you can complete that discussion. This is the actual future land use map and it shows open space designated in Mason County and all this green is actually designated as open space as well as these corridors.

(#2475) Mark Drain: It falls under open space tax classification?

(#2480) Bob Fink: No. It has nothing to do directly with open space tax classification. What we're talking about is designating open space which has multiple uses. One use is growing timber, another use is recreation, another use is environmental benefit and it could be any combination of those uses as well. So open space is basically land that is not to be developed or is developed for recreational purposes. It includes ARL, it includes steep slopes, and that would be a basis for doing planning to see if you wanted to establish a route through here. Why it wasn't necessarily acceptable to the GMHB on a stand alone basis is because the steep slopes don't necessarily create corridors. In the case of Belfair it actually is a complete corridor just because of the topography in that one location. Also, it was never my understanding that the right-of-ways of the major utilities were not intended to be designated as open space within the UGA.

(#2650) Steve Clayton: Did we get a chance to coordinate with Kitsap County for next week and find out ...

(#2655) Bob Fink: My understanding from the last I heard is that Kitsap County hasn't actually designated this area as urban area that they're studying in the south part of the county. But to answer your question I don't know of any specific coordination on open space if they should designate it as urban area who would be responsible for providing the open space and what form it would take. As far as I know that hasn't been discussed.

(#2690) Bob Sund: Bill, are you looking for us to adopt this plan or not adopt it tonight?

(#2698) Bill Dewey: I'm looking for recommendations and I'm trying to get a sense of where we're at. I'm hearing some specific changes that we need to make.

(#2705) Terri Jeffreys: I wonder if we should start with the zoning itself and then move on to the specific DR changes.

(#2718) Bob Fink: So maybe we should start with the plan and ask if there was anything in the plan that needed to be changed except for the transportation element.

(#2732) Terri Jeffreys: The plan just gets inserted into the county plan?

(#2745) Bob Fink: It can be an appendix. The older version was incorporated by reference so this could be incorporated by reference as an appendix as part of the Comp Plan.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#2766) Terri Jeffreys: I did not hear any staff recommendation or analysis of how this fit in with the county wide planning policies.

(#2780) Bob Fink: The county wide planning policies are mostly fairly general. They do call for using a market factor and sizing the urban areas and sizing them appropriately or generously for allowing future development. They provide for transportation, utilities; there would be no inconsistency between the two. I don't have a written review but they are consistent with the one exception. I had mentioned the sizing of the UGA's. The county wide planning policy has a provision that says 50% market factor and that was an issue that went before the GMHB and they would not accept more than 25% so that's the market factor that was used in the analysis.

(#2865) Darren Nienaber: What was the planning department recommending in so far as the treatment of the previous Belfair plan? Are you recommending straight deletion or are you recommending concurrent adoption? Are you recommending adoption of the new plan and any conflicting provision in the old plan was superceded?

(#2888) Bob Fink: I think the last.

(#2890) Darren Nienaber: I think that's been implied and that's been part of the general topic of discussion but I think it's important to clarify that.

(#2894) Bob Fink: Right. If you look at the previous plans they're basically elaborations of one of the other and as they get into more detail I think the theme has been carried through and they're generally consistent but there may be certain things that simply have changed through the process. That's something we haven't really done is a complete review of exactly what is needed. One of the things that's on your agenda for the next meeting is to look at the county's DR's and to see how the DR's and the new zoning code will fit into the county's existing code and what changes are needed to the DR's to accommodate the changes. We have to change the language that says how we regulate the Belfair UGA because we're adopting a coherent zoning code that will be in a separate place.

(#2970) Bob Sund: Bill, I think we need to move ahead and I feel that I don't have any qualms with ... in fact, almost of all of the testimony and the letters that were written said to accept the plan. Other than a few little minor changes here and there, I make a motion that we go ahead and accept this plan. It was done by the Belfair people and it's not in concrete forever. As they work with it they may find that there may be some changes they want to do and they can come back. I say we basically accept the plan and move it forward.

(#3015) Bill Dewey: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

(#3018) Mark Drain: I'll second the motion. Speaking of the plan itself and then we will do the DR's separately.

(#3030) Steve Clayton: It lists zoning maps and different segments inside so those would be adjusted based on whatever adjustments we do to the zoning maps.

(#3045) Bill Dewey: Let's be clear on that because I have a question about that. In passing his motion are we adopting the zoning maps that were presented?

(#3055) Steve Clayton: It's included in here so if you would make that amendment or make a friendly amendment that and under separate cover we will approve the zoning map and under separate cover we'll approve the transportation technical report and ...

(#3078) Terri Jeffreys: And I'd like to amend the transportation recommendation section.

(#3088) Bill Dewey: You're saying that within the plan itself you'd like to amend that statement ...

(#3098) Mark Drain: Let's bring those little issues up now then.

(#3100) Bob Sund: I guess I don't want to really approve the transportation plan. Is that part of the basic

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

plan? I want to address the transportation plan under a separate motion.

(#3120) Mark Drain: Let's table that motion and open it up for discussion.

(#3125) Bob Sund: So it's the basic plan except for the transportation.

(#3125) Terri Jeffreys: I suggest we start with the zoning maps and then move from there.

(#3134) Mark Drain: I'm willing to accept the one proposed by the county.

(#3145) Bill Dewey: We have Bob's motion on the floor for the plan and it was seconded. Let's have a discussion on that motion. There was a suggestion that we take the transportation technical report and address that separately.

(#3166) Steve Clayton: And also look at the zoning map separately and look at the transportation component separately.

(#3178) Bill Dewey: The transportation component is actually in the plan. So essentially we're going to say we're going to adopt the plan except for those three exceptions. Otherwise the rest of the plan we're saying we're comfortable with. So what we're thinking about doing here under discussion on the motion that's on the floor to adopt the plan is to offer friendly amendments to that that suggests that we would adopt the plan less the transportation technical report, less the zoning maps, and less the transportation recommendation starting on page 28 of the plan. We'll come back to each of those areas separately. So the rest of it we're adopting and those three areas we'll take up under separate motions.

(#3250) PAC: Okay.

(#3252) Bill Dewey: So that's the motion that's on the floor. Do you accept those as friendly amendment, Bob?

(#3255) Bob Sund: Yes.

(#3258) Bill Dewey: Any further discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. So let's take up the maps to start with. Mark, you were saying the county map, in the second set, you're supportive of. I'm with you on that with the exception of the R10 west of the Festival Retail that's in the CARA. Bob, you talked about that that we got some comments that maybe that might be better to move that particular R10 elsewhere?

(#3300) Bob Fink: The comments were not necessarily in the context of reducing the total R10 but in context of this not being the appropriate site for that intensive of use. There's a current use right here so it's all single family residential in fairly large parcels except for a vacant lot.

(#3380) Steve Clayton: Part of the comments that came from the group was that unfortunately it is on the CARA but all of downtown is and if we put high density residential next to the Festival Retail you can get people out of their cars and get people walking and if it's sewerred then you won't have the impacts there.

(#3400) Miscellaneous discussion of zoning maps.

(#3690) Steve Clayton: So Bill's concern about taking the R10 out these are also currently R10 so it would be difficult to address just that without addressing some of the rest. It looks like the intent here, with a side street coming off, it has access and it's not retail whereas the other purples are mixed use that allows retail and other such uses.

(#3725) Bill Dewey: It fits well with the Festival Retail.

(#3730) Steve Clayton: My understanding is that you build your density around your downtown core and the higher density towards the General Commercial. Also, you're going to put utilities in your denser areas.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#3760) Bob Fink: The actual number of units that you can have here is substantially reduced by the amount of wetlands on the site because you don't get credit for the wetlands in the R10.

(#0120) Bob Sund: So what we're concerned about is that this area is designated R10 and that we may have to eliminate part of it because of the wetlands?

(#0124) Bob Fink: If these are wetlands then they won't be building on them and they won't get density credit because of them.

(#0128) Bob Sund: So are you saying that in order to come up with the projections that we have to transfer some ...

(#0134) Bill Dewey: I raised the issue originally, Bob, because I was concerned about water quality impacts because that's on the CARA and it's within a quarter of a mile from Hood Canal that's already got problems.

(#0140) Bob Sund: If the sewer is there then is there a water quality problem?

(#0145) Bill Dewey: I say yes unless we put low impact development there. If you're going to stack them up ten houses per acre in there and you start adding a dog and a couple of cats to every house ... I've seen some studies on urban pet waste contribution that phenomenal. It's the main source of fecal contaminate in the watershed. Sewering isn't the only issue. Sea Grant is putting a program on right now to try to educate people on that.

(#0195) Bob Fink: This other area that was looked at for removal is also very close to the core of the town and on the information available it's significantly less restrictive. That may mean that there's not an equal balance if you shift them. That kind of analysis would be run if you wanted to recommend that.

(#0222) Terri Jeffreys: What would you recommend changing the zoning to?

(#0225) Bill Dewey: Maybe R3

(#0248) Terri Jeffreys: If we were to transfer it someplace else I would agree with you. It's just sad to lose that proximity to the core.

(#0258) Bill Dewey: As I read that plan and they say the vision is the natural wonder of the Theler Center, Hood Canal and all these things are so proud of for Belfair and yet I don't feel like they're putting adequate protections in there to make sure they're going to continue to have that. I don't even feel like I should offer that as a suggestion after people have worked as hard as they have and people are local and live there ... I don't feel right offering a radical change to the plan. Maybe I come at it from a little different perspective as a shellfish grower with the potential impacts.

(#0296) Mark Drain: I have some sympathy with Bill. Look what timber companies have given up along side of creeks to try to protect them. It's amazing to me that the Festival area would be situated where it is but if you can do it ... if that was out in the woods somewhere you wouldn't get within 200 feet of the water.

(#0300) Darren Nienaber: It's the same stream buffers as the rural stream buffers.

(#0340) Steve Clayton: This was the county preferred with lower density and that's the original which appears to be pretty high on projection.

(#0400) Mark Drain: So the way to juggle it might be if you wanted to go R5 here and maybe give a little more R10 back here.

(#0420) Bob Sund: Maybe this Festival area may be more appropriate since a good share of this is wetlands.

(#0450) Miscellaneous discussion.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#0600) Bill Dewey: So what do we want to do on the maps? Are we close to a recommendation?

(#0615) Steve Clayton: As a thought we have two people who are not here tonight and the more we finish tonight the more we don't have to bring two other people up to speed. We also have two seats that are potentially going to change over at the end of the month so the more that we do the less we'll have to bring people up to speed.

(#0630) Bob Fink: Yes, it would be best if you finished this month and you have one more meeting scheduled. I had hoped you'd finish tonight but we still have one more meeting. There aren't a lot of comments on the zoning as I remember them. The alternative was laid out for you which is not necessarily all that different. We tried to follow the purposes of the districts in selecting which areas were removed. You have other things that are also close to your commercial areas and so that's a matter of choice of which ones would also meet the purposes of the district. The question is do you want to reduce the overall capacity of the UGA by reducing density and reduce density by reducing the amount of R10? Or do you want to not recommend that alternative? The next question is if you do want to reduce R10 somewhere then do you want to go with the alternative or do you want to tweak the boundary some?

(#0685) Mark Drain: In this Mixed Use do you have specific uses for those areas or when that is sewerred about anything can happen there?

(#0690) Bob Fink: A broad range of things can happen there. If you look at the standards the zoning says the kinds of things that are allowed and it's pretty inclusive but I think there are a few exceptions that might have been missed or intentionally left out.

(#0700) Terri Jeffreys: Bulk is where the restrictions are on the Mixed Use?

(#0702) Bob Fink: Yes.

(#0704) Mark Drain: Can you put apartment complexes there?

(#0706) Bob Fink: Yes.

(#0708) Mark Drain: With the sewer what kind of density could that be? It could be significant.

(#0712) Bob Fink: You've got physical constraints that contribute to limitations and stormwater requirements, open space requirements.

(#0725) Terri Jeffreys: R3 does allow special uses like multi-family dwellings. If we were to switch that to an R3 they'd still have the ability to do multi-family with special permitting and special requirements but they could still do the high density.

(#0750) Mark Drain: I'm willing to go with this map but if Bill thinks something different ... Terri has an idea ...

(#0755) Terri Jeffreys: I'm just saying that the R3 does require a special use with some higher density with more protection.

(#0762) Bob Fink: You'd have fewer units in the same area. For the same land area that you got credit for you'd get fewer units so you could build multi-family but you'd have fewer units which would be even a smaller footprint than having the same number of units as single family.

(#0775) Steve Clayton: So on a ten acre piece you'd have 30 people instead of 100.

(#0780) Bob Fink: It's 2.5 people per residence is the average.

(#0785) Steve Clayton: So it would be 70 people versus 150 people in an R3.

(#0790) Bob Sund: I was just thinking that almost half of this is taken up with wetland and that wetland could

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

be the buffer and it would create stormwater source. All of this area is not going to be R10; it's going to be eliminated ...

(#0812) Bob Fink: You don't get density off of the wetland area.

(#0818) Steve Clayton: Should we make a motion to accept staff's revised map on the zoning?

(#0825) PAC: Sure.

(#0830) Bob Sund: Why did staff eliminate the R10 here?

(#0835) Bob Fink: Essentially because it was more remote. One of the key concepts is to have a density close to the commercial areas and the Festival Retail area. It's simply that this area here and this area here is further away from the center.

(#0850) Bob Sund: Will that reduce the growth area population?

(#0870) Steve Clayton: Yes, he reduced the projection.

(#0880) Bob Fink: The projected buildout under this would be significantly less.

(#0890) Steve Clayton: What about the critical area? If we pulled the critical area out then you could actually add some of this R10 back in. Pull the CARA out and call it urban reserve and then we could go with more density.

(#0905) Bob Fink: As I said to make it meaningful you'd have to remove it from the urban area altogether.

(#0950) Steve Clayton: The thought is if we remove this from the UGA and separately designating it urban reserve so that people know that when the time comes it will be built out.

(#0990) Allan Borden: So that's about a quarter of a mile from the intersection of 300 and Old Belfair Highway?

(#0995) Steve Clayton: Yes, the initial plan, as I understand it, on the sewer plan is the dip in the road is to just go prior to that so that gravity will feed the stuff back into town. If we were to do that then we would delete the LTA.

(#1005) Bob Fink: Then you'd need to establish zoning to that area. If you zone it urban reserve, one house per forty acres ...

(#1015) Steve Clayton: I said one per five.

(#1020) Bob Fink: That's actually not a good density for an urban reserve. It's possible that it might already be divided that way and may already be developed that way but just as a general principal urban reserve should be lower density. In Oregon, the Portland area outside the UGA, development was very constrained by the dividing of the land into these five acre lots that then become residential and then they're not brought into the market for expansion so when you try to expand the UGA you end up leaping that area in your development pattern.

(#1050) Bill Dewey: So you're better off being one to ten?

(#1052) Bob Fink: Right, because that area isn't going to transform anytime soon. So you should go to one to ten, one to twenty or one to forty. You basically are trying to prevent development that would be incompatible or prevent urban conversion in the future.

(#1100) Bill Dewey: So the initial sewer plan takes it out a third of the way into the CARA. If it's zoned at a higher density can that build out happen without sewer going there?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#1115) Bob Fink: It depends on what you mean by development. If you mean subdivision, there is a provision in our existing code that allows for subdivisions to plat a small lot development so it would be small lots ... you couldn't actually sell the lots individually until sewer was provided so what it does is it makes people build on a lot and they know that there's other lots there and so development follows consistently with that pattern.

(#1140) Bill Dewey: So how do you get at the issue of those initial lots built on septic?

(#1145) Bob Fink: They rely on the total acreage of the several lots combined. There's a condition placed on the plat that those lots can't be sold separately so depending on the soils and other conditions or depending on the CARA they would have to have an acre so if you were creating lots that were 5 or 6 lots to an acre that would be an urban density.

(#1195) Terri Jeffreys: What would you call that, then?

(#1200) Bob Fink: Ghost platting.

(#1205) Terri Jeffreys: And that's on record?

(#1205) Bob Fink: Yes. There is no technical term for it. We process mostly short plats that way now where people want to create ... a short plat is limited to 4 lots currently. It may go up to 9; the state law allows it to go up to 9 now in the urban area. We've had a number of 3 or 4 lot short plats that were in the urban area where people just wanted to break off 1 or 2 lots and they might even have large acreage so they kept a larger retainer and they created a couple of small lots that met our standards and they were able to sell some property even though they didn't have sewer. They had to do it in a way consistent with urban growth in the future. We have a maximum lot size in the urban area. In the Shelton area it's one third acre. In order to reach the goals of urban densities people aren't required to build out to the allowed density. In the urban area in order to encourage urban development we set a bottom as well as a top to the density. The bottom is one third acre lot so a third of an acre lot often is large enough for an individual septic under current standards with good soils.

(#1300) Terri Jeffreys: If you were going to put that into urban reserve and put new zoning on it ...

(#1312) Bob Fink: Urban reserve would be the zoning; that's the concept as I understand it. It's basically a rural residential zone but it's very low density. Maybe that means 1 unit every 10 acres or maybe it should be higher because it's basically a holding area.

(#1330) Darren Nienaber: It hasn't really been a part of your SEPA review to make a change in the boundary. It certainly hasn't been advertised or run through the public process. This is a big deviation. If you want to put it for future discussion maybe you would want to put that on your agenda but you're probably 60 days out from fully running a new SEPA.

(#1355) Bob Fink: You'd basically be developing a whole new alternative.

(#1360) Darren Nienaber: Right, and the public would want to know that.

(#1365) Bob Fink: And it's a change from existing conditions in a direction no one expected.

(#1380) Steve Clayton: Okay. Before we move on this do we want to include that ag land that the county currently recognizes? It's not on the zoning map.

(#1390) Terri Jeffreys: CTED's recommendations were to not even talk about ag in a UGA.

(#1392) Bob Fink: You're right. That was CTED's only substantive comment. Although the GMA does allow LTF or LTA in the urban area.

(#1400) Steve Clayton: CTED's comment was to take property out of the UGA and make it LTA. This

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

property is already designated ag so there is no change from that.

(#1440) Darren Nienaber: I think the VanBuskirk proposal is within the scope.

(#1455) Bob Fink: Yes, either in or out. That was explicitly discussed in the SEPA; whether you wanted to remove it from the UGA or not. I don't think on balance that it really would make a big difference. I don't know what benefit it would give him.

(#1480) Mark Drain: I asked him that and he couldn't think of one.

(#1485) Darren Nienaber: I always hate to have these little thorns to go back to the GMHB and they ask if OCD didn't say this? Well, here's our explanation. It's just a little issue they've got stuck on. That's just something to think about. I always like to have a clean case if I can.

(#1500) Mark Drain: You're saying that having that LTA in the UGA muddy's the water for you?

(#1505) Darren Nienaber: Only because of the OCD letter, otherwise, I don't think it's much of a problem.

(#1510) Bob Fink: It's clearly allowed under the statute.

(#1515) Steve Clayton: What about the contention that Terri raised ... there's another piece of ag property the county recognizes within the UGA and the proposal is to identify that also on this map as being part of the Belfair LTA. Do we have a problem with having to advertise that in some manner? Or it's already designated by the county as ag so its okay to put it in Belfair under ag?

(#1545) Darren Nienaber: If you want to do it absolutely right you could advertise and have another hearing. I don't know that it's that important to have it designated as LTA.

(#1564) Steve Clayton: It reduces our population projections.

(#1570) Darren Nienaber: In a small way. I'm not sure that the GMHB would agree with that; they might.

(#1585) Bill Dewey: So what would the PAC like to do about this?

(#1595) Steve Clayton: I make a motion that the parcel in Section 20 that's currently designated as ALT by the county be also designated in the LTA district in the Belfair zoning map.

(#1615) Terri Jeffreys: Are we sure that's the only one because according to this one there's another one out there.

(#1618) Bob Fink: It's outside. It's in Long Term Commercial Forest Land. My belief was that this proposal would change it to an urban district. Under the GMA it's Long Term Commercial Agriculture because it met the criteria and even though it was in the UGA at the time we were under the review of the GMHB and we basically didn't address that issue now. One of the criteria to look at for ag is its need for development and its proximity to urban areas. The way I understood it is if this plan were adopted then that would entail the removal of it from the LTA; that that parcel would no longer be agricultural but it would not be R3.

(#1688) Bill Dewey: You're saying it's forestry right now; it's not ag?

(#1690) Bob Fink: No, it's ag. It passed the criteria for agricultural. That's not necessarily the tax class. It could also be past use. It's within the urban area but it's currently zoned Agricultural Resource Land, which is what we call Agricultural Land of Long Term Commercial Significance.

(#1750) Bill Dewey: Do we have a second on Steve's motion?

(#1775) Terri Jeffreys: CTED said that they'd prefer not to see ag in UGA's and that's going to be a hard one to fight because that's in the record but the truth is, according to Bob, is that they're not prohibited.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#1790) Bob Sund: I'll second Steve's motion.

(#1800) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Do we want to go over the VanBuskirk property now?

(#1825) Terri Jeffreys: I move that we propose to deny the request by the VanBuskirk family be withdrawn from the UGA.

(#1840) Bill Dewey: Do we have a second? No second so the motion dies.

(#1856) Bob Sund: I'll make a motion that we include it in the urban ag area.

(#1864) Steve Clayton: It's already in the ag area.

(#1845) Bob Fink: To clarify, VanBuskirk's property is not designated as agricultural. The adjoining land, the Davis Farm, is designated as ag but this is land that is more recently acquired and is part, according to Ken's testimony, of his operations for the larger farm. That's why he wants it designated as ag and hopefully out of the UGA. The ag district was the response of the sub-area group to his request to not have the development pressure of a higher zoning and he made the request to the Belfair group as well to get out of the UGA but the Belfair group declined to recommend that and instead recommended the ag. That property itself is not designated as LTA but it is adjoining it and it is connected to property that is so designated. The proposal is to not remove it from the UGA but to designate it as ag.

(#1935) Steve Clayton: If we do nothing and approve the map his property is in the LTA zone so Terri's motion was he also would like not only to be LTA but be entirely removed from the UGA. So we're not looking at whether or not he's in an LTA; he basically already is.

(#1955) Mark Drain: And he's comfortable with being designated LTA?

(#1960) Darren Nienaber: No matter what, he just wants to be out of the UGA.

(#1962) Mark Drain: I think it's a nice compromise the way it's on the map now.

(#1966) Bill Dewey: You mean with what the Belfair group came up with?

(#1968) Mark Drain: Right.

(#1972) Bob Sund: I withdraw my motion.

(#1975) Terri Jeffreys: I move we adopt staff's recommended zoning map.

(#1985) Steve Clayton: The latest model dated May 6, 2004?

(#1990) Terri Jeffreys: Yes.

(#1992) Bill Dewey: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

(#1992) Steve Clayton: I second the motion.

(#1995) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. We'll move on to the transportation issue.

(#2050) Terri Jeffreys: I'd like to make a motion that the PAC abstain from making a recommendation on the transportation recommendations.

(#2058) Mark Drain: I second that motion.

(#2060) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any discussion?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#2065) Bill Sund: I would go along with that, too. I'd also like to get something in there that the two groups need to get together to push cooperatively together for the transportation plan.

(#2075) Terri Jeffreys: My discussion has to do with the fact that there's so many other elements in play here.

(#2080) Bob Sund: I don't think we can do it. I'd like to see some togetherness there in Belfair.

(#2085) Mark Drain: They probably will; it's got to get it's own momentum. Those people need to get themselves sorted out and something will happen and it will work out.

(#2100) Steve Clayton: That's an interesting solution; we just won't address the transportation section of the Belfair plan.

(#2105) Terri Jeffreys: I just feel with TIPCAP and all the other bodies that they make the transportation decisions.

(#2110) Darren Nienaber: You've done that before with certain things where you couldn't come to a firm and definite conviction in either way and that you have no recommendation on a certain issue.

(#2118) Bob Sund: Not that this should be in the motion but Bob read the portion of Pat McCullough's testimony that there should be some concurrent planning. There's two things that I think are important that we don't have to take up and indicate that we don't need to get involved in the transportation issue; that those people need to. As a community we should assist the Overtons in planning the use of their land and with the public process. Their property is an incredible resource which will, when developed, change our way of life in Belfair. They need the community as real partners in the planning process to help them succeed. Not only to succeed in controlling the traffic but to succeed in controlling the impact on their and our environment. Pat also says that the development of the industrial complex at the airport and the Overtons property are the two most important issues facing the Belfair community after the preservation of Hood Canal. He also says that to the best of his knowledge the community of North Mason has not made any significant planning input into these two developments. I think those are the two important things that Belfair needs to address now to develop that transportation plan so I go along with Terri's motion that we don't want to address it.

(#2218) Bill Dewey: On discussion before we call for the question I would just like to say I support the motion but I was pretty comfortable with the timing that was proposed after I heard all the different information. I realize there's a lot of controversy but at least my own thought process as I worked through it, it seems logical. Pat's recommendation did sound like a very sound recommendation. From that standpoint I personally feel comfortable that that could potentially be our advice going forward to the BOCC.

(#2245) Terri Jeffreys: Joint planning?

(#2250) Bill Dewey: Joint planning but that SR3 improvements are the priority because to me it seems more logical with the limited dollars to do everything by looking at the costs. You need to protect Hood Canal. That's got to be your highest priority and planning for can be concurrent. Both of them need to be moving forward but if push comes to shove and you've got twenty million dollars to work with, the SR3 sewer and stormwater have to be a priority over that. That's from all the different advice and testimony we heard and that's where I was coming down to.

(#2300) Bob Sund: I can accept that and I can feel that way, too, but I also feel that it's not up to us to decide where the funding is going to come from; that's somebody else's job. I like the terms of simultaneous or concurrent planning because that forces them to get together to do that. If we add with the priority of SR3 and the sewer and Hood Canal then the spirit of cooperation dies.

(#2335) Bill Dewey: There's been a lot of debate on it. I just feel that the BOCC appoints us as a PAC to give them the guidance. We've taken a lot of public testimony; we've done a lot of reading on it. In some respects you're kind of shirking that responsibility by not at least sharing our opinions with them after we've gone through this whole public process and to say to them to figure it out.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#2380) Mark Drain: The widening of SR3 is probably more pressing at the moment but I really appreciate McCullough's more futuristic, broad-minded thinking, when he speaks of the bypass and development of the areas north of Belfair in conjunction with it. I think that's worth a lot of consideration.

(#2405) Terri Jeffreys: I just want to reiterate the fact that to encourage the growth in the UGA's you need to provide access to those highly developable lands. There's enough land there to do the kind of development that comes along.

(#2422) Bill Dewey: I don't think any of us are arguing with that.

(#2424) Terri Jeffreys: So there's that push to make that consideration.

(#2430) Mark Drain: So, do we want to add an amendment; do we want to insert our support or recommendation for the weight and consideration for the bypass and the developments that that might provide to the surrounding area? I'm not necessarily talking about the Overtons ground; just north up by the airport and then south? It's complicated.

(#2488) Bill Dewey: You've got a major decision to be made for the county from a policy standpoint as to how to go forward in Belfair with transportation. The BOCC is wrestling with it. They're getting a lot of input from the Belfair community and they're going to get more. I think we're one piece of that puzzle that can help to focus a decision and we've heard a lot of public input on it.

(#2508) Steve Clayton: There's a lot of material behind the scenes, too, with the negotiation between the Overtons and the county as being one.

(#2525) Bill Dewey: A few of us have referenced Pat McCullough's statement as to how he suggested timing. Is that something we would consider as an alternative? Or do we just want to go with no recommendation?

(#2548) Darren Nienaber: You could say you have no recommendation on the transportation but that you give that you give substantial weight and credibility to the testimony of Pat McCullough.

(#2560) Bob Sund: That sounds good.

(#2562) Mark Drain: I would be in favor of something like that.

(#2574) Bill Dewey: We do have a motion on the floor and a second for making no recommendation on the transportation.

(#2588) Bob Sund: So Terri's motion was that we don't make a recommendation on the transportation component.

(#2592) Mark Drain: How about if we amended that motion to where you wouldn't change anything here but we would add the recommendations of Pat McCullough's testimony.

(#2600) Bob Sund: I think Darren's wording was that we give ... what was it, Darren?

(#2606) Darren Nienaber: That you give substantial deference to his testimony.

(#2610) Steve Clayton: To the testimony, both written and oral.

(#2620) Terri Jeffreys: I like the substantial deference so I'd like to amend my motion. I make a motion to include the language that the PAC recommends the BOCC to give substantial deference to the written and oral testimony of Pat McCullough.

(#2645) Bob Fink: Regarding the transportation element, do you mean only the alternative route the Transportation Recommendation-6 and not the others? I was unclear in your motion whether you intended not to make a recommendation on transportation, period, or not to make a recommendation on Transportation

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

Policies T-6, which is the one that deals with both the bypass and it's timing.

(#2688) Terri Jeffreys: I actually didn't mean all the other ones. I don't know how to say it because T-6 says that it's to develop the alternate route.

(#2710) Mark Drain: Your motion is not to change any of this but to also add giving credence to Pat McCullough's testimony.

(#2730) Darren Nienaber: Your motion, then, the way I read it was that you were making a motion to approve the transportation plan, except that the PAC has no recommendation on the sequencing and that the PAC also moves that the BOCC give substantial deference to the written and oral testimony of Pat McCullough. Is that your motion?

(#2755) Terri Jeffreys: Yes, that's exactly what I meant with the sequencing.

(#2764) Mark Drain: I second that motion.

(#2766) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Next?

(#2800) Terri Jeffreys: I'd like to move that the Development Regulation 17.23.265 be amended. Under B) I'd like to revise it to say 'The minimum landscaped area between SR-3 and a parking, service, or outdoor storage area shall be at least 15 feet' ...

(#2900) Mark Drain: I'll second the motion.

(#2930) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any discussion?

(#2935) Steve Clayton: That's to make it consistent with the other districts that lie along SR-3, correct?

(#2945) Terri Jeffreys: That's right.

(#2948) Bill Dewey: Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#2975) Bob Fink: On the plan the only other issue is the appendix of the transportation element and then you could be finished with the plan.

(#2992) Steve Clayton: On the Transportation Technical Report I had a number of factual errors on it and I'll run those by you. Bob informed me earlier that Public Works is going to review my comments and maybe make a recommendation to the BOCC. If it's acceptable to you I'll show you a rough idea of my problems with it and I would make the motion that we recommend that the BOCC do not approve the Technical Report as presented and let Public Works go back to the BOCC and put a qualifying letter to go with it with the factual errors adjusted. I'm not looking to make changes in the report I'm just looking here to show you that there are some substantial problems with it and if I understand Bob correctly Public Works is going to look over those issues and then present it to the BOCC.

(#3060) Mark Drain: I second that motion.

(#3066) Steve Clayton: Regarding the picture aspects, I've highlighted on the photos some of what Heffron says in the report exists in those places and this is what I photographed. On the first page it says that there's a 3 to 8 foot shoulder and my photo shows only 2.1". So this should extend entirely over the shoulder. The first couple aren't really dramatic but especially on Old Belfair Highway it's described as a 5 foot asphalt shoulder on west. It is for the first quarter mile of a full mile section but it doesn't describe the other side. My concerns are both that it's inaccurate but also when we look to do grant funding down the line or any kind of funding to develop a pedestrian and bicycle oriented community that says it's a 5 foot shoulder and actually it's less than 2 feet and we're going to have trouble.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#3170) Allan Borden: Public Works did have a special project to do that. By the Fire Station back to the center of town ...

(#3180) Steve Clayton: They put a 5 foot on one side of the road. On this other one Heffron shows that there's a number of 3 lanes in this section of the roadway and there is 3 lanes in this section of the roadway, which is about a 3/4 mile of roadway, and the first 100 yards has 3 lanes and the rest is 2 lanes as the photos show. That isn't acceptable. It also shows 3 foot asphalt shoulders on north and sidewalk on south. That's better photographed here. I tried to do predominate patterns with the photos and you can see the lane here is less than 1 foot of shoulder through this section. I tried to do a predominate pattern and it shows less than 2 feet but the report states it's a 3 foot shoulder. You've also got potential of bike tourist companies looking at this report and it says it's a 3 foot shoulder. We get back to these other photos that goes from the UGA out to Belfair State Park. Again, she describes it as a 3 foot asphalt shoulder and we're running under 2 feet. There were sections of this section of road that I couldn't even get on to take pictures.

(#3295) Bob Sund: So it appears that there's gross errors in the report, is that what you're saying?

(#3300) Steve Clayton: Yes, there are gross errors.

(#3304) Bill Dewey: So the recommendations of the report you're supporting?

(#3306) Steve Clayton: Yes.

(#3308) Bill Dewey: It's just the technical errors?

(#3310) Steve Clayton: Yes.

(#3314) Bill Dewey: So your motion, based on your notes, is denying the technical report only, not the transportation summary recommendations that the Belfair group reviewed and approved in the sub-area plan?

(#3325) Steve Clayton: Correct. My motion is that the PAC recommend to the BOCC to not approve the Heffron technical report. We've already approved the Belfair plan which includes their summaries and that's what the community group went through.

(#3365) Bob Sund: So the rationale why we're saying not to accept the report is because of the gross errors that we see in the technical report?

(#3385) Darren Nienaber: Your motion could say you move to disapprove the technical report unless the report is subsequently rehabilitated by Public Works or the author of the report. That way if there's a correction either by the person who wrote the report or by Public Works themselves then that would adequately correct that.

(#3410) Steve Clayton: What if we worded it for Public Works approval because Heffron could come back and make some changes that we didn't approve of but we've already granted approval after that. They could make changes but we wouldn't have an opportunity to look at those changes.

(#3428) Darren Nienaber: Changes that are consistent with your comments.

(#3435) Steve Clayton: If we keep it in house and Public Works makes the recommendations ... I have to put my trust somewhere. That's our department.

(#3444) Bill Dewey: So what's the motion?

(#3450) Steve Clayton: That the PAC recommend to the BOCC to not approve the Heffron transportation report unless the reports are rehabilitated by Public Works.

(#3500) Mark Drain: I'll second that motion.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, July 6, 2004

(#3505) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed?
Motion passes.

Meeting adjourned.