

**MASON COUNTY
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION**

**Minutes
January 23, 2006**

(Note audio tape (#2) dated January 23, 2006
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, Tim Wing, Diane Edgin, Terri Jeffreys, Wendy Ervin, and Steve Clayton. Jay Hupp was excused.

Staff Present: Emmett Dobey, Bob Fink, Steve Goins, Allan Borden, and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the November 7, 2005 and November 14, 2005, November 21, 2005, December 12, 2005 and December 19, 2005 meetings were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

November 7, 2005:

On page 1 under (#0100) it should read: 'When I was traffic engineer' ...

On page 8 under (#2600) it should read: 'is the ratio'...

November 14, 2005:

On page 14 under (#1260) it should read: 'I make a motion to accept'...

On page 18 under (#2975) it should read: 'has to be melded together'.

On page 22 under (#2380) it should read: 'Norm Eveleth' ...

November 21, 2005:

On page 2 under (#0135) it should read: 'I'll pass out some comments' ...

On page 6 under (#1715) it should read: 'as to whether Master Planned

D
e
v
e

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0300) Bill Dewey: Our agenda tonight includes the election of the Chair and the Vice-Chair. Any nominations?

(#0320) Terri Jeffreys: I appreciate the work you've done, Bill, and your balanced approach and I would nominate you to continue on as Chair.

(#0328) Bill Dewey: I don't have any problem doing that. I would also like to mention that Steve has done a good job as our Vice-Chair and maybe he would like to do it.

(#0338) Steve Clayton: You've got a good balance and I'd like you to return as Chair.

(#0342) Bill Dewey: If people are comfortable with me continuing, I'd be happy to

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

do it. How about Vice-Chair?

(#0345) Terri Jeffreys: I'd like to nominate Steve to continue on as Vice-Chair.

(#0360) Bill Dewey: Okay, so for myself as Chair, all in favor? Opposed? Motion passes unanimously to re-elect Bill Dewey as Chair. For Steve as Vice-Chair? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes unanimously to re-elect Steve Clayton as Vice-Chair. Thank you for the vote of confidence.

(#0365) PAC: Thank you for all your work.

(#0370) Bill Dewey: Next up we have a public hearing to consider proposed revisions to Title 15 of the Mason County Code as part of the adoption of Title 11.05, Forest Practices Conversion Ordinance.

(#0385) Allan Borden: In December, the PAC reviewed this proposal and the BOCC held their public hearing on it. What I bring forward to you tonight is to make sure that the procedures that are in this ordinance are integrated into the Development Code permit review. The Department of Community Development staff proposes these Title 15 changes with the recent adoption of the Title 11.05, which is the Forest Practices Conversion Ordinance, to assure that these provisions are now part of the current Mason County implementing regulations. This is also to include the standards of a previously passed ordinance, 11.04, on Forest Practice Moratoriums that was adopted originally in 1998 and updated in 2004. This is to make sure that those two ordinances are in the Development Code by reference. So on page 2, you can see I've included Title 11 as one of the codes to be applicable under Title 15, and that the Hearing Examiner has the responsibility of reviewing a Forest Practice Moratorium as a Type III permit. The contents of that application will include those permits in Title 11 and also provides for the Hearing Examiner to hear appeals for administrative interpretations and administrative decisions through Title 11. In addition, at the end of Title 15 is a table that looks at how certain permits are categorized as either Type I, Type 2, Type III, or Type IV. The Forest Practice Application that's covered by 11.05 is a Type II decision review. The Forest Practice Moratorium Removal process in a Type III heard by the Hearing Examiner and it is quasi-judicial. This is mainly just cleanup and consistency and since the Hearing Examiner has always had attention to detail, he wants to make sure that he's reviewing the proper permits. Any questions?

(#0500) Wendy Ervin: As far as the language goes it all seems pretty straight forward. But in the Purpose and Applicability section you've got the Title and then in parenthesis you've got the application of that particular title. Using the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

parenthesis, to me, changes the meaning or changes how you read it, so that when you get over to Appeal of Administrative Decisions, the parenthesis throws it off. What I would like to suggest, unless there is some reason why it can't be handled this way, that it say Title 6: Sanitary Code, Title 7: Shoreline Master Program, etc. Then when that's carried forward it makes the whole thing more clear than using parenthesis. Having something inside a parenthesis is an explanation of something and a title is not an explanation of something.

(#0600) Allan Borden: It's actually for the benefit of the reader.

(#0610) Wendy Ervin: In the RCW's, the title of that is never in parenthesis.

(#0620) Allan Borden: We could do that. But we'd have to do all the references in the entire Title 15, which may include sections that are not presented for you tonight.

(#0635) Wendy Ervin: That's why I prefaced my question by asking if there was some reason why it can't be done.

(#0640) Terri Jeffreys: It seems to me that's a format change that might get unruly after a while. For us to change that tonight, it might start working on other parts of the code that may not have been anticipated.

(#0652) Steve Clayton: There could be unintended consequences from doing that.

(#0655) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#0725) Bill Dewey: Maybe staff needs to review how they use parenthesis, but I don't think it's germane to our discussion tonight and from a policy standpoint we may not want to pursue that.

(#0738) Wendy Ervin: I didn't find any problems with this from a policy standpoint. That was the only thing I had.

(#0750) Terri Jeffreys: For my own education, in the table on page 3, I don't know the difference between the definition of a ministerial Type I decision and an administrative Type II decision.

(#0765) Allan Borden: Typically ministerial do not have standards that are closely followed. Typically they're not issued with specific conditions whereas administrative types of decisions have specific conditions that need to be met.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

(#0794) Steve Clayton: Would it be out of place, Allan, to organize the titles in sequential order instead of how they're mixed up?

(#0800) Allan Borden: I could do that. We can just list them in order of title number.

(#0815) Bill Dewey: Any further questions? Hearing none, we'll open it up for public testimony.

(#0825) Louis Cofoni: I'm Louis Cofoni and I have some questions that are pertinent to this ordinance. When you talk about forest ordinances, what size acreage are we talking about? I don't see anything in this ordinance that specifies that. Let's just suppose someone owns 20 acres and they want to short plat it into 4, 5-acre plots. Do they have to apply for a fee for 20 acres to change from a commercial property to a noncommercial property? If they do apply for that fee or variance does that include the entire 20 acres? What size property do you need to kick this in?

(#0900) Allan Borden: There's no minimum lot size. This ordinance only deals with Class IV General category forest practices. That means basically a cutting permit where the land use has potential for changing - converting from timber to some other use. The reason for this chapter is so that Mason County will administer these permits in the future rather than DNR. So if you have a 2 acre piece of property and you're taking down all the trees and converting it from growing timber to building 3 houses, that's forest conversion and this set of standards would apply. It doesn't matter if it's 2, 20, or 200 acres.

(#0935) Tim Wing: Allan, it is the case, though, that you can't just take a 1/4 acre piece of property and get it into forest practice taxation? Is that correct?

(#0944) Allan Borden: That's not covered by this.

(#0946) Tim Wing: I understand that it's not covered by this issues, but I think the gentleman's questions has to do with can you put some piece of property into a forest practices?

(#0955) Louis Cofoni: Allan answered my question about the size of the property. What puts it into a mechanism if you were to buy acreage off another person? Is that person responsible ... does that entire 20 acres have to be approved before that person could commence to sell these said plots to other people?

(#0972) Allan Borden: I'd have to say there's no mechanism for approval ... when you're talking about forest chemicals, you're talking about vegetation control by

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

chemicals and that's considered a forest practice. Not just timber cutting, but application of herbicides and chemicals.

(#0995) Louis Cofoni: Are you familiar with Lacey with their tree unit .. It's a tree count. Is that under 11.05.120, Harvest boundaries and tree retention areas? Is there going to be a tree unit stipulation on 1 acre, 2 acres, etc., and on article #5 of this same ordinance, we talk about the topography at contour intervals of 40 feet? So every 40 feet you have to have the lay of the land?

(#1025) Allan Borden: That would be the material that would need to be submitted with the actual application. You would have to have a drawing that shows contours, how you're defining harvest boundaries.

(#1035) Louis Cofoni: Under item #6 it talks about critical area buffers. If I were to buy 2 or 3 acres, is there going to be a specific buffer around the entire acreage I'm buying of trees that I can't touch?

(#1050) Allan Borden: Any critical area in the county requires buffers around it. There may be a limitation on what you can do in the critical area and in the buffer adjacent to that critical area. It could be a stream, wetland, steep slope.

(#1060) Louis Cofoni: If I were to go down that road, who would I have to contact to see what the critical buffer is?

(#1066) Allan Borden: You'd come to the Planning Department.

(#1068) Wendy Ervin: Allan, this only applies to properties that are already under DNR control, correct?

(#1075) Allan Borden: It's any property that is growing trees.

(#1080) Wendy Ervin: I thought the whole point was to create a process to get out from under DNR control ... you're converting it from being under DNR control to being under Mason County control and this is the mechanism that you're using to do that. So some of the questions that he's asking are over complicating the matter because we're only talking about changing the jurisdictional control of those pieces of property.

(#1105) Allan Borden: The only ability that DNR had was to regulate timber harvest and forest practices. Not any other part of it.

(#1112) Wendy Ervin: So when you convert you're changing the control of that

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

timber harvest from DNR to the county.

(#1118) Allan Borden: That's the only control they had. Everything else is county regulated.

(#1120) Wendy Ervin: So once that's converted then county regulations would apply.

(#1125) Allan Borden: As it's being converted, county regulations apply according to this ordinance.

(#1130) Tim Wing: You're talking about two changes at the same time. One is who is in charge of the forest practices? It used to be DNR and now it's going to be the county. But you're also talking about taking it out of forest practices and that's the second change. So if the county now is in charge of it, it's also not in forest practice anymore. That's what this is about.

(#1145) Allan Borden: That's right.

(#1150) Tim Wing: I just want to make sure that you understand that if you have a small piece of land, you can't get it into forest practice. We talked about any size piece of property. You can't just take a piece of property and put it into forest practice. It's got to be a pretty big piece. However, there are lots of small pieces in this county that are in forest practice because it used to be okay to do that.

(#1162) Allan Borden: That's an entirely different program. That's an Assessor's Office tax program where if there is open space timber or timberland ...

(#1180) Tim Wing: So you're saying the county has a program where I can take a small piece of property and have it in forest practices?

(#1188) Bob Fink: What you said at first was essentially right. The intent of the change in the regulation that we adopted last year, in which we're cleaning up here with these amendments, is to take a review that's currently done by DNR where they issue a permit to allow a forest practice ... a forest practice being an action typically of the harvest of timber. Right now DNR requires, when you harvest a certain amount of timber, you have to get a permit to do it. And if you're not going to replant within three years, and that's a conversion of the land, and if you say you're not going to convert the land to another use, then the county is restricted by law from issuing any development permits on that land for six years. That includes subdivisions, and almost any kind of development, because the presumption is that land where you did the harvest is going to be replanted within

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

three years and grow trees for the future. If you don't want to do that, they call that a conversion. It's those conversions that the county is assuming authority over rather than DNR. If you're in the timber business, and you're harvesting timber and not developing land, you're exempted from the county's regulations such as critical area regulations. So if you want to cut near a stream, you cut near a stream based on the DNR regulations and not the county regulations. But if you're converting the land, then when you cut near the stream, you have to cut by the county's regulations rather than DNR regulations because it's based on the assumption that you're going to develop that land. The affect of this action is to move the authority over these timber harvests from DNR to the county because DNR basically is saying these are no longer forest lands. That could also include agriculture. The legislature decided the county should have that jurisdiction and that's what the ordinance that we did last year does. What you talked about secondly was a forest tax program where people can be taxed at the current use of the land as forest land, which might be \$300 an acre, rather than the market value of that land if it were available for development, which might be \$30,000 an acre.

(#1350) Louis Cofoni: So if I buy a 5 acre piece of property and he knows what's happening and then I get told you can't do anything with the trees; they have to stay up.

(#1385) Bob Fink: The question you're going to have is does the amount of clearing or timber removal from the site amount to a timber harvest or not. Amount to something that DNR defines as a forest practice. There's a checklist that we have that says if you meet these certain criteria and whether what you're doing is a forest practice. This is just a shift in the administrative authority from DNR to the county.

(#1420) Bill Dewey: That shift was mandated by law and as a county we needed to adopt an ordinance to address those conversions.

(#1425) Louis Cofoni: I did have the opportunity to call DNR a couple of years back and they told me it goes by linear feet. If it's over a certain amount, then you need a permit to cut. But you're saying any tree ...

(#1435) Bob Fink: We protect certain critical areas and their buffers. So if you have a tree that's in that critical area, then you can't go out and cut it except consistent with our regulations. There's an exception to that where if you're doing it according to DNR forest practice permit. If you're doing that, then our regulation doesn't apply, but DNR rules for how close you can cut to a tree do apply and DNR issues that permit. The only exception to that is if you're converting it and

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

developing the property and then DNR is issuing that permit but it's done by county regulations.

(#1475) Wendy Ervin: If you have a danger tree, that falls under a completely different set of regulations.

(#1485) Bob Fink: Right. We have provisions for danger trees.

(#1495) Bill Dewey: Any other testimony? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing portion. Any discussion?

(#1500) Steve Clayton: I'd like to make a motion to approve the changes that staff has recommended dated January 2006 on the forest practice conversion ordinance.

(#1510) Diane Edgin: I second the motion.

(#1515) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes to adopt these revisions to Title 15. Next on our agenda is a discussion of the 2006 work program.

(#1540) Emmett Dobey: Before we start on this I'd like to make a couple of announcements. If you recall, there was a discussion about meeting jointly with the TIPCAP. TIPCAP had their first meeting last week and they are proposing to have the first joint meeting on March 8th at 6:00 pm, if you're available. That's a Wednesday. They are very excited about meeting, which is quite different than the first time they talked about it.

(#1600) Tim Wing: In the course of all the work discussion we had about roads in the UGA's, it was determined, at least as I understand it, that the BOCC asked that the county staff plan roads inside the UGA's or a road system, and that they also prepare road standards for inside the UGA's. I'd be interested in seeing the directive to staff, or some sort of reference to that in written material that was the result of those discussions. Also, it would seem to me that that would be a high priority topic for this TIPCAP meeting.

(#1628) Emmett Dobey: Yes, that's the intent of that meeting.

(#1630) Tim Wing: I'd really like to have some advanced information about what the staff has been asked to do by the BOCC before we actually get into that meeting.

(#1640) Wendy Ervin: Wednesdays are universally a problem for me.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

(#1650) Bill Dewey: How does it work for other people?

(#1665) Other PAC: Sounds good to us. We'll have to let Jay know.

(#1700) Emmett Dobey: The second thing is, as most of you know, there's a lot going on out in the Skokomish Valley with different types of studies and the CORP doing some work. The Bureau of Land Management is doing some work, and we're doing some work with the migration of the river channel. To coordinate that activity, we're proposing a public involvement outreach coordinated meeting with all the different agencies, and we have that tentatively set for the week of March 20th. Please check your calendars and if you have any interest in attending that. The meeting would be in the Valley and the way we've framed it is we would open with a general discussion and questions and answers, and then each of the participants that is doing the work in the Valley, you would have an opportunity to go to that particular table and talk about their phase of the work they're doing.

(#1760) PAC: That works for our schedule.

(#1765) Emmett Dobey: The Comp Plan was submitted to CTED. I understand we did receive a letter back saying they thought it was a wonderful plan. I assume that means we're okay for right now.

(#1800) Bill Dewey: Our regularly scheduled meeting is the 20th of March. So we'd have to do it another day that week. As soon as that's set, let us know.

(#1812) Emmett Dobey: Okay. Staff started out looking at potential work items for this year and we started with the original list that had about 42 items on it. We tried to narrow that down to what we felt was a reasonable work program. That work program was presented to the BOCC last week in a briefing and they're still reviewing it. The only thing they asked for consideration that be added to it was one item, which was a Human and Health Services item that would make that a higher priority than we had put on our list. There's a homeless count that's going to occur this Thursday and Friday and then in May there's going to be a session held on all these issues. Commissioner Kamin suggested that we expand that to be a bigger program than just the homeless issue. That was the one thing she asked to be added to the thirteen items on this list. What we wanted to do tonight is get your ideas if these are acceptable for us to put together a detailed work program and how we're going to do it, and add or subtract any that you felt we needed to address this year.

(#1880) Steve Clayton: On the Master Planning Policies it appeared to be rather

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

contentious because it appeared there was no public input in developing that. When we passed on the policies to the BOCC, there was some concern that the DR's getting more attention this time around. Is that public process going to occur on the DR's?

(#1900) Emmett Dobey: The answer is 'yes'. We're working with Jones and Stokes and there will be an extensive public process before we bring this forward. I also want to give you a copy of the Commissioners goals for 2006. The object of tonight is to look at this and if you want to add any more items, we'll have to think about taking some other items off. We just want to get your sense of it this is a wide enough array or should we start all over again and bring back a different list?

(#1985) Terri Jeffreys: I'm concerned that we've totally left off the UGA DR's, and I wonder when that is proposed to be done. That's for the Shelton UGA.

(#1995) Steve Goins: We're not the lead on that item.

(#1998) Emmett Dobey: We're waiting on them. We have to respond to them. We are also going to be looking at the Allyn UGA.

(#2005) Terri Jeffreys: So the process is they, through negotiations, are taking the lead on it, but because the county needs to adopt it, will it go before this Board?

(#2010) Emmett Dobey: Yes.

(#2012) Terri Jeffreys: So if we have recommendations for differences, would they then go back to the City of Shelton, or would they just forward to the BOCC?

(#2018) Emmett Dobey: The BOCC makes the final decision, but I would assume that we would try to negotiate.

(#2025) Steve Goins: Another angle is to participate in the City's process and make comments as they develop the regulations, which we're doing at a staff level.

(#2034) Wendy Ervin: In Shelton we have the Shelton City Limits and the UGA. Some of the UGA is in the county; some of it's in the City. Then we have an airport overlay that splits up things more. Then you have Port property, some of which is in the UGA and some of which are not. Then you have all these other districts; Port Commissioner districts, etc. There's just so many lines so

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

somehow we need to get some commonality between these things. If you have to split every decision between whether it's in the City or the county or the UGA and who is dealing with it there's too many layers. It needs to be clarified.

(#2100) Emmett Dobey: So you're suggesting a growth and development management policy framework for the Shelton UGA, which includes all the jurisdictions?

(#2108) Wendy Ervin: Yes.

(#2110) Terri Jeffreys: You said the Housing Element would be looked at this year and refine the goals and policies. Another request is to include Performance Measures throughout our Comp Plan. The purpose, for me, is that when we go through this update and review process, that it's more than a look at if we're in compliance, but it's an actual review of how well we're doing at meeting our goals and accommodating growth. Reading through the minutes, I was awakened again about what's going on in Allyn. The number of buildable lots is probably going to be gone in two years and if 'x' amount of people are supposed to be there in twenty years, where is that land going to come from? Until we get a way of being able to track this and make sure we're not artificially constraining the market, it's the tail wagging the dog. If anybody agrees with me, this Wednesday at 8:00 am, there's a house hearing on a bill that would require that very thing.

(#2250) Bill Dewey: I find it interesting in light of all the attention the Hood Canal is getting and the water quality problems we're having in Oakland Bay, on none of the three Commissioners' list is there anything to do with ... the nutrients problem, etc.

(#2320) Emmett Dobey: When this was put together Utilities are addressing that. Doug Micheau was involved with leading that charge. We have very recently retained a consultant to help us put together a comprehensive strategy to address the Hood Canal issues. They will be reporting to the Board on the 14th of February and when they do that we'll bring it back here.

(#2360) Tim Wing: I have some questions about the Belfair UGA in particular. There's virtually no mention of it in any of the recommended additional projects, and although sewers are discussed in Tim Sheldon's goals, it looks like there's isn't any effort to come up with a development plan for Belfair. There's a subarea plan that was put together by a subarea planning group and I don't think anybody has heard anything about it for about a year. I'm just wondering where we're going with that UGA? I share all of the concerns that Terri has about the buildable lots. She mentioned two years in Allyn, and I listed four lots today and most of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

them are double the price that they were purchased for a year ago. There's \$65,000 lots listed for \$165,000, a \$35,000 lot listed for \$165,000 ... there's virtually no lots on the market in Allyn or Belfair, and that's today; not two years from now. To get to the point where there are properties where builders can build homes for people to live in, we have to have roads, stormwater, sewer, DR's, etc. I don't see any of that on here.

(#2425) Emmett Dobe: Through the sewer planning there's a lot of work that's going to be done in the coordination of development of sewers in the Belfair UGA. Coordinating that also with the development of the alternative route and the improvements to SR3. As a part of that work there is a parcel analysis that the Puget Sound Action Team has asked to be developed regarding the number of vacant lots, where they are and what impacts would occur if they were sewered. We're trying to work out how that's going to be done. The last part is the Master Planning process. We'll be looking at developing how large tracts of land should be developed and we're pretty certain that part of that discussion is going to include input from the Overtons and how they might be impacted.

(#2490) Steve Goins: From the Belfair standpoint, the planning work to bring in the bypass road and the land uses that are around that is now in the design phase. It's moved beyond the planning phase. In Belfair, there's a large landholder who is interested in having Master Planning Policies in place before he brings a plan forward, which we're trying to accommodate. They have no interest in selling off lots until this Master Planning process is in place and the area can be Master Planned.

(#2525) Tim Wing: The analysis of existing lots, septic versus sewers, and what's happening out there is that people are developing lots that they might not develop if there were good lots ready to go. So they're putting septic in areas where they perhaps should not put a septic in and it's certainly not an area where it makes any sense to put a sewer system in. So the delay is leading to additional problems that everyone is wanting to avoid. I'm also concerned about having only one stakeholder holding the whole bag for the whole end of the county. I don't think that's a good idea, and I don't think the Overtons even like that idea because it ends up with the spotlight on them and all the criticism that comes with that. I don't know what effort may be able to be made to focus on other properties that are potentially developable inside that UGA.

(#2575) Allan Borden: My question is why are there no property owners in the Belfair UGA coming to the county and asking questions about development there? All of the applications for presubmission meetings cross my desk and I've not seen a single performance or regular subdivision in Belfair since Iron Horse

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

Crossing.

(#2660) Tim Wing: You've answered part of my question; getting the road in and the sewer in. Then at that point, the Overtons getting something on the table could relieve some of the pressure. But there's other problems in Allyn where there are a lot of buildable lots that if a water system was put in or a road was put in inside the UGA boundary of Allyn, that has nothing to do with Lakeland Village, that there are a lot of lots that could be developed. But there's no one person who is going to come to you about them because they're owned by dozens of different people.

(#2700) Emmett Dobby: Our proposal is to be looking at Allyn and we've already started there.

(#2705) Tim Wing: What do we need to do to complete the subarea plan for Belfair? I thought there was an effort to have common zoning for Allyn and Belfair. Is that the case?

(#2720) Bob Fink: That hasn't been the case for a long time. There was some discussion of trying to get the zones similar but there was a lot of resistance from both the Belfair and Allyn people, and it wasn't a priority for the county. It's something that was abandoned a long time ago.

(#2740) Tim Wing: So the Belfair subarea plan is ...

(#2745) Bob Fink: It stands as it is. There's continuing work on stormwater issues in Belfair as well as the sewer and the road, which DOT is pursuing the road. Then there's the project now to work with TIPCAP and start the discussion of where the county should be building new roads, where do we need to connect roads, and those issues that will probably touch on Belfair as well as other parts of the county.

(#2775) Emmett Dobby: It's not that we've abandoned Belfair but it's focused in different areas. We do have a \$30,000 grant from CTED to look at stormwater issues throughout the county. On top of that, there's a \$300,000 grant to look at actually developing stormwater infrastructure in the Belfair area. That's available to start on the ground planning now.

(#2835) Bill Dewey: Does that \$30,000 grant include consideration of LID ordinances?

(#2840) Emmett Dobby: Yes, and CTED just announced last week that they have another special grant for six communities to model what LID might look like in the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

community so we'll probably be applying for some of that money, too.

(#2875) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#3000) Steve Clayton: The item listed on the last page regarding evaluating nonconforming development. Can you tell us a little bit about what we're trying to do there?

(#3015) Emmett Dobey: We have a number of nonconforming uses and we think it's probably just a handful and we think the idea is to either make them conforming to decide how they should become conforming.

(#3050) Terri Jeffreys: So it's a matter of inventorying how many nonconforming uses there are and what they are?

(#3060) Emmett Dobey: Right, and when they were granted and then coming back and resolving the issues.

(#3070) Tim Wing: What is our goal here in this discussion?

(#3075) Emmett Dobey: We just wanted to see if you could live with these and if you wanted to make any changes. Or if you want to add any and then we'll come back next month with a detailed work program.

(#3100) Diane Edgin: In the Rural Industrial, we recently went in and changed the criteria for height for over 35 feet for certain things. It's been brought to my attention that the proposed theater on Harstine is running up against this. This is not industrial but due to the nature of what a theater needs to do, they are looking at needing probably a variance for height. Do we have the mechanism to do such a thing?

(#3140) Emmett Dobey: It would mean an amendment or change to zoning regs but we could do that. We have discussed that with them.

(#3150) Terri Jeffreys: Could you review the three items that we added?

(#3152) Emmett Dobey: The growth and development policies in the Shelton area. Performance measures. A clear focus on Belfair. Also, Harstine Island.

(#3175) Terri Jeffreys: I would like to add a Housing Element review and policies.

(#3177) Emmett Dobey: Jayni has asked for that on her list. It's in the Health and

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

Housing element.

(#3180) Terri Jeffreys: But isn't that just for low income housing?

(#3182) Emmett Dobe: So you'd like to see that expanded? Okay.

(#3190) Steve Clayton: Regarding Harstine Island Theater, why would we change the zoning and not go through a variance procedure?

(#3200) Emmett Dobe: The way it's set up now doesn't give you any authority to grant any relief for that particular height problem.

(#3224) Tim Wing: So you'd change the ordinance to allow for an exception.

(#3228) Emmett Dobe: That's correct. A number of other ordinances I have been associated with do allow for variances for certain appurtenances to a building that generally are only 35 feet high. A church tower is one example. Their argument is that it's an integral part of the building itself. There's one little tower in the middle that's necessary to make the stage work properly and so the question would be can we change the ordinance to allow that to be added ...

(#3260) Steve Clayton: So we're talking about changing the RR5 zone for the entire county to accommodate for a staircase on Harstine Island?

(#3270) Emmett Dobe: Right.

(#3272) Steve Goins: What you're discussing is creating a process where you can have an exception to allow for that. It's not a carte blanche to build taller, bigger buildings.

(#3285) Emmett Dobe: It's something that is necessary to the function of the building.

(#3300) Bill Dewey: Any additions or comments on the proposed 2006 work program?

(#3333) Terri Jeffreys: The Trails and Parks Updates; is that additional policies to that framework document?

(#3345) Emmett Dobe: Yes. That will be on hold for a while until there's some decisions made about the new Director over there. This is a really ambitious schedule.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

(#3350) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#3600) Bill Dewey: I didn't see the industrial areas on this list.

(#3610) Terri Jeffreys: The EDC is doing an independent report on that countywide.

(#3625) Steve Goins: It's likely that out of that process we might recommend some rezoning for industrial uses. We'd like to couple that with a study of Allyn's commercial area and really understand what kinds of needs the Allyn UGA has.

(#3650) Tim Wing: Do you realize that this is about five topics a month? Do you have the staff time to do this?

(#3660) Emmett Dobey: A lot of the work is already underway.

(#3675) Bob Fink: When you say five topics a month you're talking about the proposed projects?

(#3678) Tim Wing: We meet once a month for about an hour so we're going to go through five topics every time we meet? Is this list in the final cut?

(#3700) Emmett Dobey: No, only some of them.

(#3710) Tim Wing: So if they're not all in there, I want to ask about some.

(#3714) Bill Dewey: So 3 through 7 are not and 11 is not.

(#3720) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#3800) Bill Dewey: So is there any further discussion? Are we there?

(#3825) Wendy Ervin: So you will come out with a calendar proposing which months we will be working on which topics?

(#3835) Emmett Dobey: Correct. We'll have that for next months meeting so you'll have an idea of what you're doing when. It really is an exciting time in Mason County right now. There's a lot going on.

(#0120) Diane Edgin: We're finally at the first step of coming into our own.

(#0125) Emmett Dobey: I think you're there.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, January 23, 2006

(#0128) Terri Jeffreys: CTED says so.

(#0130) Emmett Dobey: In the discussions I've had with them, they are truly impressed with the amount of work and the dedication that has occurred in the last year.

(#0135) Terri Jeffreys: I just wanted to say that I went to a Washington Environmental Council work session last spring on updating critical area ordinances, and this one was specific to Mason County and they had said that the critical area ordinances in this county are in really good shape and they don't see a lot of changes being needed.

(#0175) Emmett Dobey: I'd like to talk about getting together to talk about the planning commission, the training you might want, how things have gone or haven't gone well, and what other things you would like to see shared with you. I'd like to do that at a lunch meeting. I spent some time talking with Jay about this so I know he's interested, too.

(#0195) Bill Dewey: I appreciate your showing an interest in doing that.

(#0200) *Miscellaneous discussion about a luncheon meeting date.*

(#0250) PAC decided on the 17th of February for the luncheon meeting.

(#0260) Bill Dewey: So our next regularly scheduled meeting is set for Monday, February 27th.

Meeting adjourned.