

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

JUNE 22ND, 2015

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

1. Call to Order

Bill Dewey called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm.

2. Roll Call

Present: Steve Van Denver, Rob Drexler, Vicki Wilson, Bill Dewey, Kevin Shetty

Excused: Kristy Buck, Tim Duffy

Staff: Rebecca Hersha, Allan Borden, Rick Mraz

3. Regular Business

a. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with no changes.

b. Approval of Minutes

January 26, 2015- On page 2, Vicki pointed out that the word “new” should replace the word “legal” in the following sentence:

...the application shall not be considered vested in the SMP until a ~~legal~~ new determination of completeness is done.

No other changes were made. Steve made a motion to accept the minutes. Motion seconded by Vicki, motion passed.

c. Confirm Future Meeting Dates

Rebecca verified that the next dates were July 6th and July 20th. The PAC then discussed August meeting dates and decided upon August 3rd, and August 17th.

4. Public Hearing – Rezone #15-01

A request to amend the outer boundary of the Belfair Urban Growth Area around three parcels, and have the complete three parcels each rezoned as Belfair Urban Growth Area Mixed Use zone.

Presenter: Allan Borden, Department of Community Development

Allan Borden began by addressing the request made by Ronald Szalay. He said the applicant has 3 pieces of property in various sizes which are zoned Rural Area Rural Residential 5 and Belfair Urban Growth Area (UGA) Mixed Use zone. Mr. Szalay would like to have the parcels completely within the UGA. Allan went through his staff report and

spent time explaining the attached maps. He went on to discuss allowed uses. At this time, he handed out a copy of the Belfair UGA zoning code to the PAC. Allan said that a change in zoning could create a greater number of proposed primary and multi-family residences, possibly up to 7 residences could be placed on these properties. After reading through remaining portions of his staff report, he asked for any questions. Bill asked how other parcels with split zoning would need to be addressed. Allan responded saying that each parcel would have to go through this request. Bill then asked Allan if the other split parcels were due to mapping errors to which he said no. Vicki asked about the other UGA's and asked if changing this area would be considered jumping the gun without knowing what changes were in the works for the other UGA's. Allan responded saying that would be up to the County Commissioners, ultimately. Steve asked about issues with development, mainly access to the parcels. He said there looks to be 3 private drives on the current map with no other access to the parcels behind them. Rob pointed out that access is not an issue for the PAC to worry about.

At 6:41 pm, Bill opened up the public hearing for comment.

Constance Ibsen asked for the exact location of the proposal. Rob explained that the parcels are near the Re-store in Belfair, and used the attached maps as reference. Allen showed Constance the location of the other businesses in the area. Constance asked for the history of the parcels that have split zoning. She said that when the UGA's were being created, there were people who asked to not be zoned within the UGA and questioned if that was the case with this land. Constance asked if the parcels in question would be required to hook up to the Belfair Sewer upon development. Allan said that they would. Rob added that properties within 500 feet of the sewer are required to hook up. She asked Allan if the property owner was aware of the need to hook up to Belfair services, to which Allan said he believed Mr. Szalay was aware of this.

At 6:46 pm, Bill closed the public hearing.

Vicki commented that although she feels that Mason County is in need of housing, she is worried about neighboring parcels asking for zone changes once surrounded by the UGA Mixed Zone Use. This sparked a discussion between the PAC and Allan about future growth and changes within the area. Rob said he feels it should be approved to move on to the County Commissioners. Bill asked how the other PAC members felt about this proposal. Steve made a motion to approve the proposal as written. Motion seconded by Rob. All in favor, motion passed.

5. Workshop-Shoreline Master Program Update and Periodic Comprehensive Plan Update

Presenter: Rebecca Hersha, Department of Community Development

- (a) Discuss written comments received on 6/8/2015 regarding draft SMP regulations – 17A.**

Bill announced that he and Rebecca attended the Board of County Commissioners briefing that morning and updated the Commissioners on the SMP progress. He stated that there have been 40 SMP workshops and that the Commissioners would like to see Rebecca get back to her normal duties as a planner.

Rebecca addressed a letter received June 8, 2015 from John Diehl. A conversation was had regarding impervious surface and the Stormwater Manual (page 64 of draft 17A). After some debate, it was decided that in Table 17.50.055 A: *Buffer and dimensional standards for shoreline development*, the crossed out wording in (4.) should be restored to the original language.

54. Maximum impervious surface coverage (percent of lot or square feet)	NA See Current Adopted Stormwater Manual for standards	10%	10%	NA
---	---	-----	-----	----

Within the same letter, consideration was given to grandfathered structures and vertical expansion (pg. 75, 17A). Rebecca said she could change some language around [in the Resource Ordinance](#) to make sure the [vertical expansion only applies in shoreline jurisdiction, thereby reducing the chances resource ordinance would not be that it would be appealed challenged and](#). ~~She added that the language would need to be written so the assuring that the County would be supported by Ecology in the event of an appeal. Rick suggested land owners apply for a variance.~~ Bill asked if the PAC would point out issues or questions for the remainder of the letter, instead of examining the document line by line due to time. Vicki and Rob agreed.

Vicki addressed (12.) in the letter which talks about wording in chapter *E. Industrial and Marine Terminal Regulations*. (pg. 113,17A). She said they need to be aware of the wording “to avoid”, and “minimize” throughout the SMP. Rebecca said she would make necessary corrections.

Bill asked about (14.) ~~which says that why the~~ wording on page 131 (17 A) reading,

Non-emergency construction and repair work shall be scheduled for that time of year when seasonal conditions (weather, streamflow) permit optimum feasible protection of shoreline ecological functions.

~~Is is~~ crossed out, when it was agreed that it would remain. Rick suggested that perhaps this was crossed out when ~~the draft went through P~~public ~~w~~Works [reviewed the draft](#) due to fish windows which determine when they can and cannot work. Bill asked if perhaps, wording should be added to reflect that. Vicki and Steve agreed that it was deleted for a reason but could not recall the original reason it was stricken. No changes were made at this time.

7:38-7:45

Break

(b) Review Staff recommended revisions to Resource Ordinance chapters MCC 8.52.030 (Definitions), 8.52.050 (Relationship to Other Regulations), 8.52.110 (Wetlands), 8.52.130 (Frequently Flooded Areas), and 8.52.140 (Landslide Hazard Areas).

Rebecca continued the meeting by reviewing 8.52.050, *Relationship to Other Regulations*. The PAC [agreed with Staff's recommended changes in the two page draft of the chapter, dated 6/17/2015.](#)~~had no comments or changes to this section.~~

In 8.52.110, *Wetlands*, Rebecca addressed the changes she ~~made th~~[recommended throughout in the 30 page draft of the chapter, dated 6/17/2015](#). Vicki asked about page ~~44~~[15 \(C-\)\(iii\)](#) *Wetland Buffer Width Averaging*, regarding the requirement of an MEP (Mason Environmental Permit). Rebecca said she was not sure if it was necessary. ~~After a discussion with~~ Rick ~~who~~ said this section was not something that he believed needs a permit process. ~~;~~ [However,](#) it was decided to leave the section as written.

On page 18 there were various questions about (2.) and (4.). The questions were regarding language and the placement of sections. Rebecca said she would do some research and clean up this page.

Under section (G.) Permit Review [\(page 25\)](#), Vicki pointed out that the first sentence which reads:

The basic concern in the permitting process is to avoid and minimize wetland impacts. needs to be changed because it has the language "to avoid", and "minimize" as discussed while addressing John Diehl's letter.

Erica Marbet spoke and asked for future notification of meetings via email.

Rebecca handed the members a revised Landslide Hazard Area document to be looked at for the next meeting.

Constance Ibsen said that Mason County refers to the critical area ordinance as resource ordinance. She said this is confusing. Rick said that other counties have various names and acronyms and said there is no requirement for the name.

6. **New Business**

None

7. **Adjournment**

At 8:24 p.m. Bill Dewey moved to adjourn.