

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

September 28, 2015

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

1. Call to Order

Bill Dewey called the meeting to order at 6:04 pm

2. Roll Call

Present: Kevin Shutty, Tim Duffy, Kristy Buck, Steve Van Denover, Vicki Wilson, Bill Dewey

Excused: Rob Drexler

Staff: Barbara Adkins, Vicki Kirkpatrick, Rebecca Hersha

3. Regular Business

a. Adoption of Agenda

No changes, agenda adopted as written.

b. Approval of Minutes

June 22, 2015- No corrections or additions. Kevin Shutty made a motion to adopt the minutes as written. Motion seconded by Vicki Wilson. All in favor, motion carried.

c. Confirm Future Meeting Dates

October 2015: 12th and 26th

November 2015: 16th

4. Mason County Comprehensive Plan - Amendments to Future Land Use Map – Public Hearing

Applicant: Port of Shelton

Presenter: Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development

Barbara began by explaining this amendment is specific to the Shelton Urban Growth Area (UGA). The property in question is located at the Oakland Bay Marina. Currently, a small section of the Oakland Bay Marina is located in the County Boundary, while the rest of the property is within the boundary of the City of Shelton. The proposal, if passed, would allow the entire marina to be annexed into the Shelton UGA. Barbara pointed out that representatives from the Port and the City were present for questions.

Bill asked if the city, the port and the county were all in agreement at this time. Barbara answered that the County and the port are in agreement.

Vicki asked if there were any downsides in general. Barbara said at this time she was only looking at the land use issues, and there are none. Vicki added that she sees all of the positives and is finding it difficult to find anything wrong with this annexation.

Bill said the new proposed boundary looked to be further south than he imagined. He asked if there was a reason for this. Barbara announced that she would like John Dobson to speak in regards to this question. Bill asked if there were any other questions for Barbara.

Steve asked if any other departments in the County would have an issue with the annexation. Barbara stated that she had not given this to any other departments for review, but she could do that at the Commissioner level. Steve voice concern saying that the other departments could potentially have issues that need to be addressed.

John Dobson, Executive Director of the Port of Shelton spoke and said that what the Port is asking for, is the harbor line that was present in 2008. The Port, he said, is also asking for the Eagle Point Property. John said that the Port has the intention of selling that property to the City of Shelton to be renovated into a conservation park. Bill asked if John had discovered any records regarding the boundary change. An unknown male spoke from the audience saying during the last update, there was an effort to reduce the UGA because of an excess of residential zoned land. Bill inquired if the boundary was just moved on the map, or if you could see a narrative anywhere. John Dobson said the change was only present on a map, but added that there are 3 different maps that could be interpreted in various ways.

At 6:22 pm, Kristy Buck announced that she would be recusing herself from the vote as a Port Commissioner.

Bill asked Barbara if the boundary line is contracted at this point, does it then need to be expanded elsewhere to be compliant. She answered that no expansion to the UGA would be necessary. Due to the fact that the current boundary is cutting through property, she said that this change is justified.

At 6:27 pm, Bill Dewey opened the public hearing.

Constance Ibsen asked who owns the tidelands. John Dobson said that the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) owns some, and Simpson also owns a portion. John showed 2 maps to Constance and discussed the boundary lines and tidelands.

No further comments or questions. At 6:29 pm, Bill Dewey closed the public hearing.

After closing the hearing, Bill addressed the PAC asking for input. Vicki stated that this amendment seems like common sense. Tim Duffy pointed out that there had been no objections thus far. Bill said he did have a concern with the size and then asked if the amendment would cause a split on any Simpson property. Kristy said as far as she knew, no splitting would occur. Vicki asked if anybody had spoken with Simpson for their input. Kristy stated that Simpson was in full support of this. Bill asked if anybody had heard of any opposition. John Dobson stated that there is a bigger picture regarding the reclamation of the marina/bay area underway that does include Simpson. He said that public announcement will be made in December.

Steve said that he does have concerns. He said that when the PAC motions to move something forward to the Board of County Commissioners, there have been times when the BOCC has used the PAC's recommendation as a basis to approve the project without further research. He went on

to say that the UGA was moved for a reason. There is no current documentation regarding this at the meeting, which is worrisome. Bill suggested perhaps making a recommendation with a caveat. Kristy interjected that she believes considerable research was already done by the Port, the City and Barbara. She added that if something proves to be problematic, it can be undone. Kevin asked Steve if there was any particular reason that the move, when done years prior, would give him concern if it was moved back. Steve said that there was some reason the original boundary was changed, but he was unable to recall the reason.

Kevin Shutty made a movement to recommend the changes offered by the Port. Motion seconded by Tim Duffy. Bill Dewey, Vicki Wilson, Kevin Shutty and Tim Duffy were in favor, Steve Van Denver was not in favor, and Kristy Buck was recused. Motion passed.

5. Mason County Comprehensive Plan- Review of Chapter III-8 Housing, for mandated updates, public comment, and Planning Commission edits.

Presenter: Vicki Kirkpatrick, Public Health

Vicki asked how the PAC would like to proceed with this section. Bill said an overview of the changes would be helpful. Vicki said major changes weren't necessarily present, but instead there was more enhancement and details especially dealing with affordable housing. She went through some changes and discussed her goals for this chapter.

Kristy asked where the statistics in this section were from. Vicki said they were from the 2015 Washington State Housing Needs Assessment. She explained that the assessment was done by the Affordable Housing Advisory Board which is appointed by the Governor. The assessment has two pages of data for every county in the state. Kevin asked if there was a way to see copies of this data. Vicki said there is actually a website with all of the information for the state, which is www.commerce.wa.gov/housingneeds.

Vicki Wilson asked about the definition of affordability, specifically if the definition also included property taxes. Vicki Kirkpatrick said that would be included. Vicki Wilson then said she found it difficult to see what has been changed because no track changes were included. Bill asked if this document was to be the only thing in the Comprehensive Plan regarding housing because Chapter 5 was also related to housing. Barbara stepped in and said that since she is making changes in order of chapter, the housing portion may be completely changed. The PAC members voiced their concern regarding how the housing chapter can come together with these changes. Barbara acknowledged their concerns saying when she presented chapter 3, she would show the track changes to clear up any confusion. Vicki Kirkpatrick said that she has begun work on the Health and Human Services Chapter, and is doing that with the track changes. Bill asked about policy 6.2 from Chapter 5, *Define and establish the need for affordable housing through development of a housing plan*. He asked if that is still valid and if the county has a housing plan. Vicki Kirkpatrick responded that the only plan she is aware of is the original ten year homes plan to end homelessness. She said she had not heard of a comprehensive housing plan at this time. Vicki Wilson suggested two changes on page 4:

8.4 Housing Goals and Policies:

Mason County provides the opportunity for diverse housing types that are attractive, affordable, safe, *accessible* and livable.

Policy HG-1.3

...This continuum of housing may include, but not be limited to housing first programs; year-round shelters; and sanctioned tent encampments which provide *minimally adequate* toilet facilities, garbage collection, and access to public transportation.

The PAC decided to see the housing chapter with track changes before making any other edits.

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

Presenter: Rebecca Hersha, Department of Community Development

a. Review Revised Table of FWHCA/shoreline buffers and setbacks

(MCC 8.52.170-B and MCC 17.50.055-A dated 9/1/2015)

Rebecca went through and addressed the changes made. On Table 8.52.170(B), Kristy suggested defining SED (Shoreline Environment Designations) to prevent confusion. Rebecca agreed. Rick Mraz suggested taking (2.) *Minimum Setbacks for Structures from FWHCA (equals buffer plus 15 feet)* from table 17.50.055-A, and adding it to the fish and wildlife chapter for consistency.

Gary Hanson asked how setbacks are determined. Rebecca answered that the setbacks weren't set by the County. She said some setbacks were decided by the state. Rick added that the figures were set by the Department of Fish and Wildlife in 1997. The reference, he said, is under Knutsen and Nael. The numbers used by Mason County have been the same since 2006.

At 7:26 pm, Kevin Shutty excused himself for the evening.

b. Review Definitions Chapter (MCC 8.52.030 dated 7/28/2015).

Mike Knorr asked about the definition of "Bulkhead" which states, *See "shoreline stabilization"*. Mike said when he attempted to look at the definition of shoreline stabilization, no definition was present. Rebecca said she would fix this. She advised the PAC that the reason for reviewing the definitions is to assure there are no conflicts, and to make sure no outdated language is present.

Agricultural lands- The definition of was discussed by the PAC. Bill stated that the definition should mirror the RCW language because aquaculture could be inland in the form of a chalk pond, or an upland hatchery. Rebecca said she would change the definition to match the RCW.

Base Flood- Erica Marbet said it seems as though the definition should be more reflective of a 10-year timeline. Rick clarified the fact that this is a FEMA definition and is based on a 100 year flood line.

Height- Concern was voiced regarding measurement points on a structure. Rebecca suggested striking the second sentence so the definition would read:

Height is measured from average grade level to the highest point of a structure provided that television antennas, chimneys, and similar appurtenances shall not be used in calculating height of buildings. ~~Landscaping/retaining walls and structural shoreline stabilization shall be measured~~

~~from the lowest adjacent grade to the top of the structure, or if there is a footing, from the bottom of the footing to the top of the structure.~~

Landscape wall or Retaining Wall- Vicki asked if the last sentence could be removed because it didn't make sense to her. Kristy defended it saying "fence" should be stricken but the rest of the definition should remain. Bill questioned removing any of the definition because of a decision passed by a previous Commissioner. Vicki read the definition of "Landscape Wall" from the SMP, commenting that there is no definition for "Retaining Wall" in the same document. At this time, Rebecca suggested striking the sentence. More deliberation was had and Bill advised that too much time had been spent and it needs to be left as is due to consistency.

c. Review Restoration Chapter (MCC 8.52.275).

Rebecca quickly explained her changes within this Chapter. She asked for any comments or questions regarding the changes. Constance Ibsen asked about (C) which states "*The County may collect against the bond...*" She asked what the appeal process would be. Rebecca said it would go to the Hearing Examiner as any other appeal would.

7. New Business

Rebecca said at a previous meeting, a comment matrix, dated 2/23/2015 was handed out. She recommended reviewing that before the next SMP meeting in October.

8. Adjournment

At 8:40 pm, meeting was adjourned by Bill Dewey.