

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

February 27, 2017

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

Call to Order

Rob Drexler called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

Roll Call

Present: Marilyn Vogler, Deb Soper, James Thomas, Rob Drexler, Vicki Wilson, and Aaron Cleveland (Aaron introduces himself to the PAC and the Public)

Regular Business

Adoption of Agenda- James Thomas made a motion to adopt agenda as printed. Motion seconded by Marilyn. All in favor, motion carried.

Approval of minutes-

January 23, 2017- Deb Soper noted page 6 of the minutes, second paragraph, says “WAC 246.27.2a.”, should be “WAC 246.27 2a”. Also the following changes were not applied in the new revision of Chapter 12 Health and Human Services:

PAC agrees to scratch “urban growth areas” from 1.10.

1.10 The County will ensure that on-site sewage systems ~~in urban growth areas~~ that cause significant surface water pollution or pose significant public health risk are converted to sewer upon availability.

Rob made a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Deb Soper. All in favor, motion carried.

Public Comment- None

Continued Public Hearing from January 23, 2017 – Revisions to Chapter XII (Health and Human Services) of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan.

Presenter: David Windom, Department of Community Services

Dave reports that he has made the changes that the PAC requested from last meeting, minus the one change that was mentioned during the minutes review.

Marilyn mentions she has some items that she wants to go through, she is referencing the newly revised document, without the markup.

Page 3- Marilyn would like Mobile Homes or Manufactured Homes to be included in the last bullet under “Understanding of Interactions between the Built Environment and Health”. Dave responds that when looking at previous ordinances, Mobile Homes and Manufactured Homes

were not separated from Single Family Residences, they were inclusive of SFRs. The Glossary was mentioned as the best place to put a definition of “Single Family Residence”.

Page 5 - A comma is missing from the second paragraph, last sentence, after “recreation”. In the same paragraph, third sentence, remove “has” before the word “developed”.

Page 6 – *1.1: Mason County will participate in improving public and private sector participation in health and human service planning and implementation activities.* Marilyn would like to see the word “participate” change to “facilitate”. She is concerned that a leader is not delineated well enough. Dave mentions that Mason Matters is the leader in this case. Marilyn asked if Mason Matters is actually mentioned in the chapter as the leader in the referenced topic; is a chain of responsibility clearly shown. Dave is reluctant to use the word “facilitate” in this instance because the responsibility may get kicked back to the County, not encouraging groups, like Mason Matters, to step up and take the lead on improving health in various parts of the County. Marilyn believes not calling out a leader in the various areas mentioned in Chapter 12 will allow for unaccountability. James Thomas agrees on this statement.

Dave throws out some ideas on how they could reword this section. The following was an agreed upon solution.

1.1: Mason County Public Health, as the chief health strategist, will coordinate improvements in public and private sector participation in health and human service planning and implementation activities.

Page 8 – Under “Environmental Public Health Goals and Policies” Goal 1, Marilyn noticed that the language hadn’t been changed to include the suggestion made by Teri King. Dave mentions that he had missed that note. Marilyn asked if they had talked, as a group about this change, or if Dave was suppose to note changes by the public. The PAC agreed they didn’t vote on this change, Vicki mentions that the minutes say the change was an “agreed substitution”.

James Thomas makes a note about 1.1 on page 8, there should be a period after “protected” and before “The”.

Page 9 – Under item 2.6, “Needles” or “Sharps” is requested as an add on. Dave mentions adding both, “**sharps and needles**”.

Vicki has some comments about the revised Chapter 12: Health and Human Services.

Page 1 – Under the heading “Quality and sustainability of environment”, the PAC discusses the bullet, *Aesthetically pleasing*. In comparison to the other bulleted points, *Aesthetically* is not measurable. James mentions that instead of defining aesthetically pleasing, defining what a “dump” or “trash” is.

Rob asks Dave to remind him where the original document, for Chapter 12, came from.

Marilyn mentions eliminating that bullet point and that the Code regulates the amount of trash people can accumulate.

James mentions two options, adding something about litter and waste to the bullet or getting rid of it completely.

Marilyn made a motion to remove the bullet “*Aesthetically Pleasing*”. Motion seconded by James, all in favor, motion carried.

Page 3 – Under “Health Behaviors”, the bullet *Food environment index (factors that contribute to a healthy food environment 0 – 10) is 7.6 for Mason County versus 7.5 for the State.*

Page 4 – Vicki asks for clarification on the last paragraph and the growth rate. She mentions the original version of the chapter and a couple of measures that she was interested in seeing in the new version, Child Life Expectancy in years and our State Ranking and Per Capita Income compared to the State. Dave reiterates his statement from the last meeting that several of the measures from the original chapter had a high margin of error and that was the reason for their absence in the revised version. Both Vicki and James agreed they would rather not have the data in the chapter, if the margin of error was high.

Page 6 – In the paragraph that talks about Group A and B Wells, Group A is defined but Group B is not. Dave agrees to clarify the difference between the two types of public water supply.

Page 8- Vicki mentioned Terri King’s request from the January 23, 2017 meeting. Teri had expressed that she would like to see something about encouraging people with non-monitored wells to monitor on a routine basis, which is a state goal. Dave’s initial response was that they are waiting on the Hirst water decision before the County drafts something regarding monitoring, if they write something up now they might have to completely rewrite depending on the Hirst outcome.

Page 8 – Vicki mentions readability of 3.3. Marilyn mentions adding punctuation.

Page 9 – Goal 2, 2.2 *The county will permit solid waste facilities and assure they comply with permit conditions and applicable law to assure wastes are properly managed.* After some confusion as to how this statement read, Vicki decided that she had no problem with the sentence.

Page 10 – Goal 2, 2.1. Vicki comments that Teri King had a question in the last meeting about “institutions” and whether recreational parks were included under them. Dave mentions that they are not institutions.

Open to Public Comment – None

Closes Hearing on Chapter 12. Health and Human Services

Public Hearing– Revisions to Chapter VII (Utilities) of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan.

Presenter: David Windom, Department of Community Services

Dave mentions that he is presenting this chapter on behalf of Public Works. He mentions that it is not significantly different than what is already in the Comprehensive Plan.

Rob mentions that the Allyn Urban Growth Area is left out in several sections of the chapter. Page 2- James Thomas mentions the following sentence:

PUD 1 does not serve either urban growth area in Mason County.

He instead suggests replacing it with, *PUD 1 does not serve any of the three urban growth areas.*

Marilyn mentions a typo, on the same page, fourth line from the bottom, “costumers” should be “customers”.

PAC mentions there are several places where the document only acknowledges two UGAs.

Vicki asks if US West still exists; no one is quite sure. She mentions that in several places, the language was out of date on the UGAs and that the data was out of date. Marilyn notes that part of the document sites that the PUD has a contract through the year 2002.

Rob tells Dave he may need to send the document back to be reworked.

Marilyn mentions the importance of Fiber Optics to schools and the need for it as infrastructure. Dave thinks that would be a good paragraph to add and mentions going to the PUD to ask them for their input.

Page 3 – In the third paragraph, Marilyn asks about “The targets” and wanting to know what those targets are. Dave suggests RCW 19.285 specified “targets”.

Marilyn asks if the County supports the recommendation on page 4, *The PUD recommends installation of distribution facilities below ground and in conduit.* Dave mentions that as poles are being replaced, they are taking utilities underground. Rob mentions that in some of the building codes it is outlined for facilities to be underground.

Open to Public Comment – None

Hearing tabled till future PAC meeting.

Workshop– Review a draft Ordinance amending Mason County code Title 14, Building and Construction, Chapter 14.08.031 to allow exemptions for Agriculture and Storage Structures

Presenter: David Windom, Department of Community Services

Rob Drexler explains the difference between a hearing and a workshop.

Dave talks about how MC current regulations require storage containers to be on an engineered foundation and how they hope to loosen up that regulation. He gives the background on the size

of some storage containers and how they would fall under exempt structures. He elaborates on the difference between using it for storage, rather than residential or commercial.

James Thomas asks where the 576 sq. ft. came from in regards to exempt non-agricultural structures. Rob mentions that that number was pulled from other jurisdictions.

Dave explains that it didn't make sense to address storage structures separately, and that it fits under a category, which is a reason as to why it was added to Chapter 14.09.030.

Marilyn wants to make sure there is a clear distinction between using storage containers for residential. Dave mentions that once it becomes living space, it falls under the building code. Aaron Cleveland asks if it is under the rule of residential building code when considered living space only, or when something simple like heat is added to it. Dave replies that you can have heated storage space.

James Thomas asks about Attachment A, middle of the page, *The Building Official may review and approve small private foot bridges not for vehicular use*, how do we differentiate between a foot bridge and a pedestrian bridge? Dave mentions that section wasn't something that he added.

Open to Public Comment

Cindy Wiley states her address and how long her and her family have lived in Mason County. Cindy and her husband live on a 50ft lot. She states how most of the lots are 50ft wide and that the lot next to them was sold. The lot next to them is 50 x 240, there are two trailers that are being used as permanent residences, two storage containers, and two 10 x 20 tents. She believes the storage containers should be restricted to larger lots. She states that these containers affect their property values, they are a collection site for garbage, and that they don't belong on small lots. She mentions Kitsap, Thurston, and Clark County and how they don't allow these containers for more than two weeks at a time.

James asks Dave if the County has setback requirements for the containers on lots. Dave elaborates on the County's setback requirements from property lines and from other structures.

Vicki asks what the containers are being used for. Cindy Wiley responds that one is being used as a business with internet and power running to it, and the other is storage.

Marilyn asks Dave if this issue is a code violation, he responds yes. Dave mentions that the code already addresses several aspects presented in this particular case, but it is really the foundation requirements that the amendment is trying to address.

Marilyn Pinkley speaks about all the storage containers that are now in the County, but that they are no longer an interesting thing to see because they are not to code. She talks about how the question of storage containers in neighborhoods has become an increasingly important topic.

James mentions balancing interests; containers are of considerable utility in a rural community.

Cindy Wiley emphasized that there doesn't seem to be limits on lot coverage when using shipping containers.

PAC asks if there are coverage requirements on lots.

Rob emphasizes that this particular case has to be taken as an example only.

Marilyn would like to address only the engineering of the foundation at this time.

James says that taking away the engineered foundation may make it too easy to drop containers just anywhere. PAC discusses what an engineered foundation is. James is okay with dropping engineered requirement but thinks there should be a limit on how many there are on a lot.

Rob asks why we are more offended by storage containers in multiples compared to exempt structures in multiples on lots?

Ken Van Buskirk mentions the SMP and No Net Loss as a possible solution to the Wiley and Pinkley problem.

Vicki talks about the sheer amount of pieces covering the lot, which James responds with his openness to limiting number of containers depending on square footage. Vicki steps back to say it may be best to concentrate on the foundation and then come back to storage containers in a broad sense. No matter what size, currently no storage container is exempt from the foundation requirement.

Dave mentions coverage depends on zone and lot size. James wants details on the zoning and coverage requirements. Dave will come back with that information.

Marilyn asks where engineered foundation requirements are found, Dave explains that it is in the building code.

Rob asks Dave to bring this back as a hearing.

Marilyn talks about practicality and setbacks, if containers are all on same slab, are they one building? James is more inclined to think so, if they are all under the same roof.

Vicki talks about pouring a slab for a box container seems irresponsible in regards to the environment.

New Business-

Rob Drexler announces tonight's meeting will be his last. He would like to make a motion to nominate James Thomas as chair and Vicki Wilson as vice chair. Marilyn seconded the motion, all in favor, motion carried.

Dave mentions another news release has gone out regarding PAC membership.

Rob asks for term expirations of current members to be sent to the PAC.

Adjournment

Rob adjourned the meeting at 7:51 p.m.