

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

October 16, 2017

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

Call to Order

James called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

Roll Call

Present: Aaron Cleveland, Deb Soper, Marilyn Vogler, Jason Bailey, Vicki Wilson, and James Thomas

Regular Business

Approval of minutes -

September 27, 2017 Joint BOCC/PAC Meeting - No changes mentioned. Marilyn made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Vicki seconded the motion, all in favor, motion carried.

Approval of Agenda – No changes made to the agenda.

Conflict of Interest – Jason Bailey mentioned he serves on the Pioneer School District School Board.

Next Planning Commission Regular Meeting Date, November 20, 2017

Committee/Staff Updates – Paula mentioned the Peninsula Planner’s Forum on October 19, 2017 will be starting at 9am at the Squaxin Community Kitchen.

Other – None

Continued Public Hearing from September 18, 2017- Mason County Comprehensive Plan Update – Rezones, Development Regulations, and Chapters

This time was used to hear public comment.

Jason Dose, Senior Planner with the City of Shelton, spoke about the City’s previous presentation to the PAC at the beginning of 2017. The topic at that time, as well as now, was a proposed UGA expansion and the corresponding draft environmental impact statement. The expansion proposal was for two areas, Goldsborough Heights and Dayton-Airport Road Commercial Industrial Center. In early 2017, they had proposed three different alternatives based on the draft environmental impact statement: Alternative one: no action; Alternative two: Goldsborough Heights Residential Expansion and Dayton-Airport Road Primary Business Center; Alternative three: Goldsborough Heights Golf Course and Dayton Airport Road Commercial-Industrial Center. Jason stated that the City is recommending alternative two. Jason described some of the alternative details, which can be found in the staff report that they included for the meeting.

Paula noted that by incorporating the population forecast numbers, submitted by the City of Shelton, into the Comprehensive Plan, the PAC has already taken steps to support the expansion that the City of Shelton proposed.

James asked the PAC if they had a clear consensus regarding the expansion of the Shelton UGA and their earlier vote to incorporate that information into the Comp Plan packet. Deb asked about the CARA's in the expansion areas and if they had been adequately mapped. Jason responded that the City had, as part of the EIS, had their BERK consultant review the City's maps in conjunction with the model the Squaxin's have done based, on groundwater recharge rates. He stated that they were told the City's maps roughly match the information in the Squaxin's. The EIS suggests that if they develop to their regulations and utilize LID, along with the aquifer recharge ordinance guiding development, they would be taking those CARA's into account with the best possible data available.

Marilyn asked about permitting and regulations regarding water usage in the expansions. Jason responded that no matter who does the permitting, water usage and utilities will be under the City's regulations.

Vicki mentioned that reading the City's report, the site specific critical areas studies will have to be done for any development that is proposed.

Kris Klusman, realtor and co-owner of the John L. Scott office in Belfair, noted he was present to comment on the Belfair Development Regulations revisions that have been presented for recommendation to the BOCC. He noted that part of his job was to research market statistics and how that will affect home ownership and housing inventory. He said that they are seeing a lot of builders building right now, but not in the Belfair Urban Growth Area, which has caused high prices due to their low inventory. He noted that inside a UGA there is supposed to be low income housing, but due to LID, minimum parcel sizes, larger setbacks than other jurisdictions, and high sewer hookup fees, the cost of new home construction is tens of thousands of dollars higher inside the UGA; this area is supposed to be a cheaper option. He wrapped it up by saying that if the UGA could place more homes on a parcel it would help spread out the cost of infrastructure fees and provide more affordable housing options.

Wayne Carlson from AHBL Inc., stated that Mason County was on the cutting edge of LID practices but standards within the codes (regarding the Belfair UGA) didn't support affordability the way they could have. The adoption of Ecology's 2012 Western Washington Stormwater Management Manual would provide greater protection for water resources than in the current Belfair Development Regulations. Wayne stated he was part of the committee that helped to write the 2012 manual, and that the State now has a definition of what LID is and counties don't have to be alone in trying to figure this practice out.

Stephanie Neil spoke on behalf of her rezone request. She brought printed maps for the commission members, clerk made copy for file. She spoke about the desire to remove their one-acre parcel from the Belfair UGA boundary and rezone from rural residential 4 to rural residential 5. She spoke of Irene Creek running through the property. She noted that when the Belfair UGA boundaries were drawn, Irene Creek was not on Mason County's maps or GIS layers. She pointed out one of the maps that she had handed out, showing the correction of GIS

maps to show Irene Creek, she said it was fish bearing and a tributary to the Union River. She also explained that one of her maps showed that the parcel was within a critical aquifer recharge area, which was identified after the UGA boundaries were drawn. She stated that they believed it was an error to add the parcel to the UGA boundary because the proper data was not available to zone it. She talked about the parcel borders surrounded by RR5 zoning. She pointed out that there was a parcel across the road zoned as RR4 but couldn't be developed as such because there was a huge wetland mapped on it. Additionally, there was another parcel across the road that was bought by the Greater Peninsula Conservancy and would be preserved as habitat in perpetuity. She mentioned the letter of support by the GPC which the commissioners received, also in the clerk's file. James asked Paula questions about the zoning around the parcel in question. Paula noted that the parcels above and around the one in question were pulled out of the UGA, but she wasn't sure why. Paula stated, that as a planner, she had to recommend not breaking an Urban Growth Boundary at a centerline of a roadway, due to development pressure.

Barbara Parsloe read a two-page letter regarding the Countywide Planning Policies within the Comprehensive Plan. The letter is on file for this meeting date.

Jack Johnson talked about the Belfair Development Regulations as a way to develop with more flexibility and a product that they can develop for the incoming market. He said that the building that is occurring is not in the UGA, and hopefully with the revisions building will shift back to the Belfair UGA. Deb asked Jack if he was part of the Belfair Sub-Area group back when the regulations were put together and if he was, was he happy with the product that they put together at that time. Jack answered at the time those regulations were prepared by consultants and the group had looked toward Kirkland as an example, but it wasn't designed toward the rural character of Belfair. He mentioned that in hind sight he didn't think the original regulations were much of a product and if it had stood the test of time, individuals and developers would be buying land and building, but that hasn't occurred.

James mentioned that in an earlier meeting a Belfair resident had spoken on his desire for the PAC to consider re-establishing the Belfair Sub-Area committee. James talked about how he recently went to a community meeting up in Belfair and spoke and tried to see if there was interest in such a committee and people willing to serve. He said that no real interest or initiative was shown at the meeting for such a committee. He stated that the people of Belfair were being crushed by the weight of the sewer system and that relief was only going to come from increasing development in the Belfair UGA.

Marilyn asked Kris Klusman why "mini-storage" was included as an allowed use in the revisions of the Belfair Development Regulations and what did it do to neighborhood attractiveness and value. Kris stated that there were ways to make mini-storage more attractive. He noted that if people are building in the UGA, it will typically be a smaller square footage with a limited parking area, so the need for storage could be a possibility. He talked about the school districts always needing storage space and that many times, because they are highly discounted, they get kicked out of their space. James asked if restricting mini-storage to industrial type zoning would be appropriate. Kris responded that he believed they needed all the industrial in Belfair that they could get, these are areas that could potentially contain many jobs. He believed there were other more appropriate zones in the UGA and that they were important to the area. Jack Johnson noted

that the inclusion of mini-storage was due to it not being found in the code. He said maybe it should be a conditional use, same issue with Recreational Parks and Mobile Home Parks.

End of Public Comment

Briefing #1 – Draft Recorded Motion, Comprehensive Plan Amendments and Development Regulations (2nd PAC Briefing on these topics)

Presenter(s): Paula Reeves, Planning Manager

Paula wanted to recap the last six months that she had been working with the PAC. She talked about how this update of the Comprehensive Plan had taken place since March of 2015. She quickly mentioned the Amendments that were part of the Comp Plan package:

- Revise Belfair Urban Growth Area development regulations (MCC 17.20-17.35) consistent with best management practices for stormwater, current national transportation standards, and other best practices all consistent with goals, policies and objectives of Mason Counties Comprehensive Plan and provisions of the Washington State Growth Management Act.
- Limit non-agricultural uses to agricultural lands less suited for agricultural purposes (RCW 36.70A.177(3))
- Revise the Critical Areas Ordinance and Shoreline Master Program (MCC 8.52 and MCC 17.50) to meet current state and federal requirements.
- Ensure continued public involvement in the Comprehensive Plan including annual and emergency amendments (RCW 36.70A.130(2))
- Exclude artificial features – irrigation delivery systems, irrigation infrastructure, canals, drainage ditches – from “Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas” (RCW 36.70A.030(5))
- Permit electric vehicle charging stations in all zones except residential, resource or critical areas (RCW 36.70A.695)

She also noted the rezones for Neil and Padden and the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance that was also included in the amendment package.

Since Mr. Padden was not present to talk about his rezone request, Paula mentioned that the structure on the parcel had been acting as a business for several decades, with prior business activity as an appliance retail store. It is a non-conforming use that was brought to the County’s attention due to a boundary line adjustment request. Paula pulled up the Mason County Code on the tv screen to show the PAC and public what encompassed General Commercial Use.

Paula noted that between 2005-2016 the Comprehensive Plan had changed little. She talked about how there were a lot of revisions through the State and the County’s ability to map and provide those maps had changed. Paula mentioned that the Countywide Planning Policies had been mentioned earlier in the meeting, these policies use to be throughout the twelve chapters. It had been the desire of the PAC to consolidate these policies, some things that were objectives were incorrectly labeled as policies. So now in the Countywide Planning Policies Chapter, there

are clearly policies as required by State law and then objectives to meet those policies. The PAC also has the additional chapters of the Rural Element, Citizen's Guide, and a Plan Implementation and Monitoring Chapter. The Glossary of Terms was revised and more closely matches what is in Mason County Code and reconciles with State law. She also talked about the Parks and Recreation Plan, Transportation Plan, and Economic Element which were accomplished through other committees. Paula mentioned that Aaron had suggested cliff notes to help people better understand the Belfair Development Regulations. In her summarization of the regulations, she believed they were a reasonable request to better align with some of the urban design approaches with neighboring communities.

Action Item #1 – Development Regulations

James went around the table asking each PAC member if they had any other issues with the Belfair Development Regulations. All agreed to move on to the next item.

James moved on to the two rezones, starting with the Neil rezone (DDR2017-00085). Jason noted that his main issue with this case was what would develop on site after the rezone. Paula added that the major issue with this case was the removal of the parcel from the Belfair UGA. James was still curious about the parcels surrounding the one in question and why they were pulled out of the Belfair UGA. Vicki pointed out that one of the parcels he mentioned was the Davis parcel that they pulled out of the UGA in November of 2016. Vicki read from the Davis staff report, an analysis regarding Irene Creek and its fish bearing status with a buffer and setback that eliminated its development at an urban level.

The PAC then discussed the Padden rezone (DDR2017-00074). Paula pulled up the parcel on the map for everyone to see. The parcel is both low-density and medium density residential right now, but non-conforming in use, it is currently an operating commercial use. The parcel has been a commercial business for many years, even before the current owner; Paula believed the parcel may have been erroneously zoned when the Belfair UGA was mapped. She noted that it is off a large corridor, the zoning across the road is residential, the neighbors across the road were in the audience earlier in the meeting and were not opposed to the business. Paula brought up the code on the tv showing what was allowed under commercial use, there was a great variety. Marilyn was concerned about rezoning this to general commercial when it was surrounded by residential, she mentioned encouraging non-conforming uses to become conforming. James noted that he would have the same concerns if the parcel hadn't been a commercial business when they had drawn the boundaries. Paula noted that if we are looking to the future the idea of walkability and accessibility in the UGA may be desirable. Jason asked how big the parcel was, the answer was 2.24 acres. Aaron added that not a lot of structures could be added at that size of parcel. They discussed the idea of zoning mixed-use and they were worried about spot zoning, but weren't sure if this case fit into that definition.

Break

Briefing #2 – Rural School Siting: Hood Canal and Pioneer School Districts are planning for student growth

Presenter(s): Shawn Batstone, Hood Canal School District Superintendent. Martin Brewer, Pioneer School District Superintendent.

Shawn described where the Hood Canal School District was located, the size of the school, and certified staff. Martin described his experience as superintendent for Pioneer School District, the size of the school, their new middle school, and certified staff.

Both representatives were there to present the PAC with their plan for a comprehensive high school. Both the Pioneer and Hood Canal district are a non-high school district requiring them to pay capital fees. Shelton School District can apply a capital fee to the Hood Canal and Pioneer districts if kids from their districts use the Shelton high school. The districts got together and talked about three options: continue to pay the non-high capital fee, combine the school districts, or building their own high school. Both districts surveyed the public to get their input, they got over 800 responses, in person and online; 72% of the tax payers that responded to the survey wanted the school districts to consider building a high school. The plan was to look at a comprehensive high school which included 24 college credits, engaging the community and setting up business partnerships. The school would include integrated project based learning with dual credit opportunities and job opportunities while in school.

Ideas for the location of the new high school for 550 students, included the south end of the Hood Canal district, thus keeping bus routes very similar to what they are now. The superintendents mentioned a provision in the law that allows schools to be built outside the UGA given there is no exceptional land use. They showed a preliminary design of what the school might look like.

Briefing #3 – Water Availability

Presenter: Paula Reeves, Planning Manager.

Paula talked about the State requirements for water mitigation, the change to calling it water planning framework within the County offices. Include guidelines for staff, determining water availability for building and subdivision. She mentioned Chapter 6.68 Water Adequacy regulations, language on senior water right, and drafting MOU with the tribal nations to take next steps in water planning. She asked that the recorded motion encourage further study in water study planning, in compliance with the RCWs.

Erica Marbet mentioned that they were pleased with the MOU, she talked about Ecology's in flow stream rules that might need to be added to the MOU.

Action Item #2 – Recorded Motion including Comprehensive Plan Amendments and Rezones

Presenter: Paula Reeves, Planning Manager.

Paula pulled the Recorded Motion and Finding of Facts on the tv. James asked the PAC if they agreed with the displayed findings.

There was some discussion on changing the reference to the stormwater plan.

The PAC and Paula reviewed the Finding of Facts, what was required by law to be included and what was not. Vicki asked Paula to list out the required Development Regulations in the Finding of Facts. James asked the PAC if they had any more comments on the Finding of Facts, none.

They then moved on to the Final Recommendations. They edited the document to strike the Belfair Development Regulations since they would be including those revisions in the current update. The group added water modeling language to the list of recommendations. Discussion of Belfair Development Regulations, the added cliff notes, and making the language consistent with the rest of Mason County Code. Paula went over how these inconsistencies were corrected. Group continued to discuss what was appropriate in a recommendation and in a workplan.

Kris Klusman talked about the history of the Old Belfair Hwy zoning and what type of uses had occurred over many years.

The PAC circled back to the Padden rezone and the validity of changing the zone. They added language to the recommendation approving the Neil rezone and the Padden rezone.

Paula noted that by the PAC adopting this record motion and recommendations, they will be sending the Comprehensive Plan, Rezones, and Amendments to the Board of County Commissioners. The PAC finished up their recommendations and then reviewed one by one with each member.

Aaron made a motion to adopt the recorded motion as presented. Marilyn seconded the motion.

Deb asked for discussion and read aloud a letter about her concerns, “specifically that she felt the process lacked transparency and denied members of the public the opportunity to view and comment on the proposed changes.”

Chair James Thomas asked if all in favor, five in favor (Cleveland, Bailey, Vogler, Wilson, and Thomas), and one opposed (Soper); motion carried.

The recorded motion language can be found at the following link:

<http://www.co.mason.wa.us/community-services/planning/2036-comp-plan-update/recorded-motion-10162017.pdf>

New Business – None

Adjournment

Adjourned the meeting at 9:21 p.m.