



MASON COUNTY

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION**

**MASON COUNTY COMMUNITY SERVICES**

615 W. ALDER STREET, SHELTON, WA 98584

Meetings held at: Commissioners' Chambers

411 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street Shelton, WA 98584

**REGULAR MEETING**

January 27, 2020

**MINUTES**

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Marilyn Vogler, Planning Advisory Commission Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following commissioners were in attendance:

**Marilyn Vogler  
Brian Smith  
Mac McLean**

**Deb Soper  
Aaron Cleveland**

**Excused: Morgan Ireland**

**Staff: Kell Rowen – Planning Manager  
Mariah Frazier – Clerical**

**2. REGULAR BUSINESS**

**A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner McLean mentioned his name was spelled incorrectly twice on page three. Motion was made by Commissioner Cleveland and seconded by Commissioner Smith to approve the minutes from the December 19, 2019 regular meeting with corrections.

**Vote:**

5 in favor

0 opposed

**Motion passed**

**B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

Commissioner Vogler stated that election of Chair and Vice Chair needed to be added to the agenda. Motion was made by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Cleveland to add the election to the end of the meeting.

**Vote:**

*This is a short summary of the action that took place during the meeting. The audio recording of the meeting can be found on the Planning Advisory Commission page of the Mason County website.*

5 in favor  
0 opposed  
**Motion passed**

**C. CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

None

**D. NEXT REGULAR MEETING(S)**

**February 24, 2020** – Date was written incorrectly on the agenda as February 27. This meeting will be a joint meeting the BOCC, held on the 4<sup>th</sup> Monday of the month as the 3<sup>rd</sup> is a holiday.

**E. COMMITTEE/STAFF UPDATES**

None.

**F. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – 6:05 p.m.**

None. Public Comment Closed – 6:05 p.m.

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS - 6:05 p.m.**

***Remanded: Proposed Rezone of several adjoining parcels in the Allyn UGA from Village Commercial to Medium Residential – 6:05 p.m.***

Kell began by giving a brief overview, stating after recommending approval from PAC at the November meeting, she brought it forward to the BOCC and briefed to have it put on the action agenda. The day of the hearing with the BOCC it was taken off the agenda and remanded back to the PAC for further review. Kell continued, stating she tried to get clarification as to why the BOCC remanded the rezone, but was ultimately unsure of specific reasoning or concerns that they wanted the PAC to readdress.

Public Comment Opened – 6:08 p.m.

- **Jeff Carey** – Mr. Carey, one of the applicants, expressed his agreement with Kell on the confusion as to the reasoning or concerns that led the BOCC to remand the rezone. He further indicated his concern regarding his lack of hearing before the BOCC as they removed it from their agenda and what precedent that sets for future rezones. He then reminded the PAC that the rezone is being requested by multiple property owners after many years of not being able to develop, and that the decision was not made lightly. As someone who had helped create the zoning in Allyn, Mr. Carey stated he is aware of the original intent for that area, but after 20 years, it is time to recognize the current need for it to be residential.

Commissioner Vogler stated her issue isn't with the area itself being residential rather than commercial, but instead the cumulative impact of rezones to the commercial district in Allyn, as they've already rezoned one area from VC to Mixed Use. Mr. Carey understood Commissioner Vogler's point but explained that the nature of Allyn is as a

residential community, not a commercial hub. “People don’t move to Allyn to work in Allyn.”

- **Ken VanBuskirk** – Ken expressed his concern about the rezone being remanded by stating the PAC had passed it unanimously with little discussion outside of public testimony, implying it was an easy decision. He was also troubled by Commissioner Neatherlin stating the community is against the rezone when the testimony given at the November PAC meeting from the neighborhood was in favor the rezone as well as it being requested by multiple property owners. Ken read from the briefing minutes, where it was noted Commissioner Neatherlins concern was due to it being the only commercial core in Allyn. He also repeated from the minutes that the county has 120 days to give a decision on a rezone and this has been well over 200. Ken recommended the PAC return the rezone to the BOCC with a unanimous recommendation for approval.

Public Comment Closed – 6:34 p.m.

Beginning Commissioner discussion, Commissioner Cleveland stated he hadn’t heard anything different that changes his opinion on the matter. Commissioner Smith agreed that there was nothing new to make him change is mind and stated because this rezone would be lower intensity, the mobility plan would be a non-issue if that is the concern.

Commissioner Soper asked about the effect this rezone would have on the commercial core. Kell stated there are other commercially zoned areas in Allyn and in rezoning these 8 acres to residential, it would be a decrease of commercial by a percentage in the low teens.

Commissioner McLean stated he wasn’t on the PAC at the time but was in attendance at the original hearing and agreed with the other commissioners. He also stated as a resident that lives just outside Allyn, he can attest to the fact that most people in the area go to Belfair rather than Allyn for their commercial transactions.

Commissioner Smith made a motion to recommend approval to the BOCC. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Cleveland

**Vote:**

5 in favor

0 opposed

**Motion passed**

***Proposed Rezone of a 5-acre parcel from Rural Residential 5 (RR5) to Rural Commercial 5 (RC5) for the purpose of developing a commercially operated Recreational Vehicle and Boat Storage area -6:38 p.m.***

Kell gave a brief overview stating this is an applicant led rezone. Two letters had been received prior to the meeting to add to the record. The first from Dudley Cooney at Pickering Marine, a boat storage facility further down the road stating the need for covered storage and the benefit to the community. The second letter was from William Gaines, a neighboring property owner stating his opposition due to the residential character of the area.

Commissioner Smith asked about SHPO and the cultural resources as there were some conflicting dates. Kell explained the review process for SEPA up to this point had been a bit back and forth but that she had just received notification that an archaeological survey would be done by Antiquity Consulting.

Commissioner Vogler asked Kell to speak on potential use and site-specific rezones for the present public's benefit. Kell explained that while SEPA review may address a site-specific project, in reviewing a rezone request all potential allowed uses are being considered, not just the applicant's proposal.

Before opening public comment, Commissioner Vogler asked if the consultant for the applicant would like to speak on the project. He stated he was happy to answer any questions but didn't have anything specific at this time to say.

Public Comment Opened – 6:53 p.m.

- **Miles Silverthorn** – Mr. Silverthorn expressed his concern about the effect the rezone would have on property values. He also had concerns about the traffic impact as people already speed down Pickering Rd. Mr. Silverthorn also mentioned there are other boat and RV storage facilities in the area that are not filled or used to their capacity.
- **Fred Jones** – Mr. Jones stated opposition to the rezone. He had considered rezoning some of his property several years ago and was dissuaded due to the residential zoning in the area. While currently being opposed if the rezone, Mr. Jones said he would be the first to submit to rezone his property were this rezone to pass due to the precedent it would set.
- **George Searcy** – Mr. Searcy stated he was against the rezone, citing the precedent it would set and the other allowed uses for the zoning that could occur in the future were the applicant to sell.
- **Mark Dean** – Mr. Dean said he was against the rezone due to the residential nature of the area. He also stated that he took issue with the staff report for saying because of the proximity to the boat launch, the proposed use made sense. Mr. Dean pointed out that there is a commercial district just up the road that would make more sense for this type of proposal.
- **Pamela Harrell** – Mrs. Harrell expressed her opposition reiterating what had been said before. Her main concern was the traffic and safety impacts.
- **Joshua Green** – Mr. Green opposed the rezone and was concerned mostly with the precedent rezoning would cause to the community.
- **Mike Mostyn** – Mr. Mostyn stated he was against the rezone stating the change to the residential nature would be significant. He also was concerned about traffic and property values.
- **Roxanne Silverthorn** – Mrs. Silverthorn stated her opposition and agreed with all the previous points made. She read a letter from Loretta Woerle, a neighbor unable to attend, that was also against the rezone.

- **Dudley Cooney** – Mr. Cooney stated he felt his letter was slightly misinterpreted as his approval for the rezone. Mr. Cooney stated he is not for or against the rezone. As a boat storage facility owner in the same area that was grandfathered into the zoning, he understands the need for the proposed project, but also understands the concerns of the neighborhood and believes they should be considered.

Commissioner Vogler asked what exactly Mr. Cooney meant by the need being present when the previous neighbors had stated there were similar facilities, such as his, nearby that weren't being used to their full capacity. Mr. Cooney explained the difference is that Mr. Buck is proposing covered storage that would better protect boats and RV's in the off season for non-local owners to not have to transport them as often.

- **Jeremy Morris** – Mr. Morris expressed his opposition, citing the location of the property and the traffic concerns.
- **Clay Allen** – Mr. Allen stated he and his wife are against the rezone saying he agrees with everything that has been said before him.
- **Ernie Harrell** – Mr. Harrell was also against the rezone. He agreed with everyone else and mostly concerned with the future use of the property if it were to be rezoned.
- **Mike Mostyn** – Mr. Mostyn offered insight to the demographic of Mason County, stating 88% of waterfront property owners in Mason County don't live in Mason County. He stated however, that this community is different, and most property owners are full time residents.
- **Erik Johnson (Applicant Representative)** – Mr. Johnson spoke to some of the concerns raised by the public. He stated that there is no objection that traffic is bad on the road but that it's a separate issue from the project itself. He also stated that as this is a commercial project the access in and out would be much larger than the residential driveways. He reiterated that this will be a covered storage facility and will state of the art when it comes to stormwater.

Some questions had been raised about sewer to which Mr. Johnson stated isn't required as there won't be anyone living onsite. Commissioner Soper also confirmed that there would be no dump station on site.

Commissioner Vogler had a few questions. First, she asked about there being a collection system for washing boats. Mr. Johnson stated that they were planning on a collection system that would up to the newest and best ecology standards. She also asked about the out of town clients and how often these boats would be taken in and out of storage. Mr. Johnson stated they would only be moved once or twice a year and would be left in the water during the boating season.

An audience member asked about taking down the trees and how that would affect stormwater. Kell added that the applicant is in the process of getting an FPA and that the trees could be taken down regardless of the rezone.

Someone asked about security. Mr. Johnson said there would be a security fence with a code that works during certain hours of the day. He also stated he lives right there and would be around to monitor.

Commissioner Soper also asked about the proposed maintenance building. Mr. Johnson stated it would be for tool storage and the like, not for a caretaker to live in.

- **Anna Green** – Mrs. Green wanted to state her opposition. Her biggest concern was the potential uses allowed in the future.

Public Comment Closed – 7:51 p.m.

Commissioner Soper stated there was a proposed caretaker residence for in the future and asked if it was an allowed use. Kell stated it would be a allowed as an accessory use, therefore the rezone would have to be approved and the commercial project in place before a caretaker facility could be put in. She also confirmed that at that point septic would have to be addressed.

Commissioner McLean stated his concern was with it being a spot rezone and would prefer to see it clustered with other commercial areas or have a more present need in the current area. Commissioner Soper agreed with Commissioner McLean citing the Comp Plan as a form of predictability for what homeowners are buying into when purchasing property in certain areas.

Commissioner Smith made a motion to recommend denial to the BOCC. Motion was seconded by Commissioner McLean.

**Vote:**

5 in favor

0 opposed

**Motion passed**

**5. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR – 7:59 p.m.**

Commissioner Cleveland proposed that they keep things the way they are with Commissioner Vogler as Chair and himself as Vice Chair if no one had a problem with it. Commissioner Smith asked if everyone should approve the proposal by acclimation rather than formal motion. Commissioner Vogler asked for the vote for her to remain as chair, followed by a vote for Commissioner Cleveland to be Vice Chair.

**Vote for Chair:**

5 in favor

0 opposed

**Motion passed**

**Vote for Vice Chair:**

5 in favor

0 opposed

**Motion passed**

**6. ADJOURN**

Before adjourning, Commissioner Vogler reminded everyone to think about topics for the joint meeting. A few items were briefly discussed. Commissioner Vogler called the meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.