

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
May 16, 2005

(Note audio tape (#2) dated May 16, 2005
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

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

=====

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Dewey at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bill Dewey, Steve Clayton, Wendy Ervin, Tim Wing, Mark Drain and Diane Edgin. Terri Jeffreys was excused.

Staff Present: Bob Fink, Darren Nienaber, Allan Borden, Barbara Adkins, Stephanie Pawlawski and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0015) Bill Dewey: We have two main items on our agenda this evening. They're public hearings on two rezone requests. The first one that we'll hear is a rezone request by the Shelton Bayshore Golf Club to rezone property from Rural Residential 5 to Rural Tourist and then we'll consider a second rezone request by Minerva Beach Homeowners Association to rezone three properties from Rural Tourist to Rural Multi Family. We'll begin the hearing on the Shelton Bayshore Golf Club request. Allan?

(#0035) Allan Borden: I'm Allan Borden with the Department of Community Development. Before I start I have copies of the actual application from the Bayshore Golf Club for your information. This first rezone request is to rezone one parcel from RR5 zone to Rural Tourist zone. The parcel is a little over one acre in size and it's located next to the remaining parcels that are currently zoned Rural Tourist. *(Allan shows on vicinity map)*. The Bayshore site is on Oakland Bay just northeast of Shelton along Highway 3. There are two properties up here and one was a house included in the Rural Tourist zone and the subject property is this house here located right on the easement from Highway 3.

(#0090) Wendy Ervin: Where is the espresso stand?

(#0095) Allan Borden: It's in this lawn area right here and the paved parking lot is just to the east. The

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

Bayshore Golf Course owns a 49-acre property that has a golf course on it and they do own this additional 1-acre parcel that's already zoned Rural Tourist and is used for a caretaker residence for the golf course. The applicant has submitted this rezone request in order to include the subject parcel in the potential area proposed for Rural Tourist land use activities. Such land uses will need to be compatible with adjacent land uses within the Bayshore Hamlet boundary. Typically we review these rezones on 8 criteria and they're listed in the staff report. The first criteria is whether public health, safety and welfare standards are met. If this request is approved, all land uses will have to meet proper setbacks, health, traffic and safety standards for whatever land use is proposed. Criteria 2, consistent zoning, if the small parcel is Rural Tourist it will be a consistent zone since the adjacent properties to the west, south and southeast are currently zoned Rural Tourist and potential Rural Tourist uses could be sited on all of the properties. The third criteria about sprawling, low density development; as a result of the rezone development of a Rural Tourist land use would not cause sprawling, low density development because all of the properties are all within the hamlet boundary and the hamlet boundary acts as a boundary to delineate where non-residential uses can exist. Criteria 4 talks about the level of services and are they adequate for the proposed rezone. The land use proposed on the subject parcel, if rezoned, will need to meet those levels of service for water supply, sewage treatment, traffic, ingress and egress and fire and police protection as part of the development review process. Location of such land uses that are tourist related are suitable for within the hamlet area. Criteria 5, that the proposed rezone does not affect development in the UGA. Land uses on the subject property, if approved for rezone, would not affect development in the nearby Shelton UGA because such Rural Tourist land uses take place typically in rural areas and provide open space amenities outside the UGA. Criteria 6, open space and critical area protection; proposals for development on Rural Tourist lands need to provide for such protections. The proposed rezone of the small parcel would reduce land conflicts between residential and rural tourist activities. Criteria 7, there would not be any change in population growth in the Bayshore Hamlet as a result of this rezone nor would there be pressure to cause additional rezone requests. So in summary, we're looking to rezone from Rural Residential 5 to Rural Tourist within the Bayshore Hamlet. Any proposed development, if the rezone is approved, will have to meet appropriate development standards. The Planning Advisory Commission's responsibility tonight is to review this request and make recommendations to the County Commissioners. The County Commissioners are the decision making authority when looking at rezone requests. The Planning Advisory Commission's consideration tonight include the following options: Approve the proposal as requested making any necessary modifications or deny the proposal. The county would support the requested rezone. It meets all of the rezone criteria and we find it consistent.

(#0294) Diane Edgin: Do you have anything on the application as to how many RV units they are considering?

(#0300) Allan Borden: I believe it's 31. The applicant did, in July 2004, apply for a pre-submission meeting for RV facilities. It was at that time that they realized if they wanted to develop an RV park on the subject parcel they would have to rezone it.

(#0320) Diane Edgin: Was there anything in there that mentioned whether they were going to put in a septic for the RV park or were they going to use a dump?

(#0335) Allan Borden: I don't have that detail.

(#0337) Diane Edgin: I think that's an important consideration.

(#0340) Allan Borden: If this property is rezoned to Rural Tourist they will have to apply for an RV park permit. That's a public review process that will go in front of the Hearing Examiner and there are standards in the ordinance that they will have to provide, including proper setbacks and buffers from the state highway, septic, maneuvering lanes within the park, distance between sites and any amenities including open space. Really, your issue tonight is you have to consider the subsequent development proposal but we're mainly looking at consistency with zoning standards and whether certain aspects of changing the zoning would affect the Comp Plan and goals of the GMA.

(#0375) Bill Dewey: Allan, I've wrestled with this one. I recognize that we have to rely on the Development Regulations to assure that whatever proposal comes in is done appropriately. Obviously with the shellfish industry in Oakland Bay I have the same questions that Diane has raised as far as potential impacts. It

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

sounds like the application is either for an RV park or to also expand the golf course and with a golf course comes assorted chemicals in fertilizers and pesticides that could potentially impact water quality as well. With that said, we do have in front of us criteria 3 which includes 'or to significantly increase uses incompatible with resource based uses in the vicinity'. Clearly the shellfish culture industry is a resource based industry in Oakland Bay. Is that a consideration that we take into account about potential impacts based on criteria 3?

(#0420) Allan Borden: Definitely you would want to take that into consideration. The property itself is at least 600 feet or more from the saltwater. Hopefully that would be addressed in the subsequent permit review, whether it's for expansion of the golf course or provision for stormwater, septic and water supply for an RV facility.

(#0440) Bill Dewey: I noticed in the application they're saying the stormwater will infiltrate or drain to the bay. The 'drain to the bay' raises flags for me. Any other questions for Allan?

(#0454) Tim Wing: My question is are we supposed to ignore issues of this type and just look at the zoning issue because if we start deciding on this based on what we think might happen with septic or stormwater we're putting some science hats on that I don't think is our role here. I do share the view that it is an important issue and it has to be addressed at some point in the process but there is potential that they could park RV's there without having a septic system at all and if that's the case and they're just using their holding tanks it's not going to have a whole lot of impact on anything. The real question is are we supposed to consider this issue or are we supposed to just consider the zoning and the use of the property issue and then let some other element of the process make sure that this is not going to hurt the shellfish industry or the bay?

(#0495) Allan Borden: Yes, you should consider the impacts of the subsequent development but there are safeguards for addressing a lot of those concerns. If the property owner were to put more than three RV's on the property they would be in violation of the mobile home / RV park ordinance.

(#0522) Bob Fink: My name is Bob Fink and I am the Planning Manager with the Department of Community Development. The Planning Advisory Commission should consider the nature of future development that could be allowed by this zoning. The particular proposal to do an RV park is not something that would necessarily follow from the rezone, although that was obviously the current intent of the property owner when they requested this rezone. They're not obligated to follow through with that development and they or a different owner could pursue any other permitted development in that area. So when you change the zoning from a low density residential zone, which is what's currently there, to a zoning which is for a rural tourism, then that does allow for some intensification of use of the property and the form that could take is hard to pin down because it does allow for a variety of uses. You have to also ask yourself when you consider this the overall intensity that would be allowed of a rural tourism development is limited in the rural area by the requirement that you have a separation between any new designations. You need to also consider that this parcel is already surrounded by rural tourism and gives a great deal of flexibility as to what development would happen. Those are all things you need to consider. You can't come to a very conclusive answer regarding environmental impacts since this is not a project specific proposal.

(#0580) Bill Dewey: Thank you for that, Bob. Any other questions by the PAC for staff? Okay, then I'd like to open up the public hearing for public comment.

(#0594) Bill Broughton: My name is Bill Broughton and I'm with the law firm of Broughton and Singleton in Silverdale. All the questions you've asked are good questions and I'll do my best to answer them recognizing that my client owns 49 acres and 48 of the 49 acres are already zoned and I don't know the history of why the one acre was left out. The one acre we're attempting to rezone is surrounded by existing Rural Tourist. It is our intent on about three acres to do an RV park. We've hired an RV park consultant and we're very concerned about potential negative impacts on the bay, the shellfish industry. I would note that the golf course industry over the last fifteen or twenty years has done a very good job of moving away from deleterious fertilizers and pesticides and are much more environmentally sensitive now to the way they manage golf course resources. In the process we will be talking to the shellfish industry, any Indian tribes, the WDFW and DNR which owns the park that is nearby. Scott Alexander will talk more about the specifics but what we're looking at here is a higher end, short term stay RV park to be an amenity for people who want to come play the golf course and enjoy the DNR beach properties. This is not going to be a trailer park or a

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

long term stay kind of facility. Certainly as we go through the process we're going to be evaluating issues such as stormwater; our goal is to try and impound and retain stormwater on site. In storm events there may be some stormwater that might end up in the bay but we certainly would be required to treat it to make sure it caused no negative impact on the bay. The criteria 3 question really goes to cumulative impacts and I think the test is will rezoning this one acre property cause other properties to be rezoned the cumulative impact of which would be deleterious to the environment. We have 48 acres already zoned and the one acre is contained within the body of that other zoning so we certainly don't see any cumulative impact issues before you tonight. The legislature, after passing the GMA in 1997, recognized that there were existing areas of more intense rural development that were outside the UGA's and Mason County recognized this particular area as a LAMIRD. This particular piece of property is within the boundaries of that hamlet that was designated by the BOCC so it's an appropriate use. This particular project is surrounded by the state highway on one side and water on three other sides so there certainly is a contained area. You're not going to have sprawl, which is that the GMA concerns itself with primarily. What I'd like to do is invite Scott Alexander to come up and share some things with you. He is one of the owners of the project and can tell a few more specifics of what it is that we'd like to do. Thank you.

(#0745) Scott Alexander: My name is Scott Alexander and I live in Bremerton. I am an owner of this property with three partners and we bought it about four years ago and have really just tried to come up with ways to operate it the most efficient and the most enjoyable way for all of our customers and we have a great relationship with the membership. We have several petitions from a lot of the neighbors. We sent a letter to all the neighbors. They were very supportive. What we really want to do is build a first class facility with concrete pads and a lot of grass. We already have a greens superintendent and all the equipment to maintain it and we've like to keep it as a park like setting that would blend in with the golf course. Our goal is to bring people into the area that would use the facility and use other facilities. Golf is growing in this way. We will market to outside the area people for short term stays. We are not interested in the long term stays. We want to bring in some folks who could do the whole community some good. I think we can also address the issues that you folks had. We could do holding areas or a drainfield that would stay at least 400 yards away, which would be 1200 feet from the bay. I think we are very sensitive to the issues with the bay. Since we've taken over four years ago we've reduced the fertilizer budget and we've tried to be very sensitive to where it sits and been a good neighbor. I'll have Brian Davis, who is one of my other partners, who is the managing partner who runs the day to day facility and he deals with all our membership and the outside public clientele. Thank you for your time.

(#0860) Brian Davis: My name is Brian Davis and I'm the golf professional out at Bayshore. We did put out petitions when this first came up to see if anybody was against it. We have almost 500 signatures all for it. We haven't had anybody say anything negative about it. Everybody thought it was a good idea. We're not out to make anything bad for anyone. We want to try to make things better. I've been here for almost twenty years and we want Bayshore to have a good rap. As far as the shellfish industry we don't want to make it bad for them, either. We just want to make things better for us and the community.

(#0900) Bill Dewey: Any questions by the PAC for the proponents?

(#0905) Bill Broughton: I will file with you today the petitions and we just want to make sure that you understand that a lot of the signatures are from people who live there. We hired a consultant early on and one of the things that we found out is that there is a real demand for a first class type facility near a nice golf course. One of the things that makes Bayshore more difficult for people to play is that it's a long ride from some places and there aren't really places for people to stay other than in Shelton. Remember we're talking about one acre in the middle of 49 and we appreciate your time and consideration.

(#0935) Bill Dewey: Is there anyone else that would like to testify on the Bayshore rezone request? Seeing no hands come up, I'd like to close the public comment portion of our hearing and entertain suggestions from the PAC as to what they'd like to do on this rezone request.

(#0950) Steve Clayton: It seems like a great fit to me.

(#0954) Mark Drain: I read through the material and I appreciate what the planning department put together on the rezone and I thought it was real thorough. I would agree with the recommendations of the planning

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

department.

(#0966) Bill Dewey: Do I take that as a motion to approve the proposal as the applicant has requested?

(#0968) Mark Drain: Yes.

(#0970) Steve Clayton: I'll second that.

(#0974) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second to approve the rezone. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#0976) Bob Fink: You'll need to make a motion to approve the Findings of Facts based on the staff report for signature by the Chair.

(#0988) Wendy Ervin: I'll make that motion.

(#0990) Diane Edgin: I'll second that motion.

(#0992) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second to approve the Findings of Fact. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Next we have the rezone request from the Minerva Beach Homeowners Association to rezone three properties from Rural Tourist to Rural Multi Family. Allan?

(#1020) Allan Borden: Allan Borden with the Department of Community Development. I'll hand out to you the actual application from the proponents. We have a rezone request from the Minerva Beach Homeowners Association. Their request is to rezone three parcels from the current Rural Tourist zone to Rural Multi Family. The three parcels total 16.55 acres and two of the parcels are used for manufactured home use or for RV's. The third parcel is unimproved. Mason County reviewed a mobile home and RV park permit in March of 1988 for development on two of these parcels; 00025 and 00026. The 72-site plan was approved with conditions by the county commissioners. Conditions of that permit addressed the water system, dump station, buffers and progress reports to the planning department. In review of this rezone request some differences in the existing sites and the permit approved sites were noted. The important issue to consider is that adequate water and septic services are in existence to serve the land uses located on the properties. There are differences in consistencies in what the county information is on what's supposed to be on those properties and what the applicant submitted. Currently the RV sites are conforming in the Rural Tourist and the existing manufactured homes are non-conforming development in that zone. Under the proposed Rural Multi Family zone the RV sites would become non-conforming development and the manufactured homes, at their existing number, are conforming development.

(#1210) Steve Clayton: At their existing or the number that was approved by the commissioners in 1988?

(#1215) Allan Borden: Whatever they're permitted for.

(#1218) Steve Clayton: Well, they were permitted for one number in 1988 and you're saying there's a different number now so is it conforming with the 1988 number or the current number?

(#1222) Allan Borden: You can ask that question now and I'd say whatever they were permitted for. If they have different information from subsequent review they need to submit that to the county. That's an important element in whether the rezone request should be approved or not. If you choose to approve the rezone request, that zone, Rural Multi Family, is for existing development. So if you approve this rezone request the applicants actually can't have any additional mobile home sites. There isn't consistency with what was approved in 1988. There was a water system review in July of 2004 and it actually showed that there were 101 hookups. I want to go through the rezone criteria and then we'll have a discussion on what's there and whether the request is appropriate. Criteria 1 is concerning public health, safety and welfare. There are inconsistencies with the approved septic and water supply and the question of whether these issues are being addressed adequately. Criteria 2, about consistent zone. The property was zoned in March of 2002 as Rural Tourist due to the Assessor's Office land use code and the appropriateness of the RV area.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#1335) Steve Clayton: Allan, on criteria 1 what you said doesn't align with what your staff report says. Yet, on other parts of the staff report you bring out the problematic look that we have at it. I just wanted to bring that up.

(#1360) Allan Borden: That's just a response; it isn't a conclusion. I actually was assisted by another planner in preparing the staff report so we've gone through repeated times trying to perfect the county responses on this as much as we can.

(#1380) Steve Clayton: So the current county response is there are concerns regarding public health?

(#1382) Allan Borden: Yes. Criteria 2. As I mentioned it was rezoned Rural Tourist because of the land use code which is basically a resort code and the presence of RV's. We did know there were mobile homes on the site but the site was zoned Rural Tourist. The Rural Multi Family is intended for existing multi family residence areas and does not provide for expansion of those existing number of residences. Criteria 3 about sprawling, low-density rural development. The proposed rezone to Rural Multi Family will not allow for new or expanded development of manufactured homes on the site. Existing Rural Tourist would enable the applicant to apply for new RV sites as a park expansion. Criteria 4, about service demands in the rural area. Proposed Rural Multi Family zone would not allow for expansion of manufactured homes and thus no new demand in services would result. Criteria 5, about development in urban areas. The requested Rural Multi Family zone would not affect development in urban areas because no additional manufactured homes would be allowed and the existing Rural Tourist zone would be served by on site utilities and would not affect development in urban areas. Criteria 6, about protecting open space and critical areas. The requested Multi Family zone would not allow for the expansion of existing residential development. Existing open space would be maintained under the current Rural Tourist zone due to its proximity to Hood Canal and the state park itself. Development proposed near streams would need to follow the Resource Ordinance standards. Criteria 7, about pressure to change surrounding land uses. Existing Rural Tourist and requested Rural Multi Family zones would not create pressure to change surrounding land use designations. It wouldn't increase the population growth in the vicinity. As I mentioned, the requested rezone to Rural Multi Family will still create a non-conforming land use on the property. The areas that are RV sites would become non-conforming land uses. If the requested rezone is denied, then the existing number of manufactured home sites would be considered a non-conforming development and the RV sites would be the conforming development. There's the possibility that under Rural Tourist the property owners association could apply for an expansion of our RV sites through an RV park permit. Under Rural Multi Family they would be limited to the existing number of manufactured home sites. The existing three parcels are surrounded by rural residential zone properties. There is the state park to the south and there is a typed stream on the southern border of the property that was typed by DNR as a Type 3 stream.

(#1598) Steve Clayton: The southern border or the northern border? There's a fence on the southern border between the park and the property. On the northern border there's a drainage that goes out to the highway.

(#1608) Stephanie Pawlawski: It cuts through the western half of the back two properties. It's not on the water side; it's on the land side and cuts through the back half of those two properties.

(#1625) Allan Borden: Basically the PAC has the following options: You can either approve the requested rezone from Rural Tourist to Rural Multi Family on two of the properties (00025 and 00026), which actually have development on them, the third property on the northern side is vacant so staff would state that that property should remain as Rural Tourist because there's no justification to change it to Rural Multi Family. The county doesn't have enough information to make a recommendation whether the Rural Multi Family should be approved. There's a lot of differences in information and we'll just let the PAC discuss what options they might have.

(#1700) Bill Dewey: Are there questions from the PAC for Allan?

(#1705) Steve Clayton: There are a couple of commercial operations on the property; general store and a laundromat. That fits into the Rural Tourist so they would become non-conforming in a Rural Multi Family?

(#1710) Allan Borden: They would be non-conforming.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#1722) Diane Edgin: The lots within the park, the mobile home units, are they individually owned land or does the park own the ownership and they lease?

(#1730) Allan Borden: They're not individual lots; they're sites.

(#1735) Diane Edgin: They're sites and the association collectively owns the property?

(#1738) Allan Borden: That's correct. The application indicates that on the site plan attached.

(#1800) Tim Wing: Who actually owns the property?

(#1830) Allan Borden: The Minerva Beach Homeowners association purchased the property from a previous owner so the association owns it.

(#1840) Tim Wing: So the people who have mobile homes here are part owners of the property?

(#1850) Allan Borden: You'll have to ask the applicant when they come up for public testimony.

(#1855) Tim Wing: I was also wondering about the RV spots. Do people have a long term lease on those? Or are they leased out by anyone that drives by and drives in and says they want to stay overnight? How does it work?

(#1865) Allan Borden: It's my understanding that some of those RV sites are used for long term purposes and some of them are reserved for a transient nature so people can come and go.

(#1880) Steve Clayton: There was a controversy about the 1988 Planning Commission minutes that the BOCC approved and subsequently it appears that the association didn't abide by. I e-mailed you a request to take a look at those minutes. Have you had a chance to do that to see what concerns the PC had?

(#1898) Allan Borden: Stephanie Pawlawski reviewed the tapes of that proceeding.

(#1915) Steve Clayton: There was a discrepancy on the parcels that the Assessor charges taxes on; I think the number was 39 but there's actually, according to this, more than 70 occupied units. Did you ask the Assessor about that?

(#1935) Allan Borden: No, I didn't have the opportunity to research that.

(#1938) Steve Clayton: I had another concern that I e-mailed you about which was the cancelled building permits. There were a vast majority of the building permits on one of the properties for relocation of new RV's. It went through the permitted phase, they got a building permit, it was installed, they had corrections to make, they failed the first pass, and then mysteriously a year later the building permit was cancelled; it was never completed.

(#1955) Allan Borden: I haven't had a chance to check that out yet.

(#1965) Tim Wing: Am I hearing that individual sites get taxed?

(#1972) Steve Clayton: They're labeled on the county Assessor's site as personal property tax.

(#1976) Tim Wing: I see, so that's taxing the equipment.

(#1980) Steve Clayton: My question was there's 39 tax numbers but according to the application there's 70 or 80 units.

(#1990) Bill Dewey: Allan, on the septic system, is it considered a large onsite septic system and managed by the Department of Ecology?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#2005) Stephanie Pawlowski: No, it's not considered a large onsite septic system. It's monitored by Environmental Health.

(#2008) Bill Dewey: Do we have any updated information on the status of that?

(#2010) Stephanie Pawlowski: We have no record and we've requested it from the applicant and we haven't been provided that yet.

(#2014) Steve Clayton: And that was requested in 1988 on the tapes?

(#2015) Stephanie Pawlowski: I requested it from them two weeks ago but, yes, it was requested by the Planning Commission in 1988 that that information be provided and we have no record that that happened.

(#2024) Steve Clayton: And for that large a number of units it's also a Class A water system?

(#2028) Stephanie Pawlowski: I don't know about that.

(#2030) Allan Borden: With that many connections I would think that it would be.

(#2035) Emmett Dobe: Allan, could you summarize for the Planning Advisory Commission the number of unresolved questions that you have?

(#2048) Allan Borden: Some of the chief questions are either way you go, if you keep Rural Tourist or if you approved the Rural Multi Family the county and I would think the property owner would want to know how much the development is in compliance. That definitely would come into play in even the decision. If a permit was issued in 1988 and there's a greater number of units, whether it's RV or manufactured homes on there than in the county records then that needs to be resolved.

(#2084) Emmett Dobe: Why is that not an enforcement issue as opposed to a rezone issue?

(#2088) Allan Borden: It is an enforcement issue. It's important information to consider but it's not really a rezone criteria for approval or denial. It's just so we can answer basic public health and safety questions; how much water supply is permitted, how much water demand is there? How many services are they approved for; how many services are they actually hooking up? The same of the septic. If they have a greater number of septic hookups than approved then that needs to be resolved. The reason why it's important not only for public health and safety is if you do choose to either approve the rezone request or if you deny it, the county still needs to know what's the proper number of manufactured homes and RV sites are on the property. That's not been provided by the applicant. I would expect the county health department would have some concerns so that basically would be an enforcement issue. The second question is where are they? Where are those sites? Which ones are manufactured home sites? Which ones are RV sites? It goes either way, whether you approve the rezone or you deny it. Those are two major clouds on the decision horizon. The applicant should realize that if they get their rezone approved they're only approved for a certain number of manufactured homes on that site. However, whatever the number is that they're approved for should be the number that would go with that zoning designation.

(#2215) Wendy Ervin: Am I understanding correctly that whichever way the decision goes there will be no additional sites, it's just that the conforming and non-conforming uses will flip flop?

(#2228) Allan Borden: That's correct.

(#2232) Steve Clayton: Under item #3 you indicated that under Rural Tourist it would allow for expansion of the RV park.

(#2338) Allan Borden: That's true. You can, under Rural Tourist, expand the development.

(#2245) Wendy Ervin: But that opportunity would be eliminated if it was turned into Rural Multi Family; there could be no increase in size over what exists.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#2255) Allan Borden: That's correct.

(#2258) Bob Fink: They would be governed by the non-conforming standards and the non-conforming standards might allow, for instance, the store to be expanded so there is some expansion that is possible under non-conforming standards. If it were rezoned there could be no new manufactured housing units put on the property and the RV spaces would be grandfathered only for the existing number of spaces.

(#2300) Steve Clayton: If it was approved for the Rural Multi Family would the continuing campground activity be still permitted?

(#2310) Bob Fink: It would be permitted as long as they did not abandon the use. That's assuming it was legally established.

(#2335) Steve Clayton: But in theory with Multi Family they wouldn't have to close down the campground or the temporary RV as per se.

(#2345) Bob Fink: If they changed nothing they could continue to operate indefinitely under the current county code. That's assuming that everything that's there was legally established. There are questions about the existing septic system and whether that can sustain the development that's there. We basically have no information and that doesn't mean there is a problem, it's just that we don't have any information about it so we don't know what that legal number is.

(#2375) Diane Edgin: So there is a water system, there is a septic system but we don't know the status of them. There's lots with manufactured homes on them which, if we flip flopped them, they're okay but what if there's a lot that has an RV or camp trailer on it and they want to put a manufactured home on it?

(#2395) Bob Fink: We would have to determine whether the RV was grandfathered in and whether the existing use, at the time it was regulated, was an RV or mobile home. We have to determine that for each space or unit. Once we know that distinction that would determine what's allowed as a non-conforming use to continue.

(#2430) Diane Edgin: So if there was an RV there and they wanted to go to a manufactured home ...

(#2438) Bob Fink: If it's an RV space and not a residential space they can't convert it from an RV space into a manufactured home site.

(#2442) Diane Edgin: I'm not talking about designated RV spaces; I'm talking about a site that's up there with the other homes that has an RV on it. I've not been up there so I don't know if that occurs.

(#2450) Bob Fink: You'd have to ask the applicant. I don't know the history and we weren't able to determine some of the history either because we have no record of it.

(#2474) Wendy Ervin: I live just a couple of block down from this. There was a double wide modular home being put on a private lot on the road that I live on and it was two inches too close to the property line and there was gnashing of teeth until somebody said that this is within the reservation boundary and it's not reservation property. The minute that somebody said this was within the reservation boundary the person from the county said 'oh, that's settled', and they left. There was the whole issue of being too close and following the county regulations suddenly was a wash. Now, if it's a wash on Minerva Terrace what about Minerva Beach?

(#2525) Darren Nienaber: Our regulations can apply to non-tribal members on land that's within the reservation boundaries. For example, Snohomish County has fully zoned out Tulalup Indian Reservation insofar as those parcels are owned by non-tribal members. The case law is quite clear that the county not only has the authority but the duty to regulate the health, safety and welfare of non-tribal members on those lands. So it is within the county's authority to zone it. Is that what you're asking?

(#2555) Wendy Ervin: Yes, that's what I'm asking.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#2558) Darren Nienaber: It gets confusing where there's tribal member or some form of tribal involvement and that's where the legal analysis becomes much more complex. But if there never has been and there's not tribal involvement then clearly the county has the authority.

(#2580) Tim Wing: There are unanswered questions. Is the staff saying that there are enough unanswered questions that you recommend that we not proceed with this at this point or are you just stating there are unanswered questions?

(#2595) Allan Borden: It's your choice. If you don't feel you have adequate information to determine whether the request meets the rezone criteria for one issue for another and the county states that it doesn't have that information to make that analysis then you could request it.

(#2618) Tim Wing: Is there any zoning that could be put on this property that would actually resolve all the issues?

(#2622) Bob Fink: We have no zoning this could conform to. We would have to create a whole new zone that would allow for this mix of activity in some way. You can't zone this anything where everything would be conforming.

(#2635) Tim Wing: So the fact that there's non-conforming things there now and there would be different non-conforming things if we rezoned it doesn't seem to matter to me because either way there's non-conforming things there.

(#2650) Allan Borden: That's correct. Even if they reconfigured what's out there you're still going to have non-conforming land use there.

(#2660) Mark Drain: Is it true that the manufactured homes that are there are non-conforming and is it true that they can't be upgraded, even though they're non-conforming?

(#2675) Bob Fink: That's not true. They can be replaced and the only question is if they're legally non-conforming then they can be replaced.

(#2684) Mark Drain: I'm just trying to understand their rationale for their request.

(#2688) Bob Fink: There was some concern over that issue when we first started discussing this and I don't know that we were really able to resolve that concern but that was part of the reason why they wanted the change.

(#2698) Allan Borden: One of the problems that they will encounter is that the current configuration of manufactured homes if they go to replace a narrow unit they're going to have problems squeezing a new one in there and meeting the proper setbacks from the existing interior setback. There has to be a separation between structures.

(#2730) Mark Drain: So it would be site restrictive as to what they could do.

(#2735) Steve Clayton: Criteria 8, the corrective rezoning; they addressed that in their application and you did not address it. It appears to fit in part for a corrective rezone because the RV's and manufactured homes existed before we applied zoning to it.

(#2755) Bob Fink: It's kind of semantic. We don't consider it corrective in the sense that the RV park is a Rural Tourist use in part and in part, of course, it's not. I think either zoning would be equally correct.

(#2777) Wendy Ervin: When the county creates a non-conforming use by zoning it, is the county then compelled to cause them to conform in any way?

(#2805) Allan Borden: We're not compelled to change non-conforming use to conforming use unless it really presents a hazard to safety or health.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#2812) Bob Fink: Even so, the non-conforming use is allowed to continue as long as it's not abandoned. Our current regulations are very generous in that sense; it's not limiting in that sense. They can continue indefinitely, and in some cases expand as non-conforming uses.

(#2830) Wendy Ervin: Are these lots cast in stone or can they be combined and a larger modular home be placed on them?

(#2855) Allan Borden: If the 1988 permit that they went through the county has a site plan they should be following that site plan unless it was officially modified by an amendment or another permit. So in essence, the number of sites is to be honored.

(#2900) Emmett Dobe: I'd just like to apologize for the preparedness of this report. I don't think we're really prepared to finish this evening. What I'd like to suggest is for us to continue this discussion for a month. Allow the public an opportunity to take their testimony tonight and then come back in a month with a new staff report and a new recommendation.

(#2930) Steve Clayton: A recap on the 1988 meeting, before the Planning Commission, there were some health and safety requirements that apparently came up that were needed to be addressed. Was there public testimony on why the PC required them to bring the water system into compliance and build a fence, etc?

(#2955) Stephanie Pawlawski: From what we can put together there were two meetings held in 1988 and we have the tapes from one of them. At that meeting there was no public testimony taken. The discussion of the PC was to approve 72 sites total that included the office, RV spaces, and mobile homes spaces. What their site plan shows now is 102 spaces so there's no record of how they got from 72 spaces to 102 spaces. We don't have a record of that expansion.

(#2988) Steve Clayton: My concern was health and safety stuff that was addressed here and they had to bring the water into compliance with DSHS requirements and move the water line from the sewer line.

(#2998) Stephanie Pawlawski: There's no records in the county's files of what was actually done on site. This is what was requested of the applicant and we don't know if the property owner at that time followed through with that. We just don't have those records.

(#3010) Steve Clayton: We don't know why the PC asked for it?

(#3016) Stephanie Pawlawski: There were issues at that time of allowing 72 sites; they wanted to make sure there were provisions there for sewer and water to allow 72 sites and we don't know what improvements they made on site to allow for that.

(#3035) Steve Clayton: We have here 'build a 6-foot solid fence with 10-foot buffer'. Did it say on what side of the property?

(#3040) Stephanie Pawlawski: That's for the property line on Potlatch State Park.

(#3044) Steve Clayton: All the way down to the water or just west of the highway?

(#3050) Stephanie Pawlawski: I don't know how far or how close it gets to the water but it's my understanding that it's both sides of the highway; every portion that borders the Potlatch State Park.

(#3056) Steve Clayton: Did the dump station get built that was a requirement?

(#3060) Stephanie Pawlawski: As far as I'm aware, there is a dump station there but we have no record of that.

(#3072) Emmett Dobe: I'd like to summarize the questions that I think that you asked were. The 1988 requirements, are they different today? The degree to which compliance has occurred or not occurred. The adequacy of the water supply. The adequacy of the septic system. The difference between locations

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

between RV's and permanent houses. Any other questions you have?

(#3120) Bill Dewey: I would also like to add is just an accurate accounting of what is there today.

(#3122) Diane Edgin: What I would like to know is when the last manufactured home was added. Was it a new unit? Because it's very difficult to get financing for manufacturing homes if you don't have all your ducks in a row, especially when you're talking about water and septic. I think it's in these people's best interest to know what they need to do.

(#3155) Tim Wing: It says here 'why is the applicant proposing this amendment at this time'? It says that there's problems with the Rural Tourist designation because it's caused some complications in permitting and the process for placing new manufactured homes on the site. You said they could change out a mobile home.

(#3175) Bob Fink: Right. There apparently was some confusion over that.

(#3180) Tim Wing: According to this, it's really the only reason they're applying for a rezone. All I'm saying is I'd like that clarified.

(#3192) Emmett Dobey: So non-conforming standards; what they can and cannot do?

(#3205) Darren Nienaber: Tim, you really want to know why they want the new zone. Isn't that what you're getting at?

(#3210) Tim Wing: It's not making sense to me. There's only one reason and then Bob's telling us you can change this out.

(#3215) Stephanie Pawlawski: I can clarify that. The issue that they were having was for a new manufactured home on an empty site; it wasn't to replace an existing home.

(#3240) Bill Dewey: Are there any other questions the PAC would like to see addressed? Okay, then out of respect for the fact that a number of you have come out tonight, we'd like to give you the opportunity to testify.

(#3294) Bill Peters: My name is Bill Peters and I live at Minerva Beach Mobile Home Park in space 26. We purchased the park in April of 2000. When we purchased the park a lot of this zoning was never made clear to us and when we got the summary of the review of our proposal to rezone you'll understand from the conversations that you've had earlier that confusion we've had reading this same document. I thank you for inviting us to come represent ourselves on this issue. We have a series of questions. Because of all the questions that we have and the ambiguity in a lot of the laws and the way they're being applied here I was going to ask if we could get a continuance also to get some of these questions answered, especially in the semantics between what's written here and the conversation I have just heard, which doesn't match with what we received.

(#3420) Bill Dewey: Is this list of questions that you've got, if you go through it, is that going to address the concerns of a number of the people here want to address?

(#3424) Bill Peters: These are all of the concerns that we basically had in reviewing the document that we got in the mail which was the analysis and the staff review of the proposed change.

(#3442) Bill Dewey: I'm just trying to think from an efficiency standpoint what might be the best way to deal with it. It's pretty apparent we're going to continue this. If you want to provide those to Susie we can get copies made and distributed to the PAC before we have our next meeting. Staff can also review them and try to get those included and answered.

(#3472) Bill Peters: Okay, I'll submit a copy of those. Just to give you a background, we purchased the site and there were originally ten of us that bought the park that all reside there that have homes there. We now have fourteen residents that own homes there and now own the entire park and operate the park. Some of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

the sites and some of the mobile homes have been there 35 years so the question on the zone is one thing we were really curious about was when were we zoned Rural Tourist from what we always thought were was a mobile home park and we've always represented ourselves as a mobile home park with RV site. To find out that we were no longer zoned a mobile home park, that we were RV and Tourist only ... what we were told at that time that any RV that came in had to leave in 120 days. Well, that's kind of tough on these that have been there 35 years. We have a majority of the park that is permanent homes. We have a water system that ...

(#3594) Bill Dewey: You said the majority of park is permanent homes and there's fourteen of you that are owners?

(#3605) Tim Wing: So do the people that live there that are not owners pay a monthly fee to the owners?

(#3610) Bill Peters: Yes, like a regular mobile home park with all the regulations.

(#3618) Tim Wing: And also some RV owners have their RV stationed there permanently?

(#3622) Bill Peters: There are RV's that have been there in excess of 10 years and yes, they are permanent residences for those individuals. They're just small homes.

(#3640) Tim Wing: And do some people also come in just for the night in an RV?

(#3644) Bill Peters: Correct.

(#3646) Tim Wing: Any everything in between? Sometimes they're for two or three weeks, and sometimes they're there for a year?

(#3650) Bill Peters: Correct.

(#3652) Tim Wing: And that's the RV group?

(#3654) Bill Peters: Right.

(#3660) Tim Wing: I'm going to be real interested in knowing what 'abandoning' means. If the RV moves out do they abandon the use of that site and an RV site?

(#3672) Bill Peters: We have tent sites that we rent out, also. That was addressed in here as a non-conforming use.

(#3685) Steve Clayton: Do you have a number of the permanent residences?

(#3690) Bill Peters: Right now we have 58 permanent residences; units.

(#3708) Steve Clayton: There's another similar park just to the north on the highway, isn't there?

(#3715) Bill Peters: There was one just by the power station that somebody has bought and put in a motel.

(#3750) Wendy Ervin: You said you have a water system.

(#3760) Bill Peters: Correct.

(#3762) Wendy Ervin: And you maintain the water system?

(#3766) Bill Peters: Correct.

(#3768) Steve Clayton: Is it through the Department of Ecology?

(#3770) Bill Peters: I don't know. We have the water tested twice a month and submit it to the state.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#3775) Wendy Ervin: So it's monitored by the Health Department?

(#3780) Bill Peters: Yes.

(#3782) Allan Borden: Do you have a water management service that does that?

(#3785) Bill Peters: We have an individual that's certified who takes the water samples and sends them off. What we have is unclear in the documentation as to the number of mobile homes I said we would be approved for. We have sites for where we've had mobile homes and they've been taken out and then other sites we brought new ones in and there's always a question in this as to whether or not that would be allowed.

(#3840) Diane Edgin: Are those sites surveyed sites?

(#3845) Bill Peters: Yes, they are. Any other questions?

(#3856) Steve Clayton: Tim had a key one here. Why did you ask for the request?

(#3865) Bill Peters: The request came when we went to put a new site on there and they came out there and told us that we were zoned Rural Tourist and anything we put on there had to be removed in 120 days and could not stay more than 180 days out of 360 days. So that was totally inconsistent with all the mobile homes we had in there.

(#0132) Diane Edgin: But everybody else is grandfathered.

(#0135) Bill Peters: Well, the issue was never really presented to us as such. The only zone that we found that we fit under was Rural Multi Family and we only had three selections to pick from. So the best thing would be to have a new zone and say we could operate the business as we have as a mobile home park and the RV and tent also.

(#0170) Bill Dewey: Any other questions for Bill?

(#0174) Steve Clayton: So if we go to a Rural Multi Family that would freeze the current uses there. You still wouldn't be able to put, as I understand it, a new mobile home on an empty spot, which was your original intention.

(#0180) Bill Peters: In the way the description reads, what are you calling sites and what are you calling homes? We have the mobile home park laid out where they have the power packs and the water, sewer and everything for a home. Now, the new definition says we cannot utilize those sites any longer?

(#0195) Allan Borden: That's not in the definition. Mobile homes parks have sites that they occupy with units. The biggest question is that the county does have a full tally of what you have there and what are approvals or permits you have on these sites. That's what we'll be asking of you to provide that information so we can make a decision on what zoning is appropriate and then you know how many units you have of one use versus another and we know how many you have. When you apply for a building permit for a manufactured home on site we know that's correct, whereas if it's an RV site we say that's not correct and you can't put a manufactured home on an RV site. Right now we don't know those things.

(#0238) Steve Clayton: So if Bill came, which ever way this gets zoned, and said he has an empty space and wants to put a new mobile on either way it gets zoned he's not going to be able to do it, right, because it's existing development for Rural Multi Family and it's not permitted in Rural Tourist?

(#0245) Bob Fink: It depends on what you mean by a new space. If there was a permit ... if there was a permit to allow 78 spaces for mobile homes then if one of those spaces were vacant for a period of time that doesn't mean it stops being a site for a residence. You could place a residence there at a later time as long as you're within the operation of that permit.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#0268) Wendy Ervin: The question was asked about abandoning. If you had an RV site and the RV pulled away and somebody planted a garden on that site and now it's no longer available as an RV site, is that what you mean by abandoned?

(#0278) Bob Fink: If business is poor and the grass grows that doesn't necessarily abandon it. The real answer to the questions would be did they continue to use it as an RV park or did they continue to use it as a mobile home park, or in this case, did they continue to use it for each because they were permitted to do both? The only permit we found a record for allows them to do both for a certain number of units so just because you don't fill a space for a particular period of time doesn't mean you've lost that space.

(#0308) Diane Edgin: You and others have purchased the park. I assume you have some sort of corporation?

(#0310) Bill Peters: Yes.

(#0312) Diane Edgin: So you have minutes of your corporation, and you evidently also have a homeowners association and minutes taken there. What about before your purchase, was there an association then?

(#0315) Bill Peters: No.

(#0320) Diane Edgin: So there wouldn't be any minutes you could refer to from past years?

(#0325) Bill Peters: We do have a homeowners association but we don't have any minutes from any meetings.

(#0335) Bill Dewey: If there's no more questions for Bill I'd like to open the opportunity for other folks to come up and speak.

(#0355) Rebecca Boynton: This is Tricia Boynton and we're residents of space #76 at Minerva Beach. She had a couple of things she wanted to say. Okay, I'll go ahead. We've been residents there since 1999. She has spent her whole life at the same school, at Hood Canal. I'm not real familiar with the regulations but assuming that we don't get redone to Multi Family then we'll have to find somewhere else to live and that means changing her school. My fiancé works in Lilliwaup and I work here downtown and right now we both commute either way so one way or the other she's going to have to move to a different school. She wants to graduate there; that's the only life she knows is in our area.

(#0392) Tim Wing: Why would you have to move?

(#0395) Rebecca Boynton: I'm not sure; I really don't understand the way it goes but if it's ruled to be Tourist won't all the mobile homes have to leave?

(#0405) Bob Fink: You need to distinguish and make sure you're talking about RV's versus mobile homes.

(#0408) Rebecca Boynton: We have a 1982 Fleetwood; it's two bedroom. It's a mobile home.

(#0410) Diane Edgin: So you're grandfathered.

(#0414) Steve Clayton: You're legally conforming. You have a building for that particular site. If you were in a site that didn't have a building permit would the answer be the same?

(#0420) Bob Fink: To be legally non-conforming you have to be legally established.

(#0422) Steve Clayton: Right, and in her particular space, #76, she has a building permit on file so that application would be conforming but it may not if ...

(#0428) Bob Fink: There's no way to determine that right here. There's no reason to believe otherwise, either.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#0434) Bill Dewey: You'd assume that the county would only issue the building permit if it was zone appropriately.

(#0438) Allan Borden: In 1976 there wasn't zoning so ... the big question is that the park operation has to identify what sites are for mobile or manufactured homes, what sites for RV's and transient or long term uses. That's what the county is asking so that we can evaluate the proposal and when we make a decision the homeowners association knows what sites are for manufactured homes and what sites are for rural tourist use.

(#0475) Tim Wing: Generally speaking, though, the mobile homes that were established there properly, I don't think there's any reason for people to be concerned that they're going to have to be moved.

(#0482) Rebecca Boynton: My whole family lives there. My mother lives in #75, we're in #76, and my sister and her family is in #80. My sister has been there since 1998 and that's the only home her boys have known. Her baby is autistic and to uproot him it's not a good thing because that's where his security is.

(#0500) Tim Wing: We can't make a decision until we know more information but generally speaking I think everybody should be assured that we're not interested in having people have to abandon homes that were installed properly with the permits or if they were done so long ago that there weren't permits; those kinds of things are most likely to be grandfathered in and people can stay where they are. I'm not going to tell you that everything that's there is going to be okay because we don't know the whole picture yet.

(#0520) Rebecca Boynton: I understand that. I've listened to everything that's happened tonight and I realize there are a lot of questions to be answered; a lot of misinformation.

(#0545) Bob Jordan: My name is Bob Jordan. We have owned a permanent residence at Minerva Beach for the past five years. Our home has been on the site since 1977. We are just one of many retired senior citizens here in the park that help to support local businesses and pay taxes in Mason County and call it home. We're also one of the fourteen owners of the park. We purchased the park in April of 2000 so a lot of this issue was already in place when we purchased the park. It's my understanding that in March of 2002 Minerva Beach was rezoned without any formal notification to us. In September of 2003 an application was made to the county to place another mobile home in our park and that's when we became aware of the zoning a few months later when they notified us they were denying it. Upon discovering the zoning and questioning it we were informed we needed to apply for a rezone in order to continue our business as a mobile home / RV park and that's why we're here tonight. One thing we've not talked about is the septic system. We do have two septic systems on site; there's one on each side of the highway. We've been told that our water system would supply a small town so we don't feel we have any shortage of water. We feel many statements in the public notice are not applicable to our unique mobile home park. This has a direct impact on the physical and financial well being of us as homeowners, the majority of whom are seniors on a fixed income. We don't want to lose our homes or the income that allows us to keep them so we respectfully request that the rezoning be amended so that we may continue to operate the park as it has in the past 35 plus years. As suggested in the notice we feel it's not feasible to expect those who live in and leave their RV's here on a permanent basis to be expected to move their RV's every 120 days. A lot of people will store their RV at our park and come and visit it once a month. We also have people who are living in their RV's and some of those have been there 35 years and somebody is living in it; it could be a 35-foot camp trailer. So we have that to deal with as well. One thing we were really having trouble with is the difference between a mobile home unit and a mobile home site. If we're continued to be allowed to fill our mobile home sites we're probably okay. If we can't bring on any more new units then we will be in financial trouble because just because somebody moves a mobile home off of one site doesn't mean that the next person who wants to bring a mobile home in wants that specific site; we could have five other sites for them to chose from. I guess we may not be replacing one with another one on the exact same site. As I understand it, the Rural Tourist designation does not allow mobile homes and the Rural Multi Family designation will not allow us to bring in additional residential units and if we're not allowed to continue renting our existing mobile home sites we will suffer undue financial hardship and eventually the park will be put out of business. Our park is family oriented, well maintained, and a unique facility that offers many amenities on Hood Canal to the homeowner as well as the tourist industry. We have many valuable seasonal clients that return to our park time and time again. I would like to extend an invitation to you, the council, either as a group or individually to visit Minerva Beach to view our park and it's facilities. I

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

feel this observation would better equip you to decide the fair and proper zoning for our mobile home park. Thank you.

(#0694) Steve Clayton: What unit are you in, Bob?

(#0698) Bob Jordan: We're in space #30. We're down there where all of the mobile homes have been in place from 1977 to the early 80's. They've all been on there at least 20 years.

(#0700) *Miscellaneous discussion about location of mobile home sites and RV sites.*

(#0780) Allan Borden: Are you still handing out this brochure?

(#0784) Bob Jordan: We're still using that brochure but I don't think that was accurate two years ago and I know it's not accurate now.

(#0788) Allan Borden: This brochure is approaching what the county wants to see. Sites that are mobile homes; sites that are tent; sites that are RV. That allows predictability so that if you're using a certain portion of your property as being used for the right purpose ...

(#0800) Bob Jordan: So if there's an RV site and there's no RV on it we couldn't set up a tent there?

(#0804) Allan Borden: That's not what I'm saying. I'm saying that you come up with a site plan and it says this area that's 300 feet long has 15 RV sites or camping sites. Then we know if there's 25 people in there then there's too many users on that site. The same with the mobile homes. They got segmented into sites that allow for mobile homes. The reason why you originally got a permit in 1988 was so that the county had a certain expectation of what you could do on the site and whoever had the park at that time was under the direct understanding of what they could do on that site.

(#0845) Wendy Ervin: I think what Allan is saying is that he needs definitions and you have the same definitions as he has so that you can communicate over the telephone without any misunderstanding. So when you say it's the third one in the camping area then Allan will be able to look at his material and know exactly what's being talked about.

(#0865) Bob Jordan: I think we can probably come up with what you're asking for; what we currently are using, where our septic hookups are, where our power hookups are. As far as defining whether it's an RV overnighter or an RV long term I don't know about that.

(#0878) Emmett Dobey: If we were to make a site visit to the site who should we meet with?

(#0888) Brenda Peters: You could call me at 877-5145 and I could set up a meeting with you and the managers.

(#0894) Wendy Ervin: If it is rezoned to the Multi Family then the RV spaces become non-conforming but because it is a Multi Family can someone live in an RV under those Multi Family rules and not be held to having to move it every so often or have to vacate it for those RV rules? Can you grandfather the Multi Family the other way onto the RV spaces?

(#0922) Bob Fink: If I understood the question correctly, I'd have to think about it.

(#0928) Bob Jordan: I have one more question. We also have the instance where somebody wants to put a mobile home on and they either haven't got the home chosen yet or they're working on financing and so we'll have them bring in an RV and we'll put the RV on that site for a few months until they get everything in line. It could be a mobile home site with an RV on it.

(#0935) Diane Edgin: I was asking about that earlier. But from what I understand, a mobile home site is something where a permanent home will be going in and I don't think that would be any different than one of us out here on a 2 1/2-acre putting our RV there while we're building.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#0945) Allan Borden: That's right; we do that with homes that are under construction and people reside in RV's on a temporary basis.

(#0960) Jean Lupien: My name is Jean Lupien. I live currently on site #1. Prior to that I lived on site #3. I'm one of the fourteen owners. The first time I purchased a home at Minerva Beach was in 1987 and that was a 35-foot camp trailer that I lived in onsite and commuted to work in Olympia. That is one of our permanent sites but I lived in it in a camp trailer. Then in 1995 I moved to site #1 which had a 35-foot trailer on it and lived in that one. That trailer had been installed in 1976. So in 1999 I purchased a park model to replace my trailer. The park model is not a manufactured home; it's a stick built custom cabin. So it doesn't fall into any of your categories. My plan is to stay at Minerva Beach and as the owner I'm seriously concerned about the problem that we might have in putting future homes into any of our sites, whether we would reconfigure them. For instance, in the sites #1 through #14 those are small sites. At some point in the future we might want to put two or three sites together and allow it to be a home because what we're concerned with is making a living and keeping our park alive. So when we bought this we bought it in bankruptcy court and so we were not aware of whatever happened in 1988 and it doesn't sound like most people know any more about it than we do what happened in 1988. I do know today there's fourteen of us there and we're trying to make a living and keep our park as a wonderful place for people to live that's affordable in Mason County. A lot of us are on fixed incomes and so it makes a lot of difference to us if we're not allowed to put mobile homes into the sites that we have designated as that. We've got a safe, affordable community there and we feel it's in the best interest of Mason County to continue to let us operate it as we have been. Thank you.

(#1060) Rachel Aguilar: My name is Rachel Aguilar and I live in #80. I came to say something but evidently I misunderstood. I'm Rebecca's sister. I also thought we had 180 days to move if this wasn't approved. I can't remember if I moved there in 1997 or 1998 so I've lived there six or seven years with my family and I have four children. They've always lived on Hood Canal so that was a concern for me to have to move. When I first moved there I worked in the office for the previous owners and I was able to see how the park was ran with the RV's and the campers and the extended stays. We moved to Minerva Beach because we have a manufactured double wide and there's no land that's flat enough to put it on to move it if we had to. My husband has worked for Mason Fire District #1 and he works in Lilliwaup and we need to be in this vicinity because of his work.

(#1112) Allan Borden: Who did you talk to that told you you would have to move in 180 days.

(#1114) Rachel Aguilar: No one specifically told me but my sister and my mom actually told me that they had heard that. Apparently it was a rumor.

(#1140) Michael McDaniels: My name is Michael McDaniels. We're in space #55. My wife is here also. When we moved there we were in space #60. We moved in a 34-foot RV and then we moved into #55. It's a manufactured home. Our concern was when we heard about this there was only 10 homes that are supposed to be able to stay. Were the other ones going to have to be removed because of this? That's our big concern is making sure that all the manufactured homes that are there now, trailers that have been there for a long time are allowed to stay and still have spaces opened up so we can move other homes in. They've done a lot of improvements there and it's starting to look a lot better.

(#1205) Donna Colella: My name is Donna Colella and I live in space #25. It is a 1973 mobile home. I have been there for 23 years. My husband and I bought that as retirement purposes. He passed away 11 years ago. Now when this first came up it was said that they were going to zone it for RV's only and you're going to have two years to get out of here. That's the rumor that went around. Please assure me that that's not going to happen. There is also a gentleman that has lived there in the park on the other side and he's probably 80 years old. He lives in a travel trailer and he's been there 11 years. So are we talking that travel trailers or RV's or something that's been there for 10 or 11 years, are they going to have to get out of there or are we still going to have RV's and multi family? That's my concern.

(#1268) Allan Borden: Submit the information to the county that says what sites are mobile homes and what sites are RV's.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#1275) Donna Colella: But being rezoned as Multi Family doesn't mean that we still can't have RV's?

(#1284) Allan Borden: You can have RV's in sites that you decide.

(#1290) Larry Seaberg: My name is Larry Seaberg. We live on #5. My wife and I live there temporarily on a permanent basis. Last year we purchased a 30-foot travel trailer. It's on wheels but it hasn't moved in probably 5 years. We lease the lot on an annual basis from the Minerva Beach Association as opposed to a daily or weekly or monthly. That gives us the privilege of going out there maybe once a week or once a month but we do use it year round. I don't know how that fits in the mix or in the plat map but that is one of the uses we have out there.

(#1325) Steve Clayton: Bill, it says on your sheet that you also do RV and boat storage. Where about do you do that?

(#1335) Bill Peters: There's a power line access that goes through this playfield area. There's a Tacoma PUD high tension power line and underground that goes through there. That can't be used for anything else so that's where we have that storage.

(#1350) Steve Clayton: So on the north side of the playfield?

(#1352) Bill Peters: Yes. That's where we have the RV and boat storage.

(#1365) Steve Clayton: So the water side properties are pretty much all permanent tenants and properties farthest east of the power line are pretty much permanent tenants. The bulk of the east side of the west parcel is your transients; that's where your office is, your laundromat, your tent spaces. So if it was segregated like that and this was what we left as Rural Tourist and these two were existing Manufacturing.

(#1390) Wendy Ervin: Are you proposing splitting the zoning?

(#1394) Steve Clayton: Well, we'd have to have staff look at it. It's an 11-acre parcel and if it was split roughly down power lines and what was west of the power lines was left as family housing and what was east next to the highway is left as Rural Tourist is might fit. It might minimize the number of non-conforming uses.

(#1412) Gayleen Suelzle: My name is Gayleen Suelzle and I live in space #16. I have been a tenant there since 1983 on a temporary basis for 18 years as a weekender. I retired and moved down there full time for the last 4 years. I would like to address a couple of questions that I don't think you had answered. Which one of these sites are RV sites and which ones are manufactured home sites? The ones that are marked in blue say they're permanent homes sites because at the time this map was printed we had permanent units in there. We have had double wides and single wides homes or trailers in these big lots up here. For one reason or another they have bought land and taken their home off, they have had their units repossessed, we've evicted a couple of people for rules that had to move their double wide out. So in answer to your question if there's not a mobile home on there, we put an RV on there when they come in. Also, on the water side we had three really old 1970 single wide trailers and we finally got all of them moved out. We resized those sites so that they would accommodate a double wide unit so we want to put a unit in there that will upgrade our park and we've had problems with the county.

(#1515) Bill Dewey: So that's where the application was denied on the eastern parcel?

(#1518) Gayleen Suelzle: Yes. So we want to upgrade our park and so we need some kind of zoning where we can put in a manufactured home on these empty lots and upgrade our park down on the water side with some nicer units.

(#1532) Tim Wing: Are you an owner?

(#1534) Gayleen Suelzle: Yes, I am.

(#1536) Tim Wing: There's a homeowners association and is that group different than the owners?

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#1538) Gayleen Suelzle: I don't know; do we still have meetings?

(#1540) Audience: They charged us \$1.00 to join the homeowners association and we've had one meeting and none since. They're just trying to figure out what they're doing. There's been a lot of improvements since Brenda and her husband have moved into the park. I live on the land side and there are no owners there. The owners all live on the water side so now everything is really getting taken care of in the last couple of years.

(#1575) Tim Wing: How often do you meet?

(#1578) Gayleen Suelzle: The managers meet once a week and the members are welcome to attend those managers meetings. Historically in the past we have an owners meeting every quarter.

(#1588) Bill Dewey: Any other comments?

(#1592) Audience: I just wanted to make one quick correction. You referred to an 11-acre parcel. We actually are 17 acres. That's another error that's on the paperwork.

(#1605) Bill Dewey: One of the parcel is 11 acres. There's 3 parcels totalling 16.55 acres. Okay, it looks like we've exhausted the public testimony. I appreciate everybody being patient and there's been a lot of questions asked by the PAC and by members of the public and obviously we've got some answers to seek before we can move forward with any kind of recommendation on this. So we need a motion to leave the testimony open and continue the public hearing on the Minerva Beach request.

(#1640) Diane Edgin: I'll make that motion.

(#1644) Wendy Ervin: I'll second that motion.

(#1646) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second.

(#1648) Darren Nienaber: Do we have a date certain?

(#1650) Susie Ellingson: Yes, June 20th.

(#1652) Bill Dewey: Okay, so the hearing will be continued to June 20th. Any discussion?

(#1665) Bill Peters: I was wondering if we could have an answer to our questions prior to the meeting so we could go through those.

(#1670) Emmett Dobey: Yes.

(#1672) Allan Borden: I think we have more questions of you than you do for us.

(#1676) Tim Wing: I just want to say that given everything that I've heard here tonight, this community is a unique community. It is not likely one that we can fit into any mold that we have and I've also heard here tonight enough information to give me the clear impression that we've got a group of people here living together that are doing a great job living together and I personally am not going to be in favor of voting for any zoning designation that stops them from doing what they're doing unless there's an environmental reason or a problem of another nature. When you have a community like that that is working as well as it I'd like to see a unique designation that will allow them to continue, if that's at all possible.

(#1712) Bill Dewey: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries to continue the public hearing for Minerva Beach to June 20th.

Break in meeting.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

(#1742) Bill Dewey: Okay, we are reconvened for the time permitting section on our agenda to have some Comp Plan update information presented.

(#1755) Barbara Adkins: Last time we met I gave you the Housing Element to look over and give me your comments. Did everybody get a chance to do that besides Steve? Steve sent me an e-mail with his comments. I just want you to go over it and see what changes have been made and give me your comments. Steve found some numbers that didn't add up and he was right. Maybe you have some comments that may need to be put in there or taken out. I'm just giving you the opportunity to review it.

(#1865) Darren Nienaber: Could you briefly summarize the changes, Barbara?

(#1868) Barbara Adkins: The changes that are in here are mainly statistical. The years have been changed because our planning period has shifted to 2025 so all of the sequence of dates and housing units and poverty statistics has been updated. So no policy changes have been made. This is solely census from the housing needs assessment that was done in 2003.

(#1914) Wendy Ervin: I have a couple of comments about the content and then I had a couple of comments about the arrangement. On V.3.10; this whole Housing Conditions described quality of Mason County housing stock. This portion was repeated here in 3.15. I'm not sure if it's necessary to repeat it or not. On page 3.5 up at the top there's Table V.3-3 and then under that is V.3-2.

(#2000) Barbara Adkins: Yes, Steve brought that to my attention, too. The numbers don't match up and it was something that was left in there from the old version.

(#2015) Wendy Ervin: Okay, so the rest of what I have to say is all having to do with the content and so if we're going to have a discussion ...

(#2025) Barbara Adkins: Are you talking about the policies?

(#2028) Wendy Ervin: Yes.

(#2035) Barbara Adkins: Bob, maybe you could add to this. At what point do we actually discuss policies over the changes that I'm making?

(#2045) Bob Fink: We're not really amending ... we could discuss them at any time but we're really not looking for action for the recommendation on changes until after the scope of work is adopted in July and then in the period after that is when we'll actually be making the amendments and discussing it. Right now our focus is really in identifying the scope of work of what the amendments are going to be, not the language of the amendments, but just what are we going to address in our amendment process? Have we covered everything that needs to be covered for the update? Are there very good ideas that are coming out of the public that we want to put in our work program, either for the rest of this year or maybe next year? So those are the kinds of issues that we really need to address now. The actual text that we want to adopt, that follows in a couple of months.

(#2090) Wendy Ervin: Okay, then I do have something to say. Under 6.7 on the second page, 'To avoid tightening of the urban land supply and rising housing cost'; it is not just the urban land supply that we have to worry about the rising housing costs. We need to ... GMA puts a heck of a squeeze on the rural lands supply. Not everybody wants to live in a city and I just think that's an area that we really need to apply ourselves to. There's another one, 6.8, 'Affordable housing should be convenient to public transportation, major employment centers, and public services'. That's not necessarily possible or even economically possible. That's another area I think we need to look at.

(#2125) Barbara Adkins: Okay, are there any other comments on what I handed out? I've made copies of Steve's comments for you to look at while you're reviewing the Housing Element. I'd like to pass out another element. This is the Land Use Element. It combines land use and population, that's why it's such a large document. This element still has a lot of missing information. You will see a lot of strike outs just on typos and sentences that are incomplete. Like the Housing Element, everything is shifted from 2014 to 2025, so

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

you'll see a lot of those references that have been changed to the current planning period. There's also some places where I've stuck some notes in the margins because I don't have the answers to the questions but that staff will have to figure out. Population; the planning periods have been altered and the text that goes along with it has also been altered to be more consistent. I've also updated Historical and Current Trends, Countywide Growth, Growth Rates, Net Migration and Increase, Seasonal Populations; those are all variations on population analysis that have been changed and brought current. The Growth Projections; that is going to be empty because we have not calculated growth projections at this time. The Land Use Acreages, I've been recalculating all of those from the Assessor's parcel data so those numbers have changed. The Watershed text has all been changed because we're not analyzing by watersheds anymore. Those all have to be shipped to rural and UGA areas. Land Capacity and Land Availability tables are blank. We still need to calculate those. This is all done in a version that you can see where I've made the changes and there's still a lot of information we need to gather because this is a big chapter. This is probably the biggest chapter we're going to tackle. Along with the Housing Element this is a lot of information for you to review. Maybe we might get to the point where this is something that isn't working as far as you having to review so much material and give me any changes because you just don't have enough time and if that turns out to be the case then maybe that's something we need to talk about before we get too far out of hand. I don't want to keep dumping this on you and you just don't have time to read it and then that slows our process down.

(#2420) Bill Dewey: We just need to have our agenda mapped out. By and large I think the PAC is good about doing their homework prior to a meeting if we know we're going to be asked to make changes and have it on the agenda. We didn't know that based on what was sent out.

(#2444) Barbara Adkins: It also becomes difficult when we're trying to combine the rezone requests with the Comp Plan discussions because you never know how much time you're going to have to do what.

(#2450) Steve Clayton: Are you looking to do this on the first Monday of next month or the third Monday?

(#2452) Barbara Adkins: That all depends on what else is stacking up on the agenda.

(#2455) Susie Ellingson: Bob, on the first Monday, the 6th, isn't it correct that we'll be continuing with two additional rezones?

(#2462) Bob Fink: That's right. So the next meeting is June 6th.

(#2490) Mark Drain: I'll need to be excused from that meeting.

(#2490) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second to excuse Mark Drain from the June 6th meeting. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#2496) Tim Wing: I won't be able to be here for the June 20th meeting.

(#2500) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second to excuse Tim Wing from the June 20th meeting. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. Bob, what would you like us to do with the material that Barbara has given us?

(#2550) Bob Fink: Part of the reason why we're trying to prepare drafts is to make more concrete the things that we're addressing. If we say we're addressing the Transportation Element, well, what exactly in the Transportation Element are we addressing and there's actually three or four very specific things due to changes in the GMA that have to be addressed. We have to address level of service for state facilities; the state routes, we're going to add to the Transportation Element. There's other requirements, too. So when we're saying we're going to amend the Transportation Element, are we going to address everything that has to be changed or should be changed in that element and the only way to show that is to detail it out item by item or to put a draft out. We're in the process of preparing a staff report that lays out in more detail what those changes are intended to be. The drafts will compliment that. That should be available on the 20th.

(#2766) Bill Dewey: I got a letter asking me to participate in an Economic Development Element workshop

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 16, 2005

and I'm wondering if that would be appropriate for other PAC members to try to make it to these workshops.

(#2780) Bob Fink: Right, there's a series of workshops, two each in Belfair and Shelton, on the Economic Development Element draft. It's to get some better understanding of the community feelings regarding what kinds of economic policies are they looking for. Also, what is the county's role in economic development?

(#2810) Bill Dewey: It would seem to be valuable for other PAC members to listen to the discussion that goes on in those workshops.

(#2850) Bob Fink: We'll present to you what comes out of those meetings.

Meeting adjourned.