

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

## Minutes November 21, 2005

(Note audio tape (#2) dated November 21, 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, Tim Wing, Diane Edgin, Terri Jeffreys, Wendy Ervin, and Jay Hupp. Steve Clayton was excused.

**Staff Present:** Bob Fink, Steve Goins, Allan Borden, TJ Martin and Susie Ellingson.

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the October 24, 2005 and November 1, 2005 meetings were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

November 1, 2005:

On page 6 under (#1202) it should read: 'on a two lane road' ...

On page 9 under (#2390) it should read: 'Yes, it does'.

On page 15 under (#1130) it should read: 'It implies that the public can go play there.'

### 4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0120) Bill Dewey: We have a public hearing tonight on the Master Planning process policies and regulations as part of our 2005 Comp Plan update process. This is a continuation of the November 14<sup>th</sup> public hearing on the same.

(#0135) Steve Goins: Steve Goins of the Department of Community Development. I'll give you an overview of this document. Including Master Planning policies was incorporated into the work program for this year and because of the timing and the extensive work load that was part of this effort, we decided we needed to have a consultant help us with that process. We hired a consultant that has done most of the work you see before you drafting the proposed language and the technical memorandum and other documents that were part of this effort. When we met with the consultant, we worked together to develop a strategy for public

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

participation, as well as the questionnaire that was part of the focus group meetings. Through that process we decided upon a strategy where instead of having a very large and broad extensive process that could have taken several months, we decided to try to develop a core group of people that we called the focus group of various folks with various backgrounds and interests and get some comments and feedback from that group as being representative of our larger community. That's how we proceeded. The comments that were generated as part of the focus group are also within the documents you have. These policies are the Comp Plan policies and they're intended to be part of this year's update. The larger effort of this is really developing the implementing regulations, which will happen in 2006. We anticipate that that process will have a more extensive timeline. We'll have more extensive public process as part of that and that's really where the key decision points in master planning will take place. These policies, which you're considering tonight, are establishing the framework for master planning in the county, and to a great extent, establish infrastructure strategies. I'll pass out some comments that were generated in addition to the previous comments that I gave you last week. Brian Petersen has some comments that I feel are important. His first concern is regarding the Master Plan Policy 1.7. This policy is a statement that would facilitate a process in the regulations where considerations for either changes in density or dimensional standards for lots, for example, would be considered as part of the tradeoff for providing additional recreational facilities and other kinds of open space. That is widely considered an incentive for developers when these types of projects are considered. His concern, I believe, is based upon changes in allowed density for areas within a UGA where maybe fairly high density residential development is already permitted by the zoning and Master Planning would increase that density and would therefore create a situation that's incompatible with the UGA. The answer is that that could depend on DR's that you ultimately adopt that wouldn't be part of what you're considering now. We wouldn't be asking you to come up with those kinds of policies at this time, but we would be considering different types of policies like this as part of the implementation of this. The second point he made was regarding the phased approach of development. His point is would a phasing include a process where a project changes over time and what you end up with isn't necessarily what you approved in the first place. This is a very important part of Master Planning. You want to create a certain amount of flexibility that would allow a developer to do different things, and you want to be able to change that plan if the market approaches change. Setting up that process where that plan change occurs in a thoughtful manner is a very important part of the DR's that you would establish but we're not at that detail at this point. The last part is that he is speaking to the public process that has taken place. This is not a request to change zoning or change what's been approved in any of the UGA's or the rural areas at this time. It is a tool to allow development to occur perhaps in a different fashion, and how that occurs would be subject to the DR's, which we will develop in time. We do agree that there should be a more enhanced public process and we anticipate the timing of doing the DR's would allow us to have more of a dialog with the public. Are there any specific questions?

(#0425) Tim Wing: If a master development plan were proposed and this all gets put into place and somebody came in and wanted to propose one, doesn't it go through a public process?

(#0440) Steve Goins: Yes, it would.

(#0445) Tim Wing: So Brian Petersen's concerns that all of this might happen without any control on it is just not likely to happen, right?

(#0450) Steve Goins: There's quite an extensive opportunity for public comment. There would also be a process to allow any changes proposed to be a part of the public comment, so even if you had an approval, you couldn't easily change what you had approved.

(#0475) Bill Dewey: Steve, when you were responding to Dr. Petersen's comments on 1.7, it sounded like this would be addressed in subsequent policies and my understanding is that it would be addressed in the DR's and not in subsequent policies. We're just trying to adopt the policies tonight.

(#0498) Steve Goins: That's correct.

(#0510) Bill Dewey: Let's go ahead and open it up for public testimony.

(#0520) David Overton: I'm David Overton. I just wanted to make a couple of comments based on the last

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

meeting we had on this. One of the questions that came up from the PAC is is this something that can be put off until next year? Certainly it's not one of the elements that has to go through this year, but I think it's very important to understand that these policies are put in place and then the DR's have to come after them. That will take a period of time to go through in and of itself. That's why we're certainly interested in seeing these put in place this year so that next year we can look at this and take the time to do it. If this doesn't happen this year, you're delaying this by almost another full year. The DR's will really shape how this program goes forward. The large incentive to the developer is future flexibility in case the market changes. This program really shows how far the department has come in trying to partner on large scale developments so the planning department, the community, and the developer all have a large amount of market certainty, which in a rural market like this, is the only thing that's going to help attract large scale investment dollars to this community. I'd like to say I think staff has created a very solid framework and hopefully the DR's will go as well next year.

(#0610) Bill Dewey: We'll close the public testimony portion of the hearing. Any discussion on how we'd like to address this issue? Were Steve Clayton's comments responded to? There seems to be some concerns raised about the focus group and lack of broader public involvement. Was there discussion on that?

(#0635) Tim Wing: I'd like to hear again who the participants were.

(#0645) Terri Jeffreys: I was involved.

(#0647) Bill Dewey: I was involved.

(#0655) Tim Wing: Did you have meetings together?

(#0658) Terri Jeffreys: Yes.

(#0660) Steve Goins: There was two methods of working with the focus group. We tried to schedule as many people as were able to meet at one place so there could be a dialog. There were six in attendance at that focus group and that was facilitated by our consultant. I think Jim Hunter was there and Rick Anderson. We also had phone interviews with the people that could not attend the focus group. There were four or five that were part of that. Warren Dawes, David Overton and two or three others.

(#0715) Tim Wing: Was there a general consensus among that group?

(#0720) Steve Goins: There was some limited understanding of what Master Planning really is and it took some of the folks a little longer to get a grasp of what the topic was. Once there was an understanding of what they were trying to discuss, there was fairly broad support for that type of development in a UGA. There was mixed support in the rural areas for that type of development. There was a feeling that they didn't want this to be a process that circumvented GMA and allowed different types of development to occur that maybe was not appropriate in the rural areas.

(#0744) Tim Wing: What was the result of that concern? Does this proposal allow for development proposals in both rural and urban areas?

(#0752) Steve Goins: These policies don't mandate that one way or another. Our anticipation was that because you really have apples and oranges with those types of developments that at a minimum, you would need two sets of policy regulations for rural and urban area. What types of developments could occur in rural areas is a discussion that would be a part of the DR's. Staff's feeling was that our FCC criteria, for example, seemed like a real ideal fit to mandate that to be this type of development and that statement is included in the policies you're considering tonight.

(#0760) *Miscellaneous discussion regarding separate policies.*

(#0825) Terri Jeffreys: How do performance subdivisions fit into this?

(#0835) Steve Goins: I don't anticipate that these policies would result in increased densities in the rural

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

areas, but it would allow for other benefits. One of the limiting criteria in the rural areas is, for example, a performance subdivision has limited size components to it as it's currently written. If you have a very large project you have to break it into pieces to process a subdivision and your entitlements are much shorter. That's an incentive that developers were looking to have as part of this process is to create a longer vesting. We currently can't offer that.

(#0865) Bill Dewey: From the Jones and Stokes report, the impression I have is that generally it's limited to urban areas and not to the rural areas. Other counties use similar tools such as the performance subdivision in the rural areas but not the Master Development planning. We're considering it for both and I'm trying to understand what you need here and why you think we should include it for rural areas as well.

(#0895) Steve Goins: The three biggest incentives are if we're considering a FCC in a rural area, for example, being able to develop that under Master planning offers a lot of incentives for the county. Triggering anything from design criteria that you might want to include that currently don't exist. From the developers prospective, they're getting longer term vesting and the ability of having flexible nature to the development that will allow them to respond to market needs.

(#0922) Bill Dewey: Will this result in greater rural densities than what would currently be permitted?

(#0928) Steve Goins: The regulations to address density are not part of the policies we're considering. It's not likely we could support more density bonuses than are allowed under the performance subdivision standards. That will come out in the DR's.

(#0950) Bob Fink: The FCC would be an urban designation. It may be sited in an area that's currently rural but it's actually an urban designation so you have to convert that land from rural to urban. The county has reserved population for doing that. It would have to meet the boundary limits and the density requirements. The FCC is essentially the only means by which to designate a new urban area. All the other urban land has to be attached to existing urban areas.

(#0982) Steve Goins: Our current policies would allow a master planning project like this for a resort type of development. We have those regulations now but they're specific to that type of development. This would expand that to allow a more broad type of development to occur in the rural areas. Jurisdictions take different approaches on determining where the threshold is for the size of project that mandates this kind of development and the case studies had a broad range of things. Some were 300 - 400 acres. One of the jurisdictions the cap was a minimum of 300 units. We would look at that as part of the implementing regulations and come to some agreement on that. If you're developing 50 to 100 acres in a rural area it probably doesn't make sense to use this process.

(#1050) Wendy Ervin: In the Jones and Stokes memo it talks about minimum lot size as 20,000 sf. Then it goes on to say that at least 50% of the buildable area of the property must be set aside as permanent open space. It then goes on to discuss primary and secondary conservation areas. On a 20,000 sf lot in the area that you're getting a building permit to put a house, the likelihood of putting a 10,000 sf house on a 20,000 sf lot is probably between slim and none. I think the 50% buildable area of the property sets up a red flag because it makes people feel that they are being deprived of the use of their property when there are other considerations that have to be met. I don't think it's necessary to say that 50% of the property must be set aside as permanent open space.

(#1100) Steve Goins: Those are our existing regulations.

(#1125) Jay Hupp: Is there any possibility of revisiting these policies next year given the policies are in the Comp Plan and what we're going to address next year is the DR's?

(#1135) Steve Goins: I'd be surprised if we didn't address them in some capacity when we go through the DR's. Remember, you're only allowed to update your Comp Plan once a year. You could include them in your 2006 update as part of your total update.

(#1180) Jay Hupp: I don't necessarily agree that the devil is all in the details. I don't think all of the

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

meaningful regulatory language is going to be in the DR's. From my prospective, I see the most meaningful language is in the policy. It's the DR's that flow from the policies and if you kill a direction in the policy then you won't get to it in the DR's. I also feel that there's an undercurrent that's fairly significant that's protesting the public process that took place here. We may very well see a reaction as a result of the public process that will cause a significant rethinking of these policies.

(#1240) Emmett Dobey: Do you feel right now that there are any fatal flaws that would restrict this from moving forward for further discussion?

(#1242) Jay Hupp: No.

(#1245) Tim Wing: When did the focus group meet? How long ago did this start?

(#1260) Steve Goins: The focus group met in early October.

(#1266) Tim Wing: And we got this about a week and a half ago?

(#1272) Steve Goins: This was issued around the 4<sup>th</sup> of November.

(#1275) Tim Wing: I want to go on record as not liking the fact that this was in the works, we had no knowledge of it, it's brought to us at the last minute, and we are the public process. You've had just a little public process, and now you're asking us to pass this with one week deadline and I don't like that at all. I don't really have a lot of objection to what I'm reading here, but I'm being asked to be the public process at the last second and I don't like that.

(#1305) Allan Borden: My understanding of this technique is to be used in only certain situations. We're not talking about changing the subdivision process. I would think the proposal would still have to meet development densities whether it's an urban area density or rural area density. There's one thing that's not in here and that's site suitability. Figuring out what area either can't be developed on or is limited on being developed and that might determine the overall configuration of the development on the property. There's a mention of LID but LID only applies when you are starting to develop the site. You really need to know that that site suitability technique helps in laying out the initial layout of the development. What areas are going to be open space and the common technique is to put the slopes and wetlands and streams with their buffers in open space. You would get that right out in the open when you do site suitability.

(#1385) Steve Goins: As part of the language in the first policy we're attempting to establish a framework for that. It says 'include criteria for when and where a Development Master Plan may be appropriate within rural lands and within urban growth areas'. The policy isn't dictating what those criteria are but it includes that those criteria will be established as part of the DR's that you will be reviewing. Policy #11 is a general policy that discusses these various criteria will be established. In regards to Tim's comment, I can only say that all of us were faced with a daunting task of trying to move a lot of work forward in a short period of time. Staff attempted to work with a consultant to come up with what we saw as an alternative to a larger public process by selecting people that represented what we thought was a cross section of the community. In the timeframe that we had to work with we felt we made the most appropriate move we could. It wasn't an attempt to disconnect the public from a process, but it was an attempt to move something forward rather quickly. That was the objective.

(#1455) Wendy Ervin: A FCC would be developed under a Master Plan but a Master Planned Development is not necessarily a FCC. Correct?

(#1460) Steve Goins: That's correct.

(#1465) Bill Dewey: A FCC would have to be Master Planned?

(#1468) Steve Goins: Yes. That's Policy #2.

(#1480) Bill Dewey: Tim and Jay, both of you have lodged concern over the process. Are you uncomfortable

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

enough with it that you'd rather we not take action on it?

(#1485) Jay Hupp: No, it's not my personal concern over the permit process. As I read through these materials and I've listened to some of the public comment, I get the impression that there's a dissatisfaction from folks that are observing this process with the public process. As a matter of fact, some of the comments that were made by the focus group, according to Jones and Stokes, went into quite lengthy detail in how the public process could be improved and how the communication with the public could be improved. It states that the county's communication with the public through the publishing of legal notices is inadequate. I've heard this in the past and it's come back on us bad in front of the GMHB.

(#1544) Bill Dewey: It sounds like that concern is addressed as long as we know these policies can be revisited next year as well as the DR's.

(#1548) Jay Hupp: Yes.

(#1600) Wendy Ervin: It seems to me the public process can be tweaked and improved without it being part of the Comp Plan.

(#1615) Bill Dewey: Yes. I think that can be the BOCC's direction to the staff.

(#1630) Tim Wing: It's not a stopper for me but I just feel it's been thrown at us at the last second. Even though I feel it's a good program and should be adopted, there are people out there that for whatever reason don't want it and they'll ask us why we approved it? That we're not representing them during the public process.

(#1650) Bill Dewey: Do you feel that if we articulate that because of the expedited process we're very interested in making sure the policies as well as the DR's are open for debate next year?

(#1658) Tim Wing: I do feel that way.

(#1660) Jay Hupp: I do too.

(#1662) Bill Dewey: Then that should be part of our recommendation if we're going to move forward. So let's go back into the discussion.

(#1675) Terri Jeffreys: It's talking about with sewer and water it would be preferable if a public entity took over management of them. I think that necessitates a definition of public entity. If that public entity does not include a community owned system then I can't think of it being anything else but the county.

(#1715) Bill Dewey: That was a similar concern that I raised that I was confused with the wording in both MPP5 and 8. I was confused as to whether Master Planned Developments always require sewer or if onsite systems would be acceptable. It wasn't clear to me.

(#1775) Wendy Ervin: It seems to me that if you have a development that has a complete plan and enough connections that it's a large system, you could have a separate entity running that sewer that is not PUD and is not an urban governmental agency. I don't think you should limit it to just the PUD and the UGA governments because there could be a perfectly capable private organization that turns public in order to accomplish this.

(#1815) Bill Dewey: There's a lot of private potable systems that are operated by private certified operators.

(#1830) Jay Hupp: Why are we driving this to a public system instead of private?

(#1845) Wendy Ervin: There's all kinds of regulations to make sure that the water that is delivered in a private system is good water so I don't see that there should be a regulation making it turn into a public entity.

(#1870) Jay Hupp: Why say anything?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

(#1872) Diane Edgin: Maybe because of past history.

(#1875) Emmett Dobey: It's very difficult to have a private NPDES for sewage disposal system. It's probably very difficult for DOE and DOH to approve community based sewage disposal without some type of guarantee that it's going to be maintained beyond the homeowners association.

(#1890) Bill Dewey: So MPP3 is specific to potable water not sewage?

(#1895) Emmett Dobey: It's really for both of them. One of the issues has been that there's a large number of privately owned water systems that have not been adequate. So what we're trying to do is drive it towards someone who is going to be responsible.

(#1815) Wendy Ervin: That doesn't necessarily mean that a public water system is going to be more adequate.

(#1940) Emmett Dobey: The intent here is to provide adequate water and sewer.

(#1945) Tim Wing: I would suggest that you separate the two issues because water systems are far more likely to be a privately run system that work fine. I don't know if there are any privately owned sewer systems.

(#1970) Bob Fink: They can only be the capacity for about 39 houses. Above that they have to be public systems. That's state law.

(#1980) Tim Wing: So it really isn't an issue with the sewer; it's just the water. Lakeland Village has 500 homes and they have a privately run water system there that meets any kind of standards that you'd have in public owned systems serving the same number.

(#1995) Terri Jeffreys: How many homes can you put on a community drainfield?

(#1998) Bob Fink: It depends on the design of the drainfield. Under the law they would have to be publicly owned if it were for more than 39 houses. That's under the current state law. Water systems can be very large privately owned systems. They're called public water systems in the sense that they provide water to the public but they're privately owned.

(#2025) Bill Dewey: So it sounds like there may be some support for deleting the last sentence of MPP 3.

(#2035) Jay Hupp: I would propose that. I don't think there's any reason to say who owns it.

(#2068) Wendy Ervin: All the regulations are in place now.

(#2070) Tim Wing: And any new system is going to have the same standards as a public system.

(#2075) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#2145) Bill Dewey: Let's talk about the wastewater side of it. Steve, on page 6, MPP5 and MPP8, MPP5 says 'Development within a UGA shall plan for wastewater service consistent with sewer service plans for the UGA' ... and MPP8 says 'Development in areas not planned for future public sewer service shall provide community based collection and treatment systems' ... How is a community based collection and treatment system different than a public sewer?

(#2165) Steve Goins: For example, a FCC proposed in an area that's isolated from a UGA where there's currently not a sewer system in place, they're not being requested or required to develop a sewer system for operation.

(#2195) Bill Dewey: What is a community based collection and treatment system if it is not a sewer?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

(#2200) Steve Goins: They could have a system that's doing the same treatment but it's not part of a larger collection system.

(#2225) Bill Dewey: So if you're going to have one of these in a rural area, MPP8 is saying it's going to have community based collection and treatment, which says to me it's not individual onsite septic systems.

(#2240) Steve Goins: That's right.

(#2245) Bill Dewey: So whether we're doing this in rural or urban areas, we're not doing it on septic systems.

(#2248) Steve Goins: That's right.

(#2250) Bill Dewey: That was the clarification I was looking for in my comments.

(#2265) Steve Goins: Keep in mind that this is not a community where you have 50 homes; that's not a Master Planned community. You have industry, more rounded features of the community that has more demands. This isn't just some houses in the middle of the country.

(#2285) Bill Dewey: In my comments, I note that other jurisdictions also utilize master planning for industrial development. That seems like a good alternative. I'm suggesting it might be good to include that.

(#2320) Jay Hupp: Kitsap County's whole master plan orientation is towards business development as opposed to residential. This one is focused on residential. I'd like to see a little better balance.

(#2400) Bill Dewey: I'm hearing that we want to include Master Planning for industrial / business park.

(#2430) Wendy Ervin: I'd like to go back to MPP8. It think it should just simply say that in a Master Plan a public sewer service should be planned and installed.

(#2460) Terri Jeffreys: I think there's a difference between who is paying for it and who is maintaining it.

(#2475) Tim Wing: What's the purpose of writing it that way? Is it intended that before you start developing the development you put in a sewer, or is the intention of that is that if there's not a sewer there yet you can do something with a community drainfield temporarily run by a public entity until the sewer gets there?

(#2495) Steve Goins: It's the latter.

(#2515) Wendy Ervin: Under MDP10.1, and MPP11 talk about parks and other recreational or trail facilities. I think the emphasis should be put on 'with internal community circulation' for trails within the planned community. Putting a requirement to tie that planned community into other existing open space and other existing trail connections, if they're convenient, okay, as long as the open space your tying into is not on private property. If they're not convenient, I don't see the emphasis on building considerable trails when there are transportation needs elsewhere ... I was very upset to find that the new gas tax that was voted in, that one of the first projects to be put in is to be a bike trail in Chelan. This doesn't help congestion or safety.

(#2615) Bill Dewey: Wendy, is there something specific that you'd like to see changed?

(#2620) Wendy Ervin: I'd like to change it around so that a master development shall include internal trail facilities and connections to future or existing open space and trail connections where feasible. That's under MPP11.

(#2675) Terri Jeffreys: That seems like it moves from requiring a connection, for instance, if a trail bumps up against the master community there's a chance you wouldn't be able to continue that trail because of the community being there. This policy is saying that there's a connection allowed so we can continue that trail and if we change it like that it seems like we're requiring a trail within that community.

(#2700) Wendy Ervin: I read it entirely differently. I read it as saying that it shall include connections to future or existing open space ... if it's two miles down the road you have to run that trail down there and spend the

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

money to connect it. I think the more practical thing is to have internal community circulation with trails within the planned community and if there happens to be existing trails in the vicinity that area easily connected to that's okay.

(#2740) Bill Dewey: I think Terri's point is the way you suggested wording it actually required them to put in an internal community circulation.

(#2750) Steve Goins: I'd like to suggest some revised language. 'Master Developed Plan shall include connections when adjacent to future or existing open space corridors and trail connections with internal community trail facilities for community circulation'.

(#2800) Emmett Dobey: I think Terri's point is that if there's a trail designed and developed in the future you don't want to create a situation where that development will not allow that trail to connect.

(#2810) Wendy Ervin: Right.

(#2850) Jay Hupp: Bill, I'm not sure we captured your concerns that I concurred with on encouraging business development within these master development projects.

(#2875) Bill Dewey: We talked about it but we didn't offer a specific amendment. I think we'll rely on staff to come up with more specific language.

(#2882) Jay Hupp: I think it would fit into MDP1.5. I think we need to expand that paragraph to include business development.

(#2930) Wendy Ervin: I think we should change the title of this whole thing to Master Development Plan Policies for Industrial and Residential developments.

(#2935) Jay Hupp: I'd be careful about the word 'industrial'. That means a lot of things to a lot of different people. Business development covers it.

(#2975) Steve Goins: We could say 'Encourage and accommodate a mix of commercial, retail and residential uses'.

(#2985) Jay Hupp: That doesn't do it for me. This entire approach leads me to believe that these policies are oriented towards residential development. I would make it stand alone.

(#3020) Bill Dewey: I think it almost needs a separate paragraph.

(#3050) Emmett Dobey: Jay, are you trying to reach a conclusion here that all industrial and commercial development has to go through a master planning process? I don't think that's what you want to do.

(#3080) Jay Hupp: No.

(#3090) Bill Dewey: We're just encouraging it.

(#3100) Emmett Dobey: You want to move in that direction but you don't want to require it. You want to use the words encourage.

(#3115) Jay Hupp: Yes.

(#3118) Emmett Dobey: I think we can capture that.

(#3120) Jay Hupp: I want to see the same motivation towards business development as I see towards residential development.

(#3135) Allan Borden: I was going to suggest that the first four policies stay like they are and 1.5 and 1.7 are residential. Move those to the end to group by 1.11, which is also residential. Then add a new policy that

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

talks about applying the technique to commercial and industrial development, as well as mixed residential and nonresidential land uses to stand on its own.

(#3165) Jay Hupp: I think it would be best in a separate paragraph.

(#3175) Allan Borden: Then you continue on with some of the general policies that are applied to both residential and nonresidential.

(#3200) Jay Hupp: That moves it in the right direction so I'm okay with that.

(#3205) Bill Dewey: That captures it for me as well. How about everyone else?

(#3208) PAC: Yes.

(#3220) Bill Dewey: Let's talk about the LID concern that I raised. What I'm saying is that in the second paragraph of the preamble it indicates that LID techniques shall be incorporated into all Master Plan Developments. My concern is that as you move into the policies that that gets taken from a 'shall be' to a 'consider' or a 'promote' and I feel that it's lost. If I'm understanding from Jones and Stokes ... that staff report indicates that Master Planning includes additional or enhanced development standards for the protection of the environment with the future development of large tracts of land. It seems not to be unreasonable to actually require LID and not to just encourage or promote it. So I suggest that MDP1.9 and 1.10 get merged into one that would then read 'Promote the incorporation of LID techniques in Master Development Plans and require their use if critical areas are contained within or adjacent to their boundaries. These techniques may include but not be limited to: (include i. Through iv. As written)'.

(#3365) Jay Hupp: So your emphasis is more oriented towards water quality protection than actual implementation of LID techniques. I think that's two different subjects.

(#3385) Bill Dewey: What I'm trying to get at is requiring LID if there's critical areas, which would be aquifer recharge areas, shellfish growing areas, wetlands, habitat; not just water quality.

(#3400) Jay Hupp: Okay.

(#3410) *Miscellaneous discussion.*

(#3500) Steve Goins: If I could add to the discussion. I think the intent of these policies was to do two things. It was to require that LID standards be applied to these projects unilaterally and that the DR's would include specifics on that. The second half of that was to discuss that at a minimum your LID requirements will do this. Whatever regulations are eventually set up the guidance is that at a minimum it will do this.

(#3575) Jay Hupp: I have a degree of discomfort with that because I put LID almost in the same category as BAS. It means one thing to one person and one thing to another person and it generates a whole lot of cognitive dissidence when you engage in the subject. Bill's intent to specifically target it to critical areas makes me a lot more comfortable.

(#3625) Bill Dewey: In my comments I say to promote the incorporation of LID techniques in Master Development Planning and require their use if critical areas are contained within or adjacent to their boundaries. My understanding with LID is that depending on the nature of your development and your individual situation certainly not all LID techniques are applicable.

(#0150) Emmett Dobey: I think you'll find that most of the local LID techniques are pretty much site specific. So these are outcomes that you're trying to look for and those will come through in the DR's. When we envisioned this idea of Master Development Planning we were looking at it being more directed towards large tracts of land. So if you have 400 acres and you have a 2 acre wetland in the middle of it, under the proposal that you're looking at, would just the area around that 2 acres have to meet LID techniques or would the whole tract have to meet it? When you get into those kinds of interpretations I think it's much easier to just require everyone to do it.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

(#0215) Wendy Ervin: It's just as easy to do it in the initial drawing up of the plans for those 400 acres to do it then.

(#0225) Bill Dewey: It's wasn't my intention to put the hardship, for example, on all 400 acres. But it sounds like Emmett is proposing that you just require it on all 400 acres.

(#0245) Wendy Ervin: I don't see it as any kind of a hardship.

(#0255) Bill Dewey: Emmett, you've got experience with LID from Thurston County. How do you feel about that? Would you concur with that? So if you're starting from scratch ...

(#0275) Emmett Dobey: It's much easier that way. It's more site specific so there will be some sites, depending on the types of soil that you have, where it's not as expensive to do. Other sites will be more expensive. You would have a savings on not having such a stormwater pond. That's the other part of the equation. You'd be using less land.

(#0300) Terri Jeffreys: I think we should change MDP1.9 to where we take out the word 'promote' and replace with 'guide'. Then on the next one take out 'Include technical guidance' and replace with 'Development Regulations and Mason County Code will establish performance standards that can be met through the use of LID techniques'.

(#0325) Bill Dewey: That works for me.

(#0365) Bob Fink: In your wordsmithing of this, I think you need to keep in mind the beginning, which basically says that these policies guide the development of regulations. Then it says that these regulations shall ... that's where you would pick up on reading these policies. So the current language would say 'These regulations shall promote the incorporation of LID techniques into the development of the area within the Master Development Plan'. Then 1.10 is 'These regulations shall include technical guidance on the use of LID techniques in public and private developments within the Master Development Plan'. 'These techniques shall do the following'.... which are guidance on the techniques. Just remember that when you're reading these policies they're all prefaced by 'These regulations shall'. So you don't need to put back language in there. The regulations are going to promote LID and as written here, they're not requiring LID, but just supposed to encourage and promote it. As part of doing that they provide guidance to what elements of LID are in these parameters.

(#0425) Terri Jeffreys: So what I'm hearing is that it's not necessary to change any of this language.

(#0430) Bob Fink: That's up to you. I just wanted to make sure you're reading it correctly.

(#0435) Steve Goins: In other words, it is redundant because it's already established.

(#0442) Bob Fink: You could change 1.9 and say that these regulations shall require the incorporation of LID techniques rather than promote. That's if you want to make the language stronger. Or you could say it's required where appropriate.

(#0455) Wendy Ervin: I like 'where appropriate'.

(#0460) Bill Dewey: Everybody else comfortable with that?

(#0465) PAC: Yes.

(#0470) Terri Jeffreys: In iv., can stormwater techniques actually enhance water quality downstream?

(#0488) Emmett Dobey: Water quality has something to do with the amount of impervious surface you have within an area. When you already have more than 10% - 15% of impervious surface, you're probably not going to improve the water quality. It probably should be 'protect'.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

(#0498) Steve Goins: How about 'preserve'?

(#0500) Emmett Dobey: You've got to try to improve where you can because preserve may not be enough.

(#0505) Steve Goins: 'Protect', to me, is a little loose.

(#0512) Bill Dewey: So everyone happy with 'preserve'?

(#0515) PAC: Yes.

(#0518) Terri Jeffreys: Is the theme component required? If so, define it for me.

(#0525) Steve Goins: Part of the idea with the regulations was to consider when you develop a project to develop it in a fashion where you create a community theme. As part of your development criteria you would establish architectural themes, landscaping themes, monument signing themes, different types of things that make the project more cohesive. A reason that can be important is that if you have a project where you're selling off portions of the Master Development plan to different developers who have different ways of developing, the project could start to look a lot different and you lose that cohesiveness. Part of the discussion was also about what is an inappropriate theme?

(#0625) Tim Wing: Lakeland Village has an architectural committee and it has led to Lakeland Village having a huge variety of appearances of homes, but if you really look at them, they all are a similar type. They all go well together.

(#0640) Bill Dewey: So are we comfortable with leaving in the theme component?

(#0644) PAC: Yes.

(#0648) Bill Dewey: I'd like to move on to MPP6. Why wouldn't you want to encourage maximum efficiency for all your utilities, not just wastewater?

(#0660) Steve Goins: It should. We could change out the word 'wastewater' with 'utility'.

(#0690) Bill Dewey: In the Jones and Stokes report on page 10, there were some policies that Thurston County included that I thought might be worthy of including in Mason County policies. Specifically, we talk about different types of ways to minimize impacts to the environment, but we don't talk about reducing energy consumption and demand such as is mentioned in (6). I also think (7) and (8) would be worth incorporating into the draft. Is everyone comfortable with that?

(#0750) PAC: Yes.

(#0800) Terri Jeffreys: We were talking about site suitability.

(#0825) Bill Dewey: Allan, what would disqualify a site for being considered from Master Development planning?

(#0840) Allan Borden: I don't think a site would be totally disqualified but you might find that instead of having 150 acres on the west side for residential development and you have a ravine running down through it and that could make it difficult.

(#0850) Tim Wing: Because it would be impossible to integrate all of these design concepts?

(#0860) Allan Borden: Not only that, but you'd be working in a critical area. You'd have to do a lot of engineering and site modifications.

(#0890) Bill Dewey: How do you suggest we try to incorporate those concerns in here?

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, November 21, 2005

(#0900) Steve Goins: Let me speak to what Bob brought up. The policies are reading so that these regulations shall do the following ... include criteria for when and where a Development Master Plan may be appropriate within rural areas and within urban growth areas. I would anticipate, based on the public discussion we've already had, that there will be a lengthy list of conditions for development allowed in rural areas. There will probably be a very limited number of areas that will make all those qualifications in the rural areas when we're done.

(#0960) Emmett Dobey: I don't agree with that totally. You have a lot of forest land that there are companies getting out of the tree business and getting into the real estate business. That's one of the things I'm really concerned with and why we're doing this. We need to provide a better opportunity of controlling that type of development as opposed to just chunking it up into 5 acre tracts. So I think this is something that we're going to want to use a lot.

(#0980) Tim Wing: I agree with you. Allan did give an example that there are lots of places in this county that this would just never work.

(#0984) Emmett Dobey: That's true, but I think the market is going to decide that as opposed to us trying to decide what the criteria is.

(#0992) Bill Dewey: Any other comments? Steve, do you want us to go over the changes we proposed?

(#1020) Steve Goins: I think I captured them.

(#1030) Tim Wing: I make a motion that we recommend adoption of the Master Development Plan Policies as amended.

(#1040) Wendy Ervin: I second the motion.

(#1050) Bill Dewey: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes.

(#1065) Tim Wing: I'd like to comment on the Transportation Element. I don't know if you've all read what the staff has recommended regarding our input. For the most part, they recommended that almost none of them be accepted by the BOCC. I'm highly disappointed to see that because it basically takes that Transportation Element back to the status quo and ignores all of the issues that we discussed about UGA's. There's discussion in it about why they recommend not accepting our recommendations, and in most cases, I think they totally missed the points we made. So I'm very disappointed in that. I'm going to try to come down to the BOCC meeting tomorrow and express my personal concerns. I just want to make sure the PAC knows that.

(#1200) Bob Fink: We wanted to talk to you about scheduling a special meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> of December.

(#1220) *Miscellaneous discussion about attendance at meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup>.*

(#1230) Wendy Ervin: That doesn't work for me.

(#1234) Terri Jeffreys: That doesn't work for me, either.

(#1244) *Motion made, seconded and passed to excuse Wendy and Terri from the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> of December.*

Meeting adjourned.