

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
May 21, 2007

(Note audio tape (#2) dated May 21, 2007
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, Terri Jeffreys, Jay Hupp, Diane Edgin, Dennis Pickard and Wendy Ervin.

Staff Present: Barbara Robinson, Barbara Adkins, and Susie Ellingson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the March 19, 2007 meeting were approved as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0050) Bill Dewey opened the public hearing to consider the draft revisions to the proposed final zoning code for Allyn.

(#0060) Barbara Adkins of the Planning Department noted the staff report sent to the PAC contains an outline with page numbers with some of the proposed edits. The interim Allyn Zoning Code will expire on June 30, 2007. There was a public workshop held at the Port of Allyn on May 10th. Barbara passed out a separate set of edits that are a result of that May 10th meeting.

(#0098) Barbara Robinson noted that the second set is a cumulation of the information we received at the workshop and also input we received from the general public have all been put into the final document.

(#0115) Barbara Adkins continued on noting the changes. The first change is on page 18 under 17.11.200, Residential Recreational District. Section 17.11.220, Allowed Uses. We've taken out the terminology of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

Condominiums/Townhouses and put in Duplex, Triplex, and Multi-Family. Towards the bottom of the page, Cluster Development has been added. On page 19, Condominium/Townhouses has been replaced with triplexes and multi-family. Lot Dimensions has some edits. There's the removal of the 3:1 ratio, the addition of 20 feet for flag lots and the removal of the last sentence that says 'provided that the minimum lot width is reached and maintained at a setback of 20 feet'. The Triplexes/Multi-family & Cluster development replaced Condominium and Townhouse language. We have also decreased setbacks from 10 feet to 5 feet from golf courses. On page 21, Garden apartments and Townhouses has been taken out because there is no definition in the county code for those and replaced with multi-family. On page 22, the primary building height has been changed from 30 to 35 feet. That is standard in the county. On page 28 under Lot Dimensions, we have the same edits we saw before. We have also removed the last sentence that says 'provided that the minimum lot width is reached and maintained at a setback of 20 feet'. Also removed was 'Lots shall be regular in shape with a maximum of five property lines and the side property lines roughly parallel'. On page 30 under Permitted Uses, we've taken out the words 'professional offices' and replaced it with 'offices'. That gives a broader definition encompassing all offices. On page 32, maximum height has been changed from 30 to 35 feet. On page 35 under Permitted Uses, we've taken out Real Estate Offices and replaced it with just offices. On page 36 under 17.12.240, Uses Allowed Subject to Obtaining a Special Use Permit, we removed 'second floor residential uses not ancillary to a business'. An overlay district cannot be more restrictive. On page 38, we changed Professional Offices to Offices for the broader definition. On page 39, Uses Allowed Subject to a Special Use Permit, 'Individual permitted business establishments or integrated multi tenant centers of less than 5 acres' has been removed. On page 41, there's another change to Offices from Professional Offices. On page 42, under Bulk and Dimension standards, 'plus an additional structure setback of 1 additional foot for each foot of structure height over 35 feet' has been removed. On page 48, we removed the word professional in front of office. Those are the most recent additions and changes.

(#0400) Bill Dewey inquired about the removal of #1 under 17.12.340 under Highway Commercial.

(#0410) Barbara Adkins responded that was a request that came out of the workshop. The gentleman is here from the public who could speak to that issue.

(#0430) Bill Dewey opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#0450) Gerald Salmon, who owns property in Allyn, testified first. He stated he is the owner, along with Ms. Nieuwenburg, of the property zoned Highway Commercial. To say we're confused, is putting it mildly. I have a 2.17 acre parcel and a 3.36 acre parcel, and Ms. Nieuwenburg has a 2.2 acre parcel. When I read the zoning code, it states that for 21 of these uses I need at least 5 acres or more to do them. I don't have 5 acres there that is contiguous. He stated it seems to be restrictive as far as the Business Park Commercial, with a minimum lot size of 19,200 sf. The village commercial lot size is 9,600 sf. My minimum lot size is 217,800 sf. I have a lot of people interested in the property but for a developer to come and invest in that property, he doesn't know what he can do with it. It's not spelled out here clear what can be done with it. I've been beating this dead horse since 2003. I just feel like nobody is listening to me. I don't know why I'm the only one that is Highway Commercial nor do I understand why it's so regulated. It's all about free enterprise and bringing in jobs and money to Allyn; I thought that's what these UGA's were for. I feel that a HC lot should be the same as a BP of 19,200 sf. The 5 acres just shouldn't be in there.

(#0625) Wendy Ervin inquired if that is the only HC zoning in Allyn.

(#0645) Barbara Adkins stated it was.

(#0650) Barbara Robinson added that in 2003, Mr. Salmon short platted that into 3 individual lots. In 2004, the Allyn interim zoning was adopted. At that time the HC district was applied to it. The HC is a very unique district in that it's oriented to vehicle traffic and it's usually high intense, high traffic flow areas. Mr. Carey can give you some background on how they came up with that zoning for only one ownership.

(#0700) Gerald Salmon continued on explaining he doesn't have a problem being listed as HC, but the lot size is an issue for him.

(#0745) Barbara Robinson stated that it was the three platted lots when this designation was placed on it.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

(#0755) Wendy Ervin inquired if Village Commercial would be a more appropriate designation for him.

(#0765) Gerald Salmon stated that Village Commercial would work for him. He stated he asked for that at one time and they said I wasn't part of the village. I don't agree with that. If you bring commerce to this end of town, either it's going to work or people aren't going to want it. I don't see a problem with the jobs it would provide or anything to the Town of Allyn. It would also spread out some of the congestion.

(#0800) Tim Wing noted the size of the lots are smaller than the required size. Tim inquired if that means that you can't do anything with that property at all.

(#0815) Gerald Salmon stated it sure makes it confusing. I've had a couple of people who want to buy the property and they were concerned about having to get a special use permit to develop the property.

(#0820) Tim Wing stated you could use it but you'd have to get a special use permit.

(#0825) Gerald Salmon responded that looks like a red herring to an investor. If you're a businessman and looking at some property and they don't even know what they can do with it, that's confusing.

(#0845) Barbara Adkins explained that the 5 acres was taken out in the most recent version of the document and if everyone is in agreement that can also be taken out of the original document. I just wanted to bring it up for discussion if you wanted to remove the 5 acre reference.

(#0865) Wendy inquired of Gerald Salmon if that would be acceptable to him.

(#0900) Gerald Salmon responded that it would help but is still concerned about the difference between his area and the downtown area.

(#0925) Wendy Ervin inquired if there was a requirement that there be an HC zone in the Allyn plan.

(#0930) Barbara Robinson responded there is because the Allyn Sub-Area Plan has that in there which is in the Comprehensive Plan. If you're thinking of doing away with that, the whole Comp Plan would have to be updated and that's not what we're here for tonight. If he wants to seek a rezone, he would have to do it at another time. The idea was to keep the more intense, vehicular oriented type businesses away from the more village type downtown.

(#0945) Gerald Salmon stated it's not the zoning, but the lot size, that's the issue.

(#1000) Terri Jeffreys stated it looks like they're trying for a shopping mall.

(#1002) Gerald Salmon responded if you look at the slope of that property it will never happen there. In the Business Park area further into town, there's some flat land where you could put in a mall. My property is not flat. You need to use common sense when you're zoning these properties including the slope, etc. You're not going to fit a Safeway on that piece of property. We're not going to put the lots together.

(#1040) Jay Hupp noted Mr. Salmon is asking for the removal of the 5 acre minimum and the square feet minimum.

(#1052) Gerald Salmon stated that would work for future reference for the property. I would be happy with that.

(#1075) Rob Drexler, representing the Mason County Association of Realtors, spoke next. The realtors believe home buyers need more choice. We have consistently advocated for flexibility in Development Regulations in order to encourage more choices in housing. As written, the regulations favor traditional single family housing development, and that would not meet all the housing needs that would come about. Increased cost of housing and land, aging population, smaller households and limited buildable land area have created a new emerging housing market. Development regulations need to be flexible to meet the demands of these emerging markets. It's important that the land use regulations not be so outdated that

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

project applicants must wait for regulations to catch up to the market. The market will drive what we need to build. This increases time, cost and risk to the applicant, factors that can kill projects and leave many would be buyers out of the market. The Thriftway Store in Hoodspout took so long to get approved because we had to catch up on our regulations. Realtors have recommended some specific changes that would increase the variety of housing projects that can be built in Allyn. Legislature and Urban Planners recognize accessory dwelling units as an important contributor to affordable housing and housing that meets our population changing demographics. They should be allowed outright rather than forcing an applicant to go through a special use permit. Design standards can litigate problems that may negatively impact neighbors. We recommend permitting them outright in R-1 and R-2 zoning districts. Design standards should be written to accommodate attached and detached units, parking, sewer, and stormwater issues. The R-3 zone does not allow small lot, detached housing an increasingly successful form of housing that meets the needs of first time buyers and people downsizing to smaller homes, thus freeing up larger homes for families. We recommend allowing detached housing in R-3. Minimum lot size requirement in the R-3 zone is arbitrary. There should only be front yard and rear yard setbacks. This limit micro manages a building project for no apparent purpose. Builders know what size unit the market will bear and will build accordingly. Staff and the Allyn Planning Association had agreed to accommodate plans by the Anderson Family for new development in Lakeland Village, and their proposal is for the R-1P and R-1 should be adopted. Planned development regulations are a good start for the much needed Planned Unit Development regulations in the Allyn and Belfair UGA's. However, as written, they offer little incentive for projects to go forward. An important incentive for builders is the ability to increase the amount of dwelling units to offset costs associated with increasing permitting time, land cost, and installing supporting infrastructure. A few more units can offset these costs and keep the price per unit down and help the project to pencil out. The regulations will need to be reworked to allow some density bonuses. Not just clustering, but have some building bonuses we can put in there. Realtors need more flexibility in placement of temporary open house signs to better serve our clients and accommodate federal fair housing laws. In the written comment provided, we recommend language temporary placement of open house signs on county right-of-ways when safety can be protected.

(#1250) Tim Wing inquired about the accessory dwelling units.

(#1255) Rob Drexler explained that ADU's are like an apartment above the garage, or a basement apartment. They're allowed by a special use permit and we are saying they should be allowed outright.

(#1300) Rick Anderson, Anderson and Sons from Lakeland Village, testified next. On the changes on the lot dimensions on the platted portions of Lakeland Village, we are in the process of doing a long plat. We have already submitted our plans to the county and they found that the lot dimensions didn't work. Due to the shape of the property it just didn't fit, and we would have had to do a variance just to get the plat approved. The staff helped us rewrite that so we could plat it. We did the same wording on the unplatted portions of Lakeland Village. The other main change was regarding the density. We did agree to an overall density of 5 units per gross acre, but we wanted the wording such that we were able to do things in certain areas where we're going to have denser housing, but the overall density won't exceed 5 units per gross acre. Staff and Bob Fink wrote this cluster development section and they seem to think that will work for that.

(#1400) Jeff Carey, President of the Allyn Community Association, testified next. He stated the ACA has always taken a position to work with all property owners, not to single out any one in particular, contrary to popular belief or presentation. Jeff discussed the origin of the Highway Commercial zoning. In the beginning, that never existed. We worked with the county and they came up with the language and asked, in following GMA goals, how to control sprawl and keep the village center. Mr. Salmon asked to have commercial zoning and the only thing we could come up with was something of a HC. When that was created in 2003, it was all one parcel. It wasn't until we had the hearing in June of 2004 that we even understood there were additional parcels involved. The other reason is because it's all adjacent to residential. It was brought to our attention that it could be developed as a special use. There has never been a singling out of any property owner and I've been on that committee for ten years. While there's been some trouble trying to come to a happy compromise, this association has always worked with everyone. We've always strived to work with everyone and solve the issues. In so many words I want to leave this commission with the understanding that this organization has tried to work with the people and we've made good faith efforts in this endeavor. With what's there, we do have some concern regarding the tourism overlay. What we left with at the last open house was it was supposed to make it more restrictive and now it's less restrictive. The idea was to have a more tourist section right around the highway and we got caught in a situation where we started with an overlay when it

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

should have been a separate zone. What we came back to the county to present, and the county said it couldn't go any farther, was to create yet another zone so that could focus more on tourism and didn't have to encumber this overlay issue between the rest of the Village Commercial area.

(#1600) Wendy Ervin noted that she understood the overlay zone could not be more restrictive than the underlying zone.

(#1615) Jeff Carey responded that is correct, and that's why it doesn't work because we are trying to be more restrictive. That's the problem we're presented with.

(#1630) Wendy Ervin inquired about the tourist area and why can't that be accommodated with the parking, and access to other features and why that doesn't accomplish their purposes.

(#1660) Jeff Carey explained at this time it will be hard to accomplish the purpose because it needs to be more restrictive in nature. The parking for tourism is different than the parking for Village Commercial. Our intent has been to focus on a limited part of tourism and then have more general uses around it.

(#1685) Wendy Ervin inquired about what tourist based uses did he want to see accomplished that you can't accomplish this way.

(#1698) Jeff Carey explained the process of working this through has gone backwards of what we are trying to do.

(#1705) Bill Dewey inquired if Jeff Carey had any particular solutions he could offer for that problem.

(#1710) Jeff Carey noted if it can be done, give it a different district and get on with it.

(#1730) Jay Hupp inquired if the ACA was ready for this to go forward in its present form.

(#1735) Jeff Carey stated it is never perfect but it does have to move forward, but we need to address this problem sometime in the future, as long as we have that commitment from the county.

(#1745) Wendy Ervin inquired if there was a possibility under the VC and Tourist Overlay that something under VC could be instituted in the Tourist Overlay that then would be something he would be open to seeing.

(#1780) Jeanette Moore, Chair of the Allyn Planning Committee, added some comments. She stated that Bonnie Knight, also a member of the ACA, has been involved with tourism for the last several years. She has gone through seminars, meetings, etc., and looked at the potential and we cut that tourist overlay way down to focus on just the tourism. It's a half a block on either side of the street and two or three blocks long. It is the core of accessibility from the state highway. As most of you know, the state highway is one of the few public roads through there. She could not be here this evening, but she would passionately defend the concept of having a real tourist oriented central block there that catered to tourism. As Jeff said, the parking requirements for tourism are different than the parking requirements for others. We have been working with so many different planners and juggle these issues around and that was something that just slipped through the cracks. There just isn't a good way to solve this issue tonight. We really need to take some time and work this through.

(#1860) Jay Hupp inquired if the rest of the ACA was comfortable with the focus on tourism for the commercial core.

(#1875) Jeanette Moore replied that they were.

(#1888) Wendy Ervin stated her particular pet peeve was running bicycle lanes on the sides of highways. The medical examiner's office calls them donor lanes. My personal choice is to put the pedestrians and bicycles on the same chunk of pavement separated and put the cars over in another space. Bicycles don't kill pedestrians; cars kill bicyclists.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

(#1945) Jeff Carey stated we have an interesting town; we have a plat and a development and future development and the dilemma is how to make this work in this community and keep everybody happy. One concern is with R-1R. We want to see Lakeland Village develop as it developed, and better, from where they've been. The concern we're really focused on is this density issue. We have some concerns about how the clustering is being considered. We just want to make sure that, if you cluster, what's being counted as the open space is within the zone and not in the rest of Allyn of Lakeland Village as part of that open space calculation. There's a reference in the first paragraph that you're not only counting R-1R but you're counting the rest of Lakeland.

(#2065) Rick Anderson stated he would like to speak to that because that's exactly what it's supposed to mean. We started that development with a long range plan. We have something that is called Exhibit A. It's all of our holdings in Lakeland Village and that's what the community agreed upon that we could develop. That is the property in the UGA. Then you come along, and just because we put a lot of the amenities and recreational facilities in up front with the idea we were going to develop the rest of our property and let everybody use them the properties in the unplatted portions can still use the community beach areas and the things that are in the platted portions, so to say that you can't get credit for that is totally unfair.

(#2100) Jeff Carey stated to Rick Anderson the problem he has is that you have two different zones ...I'm not hear to cross up Lakeland. I've worked with your dad and you family and have all the appreciation for that. All I'm saying is the language, up to this point, is that you're going to consider other things for open space it's usually been within the zone you've created. Here you're using one district and counting another district as part of that open space. I don't think that's the direction you want to go. If it needs to be denser let's hammer it out but then we have to be careful because then we go into the Comp Plan issue. I'm not here to throw mud on any issue; I just want to solve this.

(#2200) Wendy Ervin talked about density credits and moving them around in other areas. If one particular area has more open space than that area would be required to have, it would seem that you could move an open space credit over here.

(#2235) Rick Anderson stated this is the problem with zoning. We're sitting in a situation where lines are being drawn arbitrarily and as a landowner that had all of this laid out as a concept. The homeowners association that regulates Lakeland Village is well aware of the amount of property we were going to add to Lakeland Village. We told them we had a document called 'Exhibit A' and it's in the bylaws of the homeowners association and that it included this property that's in the UGA. Now what happens is that you come in and draw a line and all that stuff we were planning on using for the entire community now can only be used for the people that are there and the new people don't get credit for that. Or as a developer we don't get credit for dedicating that land up front. That's what my complaint would be.

(#2290) Tim Wing inquired when 'Exhibit A' was first established.

(#2300) Rick Anderson responded it was established back in 1972. Exhibit A was a document that was created because people saw us developing more and more land. We had already built the lake and we built nine holes of golf and some heads up people on the board inquired how much development there would be. We responded whatever land my grandfather originally bought. If we add anymore land or anymore development to Lakeland Village, they will not be able to use the common areas, besides beyond this UGA border.

(#2335) Dennis Pickard inquired if there are any plans in the works for development in Lakeland Village at this time.

(#2345) Rick Anderson responded we have been developing a new project and we're going over it with staff. We're not just going to put in all houses. We have a concept where we're going to put in areas of walking paths, areas to view the wildlife and wetland areas. Our densities from that would probably come out even, but it would be just totally unfair to have us have this line drawn saying everything we've done in the past is not part of the future.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

(#2375) Tim Wing stated to a large degree in the mid 70's you established a community plan for the entire community, even though that wasn't required at the time. I would look at that as a commitment that was made at that time prior to the county having any rules about that, and that should be honored.

(#2400) Rick Anderson thanked Tim Wing for his comments. Everybody that owns property in the UGA can sometimes feel frustrated with the zoning, but it's different if you buy the property and it's zoned that way versus someone coming in and saying this is what you're going to do.

(#2425) Jeanette Moore, Chair of the Allyn Planning Group, testified next. The Lakeland Village zoning with this last subdivision has been the subject of some discussion in the last few weeks only. Jeanette talked about the open space language and the clustering language and inquired about the density.

(#2500) Barbara Robinson clarified that the overall density cannot exceed what you're allowed based on the acreage, but you can cluster units together in smaller spaces and then have the remainder as open space.

(#2515) Jeanette Moore inquired within that division or area that's being zoned. If I understand this language here, open space that would normally be part of that division can now be taken out of something a half mile away that's common space instead of being left for that particular subdivision. So the open space of a planned development, which is normally part of that planned development, could then be later developed.

(#2580) Rick Anderson explained what staff explained to him was that we have 125 acres left and at 5 units per acre that gives us approximately 600 units. We can develop that 600 units in the various clusterings on that acreage as long as we don't exceed 5 units per acre.

(#2600) Jeanette Moore inquired what happens to the acreage that is not developed within that 125 acres.

(#2605) Rick Anderson reiterated that he's only allowed 600 units so once I hit 600 that's it.

(#2610) Jeanette Moore inquired who owns the remaining acreage.

(#2620) Rick Anderson stated that he owns the property but cannot develop on it.

(#2625) Jeanette Moore inquired what if the zoning changes. Jeanette Moore stated the language says 'open space and other development requirements for the future divisions of Lakeland Village shall be based on their ability to develop within the entire development of Lakeland Village'. She inquired what that means, and if they are available for later use. Our concern is Allyn has been fighting the boundaries of the UGA, which have been so constrictive. Lakeland Village has been an absolute model of an attractive subdivision, which has helped the entire county. When Lakeland Village pulled lots off the market, there were no other lots available. There is an allocation now for the UGA for population growth and there's been some arguments about that as well. Until Allyn reaches 'x' number of people in the UGA, it's very difficult to expand the boundaries. If Rick is able to go back in Division 14 and he puts in 600 houses but they are clustered and he can go back and rezone it and get another 600 zoned and is choosing to wait until the market climate is good, Allyn UGA has 600 available lots that would prevent us expanding the boundaries. That's why it's important. That would be a fatal flaw for the Allyn UGA. I would ask the PAC to move this forward, but we really want that density issue in Division 14 cleared up.

(#2850) Pat McCullough stated he has worked the last fourteen years with the Andersons to develop Lakeland Village. Lakeland Village, as it exists now, is probably the finest development of its type in the state. The Andersons did that with nobody telling them what to do. They did that by responding to the market and their own needs. I've been involved in the last three years with Rick planning the remainder of the development. Now we have a whole bunch of people coming to the Andersons telling them how to do it. You can see how frustrating that is. We have a plan that we're working on now by just completing the drainage plan as part of the UGA requirements. That effort is almost a \$50,000 effort just to do that planning. This is no small effort. We can't commit to open space because we are still in the planning process, but I can tell you there's no reduction in the percentage of open space we're planning in the next divisions. We have a problem from a practical standpoint. The UGA requires with sewer and roads and storm drainage that you

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

develop a fairly intense development of property. The idea is to use those capital facilities to centralize population. We need to put a lot of different housing types in this development in order to meet those requirements. Frankly, it's not that easy to get five units per acre. You need to have sections of this development in condominiums or cottage development that are ten units per acre. We want to maintain the existing rural character of Lakeland Village and to do that we have a lot of lots that are ½ or 1/4 acre lots. So from a planning standpoint I want to assure you when Rick stands up and says we have been planning this development for years, don't put us in a box now. One of the reasons I came tonight is that right now we don't have any guidelines for cottage housing in this county. Cottage housing is becoming a very popular form of housing. Single family, small lot sized of 3,500 sf and basically the houses are right next to each other. Typically the cottages run anywhere from 1,300 to 1,750 sf. A lot of the people really like that. We don't have criteria for that and we're in the process of trying to plan this community to include cottage housing and I want to make sure that the new requirements here allows that. Clustered housing, multi-family, triplexes and I don't know whether it's necessary to specifically specify cottage housing in this context because I'm not sure what we are talking at this point. Many of the communities in the state have developed cottage housing guidelines and ordinances.

(#3250) Jay Hupp inquired if the present language that we're proposing is comfortable with Rick.

(#3270) Pat McCullough stated that it was. However, you have to understand that in Lakeland Village the lake is a manmade lake. The lake was planned for the entire property. We use the lake to control storm drainage. We've got extensive plans for storm drainage and our model shows that we have exceeded our goals. That's reflected in the water quality of the lake. We're working extensively right now with the people at Lake Devereaux to prevent any future issues in the westerly drainages. There's a lot going on and more will come up with we begin to present the plans. That wording is really important because Lakeland Village is Lakeland Village and it's important that community continue as a unit.

(#3400) Wendy Ervin inquired about the open space and will that ever be developed.

(#3440) Pat McCullough indicated that it would create a real problem for the community to develop Generation 1 golf course into condominiums and that it is not going to be done. You have a development with no county requirements for the last 20 years and they've been incredibly responsible. Now why and how, given the bylaws from the homeowners association, try to double the density of the existing property? It's not going to happen.

(#3500) Bill Dewey closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#3550) Tim Wing inquired on page 23 under Allowed Uses regarding the density of not less than 6 dwelling units per acre. He noted that there's an 8-acre piece of property right here where they're planning to put 42 units. That doesn't work, so is the plan to disallow this?

(#3700) Barbara Robinson responded that right now there is a minimum lot area requirement and there's not less than 6 units per acre the way it's written now. This has been the interim zoning since 2004. So he should have been designing that under what the interim zoning was.

(#3745) Tim Wing stated he has met with the county a number of times and has also met with the Allyn Association several times.

(#3750) Jeanette Moore stated that we've done everything he's asked for to make it work for him.

(#3755) Tim Wing noted that's why he is surprised to see the 6 units per acre when he's doing a little over 5.

(#3800) Barbara Robinson stated that we have the R-1, R-2, and R-3, and the R-3 is the highest density to allow more units on the property. The way it's written, he has to follow the regulations.

(#0120) Jeff Carey stated that somewhere in the process, the interim zoning did not have that language. What's happened, is the language got copied from one zone to another and it should not have been.

(#0130) Miscellaneous discussion regarding R-3 in the interim zoning. There was a consensus that the

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

original language stating there was no minimum is the correct language and it should be a correction in the proposed draft. Under allowed uses, #2, the language should say 'Attached single-family residential projects of at least 10 units'.

(#0320) Jeanette Moore explained Mr. Payson did not want to do condominiums because of the liability issues. We agreed with him on that so we eliminated the condominium language and allowed the townhouses and they will have common wall construction. There are lots of small lots in Allyn for detached houses. This was so we could have a variety of housing within the community. It was what he wanted to build and we were very supportive of that.

(#0375) Terri Jeffreys inquired about adding the word 'detached'.

(#0380) Barbara Robinson explained that detached means it's single-family and you have to make sure that it is multi-family because it is a high density zone.

(#0400) Terri Jeffrey inquired about language for 'cottage housing'.

(#0420) Barbara Robinson stated we would have to develop a definition of cottage housing and look more into the feasibility of where we would put them. We're not opposed to it, but that was never part of the work plan for this project. We have other things we need to look at as well so it would be something to look in the future.

(#0430) Tim Wing brought up the Highway Commercial zone issue. Tim indicated he had the impression that the Allyn plan is really trying to keep small lots and small business in the center of the town and they would like to see something different on the highway. It makes no sense that we've got a zone that requires someone get a variance to use it. He stated he's not in favor of changing the density on that property down to the very small lots in the center of Allyn, but the lots over 2 acres should be able to be developed without having to go get a variance right away. Tim inquired if we could possibly change that highway commercial from 5 acre minimum to a 2 acre minimum that would allow each of those 3 lots to be used.

(#0470) Jay Hupp inquired why not go down to the smaller lots there.

(#0475) Tim Wing responded that it would promote really small buildings and businesses there and that's not in keeping with the Allyn community's interest.

(#0480) Jay Hupp stated it is within the UGA and the basic philosophy of a UGA was that's where residential and commercial in business development was going to be forced out of the rural area. Now we get into the UGA and we start tightening the noose on business development by restricting the properties that you can do business development on because of the size. It seems it defeats the original purpose of creating a UGA to stuff everything into it to now start saying you're going to limit what can be stuffed in there because of the size of the lots. I would have no restriction on the size of the lots at all.

(#0500) Wendy Ervin agreed with Jay's statement and noted to just delete 'of at least 5 acres' wording.

(#0520) Dennis Pickard noted the individually permitted uses that are described are not generally talking about something that would be a large scale business. It seems like the intent of this particular district is to provide for an integrated driver oriented shopping center of some sort. This would have a highway access as it's focus rather than the pedestrian tourist emphasis of the core village area. The landowner mentioned that the topography wouldn't necessarily permit a connected shopping center as a viable project design, but the potential to divide those parcels into lots of the size more appropriate to the sorts of uses that are described would be the way to go. So we should permit those lots to be developed at a size that's appropriate to the businesses that are proposed.

(#0565) Bill Dewey inquired of Dennis if he was speaking in support of Tim's suggestion of less than 2 acres.

(#0570) Dennis Pickard responded he is speaking in support of the idea of permitting smaller lots to be developed out of it in a similar size as the village core recognizing that the sorts of businesses that are

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

proposed would not be suitable for larger lots.

(#0585) Gerald Salmon stated he would be happy with 1/2-acre lots.

(#0585) Diane Edgin added whether the lots are 2 acres or smaller the market place is going to determine what will go in there. It has accessibility and it's a little larger than something downtown so it could feasibly hold something that needs more parking.

(#0600) Wendy Ervin commented on the permitted uses throughout this document. That's presupposing that we know what the market place is going to be and what popular businesses there will be for the next 20 years or so because if you're limited to exactly what's on that list, there's no room for new products and new series of operations. Wendy stated it's much more useful to say what's not permitted than what is permitted.

(#0625) Jay Hupp stated that goes back to the basic argument that has been raging around through Planning in Mason County for 15 years. It was the matrix of permitted uses, which is backward in philosophy.

(#0650) Terri Jeffreys recommended on page 38 putting a period after shopping center, strike the rest of the language in that paragraph. Then put in language saying 'other businesses similar in nature', then we're not excluding other businesses. Perhaps add under #22, 'or uses of similar nature'.

(#0700) Diane Edgin inquired why medical offices or dentist offices should have to obtain a special use permit.

(#0720) Jeanette Moore responded the whole philosophy was promoted by a planner who was a contract planner with Mason County and then worked for the ACA. The idea was to have an intimate core area, however, we recognized the vehicle oriented nature of our society and the need for a larger area for those vehicle oriented areas. In order to provide for that, he suggested the 5 acre minimum so that we would have a complex similar to the Safeway, which has a lot of small businesses. That is done as a highway commercial area. There are a lot of retired people in the area, so we didn't want them to have to drive to get there. The idea was to have dental, medical offices right in the core of Allyn. What we were after was to provide a balance to that. We did not do that in order to have a competing, separate central business district and 6 acres in that small area starts to become a competing central business district which then you have to drive to. That defeats the whole purpose of having the village kind of concept.

(#0850) Tim Wing inquired if everyone was in agreement with the smaller lot sizes.

(#0875) PAC agreed there would be no minimum lot size in the Highway Commercial zone.

(#0885) Tim Wing also stated that he was in agreement with Mr. Drexler to add a very short section at the end about open house signs.

(#0900) Barbara Robinson stated that you need to remember you can't use a public right-of-way for private enterprise. If you do that then you open it up to anybody that wants to put a temporary sign in the right-of-way.

(#0945) Tim Wing stated it should say 'temporary signs may be placed in the county right-of-way for the duration of the event and in locations where they do not obstruct traffic'. That would be under section 17.15.080.

(#1100) Wendy Ervin inquired about the definitions of accessory structures and guest houses.

(#1135) Terri Jeffreys explained that guest houses are not for long term use as a residence.

(#1200) Miscellaneous discussion.

(#1550) Wendy Ervin suggested on page 52, under Parking Lot Location, Construction and Design, under (a) to change the language of 'Pervious paving surfaces are allowed' to 'Pervious paving surfaces are

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

encouraged'...

(#1600) Bill Dewey added that it should be an incentive for reduced stormwater infiltration on-site.

(#1630) Jay Hupp suggested doing away with any restriction what so ever for the type of surface you're going to have.

(#1700) Jeanette Moore spoke to the ecological importance of the restriction. When you have asphalt or concrete surfaces or parking then the oil that leaks from vehicles and the contaminants drain into a Type II catch basin which is then cleaned out. Otherwise it goes into the soil which is contaminating. That's why that was written that way. In King County, there is no parking lot allowed that is not paved because of that issue.

(#1720) Tim Wing stated he was in favor of the change regarding the 'Pervious paving surfaces are encouraged'... There needs to be a lot more study on the definition of what's the best way to provide parking lots. There is such a thing as porous concrete, but this isn't the meeting that we should try to craft language to finalize that.

(#1740) Barbara Robinson added that both the parking ordinance and the sign ordinance are two ordinances, along with the landscape ordinance, that are going to be looked at further.

(#1755) Bill Dewey stated that is good information to know and that he is also interested to know where stormwater planning is in general for the community of Allyn.

(#1765) Barbara Robinson responded that we have a stormwater management plan completed for Allyn and it's under review right now. That will come back before the PAC.

(#1785) Wendy Ervin added she would encourage LID practices under landscaping in the parking lots so the runoff can go into the landscaping areas. It should be incorporated into this as much as possible.

(#1800) Jeanette Moore added that wording in there now is something that is in there until we can get back to proposing new language for the parking and landscaping areas in the oncoming months. She was in agreement with Wendy regarding the LID practices.

(#1850) Diane Edgin noted on page 33 'Overhead Doors'. She stated the language 'Overhead loading doors shall not be permitted along street frontages'. She went on to say it could mean a business failing or not.

(#1900) Dennis Pickard stated that the sorts of businesses in general in Allyn probably wouldn't be a reasonably required element.

(#1935) Tim Wing noted there are no businesses in Allyn at this point that have overhead doors. Tim also stated it is an aesthetic issue especially in the village commercial district rather than an outlying district.

(#1965) Jay Hupp noted in the Purpose section it talks about the village area includes services uses. Service uses might include a rolling door and I think that's a restriction that reaches too far.

(#1990) Tim Wing explained the community probably addressed that issue and saw it as an aesthetic issue that they would prefer not to have that in the center of the community. Tim stated he would be in favor of leaving it the way it is.

(#2000) Dennis Pickard agreed with Mr. Wing. Dennis noted he would also leave the language in.

(#2020) Wendy Ervin suggested allowing them but with a special use permit.

(#2040) Miscellaneous discussion. The PAC agreed to take the statement out regarding not permitting overhead doors along street frontages.

(#2075) Wendy Ervin noted the staff report stated Allyn does not have a manufacturing / industrial district

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

specifically. Wendy noted she was in agreement with that. Allyn is not an appropriate location for manufacturing / industrial.

(#2090) Barbara Robinson noted there is a Business Park District.

(#2095) Wendy Ervin stated there was a comment made that they wanted a reduced amount. That is appropriate, but that doesn't mean that Mason County doesn't need the jobs that these businesses would generate. For the population base of the UGA of Allyn that industrial zoning and manufacturing zoning that they would otherwise allow for that population base, that should be moved to Belfair and Shelton. That would increase the industrial base for what Allyn doesn't want.

(#2120) Jeanette Moore responded that it doesn't have anything to do with what Allyn doesn't want. Allyn desperately wants manufacturing and commercial and more retail space. It has been a constant conflict with the county to increase the size and location of the boundaries of the UGA so that is possible. It is part of the GMA that requires that UGA's be treated by the county such that they can become incorporated areas. Allyn clearly has the population and there have been discussions on incorporation. If you're going to have a complete city, you're going to have to have manufacturing.

(#2190) Dennis Pickard stated he would like to see the Lot Dimensions language in R-1 and R-2 the same as in R-1P eliminating the depth to width ratio requirements as well as noting the flag lots.

(#2250) PAC concurred with that.

(#2265) Dennis Pickard noted that in R-2 and R-3, and it was noted in the Association of Realtors discussion, is the Dwelling Unit Size. It establishes minimum square footage per dwelling unit. That would seem to be somewhat contrary to the goal of establishing affordable housing. Those tend to be the higher density districts.

(#2300) Wendy Ervin brought up 'affordable housing'. If you have adequate jobs, everything is affordable. If you don't have adequate jobs, nobody can live anywhere so calling it affordable is just patronizing.

(#2350) Terri Jeffreys inquired of Dennis if he was suggesting striking that language.

(#2375) Dennis Pickard stated he was throwing it out for discussion. Dennis also stated he is somewhat uncomfortable with imposing minimums of that nature on those districts. He suggested either striking the language or maybe there should be something that was considered to be common sizes.

(#2425) Tim Wing noted those are common sizes that you see fairly often in covenants or restrictions.

(#2450) Dennis Pickard responded that removing the minimum here doesn't preclude the property owner from establishing minimums of their own. It just permits the developer to establish smaller units if they chose. Dennis also indicated to have this limit as the regular limit and to permit lower limits under a special use permit.

(#2500) Tim Wing noted this just doesn't govern developers but it also governs an individual who wants to build a 600 sf house on a small piece of property in downtown Allyn. There's a lot of very small lots there.

(#2520) Dennis Pickard responded this would just be in R-2 and R-3. So these are the multi-family, high density.

(#2535) Tim Wing noted the reason there are these limits is because the developer wants to see some sort of conformity for these houses. It's really an aesthetic issue.

(#2550) Dennis Pickard stated he understands that from a business perspective, but he's not certain that's the role of the government to impose. That's the issue he has. Using the special permit process, that would allow greater oversight that the potential development regarding the unit size.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 21, 2007

(#2575) Miscellaneous discussion.

(#2600) The PAC's consensus was to strike the language in R-2 and R-3 under Dwelling Unit size.

(#2625) Dennis Pickard brought up the Village Commercial District, section 17.12.120, Permitted Uses. This is an issue we worked on recently regarding grocery stores and their square footages that might preclude them from being commercially viable. I suggest we incorporate the same solution that we did for Hoodsport with a special use permit. Those would be #'s 20, 21, and 24.

(#2700) Terri Jeffreys suggesting inserting that language under 17.12.150 and the PAC was in agreement. Terri continued on stating she agreed with the accessory dwelling issue. She proposed on page 16 of the new version under 17.11.130, Accessory Uses to add a #6, from 17.11.140, Accessory Dwelling units.

(#2785) Barbara Robinson reminded the PAC that every accessory dwelling unit in the county requires a special use permit. That would be different than the section we have adopted county wide. Then you also open it up to allowing accessory dwelling units in the shoreline so you have to be careful where you put that.

(#2800) Dennis Pickard suggested tabling Accessory Dwelling units and look at a more comprehensive solution over the course of our next meeting with this.

(#2815) Terri Jeffreys stated when we were doing our Master Plan Development regulations she heard a lot of concurrence on density bonuses and that they were favored by this group. The Planned Development Regulations can be reworked to accommodate density bonuses in return for open space. Terri inquired if we could get agreement to have staff address that issue.

(#2865) Barbara Adkins responded we probably can't do it in this time frame.

(#2875) Barbara Robinson added that once we get this adopted, we can go back and look at some of these issues further because they would take additional staff time to review.

(#2882) Terri Jeffreys stated she can appreciate that, but, honestly, she has been promised that about five or six times over a three year period.

(#2900) Bill Dewey noted that accessory dwelling units and density bonuses will be put on hold to come back to at a later date for a group request to work on those issues. Bill Dewey inquired about the Business Park District. Under Purpose, it states light manufacturing business development, yet it is listed under uses allowed subject to a special use permit.

(#3000) After a small discussion by staff and PAC, it was agreed to move Light Manufacturing up to Permitted Uses.

(#3120) Bill Dewey noted on page 60 under Prohibited non-commercial signs, it says 'are prohibited in all areas of the county'. That should be changed to reflect in the Allyn UGA.

(#3135) Tim Wing made a motion to recommend the Allyn Zoning with the recommended changes.

(#3145) Jay Hupp seconded the motion. Bill Dewey called for any further discussion. There was none and the motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.