

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Minutes
October 15, 2007

(Note audio tape (#2) dated October 15, 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 Vice-Chair Tim Wing at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Tim Wing, Jay Hupp, Diane Edgin, and Wendy Ervin. Bill Dewey, Dennis Pickard, and Jim Reece were excused.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the May 21, 2007, July 9, 2007, and August 20, 2007 meetings were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

May 21, 2007:

On page 4 under (#1075) it should read: "Builders know what size unit the market will bear" ...

July 9, 2007:

On page 5 under (#1250) it should read: "...not addressing it properly now does not make it cheaper."

4. NEW BUSINESS

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 15, 2007

(#0150) Tim Wing opened up the meeting and announced the first order of business is the Public Hearing on the Shelton UGA Plan. We will also switch items #4 and #5, the Shumaker rezone request will be presented first, and then we'll have the Ward rezone request.

(#0165) Barbara Adkins, Community Development, introduced the topic explaining this is a continuation of the public hearing we had on September 17th on the Shelton UGA Plan. At the hearing there were comments that came up about the language that was inside the Plan. There was some confusion on the City's and the County's role in the UGA. We also had some comments from Steve Whitehouse at that meeting. I met with Steve Goins of the City of Shelton and we reviewed the comments. Lisa, of Jones and Stokes, has put together a revised version that better addresses the issues that were brought up. She is here tonight, along with Steve Goins, and she has a power point presentation to help in reviewing the background and go over the changes. Steve Whitehouse has sent us his comments from the version we sent the PAC. He does not suggest any changes that need to be made; his comments reflect issues to watch for in implementing this Plan.

(#0275) Lisa Grueter, Senior Planner from Jones and Stokes, presented a power point presentation. She explained she is providing staff assistance to the City of Shelton and Mason County to work on the Shelton UGA Plan. The Shelton UGA was established in 1995/1996. In 2003, the City and the County executed an Memorandum of Understanding regarding joint planning for the Shelton UGA. In 2004, and in 2007, the UGA Plan was reinitiated and several public workshops have been held along with joint meetings with the City Commission and the BOCC. In terms of the UGA planning, the County is ultimately responsible for setting the UGA boundaries, as well as the population targets. As part of the MOU, the basis was set that the City and County would come back together to look at development regulations jointly and to look at a joint review process for permits. The proposed UGA plan as three aspects to it. There is a Future Land Use Map, specific goals and policies, and both the UGA policies and map would become part of the Comprehensive Plan. There were some refinements made on the Future Land Use Map that identify more specifically where the residential, commercial, industrial, and public areas are. This was also done to avoid splitting parcels. We also tried to address the County's population target that was provided to the City. The original UGA boundaries were sized for 13,000 people but the allocation given to the City is 10,500. We needed to look at the balance of land uses and the population target to size the UGA boundaries. We also looked at establishing additional employment opportunities based on public comments at the open houses and workshops. We also looked at where the services are planned for the future.

Regarding the land use designations in the UGA, there's Neighborhood Residential, which takes up the majority of the UGA in terms of acres. There's Mixed Use, which you'll see around the Matlock interchange and other locations. There is Commercial, and Commercial/Industrial, then Industrial, and Public Lands. You have reviewed the goals and policies and they address a wide variety of topics that include: Land Use, Compatibility, Transportation, Public Services, Annexations for the future, and City / County Coordination. Also at your last meeting there were some comments about being clear regarding the roles of the City and the County. Also, there were comments regarding making sure it integrated well with your own Comp Plan and making some more cross references with other chapters of your Plan. On the specifics, you asked us to look at how we can broaden some of the goals and policies related to inter-local coordination regarding future regulations and future review processes.

Barbara noted that since you were sent the October 2nd document, some internal staff review identified some further areas to clean up or consider changes to. Barbara will pass those out now. It's the same as the October 2nd version, however, wherever you see gray shaded areas, that's where we've made additional changes. On page 8, we're trying to clarify the recent airport overlay zoning that the City and the County adopted. Another issue that come up through the staff review are related to Level of Service for Transportation. LOS is describing the quality of the operating conditions of a road. It's usually graded from 'A' through 'F', with 'A' being the best and 'F' the worst. Cities and Counties are obligated to identify the LOS and then provide infrastructure to maintain that LOS over time. The City standard currently is LOS 'D', and the County standard is 'C' in the rural areas, and 'D' in the urban areas, but according to county modeling, most roads are reporting at 'C' or better. We are identifying this issue now because setting the LOS does determine the cost and timing of future improvements and it's our suggestion that because LOS is complex that the joint standards be addressed through the inter-local agreement process. We are proposing some of the text and policies to take out a specific LOS standard at this time for the UGA and instead for that to be

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 15, 2007

addressed through the inter-local agreement process, and identify that future modeling of the area would be a joint effort with the City and the County at the appropriate time.

The last slide highlights some of the public participation that has occurred either by the City or the County, or together, that there were joint meetings January through April, and several open houses at which the City mailed notice to all property owners within the UGA to make sure citizens of the unincorporated area were invited to those meetings. The City had a hearing in May. You've had your hearing in September, and now continuing here to October and after this point, after your recommendation, it would move to the BOCC. They would also hold a hearing. The City has also been conducting its process and its hearing is coming up at the end of October.

(#0740) Diane Edgin noted the revised document certainly reads better and is more consistent.

(#0750) Wendy Ervin noted the intersections that are discussed in the LOS, they're all up in the north end.

(#0760) Lisa Grueter explained for the UGA Plan, the City did identify and focused their analysis on the intersections to the north. There are some intersections that were also looked at near Matlock. We worked with the City's consultants on the modeling that's not yet complete, and discussed with them which intersections they thought were most important to look at. We also looked at the volume history of growth and the areas most likely to change in terms of land use patterns.

(#0800) Wendy Ervin inquired about the 995 additional vacant industrial acres needed, and if that was in the Shelton UGA or countywide.

(#0825) Lisa Grueter explained the need is established countywide. The Shelton UGA Plan would not completely fill that need, but it would fulfill a large majority of that need. That needs analysis was conducted by the Economic Development Council.

(#0840) Diane Edgin inquired if there was any discussion about the variety of sizes.

(#0850) Steve Goins explained that the lands needs analysis looked at a number of things, including the various sizes of parcels. There was a lot of market interest in having a range of parcel sizes, and for industrial purposes, it was deemed that a site of less than 3 acres was probably marginally usable, and that's why those are excluded. One of the recommendations was that, not only do you need to provide this additional acreage, but you need to provide the acreage in a manner where it provides a range of sizes.

(#0900) Tim Wing opened the hearing up to public testimony. No one from the public came forward to speak, so the public testimony portion of the hearing was closed.

(#0925) Diane Edgin stated this is going to be a work in progress as time goes on, and she felt there was nothing that jumped out at her at this time.

(#0935) Wendy Ervin noted under Policy UGA5a, it should read 'The annexation boundary should provide, where appropriate, a contiguous and regular boundary with current City limits'.

(#0985) Lisa Grueter responded that would be appropriate to add.

(#1000) Wendy Ervin noted that if you add up all the population characteristics, you get more than 110%. That paragraph is really confusing.

(#1025) Miscellaneous discussion on the population characteristics.

(#1100) Wendy Ervin suggested stating that 90% of the population is Caucasian and the other 10% is of mixed or other race.

(#1140) Lisa Grueter stated that paragraph can be modified.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 15, 2007

(#1165) Jay Hupp stated he has approximately 50 specific issues. He noted he didn't think it would be fruitful to go into those details tonight. He stated he has one general comment. He stated he didn't want people to misunderstand or make the assumption that I'm going to make these comments simply because I'm running for office at the Port. I would have made these comments a year ago, or longer. This action has a huge input on the Port of Shelton, because the Port of Shelton happens to be inside the UGA. It's only there because there was an arbitrary decision made back in the early 1990's to wrap the UGA around the Port of Shelton. Since that time, the Port of Shelton has operated under development regulations that are covered by the County that are very, very loose. It has allowed the Port of Shelton to operate to the best advantage to pursue economic development progress. If you apply this concept, what we're doing here, to the Port of Shelton, you find that the Port of Shelton, once you put the City's development regulations over the entire UGA, you have just enveloped the Port of Shelton under the City regulations. That is huge. Yet the Port of Shelton has not even been invited into these discussions. It's been government to government between the City and the County, and the Port has been excluded. We need to point that out, and the whole process needs to take a step backwards and invite the Port into the process.

(#1250) Diane Edgin stated the Port is there to serve the industrial and business community. Ports are designed for trade, and you have to have trade to survive.

(#1300) Tim Wing inquired of Steve Goins if the Port has been involved in this process.

(#1325) Steve Goins stated there is an important link between the process and the future for the Port. The Port has been involved in the process going back to earlier this year. We had a number of workshops in the spring. The Port was represented in those, and during the process, in fact, they suggested two land use changes. The Port has a number of holdings on the east side of Highway 101 and they asked that this area be changed to a Mixed Use designation, which we accommodated that request as part of this change. The Port also has a portion of land near the City's sewage treatment facility and they pointed out that the previous plan showed that as residential, and they can't develop residential as part of their mandate. We did that change as well. We have had joint meetings with the City, County and Port Commission to discuss the plan. We have discussed the issue that Jay raised about the City's industrial zoning regulations applying to the Sanderson Field area, and specifically how to deal with that. That is part of the development regulation piece that's trailing this issue. The Port has and will remain involved in the process and they've had a number of opportunities to comment preceding tonight.

(#1390) Jay Hupp responded that it may be that they've had an opportunity from the staff prospective but when I discussed this issue with the Chairman this afternoon, she was not aware of what was going on here tonight. I think that needs to be dealt with. The environment under which this has been developed, at least as of today, has been in a state of non-understanding. This has a great impact on the Port. This issue is moving way too fast and needs to take a step back and make sure that the Port is comfortable with what is going on here.

(#1435) Tim Wing inquired what the timeline was in regards to the approval of this issue.

(#1445) Barbara Adkins responded they were hoping for December to approve this, but there is not a deadline on it.

(#1455) Steve Goins added the deadline that both jurisdictions are operating under is you can amend your Comp Plan at any time, and this would be part of the County's and City's amendment to their 2007 Comp Plan. If we don't do it by December, then we will probably have to wait until next year's update.

(#1475) Tim Wing inquired if we could postpone this and make sure the City and the County address the Port.

(#1485) Steve Goins stated that the Port has been involved in the process. The process dates back to 2003. The fact that the Port has been established in the UGA dates back to 1996.

(#1500) Jay Hupp stated the staff may be comfortable that the Port understands it, but I am not. Implementing this makes the Port come under City development regulations simply by adopting this.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 15, 2007

(#1515) Steve Goins responded that's not what is being proposed.

(#1525) Barbara Robinson added it's going to be Shelton UGA regulations.

(#1535) Jay Hupp stated it may be Shelton UGA regulations but the way this is worded the development regulations simply become the City regulations as they read today. That's what this document tells me. That's what I'm concerned about. The Port today operates under County regulations as we know them. Tomorrow, after this is adopted, the Port operates under City regulations.

(#1550) Barbara Adkins stated they will continue to use the County's regulations until new development regulations are adopted.

(#1575) Jay Hupp stated this document says it is the intent for the County to effectively adopt the City's development regulations and apply them to the UGA.

(#1600) Steve Goins stated our intention is to move forward with development regulations that the County would adopt for the Shelton UGA. Those regulations are being worked on, but not available at this time. One of the thoughts is that the regulations for the Sanderson Field area would mirror the Sanderson Field Master Plan in that basically the County would regulate Sanderson Field in accordance to what the Port of Shelton has adopted as their Master Plan. This process that we're embarking on is analogous to the overlay zone process that we went through a couple of years ago. Some of the similarities are the City and the County had to adopt regulations to that affect the airspace and the public facilities around Sanderson Field. They did that independently; those regulations are very close in language and they represent very similar regulations, but each jurisdiction had to go through a separate process. They choose to adopt similar regulations because it made sense. Here, we're forwarding a policy document that says the regulations for the UGA area, as appropriate, should match the City anticipating that someday this area will be in the City. On the other hand, there's an understanding that the area around Sanderson Field is unique and different, and applying just an industrial zoning to that area isn't the best approach.

(#1700) Jay Hupp stated he is more worried about Johns Prairie than he is Sanderson Field, as far as development regulations are concerned. In the Airport Master Plan, it only covers Sanderson Field, and in the Airport Master Plan, there are no regulations. The Port has no authority to issue development regulations. That is simply a policy document.

(#1730) Tim Wing inquired what would have to happen in order for them to be operating under City regulations.

(#1740) Steve Goins responded they would have to be annexed into the City.

(#1755) Jay Hupp stated that this document pulls the Port under City regulations. The intent is to pull the Port under what are currently City regulations that would be adopted by the County. Same regulations.

(#1765) Diane Edgin stated that Jay has a number of concerns and somehow they need to be addressed whether we do it here or postpone approval of this for a month so he can get some answers.

(#1790) Tim Wing stated he doesn't have any problem with people getting answers, but this is a policy document and that the concerns Jay has about regulations are concerns that can be addressed in the future. We have a responsibility to say that we want that done. We want the Port involved with any decisions about regulations about the Port, but that's not what this document is.

(#1810) Jay Hupp stated there's a page marked in here that in no uncertain terms intends to adopt the City's development regulations as a master overlay over the UGA once this policy is implemented. They are adopted by reference.

(#1840) Lisa Grueter responded that the water and sewer plans are referenced, but not the regulations.

(#1850) Jay Hupp noted some of the largest concerns he has pertain to water and sewer.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 15, 2007

(#1860) Lisa Grueter explained the GMA required that the City and County show that it can provide services to the UGA if and when it develops. The point of incorporating those by reference was that if that were to be done, it identifies where certain services would be extended to support future growth.

(#1875) Jay Hupp inquired if that was the only place in here that it adopts by reference.

(#1880) Lisa Grueter responded that was correct.

(#1890) Jay Hupp inquired what the UGA operates under during the period of time between when this policy document is adopted, and the period of time when the final details of the development regulations that pertain to the UGA as opposed to the City or the County. What do we develop under during that time?

(#1900) Barbara Adkins explained that until there is something new adopted, they will continue under the County regulations.

(#1915) Tim Wing stated the Port should be involved with the regulations that affect them, but that's not what we're doing tonight. We're not reviewing development regulations tonight.

(#1930) Jay Hupp stated again the intent of this policy document is to simply take the City regulations and overlay them over the UGA and have the City regulations, as we know them today, become the regulations under which those within the UGA will operate in the future.

(#1950) Tim Wing reiterated that is the development regulations and before a decision is made that the County is going to adopt the City's regulations, there's going to be more discussions.

(#1965) Steve Goins stated that was correct. He continued on by stating this is somewhat similar to the discussion we had with Mr. Whitehouse at the last public hearing. There seems to be a concern that somehow the City regulations are going to become the regulations for the UGA. The City will not regulate that area until it's annexed; it will continue to be the County's responsibility.

(#2000) Jay Hupp quoted from page 2; 'To implement the goals, policies, and recommended actions of this plan, the City and the County have incorporated the UGA plan into their Comprehensive Plans. The County will then revise and implement development regulations for the UGA consistent with the City of Shelton's regulations'. That's what my concerns hinge upon.

(#2050) Miscellaneous discussion.

(#2100) Tim Wing noted the words 'as they exist' do not exist in this document. It is the goal to have the regulations of the City be the same as the regulations of the UGA around the City so when annexation does come there is consistency in the way things are developed. It isn't the goal to adopt all of the City's current regulations and apply them to the UGA now.

(#2150) Miscellaneous discussion.

(#2200) Steve Goins read aloud the language from the Memorandum of Understanding that was signed between the City and the County on the 5th of May 2003. This is a memorandum to establish a joint planning process to do what we're doing tonight. 'WHEREAS the County recognizes the benefits associated with incorporating the City's revised future land use designations into the County's Comprehensive Plan Zoning Map and Development Regulations, and WHEREAS County staff is prepared, upon adoption, to prepare these revised land use designations in consultation with City staff when reviewing land use and development proposals in the UGA'. This was a directive from the BOCC and the City Commission dating back to 2003. We are still trying to get ourselves to the point where we can fulfill that obligation.

(#2275) Wendy Ervin suggested inserting language including the Port in the decision making of revising the development regulations for the UGA.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 15, 2007

(#2285) Jay Hupp stated we aren't in a position to recommend that anything specific be done on behalf of the Port. That's their responsibility. My concern is that the opportunity to have indepth conversations and negotiations with the Port, notwithstanding the feelings of the staff, those opportunities have not been created. There needs to be a specific articulation between the two commissions at the commission level on how this impacts the Port and whether or not it's going proceed without some modifications given either the comfort or discomfort of the Port.

(#2340) Tim Wing inquired of Jay what he would recommend regarding this document tonight.

(#2345) Jay Hupp stated he would recommend that this entire process be put on hold until there has been a joint discussion specific to this proposal between the three commissions; City, County, and the Port. I'm comfortable with that recommendation coming out of this body.

(#2375) Tim Wing inquired of Steve Goins what level of discussion has taken place to date.

(#2400) Steve Goins explained he made a presentation to the three commissions in this very room around May or June to discuss this plan and the proposal, and in particular, their concern of the regulation of the Sanderson Field area.

(#2410) Tim Wing inquired if the Port is familiar with the document as it exists now.

(#2415) Steve Goins explained the document hasn't changed to a great extent since that meeting.

(#2425) Diane Edgin noted Sanderson Field was mentioned but not Johns Prairie. Jay also talked about what that overlay could do to the Port in the Johns Prairie area.

(#2435) Steve Goins responded the Port expressed concern about the area east of Highway 101, and in a later process, the potential of not accommodating the flexibility that they currently enjoy at the Sanderson Field area. There has not been a concern raised by the Port on imposing industrial zoning on the Johns Prairie area.

(#2475) Miscellaneous discussion.

(#2745) Jay Hupp made the recommendation that it be sent to a joint commissioner meeting to be specifically addressed by the Port Commission, the County Commission, and the City Commission. This could very easily be done as a specific stand alone item at the quarterly joint commissioner meeting.

(#2815) Tim Wing noted we have two choices. We can proceed to recommend this to the BOCC or we can recommend that it be postponed until it can be put before a joint board.

(#2830) Jay Hupp stated maybe we can recommend that it go forward to the BOCC with a recommendation that they not proceed to public hearings on it until they're certain the commission level is comfortable with the process as it's so far developed.

(#2885) Tim Wing noted it has been moved and seconded to move the Shelton UGA Plan forward to the BOCC as described in the recommendation. Motion passes. Allan Borden has the next staff report for a rezone request.

(#2950) Allan Borden opened up the hearing. This is a staff report for Clint and Kelly Shumaker, Rezone request 07-02. The subject parcel is 1.20 acres located in the Belfair Urban Growth Area on the Old Belfair Highway. You reviewed a rezone request for Ken VanBuskirk a few years ago and the property is just across the street on the north side of Davis Farm Road. It's currently zoned Residential 3 and the proposed zone is Mixed Use. The Residential 3 zone is the low density zone for the Belfair UGA. That means that per acre, you can have three residential units. Under the proposed zone of Mixed Use, that provides for a wide mixture of commercial, professional, and service type of land uses mixed with residential when possible. The applicant wishes to continue and expand their existing land use which is a feed and supply store. It's currently considered non-conforming because it is in a residential zone. Under this zone it would be allowed

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 15, 2007

to continue but is limited in its expansion. So the applicant is proposing this rezone to make their land use conforming. The Shumakers had started this land use in August of 2004 at the same time the subarea planning group in Belfair was finalizing their plan. When that went to the PAC and then to the BOCC it wasn't recognized the land use changed over the course of time so it was not zoned appropriately. In reviewing this request we will go through the seven rezone criteria. Under criteria #1, the new proposed development will have to follow the UGA development standards, and under these standards, will have to protect public health and safety, and the land use itself will provide additional services to area residents. Criteria #2 deals with appropriate zoning classification. The proposed Mixed Use is the most appropriate zone, especially for the existing land use. Criteria #3, if the rezone proposal is approved, no sprawling development will be encouraged in the area. Nearby residents and commercial uses are already accustomed to this land use and the ag lands in the vicinity are distant enough not to be impacted if this rezone were approved. Criteria #4, there will be no material increase in the demand for urban level of services. The services are already provided to the site. Criteria #5, the site is already within a UGA and would not impact providing services within the UGA. Criteria #6, the proposed use will need to comply with the proper development standards in the Mixed Use zone. There are no critical areas present that are within any of the buffer standards and proper signage and necessary screening will be needed to be provided when development is proposed. Criteria #7, approval of this new zone will not cause pressure to change other land uses, although within a UGA, land uses can be expected to change in response to demands for new land uses. Staff would conclude that all seven criteria are met when considering this rezone request. Staff recommends approval of the rezone request of Clint and Kelly Shumaker from Residential 5 to the Mixed Use zone in the Belfair UGA. Included in the staff report are maps showing where the parcels are and how the parcels developed. There is also a letter of support from Ken and Peggy VanBuskirk supporting the proposed rezone request. I've not received any other comments regarding the rezone request.

(#3500) Tim Wing opened the public comment portion of the hearing. Seeing no one wanting to testify, Tim Wing closed the public comment portion of the hearing and asked for discussion from the PAC.

(#3540) Wendy Ervin comments it seems like a like a very reasonable request.

(#3550) Tim Wing noted he visited the site and they have a very nice feed store there. It is in an area where the feed store is a real good fit.

(#3600) There is a motion and a second to approve the rezone request of the Shumakers to rezone property from Residential 5 to Mixed Use in the Belfair UGA. Motion passes.

(#3675) Allan Borden opened the next hearing on the rezone request of Christopher and Michelle Ward to rezone property on Brockdale Road from Rural Residential 20 to Rural Residential 10. It's just to the west of the intersection of McReavy Road. Ace Paving has a gravel and asphalt plant just to the east. That property, as well as the green diamond property to the south, are Residential 20. Properties to the north are Rural Residential 5. The property previously approved to Rural Residential 5 zone is immediately to the west. Southwest are properties that continue to be Rural Residential 20. The present zone allows the density of one dwelling unit per twenty acres, but in addition, churches, community centers, fire stations, and utility facilities are allowed uses. Under the RR10 zone, the same kinds of uses are allowed, but at a density of one dwelling unit per ten acres. Under both RR 20 and RR10 zones, performance standards are allowed when dividing the property. Through this, it encourages the clustering of lots that are created and setting aside open space and conservation areas on the property. The applicant is desiring the requested rezone to go from RR20 to RR10 in order to create new residential lots as their neighbors have done in the past under different development standards. The property is 800 feet wide and almost 2000 feet deep and dimensions of that size would afford some proposal for a performance subdivision. In addition, there are few critical areas that would affect the layout of a proposed subdivision. In reviewing the seven criteria, I made the following comments. Under criteria #1, the proposed subdivision and subsequent development will have to follow the county standards and consider the need for proper building setbacks and provision for adequate water and septic when the development is proposed. Criteria #2, in regard to consistent zone designation, staff notes that the parcel location is just to the east of a parcel that was zoned RR 5 in September of 2005, and just to the south of many small parcels that are zoned RR5. The subject parcel is in a transitional area between the kinds of land uses and would be suitable to meet the criteria for the RR 10 zone. Criteria #3, the cumulative impacts of rezoning the subject parcel would not increase sprawling, low-density rural development beyond its

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, October 15, 2007

current extent. Criteria #4, if the rezone were approved and the proposed subdivision were to result, there wouldn't be an urban level of service that would be demanded by the subsequent development. Access from Brockdale Road would likely be limited to either one or two accesses to the county road. Criteria #5, approval of this rezone request would not interfere with encouraging development in the UGA. Septic and water would have to be provided or shown to be available in the newly created lots. Criteria #6, a performance subdivision would be conducive to dividing this property, either as RR 10 or RR 20. Criteria #7, the property to the north and west is already RR 5. Properties to the southwest are land locked and affected by the wetland and stream resources. The timberland to the south and the mineral lands to the east are RR 20, and most likely would remain in those zones because they provide important services to the county. After reviewing all of the criteria, staff finds them all met and would recommend approval of the request by the Wards to rezone from RR 20 to RR 10 zone.

(#0400) Tim Wing opened up the public comment portion of the hearing. No one chose to speak, so Tim closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#0450) Miscellaneous discussion on cumulative impacts of such zoning to create pressure to change land use designations of other lands in the area.

(#0500) There was a motion and a second to approve the rezone request. The motion passed to approve the rezone request of Christopher and Michelle Ward to rezone property on Brockdale Road from Rural Residential 20 to Rural Residential 10 zone.

(#0550) Barbara Robinson noted this Friday is a planning conference put on by the Peninsula Section of the Washington APA. This is a day long conference, opening the first portion of the conference with a Planning Short Course. She encouraged attendance of the PAC. Barbara also reminded everyone of the Belfair Bypass Meeting to be held Tuesday October 23rd from 4:00 to 7:00 at North Mason Auditorium. The next meeting is Monday, November 19th.

(#0650) Diane Edgin noted that at the August 20th meeting she made a motion that we start every meeting inquiring the status of the roads from Public Works.

Meeting adjourned.