

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

September 21, 2009

(Note audio tape (#1) dated September 21, 2009
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 at 6:00 pm by Chair Dennis Pickard.

2. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bill Dewey, Dennis Pickard, Jim Reece, Debbie Jacobs, Don LeMaster, Ken VanBuskirk. Debbie Jacobs was welcomed back to the PAC and Ken VanBuskirk was welcomed to his first term.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the April 20, 2009 and May 18, 2009 meetings were approved as presented.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0050) Kell McAboy of the Mason County Planning Department stated this is a public hearing to adopt permanent zoning for properties that were previously determined to be part of the Olympic National Forest, and which are zoned on an interim basis since October 2008. These are properties that are under county jurisdiction but had not been previously zoned. We made zoning determinations based on the Comp Plan, and we choose Rural Residential 5, 10, or 20. The interim zoning allowed for one year to then go through and notify all of the property owners of these properties that are affected. We heard from City of Tacoma, which owns the majority of the property. They didn't have any issues. DNR did have some concerns, and we talked all through that, with confirmation they didn't have any issues with the zoning either. I didn't hear back from any of the individual property owners. In addition to this zoning map, we did update the future land use map so it shows those properties around Lake Cushman as being in the rural area now rather than Olympic National Forest, and it also reflects the new Shelton UGA boundary.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 21, 2009

(#0165) Bill Dewey inquired what properties this included.

(#0170) Kell McAboy explained the properties are outlined in black on the map.

(#0180) Ken VanBuskirk stated he is real familiar with these properties as he worked for the forest service and walked many of the boundaries. He inquired if the Forest Service commented on these boundaries.

(#0190) Kell McAboy responded they did not, however, when we were doing the zoning layer, that's when we discovered the new boundaries. Back then we did confirm with the Forest Service that these were the correct boundaries. We confirmed with the Assessor's office that these properties were indeed in county jurisdiction.

(#0210) Ken VanBuskirk noted quite a few of the properties are land locked, and inquired why they weren't zoned Long Term Commercial Forest.

(#0215) Kell McAboy explained there isn't a reason for that. Bob Fink and I went through the surrounding properties and looked at the developments on the northwestern shore, and determined to do rural residential on these properties. We based it on 5, 10, or 20, based on the lot sizes. There wasn't any analysis done for the Long Term Commercial Forest. I spoke in detail with DNR and the issue of the properties that don't have access, or only access through forest service roads.

(#0275) Ken VanBuskirk noted the piece on the northern shore is the Mount Rose Wilderness boundary, and if you put rural residential right up against it, there could be some potential conflicts.

(#0310) Kell McAboy noted most of the property there is owned by Tacoma City Light. There are very few in individual ownership.

(#0350) Dennis Pickard opened up the public comment portion of the hearing. There was no public to testify, so the public comment portion of the hearing was closed. Dennis noted the designation 'residential' doesn't require it be used for any other purpose than what it is, and if it is under the control of the City of Tacoma, then presumably their primary goal, at this point, would be to manage it for their hydroelectric facilities rather than developing additional residential properties.

(#0400) Bill Dewey stated that when we're talking about zoning, we generally try to avoid consideration of current ownership or even proposed uses in front of us. Maybe we need to consider keeping some of it in Long-Term Commercial Forest instead of rural residential.

(#0445) Don LeMaster noted that residential is backed up to commercial forest, as well as state lands. I don't see what the conflict could be. You have houses under the residential development backed up to commercial forestry and that's okay. There's recreational asset here, and in my mind, to run the commercial forestry right down to the lake is a waste of the asset. From my point of view, I would like to see the residential zoning passed based on people being able to enjoy that asset.

(#0490) Miscellaneous discussion regarding service needs.

(#0600) Bill Dewey inquired of Kell what Bob Fink's thinking was at the time of your discussions with him.

(#0610) Kell McAboy explained that the discussion of Long-Term Commercial Forest never even came up. We went to residential naturally because of some of the development that is already occurring on the west side, and the properties around it.

(#0635) Don LeMaster made a motion to accept the existing proposal to rezone it under the RR5, RR10, and RR20 designations. There was a second to the motion.

(#0645) Miscellaneous discussion regarding three outlining parcels.

(#0835) Kell McAboy offered a suggestion for the outlining properties, that they could be zoned as In-Holding Lands, which is a resource designation. In-Holding Lands are lands that are surrounded by Long-Term

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 21, 2009

Commercial Forest lands. As staff I could make sure the criteria for designating In-Holding are met.

(#0875) Don LeMaster modified his motion stating he moves to pass the RR20, RR10, and RR5 as depicted with the exception of the two north and south parcels which I would recommend they be designated In-Holding Lands. The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

(#0925) Allan Borden opened the hearing on the Morris rezone request. This is a request to take a portion of a larger lot, 11.38 acres in size, from Long-Term Commercial Forest Lands to Rural Lands, and then zone the parcel to Rural Residential 5 zone. A couple of years ago Sharon Morris came in inquiring about one of the pieces of property the Morris Family owns that is 80 acres in size is designated as Long-Term Commercial Forest. She was interested in the northern portion of the property and whether it really qualified for Long-Term Commercial Forest. Typically Long-Term Commercial Forest parcels are 80 acres in size, however, there are occasions when smaller parcels can be included if they create a contiguous block of land that could maintain timber management on a long-term basis. In 1993, when the Comp Plan was being revised according to GMA, one of the first actions was to take the county as a whole and figure out what lands had resource values. Those lands were either timber, forestry, or minerals. Allan showed the parcel configuration on the map and the adjacent rural residential parcels, and explained the history of how they were designated. We researched the history and discovered that there were several things that happened. In 1991, a deed was recorded with the county that created this smaller parcel of land. Due to the lack of adequate mapping procedures, the Long-Term Commercial Forest designation continued. What should of happened is that small parcel was given an individual parcel number and then it might have been designated as not being large enough for Long-Term Commercial Forest, and possibly allowed to be a rural designation. After reviewing this, we came to a conclusion that a map error potentially was made. Subsequent to that, Sharon Morris applied for this map correction. Criteria 2 and criteria 8 are both met, so if this request is approved, the Mason County Future Land Use Map and the Development Areas Map will be corrected and potential residential land uses can become conforming land uses.

(#1415) Ken VanBuskirk inquired about Ms. Morris having to pay a fee.

(#1420) Allan Borden responded a fee was not paid for this map correction.

(#1425) Dennis Pickard opened the public comment portion of the hearing. There were no public present to testify, so the public comment portion of the hearing was closed.

(#1440) Jim Reece inquired if there was any requirement that the petitioner has to be present when an item is heard.

(#1445) Allan Borden responded there is no such requirement.

(#1450) Don LeMaster made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed map correction. There was a second, and the motion passed unanimously.

(#1500) Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development, opened the hearing on the Capital Facilities Element. A revised version was handed out to the PAC. This is our annual update as required on the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The reason this has to be updated every year is it contains a 6-year budget. None of the budgets in here are from DCD. They're capital projects we don't do so I can't speak to the numbers they came up with or why they did what they did. If you have questions about any of these numbers, I can take the questions up with them and report back to you. I will go through my changes with you. On page 13, the Harstine Pointe Sewer budgets have been removed. As of next year Harstine Island will take over their own improvement program. There are also noted changes through page 29.

(#1645) Ken VanBuskirk inquired about some wording on page 11. In the Introduction it talks about the North Bay Case Inlet area, which is the Allyn UGA. In the next paragraph, it talks about the Belfair UGA, and it sounds like there's a schedule planned out to provide service to the entire Belfair UGA by 2025. Regarding the Allyn UGA, there's no timeline set to it. He inquired why we're planning for one, and not the other. Page 15 shows they may be reaching capacity by 2010, and they will have to be revisiting the facility

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 21, 2009

plan how we're going to deal with the buildout. It gives the impression that Allyn is either built out or there is no plan expansion.

(#1730) Dennis Pickard stated not all of the lots have been developed in the Allyn UGA and as that continues, capacity may have to be expanded. It's maybe not as clear as it should be, but that's what it means when it talks about no planned expansions beyond the existing platted lots.

(#1765) Barbara Adkins noted she will look for clarification on that issue.

(#1800) Ken VanBuskirk stated he would also like to see clarified the statement on page 24 where it states 'Much of the expansion of this system will be developer funded, however, it is typical for a utility to assist and support this effort'. Then on page 101, under the Appendix, it states 'The development of the sewer collection system to serve the northern area will occur as the MBR plant is developed at developer expense'. Barbara noted she will clarify that as well.

(#1850) Miscellaneous discussion regarding crossed out items as they have been deleted from the programs.

(#2050) Barbara Adkins explained in the Solid Waste Utility portion Emmett Dobey requested the projects be moved out to 2015. They all show they will be taken care of and funded by 2015.

(#2120) Discussion regarding new hours of operation at some of the facilities, and the closing of others. It was noted to just say they are open several days a week.

(#2300) Ken VanBuskirk noted under Parks, on page 49, the Theler Center is actually 70 acres, and is owned by the North Mason School District, so it is not a private facility. Barbara stated she would pass that on to Mr. Keates.

(#2450) Miscellaneous discussion of Space Needs Update under County and Administrative Buildings.

(#2800) Ken VanBuskirk noted on page 87, under Public Works New Belfair Shop, the land trade negotiations for the property have all ready been successful. Barbara noted she would pass that on to Mr. Butros.

(#3000) Barbara Adkins explained Appendix A was drafted by the consultants.

(#3010) Ken VanBuskirk noted some concerns on page 101 regarding the different connection zones. For example, the next area that's supposed to be connected after the initial connection is the Old Belfair Highway zone. It states the Old Belfair Highway zone is characterized as a larger urban density residential community. I live in that neighborhood, and I don't consider it an urban density, and in looking at the map, they're talking about the whole of the Newkirk area is included in the Old Belfair Highway zone. It's confusing to the people who live there. That needs to be clarified, so it matches what's on the ground.

(#3200) Dennis Pickard opened the public comment portion of the hearing. There was no public to comment, so the public comment portion of the hearing was closed.

(#3250) Discussion on whether the PAC should review the Capital Facilities Element one more time with the additional edits. A motion was made to approve the Capital Facilities Element as proposed with the suggested changes and pass on to the BOCC for approval. The motion was approved.

(#3300) A motion was made, seconded and approved to move the PAC meeting from October 19th to October 26rd.

Meeting adjourned.