

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

September 20, 2010

(Note audio tape (#1) dated September 20, 2010
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: Dennis Pickard, Jim Reece, Jim Sims, Ken VanBuskirk, Randy Neatherlin, and Cathi Bright. Bill Dewey was excused.

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

4. NEW BUSINESS

(#0030) Dennis Pickard opened the public hearing on the rezone request by Earl and Laure Iddings, / Northshore Storage LLC by inquiring if any of the members of the PAC have had any exparte communications with anyone regarding this matter, or if they have any interest in this matter directly.

(#0055) Ken VanBuskirk stated he did not have any exparte contact, but did go and look at the property. I also should disclose that I am a steward for the Cascade Land Conservancy that has the easement on the property to the east of the site.

(#0065) Jim Reece stated he did go to look at the property but was careful not to talk to anyone there.

(#0075) Dennis Pickard stated he had one piece of exparte communication. I did receive, in a message given to me explaining that Bill Dewey would not be in attendance, I was told that Bill, based on the written materials he had received, that he had no objection, at that point, to the proposed rezone request. Dennis inquired if based on the communications we have received, do any members of the public or any members of

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 20, 2010

the public have any objections to any of the PAC members hearing this matters. There were no objections regarding any of the communications.

(#0095) Allan Borden of the Department of Community Development, presented the staff report. The request is from Earl and Laure Iddings doing business as Northshore Storage LLC. Allan noted the property is actually 38.5 acres, and not 40 acres as noted in the staff report. The property is currently zoned Rural Residential 10, and the request is to rezone the property as Rural Industrial and the applicant has provided in his application that he believes the county made a map error in 2002 when the properties around the county were officially zoned in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. The different uses allowed in either zone are listed on the front page of the staff report. (See attached). The applicant submitted this request, and has plans in the future to continue to operate the property as a self-storage land use, and if approved, would be able to expand that land use. The history of the site is relevant. This parcel is located at the corner of State Route 300 and Sand Hill Road. The previous owner started two land uses in the early 1990's. The configuration of indoor self-storage buildings, and also a 65-unit mobile home park development. The storage buildings and fenced area were completed, and have remained in operation since the 1995 initial construction. The mobile home park was proposed and approved in 1999 and was approved. The owner, at that time, did not complete many of the things that needed to be established in order to continue progress on the mobile home park. The permit lapsed in early 2001. The current owner, Mr. Iddings, has owned the property since 2005/2006, and has continued the storage facility in use. Mr. Iddings has a construction / contractor business and he has stored equipment and materials there. The property is west of the UGA, and north of Lynch Cove and Hood Canal. There is a non fish-bearing stream in the northeast quarter of the parcel, and a forested and sub-shrub wetland in the southeast half of the parcel. Development proposed on the property will need to meet critical area development standards. The property to the north, east, and south are zoned Rural Residential 5 Zone. The property to the west is zoned Rural Natural Resources zone, and is owned by Ace Paving that has an existing gravel pit, but the gravel mining operation has ceased. There is currently power, septic and water services on the property. This application was submitted as a corrective rezone to address the fact that Mason County made a mapping error when the Rural Area zoning designations in Mason County were approved and mapped in March 2002. The two rezone review criterion that are used for evaluation for the rezone request are #2 (consistent Comprehensive Plan designation), and #8 (corrective rezones of land).

Under Criterion #2, the designation of Rural Industrial does match the characteristics of the area better than any other zone designation, primarily because the land has been used for self storage since 1995. There are county permit reviews that have been noted in our permit tracking system talking about the establishing of the self-storage business in 1994 / 1995, and the mobile home park request done at the end of the 1990's. The property can serve the needs for household, vehicle, and commercial supplies storage in the vicinity of the Belfair UGA. The rezone to Rural Industrial zone would be consistent with the Mason County Comprehensive Plan, Development Regulations, county ordinances, and with the GMA.

Under Criterion #8, the request does claim mapping errors were made. With the approval of the submitted rezone request, the zoning map for the Mason County Development Areas Map will be corrected, and the existing self storage and contractor equipment and materials land uses can continue as conforming land uses. In its current status as RR10, self storage could continue, but would be limited on expansion.

(#0525) Ken VanBuskirk inquired if the special provisions under DR's 17.04.407 apply to this rezone.

(#0535) Allan Borden responded that they would. The special provisions are really oriented to much more manufacturing types of land uses where noise and odor and light would need to be controlled.

(#0540) Ken VanBuskirk inquired if the applicant decides to expand the development to do more, do they have to go through this process outlined in paragraph E, F, & G, such as a special use permit and have to go before the Hearings Examiner. For instance, would they have to do a traffic analysis?

(#0565) Allan Borden explained that it depends on how much additional proposal they want to bring forward. If they propose to go from one building to six buildings, that will be an increase. That might come into play then.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 20, 2010

(#0580) Ken VanBuskirk inquired if the storage facility is currently open to the public.

(#0585) Allan Borden stated it is still open to the public.

(#0610) Ken VanBuskirk inquired about the area directly to the north; the Beards Cove development, that's currently zoned as RR5. When the county originally zoned these properties, surely they had to look at how intense that development was. Is that the smallest zoning they could go to?

(#0640) Allan Borden stated there is RR2.5.

(#0645) Ken VanBuskirk inquired if that is the case, would it be fair to say that's incorrectly zoned as well?

(#0650) Allan Borden responded, no, because at the time we did that RR2.5 was reserved for the RAC's.

(#0655) Ken VanBuskirk stated those were all pre-existing to 2002.

(#0660) Allan Borden noted the line you're heading. Then every subdivision would qualify for 1 - 2.5, and the zoning strategy would implode. If you have the RR2.5 next to 5, 10's, and 20's. Then those 5, 10's, and 20's could then rezone to more intensive zoning designations. The small lots are nonconforming to the process of dividing land now. However, they are existing, and each lot has the ability to develop one residence.

(#0695) Dennis Pickard inquired if this area was not included when we established the local area of more intensive rural development.

(#0705) Allan Borden explained he did not handle that first hand, but his understanding is the funding for that strategy did not come through. It was no longer pursued. They were wavering over the extension of the Belfair sewer system. They really can't do that as it violated the growth management principals. They were trying to come up with satellite sewer system, and the funding for that sewer system halted and stalled.

(#0745) Randy Neatherlin stated we are looking at this not just as a rezone but a correction. Your belief is that if it had been know that there was this use there, it would have been zoned differently originally. This parcel is hidden out there. Is there a difference between rezoning based on the concept to a correct rezone compared to change of a zone?

(#0785) Allan Borden stated if this property did not have some sort of existing land use on it, they would have had to go through the request and have to qualify for all seven rezone criteria. You're recognizing the number of criterion to review isn't as great.

(#0810) Laure Iddings, Applicant, stated it's important to note that this really was a mapping error. The infrastructure that is in place, the permits that were granted in 1995 and 1996 for the self-storage facility were quite extensive. There is a huge road system, the electrical system, the septic system, the onsite wells; there's an awful lot there. What makes this different from the questions that were raised about the residential to the north; Allen hit on it quite extensively. They are not conforming home sites; they can't subdivide, they can't get four homes to the acre, but they are still allowed to have their one house. If their house burns down, or they want to remodel, they can get financing to do that. In this particular instance, as a nonconforming use, financing is extremely restricted and it's really difficult to do anything. It's important to note that the mobile home park is no longer on the table. We're talking about just expanding for RV covered mobile home storage; some additional storage for RV's, and the continued use of our construction equipment that is on site as well. We do recognize there are wetlands; we want to maintain current buffers, and it's important to note that with the uses and we currently have and would like to continue to use on the site as conforming uses, create less harm to the environment. There's no phosphorus or pesticides that you get from homeowners. Please take all this information into consideration when you make your recommendation.

(#0900) Jim Sims inquired how many mobile home sites are existing on the property.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 20, 2010

(#0920) Laure Iddings responded there is no one living in any mobile home on the property, however, there is an existing mobile home there that is being used as an office. There may be a caretaker living on site if any vandalism issues arise. Laure noted there is already an existing septic system there that was installed in anticipation of the mobile home project.

(#0930) Earl Iddings, applicant, stated if we move forward with any new construction that would take place, we're looking at not only the 4.5 acres that are existing, but also adding 4.5 to 5 acres of covered boat and RV adjacent. My company, DBD, also employs around 20 people from the Mason County region. We need a place that is zoned properly for my continuing business. Right now I feel like I am a traveling suitcase contractor without a real designated place. Having the Rural Industrial zoning with the infrastructure that's taken place. Any sensitive areas like the wetlands will be carefully mitigated. I have a Minor in Conservation in Green Forest Management so I do understand what we would need to do in moving forward. We know we will need to meet all new development regulations and guidelines, and we are fully prepared to work with the community and Cascade Land Conservancy.

(#1000) Matt Matayoshi of the Mason County Economic Development Council stated he has been out to the site and Earl gave me a tour of the property. I agree with everything that has said, and I feel this is the most straight forward rezone request, or map correction, considering the project going all the way back to 1995. The level of intensity that was originally planned for the development would have been nearly 70 mobile homes and sites for the property. This proposal would be a much less intensive use than 70 mobile home sites. What impressed me most about the site is the amount of infrastructure, with the paved road, the utilities that are in place, stormwater, etc., that are already on site. This county had a number of challenges in coming into compliance with the GMA and the effort and eagerness to come into compliance made for some of these oversites laid out in the county. This correction is needed to accommodate what's actually occurring. Allan's staff report is very clear and very detailed, and shows it meets the criteria for the rezone. On a personal note, I worked with DBD (Dewatto Bay Development) for almost 6 years now, and have been impressed with the way they do business, and their ability to secure contracts all over Washington, and beyond to put people to work. This project most definitely will have additional construction jobs in the future, and I request your favorable recommendation.

(#1125) Dennis Pickard closed the public portion of the hearing.

(#1135) Randy Neatherlin stated he has followed that property close to a dozen years, and when he looked at it several years ago when they were going through some financial issues, I would have loved to have owned it because of the infrastructure that is already there. I can see how it definitely could be a mapping error when they were initially zoning the county, because you cannot tell it exists, unless you go to the end of that road. I would like to suggest that we look at it as a mapping correction and not a rezone.

(#1160) Ken VanBuskirk stated he did some research on the Sand Hill / SR 300 intersection and there are 11,000 vehicles a day currently that pass that intersection. It is a very dangerous corner. He stated his concern is that if the site expands, he hopes that the Hearings Examiner asked for a traffic analysis. There might be another way to access SR 300 so that that corner isn't impacted as much. The county tried to put in a safety improvement at that intersection with a solar lighting system, and they couldn't get the footings to sink in the ground because it's too wet there. Ken noted the blue line signifying the stream is incorrect and is actually over in the wooded portion.

(#1200) Miscellaneous discussion regarding the possibility of higher intensity industrial development going in there and what the requirements might be for buffering, etc. That would be relatively impractical given the neighboring residential uses.

(#1300) Ken VanBuskirk inquired if the applicant paid the fee for the rezone considering this is a mapping error.

(#1315) Allan Borden responded the applicant did pay the rezone fee.

(#1330) Ken VanBuskirk inquired if there is a way they could be refunded that fee because it was a mapping error. Ken inquired if that has happened before.

Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, September 20, 2010

(#1345) Allan Borden responded that has not happened before. Earl and Laure Iddings approached me about having the property rezoned. In investigating the history of the property, I discovered that they had these self-storage land uses, and a mobile home park.

(#1380) Jim Sims made a motion to recommend approval of Rezone Request 10-03 for Earl and Laure Iddings. The motion was seconded by Jim Reece. There was no further discussion, so the vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

(#1420) Dennis Pickard announced the second item on the agenda is the discussion on the proposed update to the Capital Facilities Element of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan.

(#1435) Barbara Adkins handed out a copy of the currently adopted Capital Facilities Element and explained there are a few more changes to add from other Departments, and we then send out to you the revised version. Every year, everything that has a budget in the Comprehensive Plan has to be updated. We are required to have 6-year financial spreadsheets for capital projects in the Plan. Barbara explained she sends out the current plan, and asks each department with capital projects to update them. Those departments include, Parks, Utilities, Public Works, Grounds, and Sheriff. Those updates will be coming to you in the next few days. The text portion of it is fair game, and most of the policies that are in here are property of other departments. The budgets in here are not anything you want to tinker with as those are put together by the departments heads and their financial people. There is a summary of REET 1, REET 2, and Point 09 money. I'd like to have a public hearing on this in October at our regular meeting, so that we make sure we have enough time to get through this before the end of the year. I have invited other department heads that have contributed to it to come to our meeting to answer any questions you may have about the edits they made. Barbara explained about the 60-day review process that will need to happen before it can actually be adopted by the BOCC.

Barbara stated she wanted to add something regarding the mapping error request that was just heard. There are two kinds of mapping errors, this was really a zoning error, as it was intentionally put on the map as that zone, so they had to come in and prove that it was not supposed to be that way. We do have mapping errors where someone will come in say that they're supposed to be RR5, but when you look at the map it says I'm RR10, which is clearly a GIS error. We do have to go through the public process, as the maps need to be changed, and signed off by the BOCC.

Meeting adjourned.