

MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

July 21st, 2014

(This document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript.)

1) Call To Order

Vice Chair Bill Dewey called the meeting to order at 6:06pm

2) Roll Call

Members Present: Tim Duffy, Bill Dewey, Vicki Wilson, Rob Drexler, and Steve Van Denver
Ken VanBuskirk and Kristy Buck were excused.

Staff Present: Barbara Adkins

Bill Dewey discussed why Ken was not in attendance. Ken felt there was a conflict of interest with the Multi-Family Housing topic therefore he excused himself.

3) Regular Business

i) Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted, none oppose.

ii) Approval of Minutes

The June 16th, 2014 minutes were reviewed. Steve Van Denver made a motion to adopt the minutes. Rob Drexler seconds the motion. All members were in favor.

4) Public Hearing

Consider amendments to Title 17 of the Mason County Code adding Section 17.90 establishing a Multi-Family Housing Tax Incentive Program under the authority of Chapter 84.14 RCW

Bill Dewey opened by explaining how the Public Hearing will run.

Barbara Adkins, Director Department of Community Development

Barbara explained the next step in the process was to amend the code. This will break down what the program entailed. Barbara updated the planning fee schedule to include the new Multi-Family Housing Tax Incentive Program Tier. The new rate was pulled from similar applications the county currently processes. Steve Van Denver asked Barbara "How could we adjust that fee at a later date?" She answered; we would need to run through the first application process. See how long the process took, identify whether multiple hearings were needed and from there we could adjust the fee schedule.

There are three target areas that are being looked at one in each Urban Growth Area. The program would allow for the value of new housing construction, conversion and rehabilitation improvements an exemption from ad valorem property taxation for eight years. Steve interjected; he had hoped there would be a point of contact from the assessor's office at the meeting to bounce questions off of. Barbara agreed. She stated she had provided copies of the maps to them and received no response. The PAC conversed, Vicki then asked is there any sort of idea how many people are interested in applying? Barbara explained, she is aware that there are people waiting for this to go into play before buying property but has no exact number. Barbara noted that she hoped when it came time to review applications there would be no disconnect between the two offices.

Public Comment Opened--

Amy Davis commented regarding property taxes. Amy stated she lives on 10 acres of rural residential land and believed that if you qualified as a "low income senior" there are already property tax exemption options within Washington State.

Barbara continued with the remainder of the staff report. She stated some of the qualifiers for eligibility include being located within residential targeted areas, be served by sewer, and must include at least 4 units that are at least 20% low-moderate income. Once the application is completed and reviewed the applicant would receive a conditional certificate of acceptance of tax exemption. They would then need to enter into agreement with the board.

Vicki asked Barbara if she could elaborate on any concerns that have been voiced. Barbara did not have anything specific; she had just heard a few comments passed along from Commissioner Neatherlin. Bill asked Barbara "What kind of concerns did Ken express at the Public Hearing?" She stated he had concerns that stem back to the zoning and that the maps were mislabeled. He felt that more should be required such as public services like improved sidewalks, roads and public safety. Barbara explained that those stipulations were not apart of the state law and that is why they were not included. Bill asked "If its not part of the state law do we not have the option of adding it?" Barbara explained that you do have the option but it does make it difficult and more expensive for the consumer. Bill asked, "If we were to adopt the maps what if more sewer area became available would it be eligible?" Barbara commented no you would need to go back and amended the maps and widen your area. Barbara discussed her updated map (Belfair) with the Commission. She made it clear that target areas have to be designated first; you have to decide on the area and have your maps. Bill interjected, could we designate the entire UGA which will eventually have sewer then add in language to the code that stated if it is currently connected your eligible if not it can become eligible when connected to sewer. This would streamline it so you would have no need to come back and change the maps. Barbara asked the PAC what would they like to do now since a recommendation had already been given. Bill commented that the agenda tonight included working on the Multi-Family Housing Code and would like to tackle that first and then come back and make a recommendation on the maps for the July 22nd, 2014 Commissioners meeting. All concurred.

Rob Drexler and Vicki Wilson discussed the tax impacts that this program will have on the county. Bill Dewey stated that the only way someone would have to pick up the tab for this program is if additional infrastructure is added, as in streetlights and sidewalks.

Vicki Wilson sought clarification within the Title 17-Zoning proposed regulations [New] Chapter 17.90 Multi Family Housing Tax Incentive Program. On Page 1, under purpose she mentioned it referred to construction, conversion and rehabilitation. She then referred to page 2, and commented when reading the definition of rehabilitation it lacked mentioning the term conversion. Also Page 3 under 17.90.050 referred to the requirements for both new construction and rehabilitation but also does not include conversion. Vicki stated she wanted to be sure nothing was overlooked. Barbara replied if we are going to use it then we need to make sure that it's defined. Vicki mentioned that on Page 3 (a) Intent should state the ultimate goal, which she felt, was to provide affordable available housing for low or moderate-income households. The PAC was all in agreement. Vicki noted a typo on Page 4 Section D, IV where it stated "commissioner" it should read "commissioner's. Barbara was in agreement. Page 5 Section E, 5 as it reads: *For rehabilitation projects and for new development on property upon which an occupied residential rental structure previously stood, the applicant shall also submit an affidavit that the dwelling units have been unoccupied for a period of six months prior to filing the application.* Vicki was concerned that this stated a "6 month" window and the definition gives a "12 month or longer" window. Barbara agreed to research why the time frames do not match. Vicki questioned Page 6 section J, What type of impact will the annual compliance review have on staff's time? Barbara discussed with Steve Van Denver whether or not this referred to Department of Community Development versus the Assessor's office completing the review. The PAC discussed Page 6 Sections J & K and all came to consensus that those sections seemed to sound like responsibility of the Mason County Assessor. The PAC would like to understand the scope of both departments' duties before submitting final recommendations. The PAC and Barbara conversed regarding the maps and the ordinance language. Vicki asked if anyone from the public wanted to comment.

Tom Davis came forward and asked, "Will the tax exemption only apply for the 20% component that is the low income or to the entire development? Barbara replied she believed it was the entire development as long as you met the 20% low-income requirement. Tom voiced, by making the target area more broad the impact would be positive. If you concentrate to a small area "they will feed upon themselves and bring the neighborhood down" the point is to raise the bar.

Barbara provided current maps as of 7/21 showing the city's sewer plans for the PAC to review. The PAC discussed the proper verbiage that should be used to not contradict the code. Vicki read the RCW to help clarify any confusion amongst the PAC. Bill asked Barbara if she would be able to express the PAC's position at the Board of County Commissioners meeting she replied yes.

Bill Dewey made a motion to continue the public hearing until input is received from the Assessor's office and another version of the code that reflected the amendments discussed, Rob 2nd the motion. All were in favor, none opposed.

Tom Davis commented by referring to the commission meeting that morning, the commissioners talked about extending the parameters of phase one within reason 200ft outside the targeted area, but also were hitting a dead end; he made this reference because it helped keep the issue alive.

5) New Business

Barbara explained what might be coming down the road for the PAC and possible recommendations from them regarding the moratorium. The PAC requested minutes from the previous meetings regarding Marijuana to review.

Next meeting 8.4.14

6) Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 7:48 PM