

**Mason County  
Planning Advisory Commission**

May 18, 2015

(This Document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript)

---

**1. Call to Order**

Rob Drexler called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

**Members present:** Rob Drexler, Kristy Buck, Kevin Shutty, Vicki Wilson

**Excused:** Steve Van Denver, Bill Dewey, Tim Duffy

**Staff:** Rebecca Hersha

**3. Regular Business**

**a. Adoption of Agenda**

The agenda was adopted with no changes

**b. Approval of Minutes**

December 1, 2014- Rob pointed out a misspelled word on page 3. No other changes. Kristy made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Vicki, motion carries.

March 23, 2015-Vicki said on page 3, the comments made by Ken VanBuskirk needed to have a focus on buildable lands within the UGA's. Vicki suggested adding parenthesis with a note to focus on UGA's, would be sufficient. Kristy said the wording at the bottom of page 3 was a little harsh:

*(During the break, PAC member Steve Van Denver was dismissed for the rest of the evening)*

Kristy and Vicki suggested changing "dismissed" to "excused". No other changes. Kristy made a motion to approve as amended. Motion seconded by Kevin. Motion carries.

**c. Confirm Future Meeting Dates**

Rebecca stated that June 8, and June 22 were the upcoming meetings scheduled at the previous meeting. She advised that from here on out, Barbara would need at least 1 meeting per month for the Comprehensive Plan update. The PAC discussed July dates and decided upon July 6, and July 20.

Rob asked if an email could be sent out with future dates to all of the PAC members, that way they are able to schedule in advance.

#### **4. Shoreline Master Program Update- Workshop**

Continue to review PAC's recommended changes to the Draft SMP "17 A" dated 2/17/2015.

*Presenter: Rebecca Hersha, Department of Community Development*

Additional Supporting Documents:

a. Dock Chapter

- i. Dock Regulations- revised May 8, 2013. (draft SMP 17.50075 (D) in "17A")
- ii. Diagram of Single Use Docks on Lakes – drafted May 2015
- iii. Diagram of Joint Use Docks on Lakes- drafted May 2015
- iv. Diagrams of Single Use Docks on Saltwater – drafted May 2015
- v. Diagrams of Joint Use Docks on Saltwater- drafted May 2015

Rebecca prefaced by giving a quick review as to why the dock chapter was being revisited. She began with freshwater docks for a single family residential use, stating the length of a dock can be 60 feet, and an attachment can be up to 20 feet wide as measured parallel to shore. (That figure does not include the main stem). At this time, she handed out a copy of an email received from John Egbert regarding wakes and moored boats. After taking a moment to read through it, Vicki asked if the proposed changes are going to give residents more or less options. Rebecca said the changes will give people more options, and will clarify the current language in the SMP. She added that currently, the SMP limits attachments to an "L" or "T" formation and limits the attachments to only be floats. Vicki asked Rebecca how a unique circumstance would be handled if for any reason somebody building a dock didn't "fall into the box". She asked if wording needed to be added for that special case. Rebecca said there is a chance for a variance, but that the criteria is that you have to show that you don't have minimum reasonable use which is difficult with a dock.

John Egbert asked if a dock can vary in shape as long as it stays within the measurements. He gave an example of having a larger platform at the end of the dock. Regarding his example, Rebecca said that would not work because a dock is not supposed to be a deck, and is only there to get you to the water or to your boat. Vicki requested he draw an example of his question regarding shape on the whiteboard. After presenting his drawing, he asked if the dock owners would have the flexibility to have a different shape. Rebecca answered that they will to a point, but the newly adopted state regulations limit floats to 8 feet in width and piers to 6 feet in width. Rebecca added that two floats could not be put together. John asked if there was a difference between docks on water or those on pilings. Rebecca stated that the docks on pilings are piers, which do have a maximum width of 6 ft., and the floats have a maximum width of 8 ft.

An unknown female resident from Benson Lake asked about existing docks on the lake stating that most of them are wider than 6 ft. with varying designs that will not comply with the new SMP. Rob advised that anything already built would be grandfathered, and the proposed changes are for new construction.

Jim Reece said he commended Rebecca's dock illustrations and added that they're extremely helpful. He went on to question the use of an 18 foot boat in the examples saying he doesn't know anybody with a boat that size. He said that most of the ski boats are around 20-22 ft. and pontoon boats are 24 ft. He suggested changing slip sizes to 12x26. Rebecca asked Jim if he felt it was necessary to have both sides of the boat enclosed. He said yes because you need access to the 4 corners of the boat to secure it due to the waves from wake boats beating up the boats. Rebecca pointed out a configuration she had on the freshwater dock designs handout and asked Jim if he believed that design would be sufficient for his issue. He agreed it would work.

The resident from Benson Lake asked about the small floating decks that various residents have. She asked if the SMP regulated those. Rebecca stated that there are regulations and freshwater unattached floats can be up to 160 sq. ft. for single use, or 320 sq. ft. for community use.

Teri King asked about dock exemptions for freshwater endangered species. Specifically she asked if a dock could be lengthened in special cases to avoid certain species. Rebecca said language could be added, to which the PAC agreed. Rebecca said she would use similar language from the saltwater section and have an increase in size of 15%.

Rebecca asked to go through *Dock Regulations- revised May 8, 2013. (Draft SMP 17.50075 (D) in "17A")*. On page 1, Vicki pointed out the fact that davits are discussed in the introductory paragraph, but aren't discussed after that. A lengthy discussion was had between the PAC and community members in attendance. Rebecca suggested removing davits from the dock section, moving it to the boat lift section and say they may now be included.

Teri King questioned setbacks for saltwater docks. She said some lots along Hood Canal are only 30-35 feet wide, yet a dock width of 38 feet is allowed. Teri asked how those docks would be allowed. Rebecca answered saying that setbacks would still need to be met, and the dock would need to be smaller. Teri suggested adding a side note to the images regarding the setbacks. Vicki questioned (1.) (i.) which says:

*New covered moorage and over the water boat houses are prohibited except in marinas. Replacement structures shall be restricted to the original footprint and size dimensions, except for any variations required by health and safety regulations. Proposals for covered moorage and overwater boat houses on marine shorelines and on lakes with species listed under the federal endangered species act as either proposed, threatened, or endangered shall include a Habitat Management Plan that identifies measures to protect habitats and mitigate for unavoidable impacts.*

She stated that she had notes from the August 4, 2014 meeting to change the following:

*New covered moorage and over the water boat houses are prohibited except in marinas. (Replacement structures shall be restricted to the original footprint and size dimensions, except for any variations required by health and safety regulations) (Proposals for covered moorage and overwater boat houses on marine shorelines and on lakes with species listed under the federal endangered species act as either proposed, threatened, or endangered shall include a Habitat Management Plan that identifies measures to protect habitats and mitigate for unavoidable impacts.)*

**Commented [MD1]:** This sentence was moved to (J.) (i.) per the August 2014 notes.

**Commented [MD2]:** This section was moved to the Marine section per August 2014 notes.

On page 4, Vicki said that in (j.) (i.) boathouses need to be added. Kristy added davits to the list as well. After discussing all of the structures that could be added, a verbiage change was suggested. Rebecca recommended adding “including grandfathered docks and other structures discussed in this section.”

Vicki questioned the language in (2.) (a.) and proposed changing it to:

*Depending on location and shoreline environmental designation, a conditional use permit may be required for a dock. If so, the following apply*

In section (2.)(a.) (i.) Vicki asked to add the words “and uses” to read

*...A balancing of the interests of project proponents, adjacent shoreline property owners, and uses, and those of the public is necessary.*

Rob discussed the allowed sizes for unattached floats in (f.) (viii.) (f) on page 12. He said the new language has smaller measurements than those found in the current SMP. After a discussion, Rebecca said she assumed the draft language was a mistake. She proposed changing the freshwater square footage to 250 sq. ft. For saltwater the increase would go to 400 sq. ft. Currently there are no regulations on a joint use unattached float so the PAC talked over sizing options. Vicki and Rob said more research is necessary, which Rebecca agreed to do.

## **Break 7:50-7:57**

b. Archaeology Chapter – revised May 8, 2015. (draft SMP 17.50.055 (G) in “17A”)

After break, Rebecca asked the PAC to refer to the revised archaeology chapter (revised May 8, 2015). She advised that some added language regarding duplicate applications was not added as previously discussed after doing some research. Rebecca said she spoke to DAHP (Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation) and they advised against it due to the fact that federal permits are not consistent about what is required and when it is required. Rebecca said she was also advised that the federal review usually comes much later after the local review is done. Vicki commented that she was worried about someone having to go through parallel processes with the Army Corps of Engineers and the county.

Rebecca walked the PAC through the formatting changes in the archaeology chapter, and no further revisions were suggested.

Teri King asked the definition of “historic structure”. Rebecca answered that it is not defined in the draft SMP. She asked if that is something that should be added to which the PAC said yes.

Rebecca asked if they could discuss a few chapters from the Draft SMP (17 A 2/17/2015). Beginning with (K.) Residential Regulations. She walked them through discussed changes, and no other suggestions were made.

While reviewing (L.) Restoration Project Regulations, Teri King questioned the need to have restoration regulations, saying they are not legally required. She said she believes there are necessary changes that need to be addressed. At this time, the PAC decided not to make changes.

Vicki asked if the verbiage in (M.) Transportation Facility Regulations (4.) could be changed. She said the current wording sounds as though you would not have to conform to any other standards besides the 3 listed in this chapter. She suggested changing the wording to “*private road construction and maintenance shall conform to all of the regulations of this section where applicable, and to the following:*”

## **5. New Business**

None

## **6. Adjournment**

Rob Drexler adjourned the meeting at 8:40 pm.