

# **Mason County Planning Advisory Commission**

**March 20, 2017**

(This document is not meant to be a verbatim transcript)

---

## **Call to Order**

James Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

## **Roll Call**

Present: Marilyn Vogler, Deb Soper, James Thomas, Vicki Wilson, and Aaron Cleveland

## **Regular Business**

Adoption of Agenda- Marilyn would like to add discussion of the Allyn Village Commercial changes and the timeline and scope for the rest of the COMP Plan. Vicki would like to add a discussion on conflict of interest to New Business as well. Marilyn made a motion to adopt agenda as amended. Motion seconded by Aaron. All in favor, motion carried.

## **Approval of minutes-**

February 27, 2017- Vicki suggested adding the language Terri mentioned at the January 23, 2017 meeting, on monitoring of wells, to the February minutes. In particular, on page 3 of the minutes, half way down, which discussed page 8 of the Health and Human Services chapter of the COMP Plan. Also, page 4 of the minutes, add the actual RCW reference in regard to energy targets, RCW 19.285. Marilyn made a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Vicki. All in favor, motion carried.

## **Public Comment- None**

## **Public Hearing – Ordinance amending Chapter 17.07 – Development Regulations, Shelton Urban Growth Area, Article 6 – Industrial, Section 17.07.650 – Prohibited Uses To Remove Self-Storage Facilities**

*Presenter: David Windom, Department of Community Services*

Dave mentioned that the staff report was originally prepared by Barbara Adkins. He showed the Planning Commission where the Industrial area was in the Shelton UGA on a map that was hanging up, as well as on the tv. The topic of allowing storage facilities in different zones has been a reoccurring issue and now has been requested as an allowed use in the Industrial zone of the Shelton UGA. Dave opened the discussion up for questions.

The applicant Kerry Ritland spoke on behalf of removing Self-Storage Facilities as a prohibited use. He and his wife, Faith Supranski, are small business owners of a storage facility on E Johns Prairie Rd in Shelton. He mentioned how their facility is full like most of the other storage facilities in the county. They would like to meet the demand by expanding. As it stands now, they are a non-conforming allowed use. The property was rezoned as industrial, essentially making it non-conforming. He discussed the benefits of expanding, not only for people who want

to utilize the facility, but for the contractor and employee(s) they would hire, as well as the property taxes they would pay.

Faith Supransky talked about the misconceptions about self-storage and that most of their customers use their facilities when they are going through life changing events; 1 out of 10 people utilize self-storage facilities and it is not just a place for people “with too much stuff”. She pointed out that their location is excellent because it is in a convenient location for the rural community; if you are on your way to one of the stores such as Wal-Mart or Fred-Meyer you will pass by their storage facility. The owners had to turn people away all last summer because they didn’t have anything available. Ms. Supransky mentioned that when self-storage originally started out it was primarily located in industrial zones. She talked about industrial zones in Eastern Washington and how most of self-storage is located there. Building self-storage is more expensive in commercial zones, therefore if they build in industrial they can also keep costs down for their customers.

Marilyn asked about their employee numbers and status. She asked where they intended to extend their facility. Ms. Supransky said they planned on expanding behind, where the Rvs were currently located. Marilyn believed their project made sense, but she mentioned that this isn’t the first time they have changed the whole UGA zoning regulations for one request. She noted the change they made to the low-density mixed use area in the UGA, regarding self-storage units.

Marilyn talked about the lack of flat, developable, industrial land that is available. Industrial Urban Growth Area on Johns Prairie is sellable and people can develop it. Storage units are not as dense an employer as more industrial based businesses, generally. She is not opposed to this project, just opposed to the way they are processing this request.

James would rather see self-storage areas in industrial zones, than in mixed use areas. He mentioned that the industrial land that we have now is not well used.

Dave stated that industrial is 65% undeveloped, currently.

Faith Supransky mentioned that businesses also use self-storage for storing tools, vehicles, and building supplies and that is another reason why it shouldn’t be delineated to one zone.

Kerry Ritland mentioned the great amount of spot zoning in the County already. Marilyn agrees with the applicant’s correspondence with the County stating that the County zoning and UGA zoning should match. She mentioned how the County hasn’t adopted the City’s development regulations, they have adopted the zoning but not the development regulations that talk about how the zoning is to be implemented.

James reiterated that the issue is not the availability of storage units, it is the siting of them.

Marilyn would rather they be in the industrial zone than in the low density mixed use zone.

PAC discusses the low density mixed use that they allowed self-storage units on. PAC had a general discussion about Better Storage Solutions on Shelton Springs Road. They also talked about the self-storage facilities on the Stout property.

Deb Soper talked about the Roads to Rails Luncheon and the speaker, Brian Riley, who mentioned that any community that wanted to grow needed industrial property.

James mentioned, again, that our 65% industrial is still undeveloped and there could be many other areas rezoned, not necessarily in the Shelton UGA.

Marilyn mentioned in the short amount of time that she has been on the PAC, there has been storage unit expansion on Deegan Road, a Rezone on McEwan Prairie for storage units, changing an ordinance in the low density mixed use zone to accommodate storage, and now they are receiving another request for storage expansion. Marilyn asked whether this could become a potential problem, using up the industrial zone for storage.

James said we had a lot of industrial land and not a lot of people interested in development.

James asked Dave what would be the most straight forward way to address this. Dave mentioned taking the case to the hearings examiner for a variance. Grandfathering was mentioned, that according to Dave, was not an option in this case.

James asked the PAC what would stop them from passing this request and then looking deeper into the development regulations.

Vicki said that when asking the question whether industrial zones will be used up by storage units, we have to look at the numbers. The industrial zone works out to be roughly 1100 acres, with a large portion of it available for sell, besides the Port of Shelton.

Dave mentioned that we don't have any regulations in place to accommodate the change in industry.

James suggested that if the UGA becomes overburdened with storage units, the regulations can be changed back.

Kerry Ritland suggested that if the County got a flood of applicants, after the change happened, that a moratorium could be an option, and that vesting didn't happen until an applicant had a permit.

Vicki pointed out that when one looks at permitted uses, under industrial, it lists "storage of materials and products". She then asked, "What is self-storage?" Is it not the storage of materials and products?

James talked about the original concern when the earlier draft of the industrial zone was written, which was that storage units somehow invited crime. James mentioned calling the City police chief, the County Sheriff, and talked to a company in Iowa that actually tracks crime associated

with storage. They all mentioned that it was the lack of such security features as fences that would contribute to possible crime, but it seemed if proper security features were in place, storage facilities were not an issue in breeding crime.

Vicki said when she looked through the documents, she looked for internal consistency in the regulations. The exception of self-storage to what is allowed in the Industrial zone didn't make much sense, after the description of what was allowed was given.

Aaron Cleveland mentioned Dave's earlier discussion of the County's desire to list what is permitted, in the future, and replacing the use of what is not-permitted.

Vicki made a motion to approve the proposed change, to remove self-storage from prohibition in the Industrial zone. The motion was seconded by Aaron. Three votes in favor and one abstention, motion carried.

**Public Hearing – Ordinance amending Mason County code Title 14, Building and Construction, Chapter 14.08, Building Code Amendments, Amending section 14.08.031 to Allow Exemptions for Agricultural Storage Structures and Cargo Containers as Storage**  
*Presenter: David Windom, Department of Community Services*

Dave gives a quick overview of the hearing topic, he reads from the staff report that was given out at the meeting. He mentioned that he pulled out the information on boat lifts and associate items because it was confusing in regards to the topic of cargo containers. Boat lifts are addressed in the SMP and building regulations. He mentioned that regulations would not be relaxed for cargo containers in regards to using them as a business or housing.

Marilyn asked if it's building code approval that is needed for transport of cargo containers or state approval.

Dave mentioned the change regarding foundation, no longer requiring a foundation, and no need for exit doors, which open from the inside (this is only when using the container as storage).

Marilyn asked how the new version of the document compared to the last document. Dave answered by saying he just defined the surface that the container sits on and defined the exit doors.

The PAC goes back to the transport of the containers that Marilyn mentioned earlier. "As with other prefabricated structures such as portable or manufactured homes, building code approval of cargo containers maybe obtained through the Washington State's Factory Built Structure Agency". The PAC was confused as to what department has authority, when a cargo container is 576 sq. ft. or less and used for storage. The container is exempt, thus falling under the building code.

James noted when a container is 577sq. ft. or greater it has to go through the whole permitting process. He confirmed with Dave that this version of the document just cleans up what they had

looked at last time. Dave also mentioned that this document does not concentrate on the number of containers on a lot, or the setbacks, these items will be revisited at another time.

Vicki asked about signing affidavits and the process of applying for an exemption. Dave explained the process, where people come in with a site plan, application, sign conditions, pay a fee and it is recorded with the auditor.

Marilyn moved to approve the code amendment as presented. Motion seconded by Vicki, all in favor, motion carried.

Marilyn asked what Attachment B was used for? Dave answered that it was the current policy for storage containers that appears online, which will be replaced after this change.

Aaron asked how hard, level surface is defined in regards to placing of a storage container? Dave answered “fairly loosely” and that will be the applicant or owner’s responsibility to site it accordingly.

Vicki mentioned the affidavit and the list of items at the top of the form. She wondered if the planner goes through this list with the applicant. Dave answered that a permit technician goes through this step with the applicant.

Vicki mentioned changing the title of the affidavit, so it’s clear to include cargo containers as storage. She would also like to see the size of the cargo container clear on the affidavit. Dave suggested adding a line that talked about the dimensions of the cargo containers.

Vicki asked about Attachment A, and the note about the container exceeding the 120sq.ft. or 200sq.ft limit. Dave replied that these sizes and smaller do not require an affidavit of exemption or permit in Mason County if used as storage only. They do have to meet other requirements, setbacks, wall height, etc.

Open to Public Comment – No public present

### **New Business-**

James asked about the COMP Plan and what an outline looked like regarding what was left to do and submit by dates. Dave replied that the Department of Economic Development has hired a contractor to write the Economic portion of the COMP Plan and a final product should be available by June. The Utilities piece is still being worked on, Dave has to get in contact with PUD 3 to talk about fiber concerning the telecommunications section of the Utilities Chapter. Capital Facilities Chapter has to be rewritten to include two pieces, a long range 8 year plan and a 1 year plan. Right now the BOCC is working on a two year budget for facilities and once they are done, Dave will pull that data to fill in the 1 year plan, which will be what they can fund; the 8 year plan will be a wish list. Transportation pages need to be added to the Capital Facilities Chapter as well. Dave also mentioned going back to the development regulations and the glossary.

Marilyn asked if the BOCC has to approve by the end of June, Dave replied no. She wanted to know if, after submitting a chapter to Commerce, they could begin updating the same chapter. Dave answered yes, updating can begin. Though submitting to Commerce and then revising and submitting again can drag out the public comment period. Marilyn also mentioned the non-mandated issues that the public brought up and making time to address those issues as well.

James would like Dave to provide the PAC with a checklist of the public comments regarding the COMP Plan.

The PAC then discussed the Allyn Village Commercial Amendments that were taken to the BOCC. Marilyn stated that the language discussed with the PAC was Multi-family units with a minimum of 4 dwelling units. She said they also talked about a 4 plex, but when it went to the BOCC it said four dwelling units per acre. She would like to get a copy of the changes approved during the meeting that are to be made by staff, before it goes to the BOCC.

The PAC agreed they would like to revisit the Allyn Village Commercial Amendments. Dave would like the PAC to write up their issues about the current changes so he can add it to a new staff report.

Vicki would like to add Conflict of Interest to the outline of the Agenda. James will send the language to staff to add to the agenda format.

### **Adjournment**

James adjourned the meeting at 7:39 p.m.