

Mason County Planning Advisory Commission

April 17, 2017

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

Call to Order

James Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

Roll Call

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

Regular Business

Adoption of Agenda- James Thomas asked to add a section in between the approval of the minutes and the public comment, under regular business, to welcome Commissioner Terri Jeffreys to the Planning Commission Meeting and hear a few words from her. Marilyn made a motion to adopt the agenda as amended. Vicki seconded the motion, all in favor, motion carried.

Conflict of Interest - None

Approval of minutes-

March 20, 2017- Marilyn pointed out spelling error on page 2, “then” to “than”. Aaron made a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Marilyn. All in favor, motion carried.

Presentation by Commissioner Terri Jeffreys - Commissioner Jeffreys mentioned April is Appreciation Month, thanked the Planning Commission for all their work, and handed out certificates of appreciation. She mentioned the idea of changing code to outline the “not allowed uses” rather than the current “allowed uses”. Also, talked about developers and land owners bringing forth proposals to the Planning Commission. Another application for the Planning Commission had been turned in and is now waiting to be scheduled for interview.

Public Comment- Jose Hernandez, lives on Old Belfair Highway, concerned about Loudin hearing and that many neighbors did not know about the rezone hearing. James interceded to mention that comment for the Loudin hearing will take place after the hearing starts and that this portion of the public comment is for items not on the agenda tonight.

No other public comment on non-agenda items.

Public Hearing – Loudin application for a request to rezone parcel 12317-41-00060/12317-41-00050 from Rural Residential 5 to Rural Industrial.

Presenter: Paula Reeves and David Windom, Department of Community Services

Paula gave her staff report overview, mentioned the standard mailings, and public posting. The request was to reconcile the zoning after a boundary line adjustment took place in 2008, which left the parcels with a mix of rural residential and rural industrial band through the rural

residential. The change would consolidate the two parcels into rural industrial. She talked about the SEPA process, the eight rezone criteria, the adjacent highway, and the structures on site (all within the industrial zone). The updated FEMA maps show a more accurate picture of where the Union River is located.

There were concerns with the applicant answering no to future activity on the SEPA application.

Paula mentioned the staff report and the applicant's future development, but the County does not have the application for future development. The case before the Planning Commission is a non-project proposal. In the future there might be a project proposal.

There were concerns with the rezone allowing more employees on those parcels. Paula stated that the industrial band on the parcel already allows for more employees.

There were concerns about the Union River and where it runs. Maps were pulled up on the screen showing the river. The FEMA maps showed, according to staff and Loudin, a more accurate location of the river.

There were concerns about how future projects would be reviewed regarding these parcels. Staff responded that the same planning and code process would have to be followed, as in any other project and that projects may have to go to the Hearing Examiner for review.

There were concerns if a rezone occurs will the SMP have to be changed. The answer was no because both rural residential and rural industrial exist and have existed there since 2008, this proposal would be establishing the parcels as rural industrial only.

Parcel boundaries were brought up on the map again, PAC and staff worked to explain map and legend to understand the rezone in its context. Aaron mentioned that the aerial map agrees with the FEMA map. The tax sifter GIS map shows the river going through the middle of the parcel, but does not match the new map data which shows it near the edge of the western parcel in question.

James mentioned the document Marilyn circulated for this meeting, regarding rural industrial and uses of buildings that were commercial; not used in such capacity for a long time and now are desired restored. Marilyn went through the research she had provided for the PAC meeting, for a working area zone.

Paula shared her thoughts on the integrity of zoning, how our Mason County zoning code overlaps. The form based code is a forward way of thinking that many cities are trying to get a grasp on. No counties, Paula knows of, are applying form based code yet.

Marilyn asked the applicant if they plan on building out on the residential building, answer was no. Dave brought the Municode for Mason County up on the tv screen, so everyone could view the rural industrial zoning. Residences are not a specifically permitted use in the zone. Marilyn mentioned that living and residential quarters, such as guard quarters and other residential uses directly related to the operation of the primary purpose, 17.07.630.

Public Comment – Jose Hernandez asked if the earlier mention of 25 employees was a correct assumption, James answered no, according to the application received. He asked if the parcels were all rural industrial when Chet's Trusses occupied the building. He was also curious what was currently in the building. He mentioned notification of neighbors and that he didn't receive the newspaper. He had issue with what kind of business was done on the site and if it will have an effect their property values. James answered that as long as it is a permitted use in that zone, then there are no other requirements. Jose was generally worried that business will grow, owner Loudin is not sure at this time. James reiterated that the commission in this case is looking at the idea of zoning, not a particular project proposal.

Marilyn asked what the standard distribution of notice was. Dave answered that the County had a list of the mailings, he personally staked the site, in question, at the front of the road with a notice. Deb asked when the mailings were sent out, March 13, 2017 was the answer. The notice was also in the Mason County Journal on April 6, 2017 and April 13, 2017. The list of addresses notified was sent around the room. Dave also mentioned that the list is made of parcel owners that are listed as the parcel owners of record with the Assessor's office.

Alan Borden spoke, mentioned his time as a land use planner for Mason County from 1991 to 2016. He was familiar with the property containing the unusual gray band through the residential, but in regards to the boundary line adjustment that occurred he never had the opportunity to review it. The important issue at the time, according to Alan, was rezoning and keeping the integrity of the original parcels. The eastern parcel is mostly residential and the western industrial, with Chet's Trusses occupying the western parcel even before 1990. He believed a special use permit would be needed if a building exceeded 7500 sq. ft.

James asked if the parcels had been in the current configuration since Chet's Trusses. Alan answered yes, the only difference was rural industrial was near the Old Belfair Highway and residential closer to the river. James asked how common it was for different zones to occur in the same parcel. Alan answered that it wasn't common, but historically zoning maps were based on Assessor's information that showed parcel shape, when they were digitized, initially, they followed those boundaries. Alan requested that if a rezone does occur, the critical area regulations be followed. Land use could be a problem, in his opinion, on the eastern parcel. Alan gave a letter addressing the rezone to Dave and Paula.

Dave mentioned that if they rezone the western parcel one zoning designation and the eastern another, it falls under the rules of the GMA and will affect the Future Land Use Map. They would also have to wait till Fall to complete this type of request.

Ken VanBuskirk talked about how zoning hadn't changed much since the GMA arrived. He knew the Loudins and explained that this was a non-project request, the property was posted, and that the County hydraulic layer of the GIS map was incorrect. He didn't know that the Union River met the definition of a shoreline that far upstream where the Loudin property was and also mentioned that the SMP update was not adopted yet.

Chester Loudin pointed out the stormwater retention pond that he had created on his property, adding that it filtered water that flowed from properties across the highway.

Public Comment Closed

James explained that the Loudin property has been used as industrial for many years and the area around it had become largely residential.

Marilyn's preference is to rezone westerly industrial and easterly residential instead of rezoning to all industrial, doing so continues the residence in a non-conforming use, the residence could not expand which she voiced could cause more problems down the road.

James asked Paula and Dave, what the best case against them rezoning the parcels individually, like Marilyn mentioned, would be. Dave said that both parcels have encumbrances that prevent expansion, i.e. stormwater pond and river. If it is rezoned to all industrial, the house could not be expanded or torn down and rebuilt as a residence, but it could be a supporting office to the industrial use.

Vicki clarified that the house is currently in the rural industrial zone and is legal non-conforming. Vicki mentioned her agreement with Ken VanBuskirk and that the case before them is really an error correction.

The PAC had a discussion about more industrial in the area, constriction of the site by pond, and development managed by other factors down the road.

Vicki made a motion to approve the rezone of the two lots to rural industrial, motion seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

Rural industrial permitted uses were read out loud, the limitations regarding site restraints were reiterated.

Marilyn requested that language in the permitted uses be modified to allow residential for owner/manager/security. Dave responded that they would have to come back to that addition after this rendition of the COMP Plan was submitted.

Deb was concerned about the notification process. Dave answered that the application was accepted and went through the review process. Then the department received, from the Assessor's office, a list of property owners within 300ft of the parcels in question. Letters were sent to everyone on the list received; the 300ft is from the parcel boundaries. The notice was in the paper and online as well.

Comprehensive Plan Update, 2017 Work Plan – The purpose of this briefing is to present the remaining tasks and timeline necessary to complete the 2016 update of the Mason County Comprehensive Plan.

Presenter: Paula Reeves and David Windom, Department of Community Services

Paula introduced the COMP Plan update, outlining the work to be completed. The plan outline was pulled up on the tv screen, showing the next chapters as Utilities, Economic Development, Development Regulations, Joint Plan, and Shorelines and Conservation. Then there is a move

into the third stage, which is SEPA review, joint meeting/public hearing, public comment period, staff addressing public comment, and subsequent review with Planning Commission. The Staff Report includes County wide planning policies and Washington Growth Management Act as the heart of COMP Plan. She pointed out the meeting schedule and opened the conversation to include other commissions, parks, and historic preservation.

James mentioned the last meeting and getting started on the Glossary. The importance of the glossary at this point was questioned. Glossary, for the PAC, is a big piece of the COMP Plan. It was questioned whether policy making by way of definitions is a great way to facilitate tough issues. James clarified that the PAC wants to be clear on definitions when they review, or to change the definition to meet the overall goals of the GMA.

Marilyn mentioned the public comment; talked about considering only the mandated changes before coming back to the public comment. The PAC would like something in the timeline addressing the public comment, Paula will try to build in time for this. Dave would like the commission members to send a list of their concerns, they want addressed in the COMP Plan, to Paula or himself. It was mentioned that the longer the completion of the COMP Plan is stretched out, the less favorable the County is viewed in regards to state and federal funding.

Public Comment – Constance Ibsen asked about the multiple development regulation review dates in the schedule outline. Dave answered that it was based on the Hirst decision and the preparation for how it will affect our current regulations. She mentioned extending notifications more than 300ft from the parcel boundary. Dave believed the 300ft distance is a RCW. She was curious about the sub area plans, who was updating those. There are no current committees taking care of sub-area plans. Belfair-Allyn committee disbanded mid-year 2016.

Ken VanBuskirk served on the Belfair Sub-Area Committee and Planning Advisory Committee, also served on Belfair-Allyn Committee. He mentioned the County wide planning policy amendments, the Shelton UGA expansion and Belfair UGA shrinking, Belfair sub-area plan hasn't changed since 2003, Belfair-Allyn Committee was only directed to look at development regulations, and stated that the CARAs in the Old Belfair Hwy area deter a lot of development capabilities.

PAC had discussion with Ken on the Belfair sub-area committee and the need for reestablishing the committee. They also discussed the Allyn and Belfair UGA combination and redistribution of growth projections, developable lands of Belfair; slopes, critical area, and easements were talked about as well as County roads not being able to handle development if it were to locate in some areas.

Dave had talked to Commerce about shrinking the Belfair UGA and the possibility of shifting the population, if it was feasible. One of the options was to leave the Old Belfair Hwy portion alone, until it was needed.

Marilyn asked for the Land Use, Housing, and Health & Human Services chapters by May 1st, Paula mentioned adding the County wide Planning Policies to that list.

New Business- Vicki mentioned the videos they watched regarding Public Records training, Public Meetings Act, and Records Retention. There were certificates on the table for the PAC members who had completed the training to sign.

Adjournment

Marilyn made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 p.m.