



MASON COUNTY

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

MASON COUNTY COMMUNITY SERVICES

615 W. ALDER STREET, SHELTON, WA 98584

Meetings held at: Commissioners' Chambers

411 N. 5th Street Shelton, Wa 98584

REGULAR MEETING

March 19, 2018

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

James Thomas, Planning Advisory Commission Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. The following commissioners were in attendance:

Aaron Cleveland

Marilyn Vogler (arrived 7:42pm)

James Thomas

Deb Soper

Brian Smith

Jason Bailey

Excused: Jamie Bariekman

2. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES AND AGENDA

Motion was made by Commissioner Cleveland and Seconded by Commissioner Smith to approve the minutes of the February 12, 2018 Regular meeting as presented.

Vote:

5 in favor (Bailey, Cleveland, Soper, Thomas, and Smith)

0 opposed

0 abstentions

Motion passed

B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

None

C. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None

This is a short summary of the action that took place during the meeting. The audio recording of the meeting can be found on the Planning Advisory Commission page of the Mason County website.

D. NEXT REGULAR MEETING(S)

April 16, 2018

E. COMMITTEE/STAFF UPDATES

Paula mentioned the 2018 revised PAC schedule and the layout of topics to be included in the docket of amendments. Commissioner Thomas mentioned that he had wanted to approach the topic of public comment at the beginning of worksessions again, in order to get the opinion of the two new Commissioners. Since only one of the two new members were present, the topic would be revisited at the next meeting.

F. OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Thomas mentioned that tonight was Paula Reeves' last night as Planning Manager and that she had accepted a position with the Washington Department of Health. He thanked her on behalf of the Planning Advisory Commission for all her work and dedication to the issues they have been tackling.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- **Ken Van Buskirk**

- Mr. Van Buskirk asked if he would be able to speak during the worksessions, the answer was yes and that it was a change in process not the Bylaws. Mr. Van Buskirk believed there were a couple of worksessions since the December 2017 vote to allow public comment during such sessions, that he wasn't allowed to speak. He stated that if the PAC was allowing comment during worksessions then he would like to speak at the PBRs worksession and the Belfair Sign Code worksession.

4. BRIEFING – Water Availability

Dave Windom explained that tomorrow, March 20, 2018, would be the third hearing on water availability, post Senate Bill 6091. The first hearing was to put in place an emergency interim ordinance and a \$500 well fee. The second hearing was required to officially adopt the ordinance and fees, but not all the documents got posted online. The third hearing, tomorrow, is to allow the public to see all the documents and perform the hearing again. Some of the highlights of the water adequacy issue include: WRIA 14 and 15 are limited to 950 gal a day and would pay the \$500 well fee before drilling, \$350 of this fee would go to Ecology and \$150 to administrative fees with the County. If there is a water emergency then these WRIAs would be limited to 350 gal a day. Dave noted that the typical household uses 170 gal a day, based on 2.67 occupancy. WRIA 22 is limited to 3,000 gal a day and WRIA 16 there are no changes due to the in stream flow rules already in place. WRIA 22 requires an update to the water plan and WRIA 14 & 15 have until 2021 to complete. Dave also mentioned that Ecology will be hiring two planners to review the WRIA work.

He also noted there was still the option to hire a hydrogeologist to prove a well has no hydro-connectivity to a stream flow in order to be allowed 5,000 gal a day. These

reports could cost \$5,000 - \$7,000 though. He noted Mary Verner, Water Resources Program Manager with the Department of Ecology, encouraged the County to move forward with revising the old WRIA plans rather than starting from scratch.

This complete briefing and resultant discussion is on file (via audio) and will be made available on the Mason County website.

5. BRIEFING – Transitory Housing in Mason County

Paula noted housing availability was included in the 2018 PAC work plan as needing study and possible solutions. She introduced Todd Parker, Homeless Program Coordinator for Public Health, he was there to talk about trends. She talked about the work that Kitsap County had put in place and the programs to allow several different categories of shelters, temporary transitory housing. She noted that there was draft code in front of the Commissioners that would allow the County to start documenting recreational vehicles used as housing through a permit, no fee required but plans showing proper disposal of waste. These proposed transitory housing programs were there to ensure enough emergency shelter in inclement weather as well as shelters with good security, waste disposal, hygiene, safety, and food prep areas.

Todd Parker spoke about the homeless data and the Comp Plan. The point in time counts are not a comprehensive look at the homeless situation, they are meant to count the minimum number of homeless at a location at one time. He went over several aspects of an Executive Summary for 2016-2017 on Housing and Homelessness in Mason County, which he provided before the presentation.

Paula mentioned that the draft code addresses a permit for Recreational Vehicles, no fee, but plans for pump out, two 180 day extensions and the possibility of a permanent situation. Commissioner Bailey also mentioned that it might be beneficial to have incentives or resources for disposal of waste.

This complete briefing item and resultant discussion is on file (via audio) and will be made available on the Mason County website.

Break 6:58 – 7:09pm

6. WORKSESSION – Parks, Recreation & Open Space Planning

Public Comment -

- **Ken Van Buskirk**
- Mr. Van Buskirk mentioned that he would like the current applicants already in the PBRs program to be notified of meetings that they can voice their concerns, he talked about the staff recommendations, he would like the PAC to slow down the process until the applicants are notified, 120 of the parcels in the program don't meet the 5 acre minimum, he talked about the Detroit township in Grapeview and that many of the parcels are not 5 acres but are in Open Space,

and he thought that the work load on the PAC would increase with the changes to the PBRs. He didn't think the Parks Board needed to be involved in Open Space, encouraged the PAC to recommend to the BOCC a committee on Open Space like the one that was created in 2007, mentioned the Comprehensive Plan and Open Space Planning policies page 14 and 15, and the Land Use Element page 29 and page 33.

Commissioner Thomas responded that it was the duty of the PAC to create a system that is fair and equitable with a point system that reflects that. The workload on the PAC can not be an issue, the duty was passed onto them by the BOCC. He noted that there will be a committee for Agricultural interest that will be working with the Assessor. Paula mentioned that she met with the Conservation District and they offered a standing Agriculture committee that they have convened, rather than the County creating a new Agriculture committee. She suggested the County and the Conservation District plan a meeting with this committee to discuss the Department of Revenue guidelines.

Public Comment Cont. –

- **Constance Ibsen**
 - Ms. Ibsen mentioned that when the Assessor and Deputy Assessor were present at the last meeting, they presented that the Assessor's Office was responsible for the Agriculture and Timberland programs because it is mandated by a certain RCW, but that Open Space was an item belonging to the Commissioners. She asked which staff were going to do the reviewing of the open space land, Dave Windom answered that it would probably be the Planning Department. Commissioners will approve the scoring sheet and the Planners will be reviewing the parcels.

Commissioner Soper asked what kind of time restraints reviewing PBRs applications would have. Dave and Paula answered that they didn't think they would have more than a range of 2 – 6 a year and that it was the PAC's intended purpose to set the criteria and not so much to review every application.

Commissioner Cleveland asked why the parcel minimum is 5 acres and whether a smaller size is appropriate. Commissioner Bailey noted that he could see the public benefit in a one, two, or three acre parcel. Commissioner Cleveland argued that if there are already rules in place that protect wetlands and other natural resources and provide buffers, why would there need to be a minimum parcel size required for the PBRs. He thought it was more important to argue why there should be a five acre minimum rather than no minimum.

Commissioner Vogler arrived at 7:42pm

Commissioner Vogler voiced that she didn't think golf courses should be receiving the tax break, they aren't organic spaces, discourage wildlife, and they charge a fee. The PAC discussed that the PBRs document does allow you to charge a fee for entrance but it has to be comparable to an equivalent public venue. There is a section in the PBRs that talked about ineligible examples, but it may not be appropriate to call out golf courses directly. The low priority public benefit resources still needed reworking. There was also discussion about adding a bonus for significant restoration.

This complete worksession item and resultant discussion is on file (via audio) and will be made available on the Mason County website.

7. WORKSESSION – Belfair Sign Code Update – Compliance Issues Only

Marissa Watson, Planning staff, went over the changes in the provided draft of Chapter 17.34 – Signs in the Belfair UGA, explained that “billboard” was crossed out because it was defined as the same thing as an “Off-premise” sign and redundant within the text. She noted that the two sections “Maximum Number” and “Maximum Sign Area” may need to wait till a second phase of revising the Belfair Sign Code overall.

Public Comment -

- **Ken Van Buskirk**

- Mr. Van Buskirk took the recommendation about “in keeping with the original intent of the sign regulations” and suggested the reformation of a Belfair sub-area committee, noted the number of prohibited signs existing in Belfair and that the allowance, for non-conforming signs, ten years from the date of adoption of the sign code had ended in 2014.

Commissioners Thomas and Vogler noted that they hadn't received any other encouragement or interest from the Board of County Commissioners or the public to start another sub-area committee at this time. Marilyn mentioned that if a second phase of revisions occurs, outside the compliance issues, the code should be simplified if the majority of the signs in Belfair currently can't meet the standards. She also stated that in the second phase it should not only be the voice of the residents, but of the businesses as well, since there may be great differences in what they think is financially acceptable when allowing only certain types of signs. Dave Windom noted that there were several other communities that had guidelines regarding signage to which the purpose was to convey a certain agreed community aesthetic.

This complete worksession item and resultant discussion is on file (via audio) and will be made available on the Mason County website.

8. ADJOURN

Commissioner Thomas called meeting adjourned at 8:31 pm.