



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

JUNE 18, 2018

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Marilyn Vogler, Planning Advisory Commission Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. The following commissioners were in attendance:

**Aaron Cleveland
Marilyn Vogler
Jason Bailey**

**Deb Soper
Brian Smith**

**Excused: Jamie Bariekman
James Thomas**

2. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES AND AGENDA

Motion was made by Commissioner Cleveland and seconded by Commissioner Smith to not approve the minutes from the May 21, 2018 regular meeting at this time, as there needs to be more detail and a few corrections made.

Vote:

5 in favor

0 opposed

0 abstentions

Motion passed

B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

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.

C. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None

D. NEXT REGULAR MEETING(S)

July 16, 2018

E. COMMITTEE/STAFF UPDATES

Kell mentioned that there will be approximately 5-6 rezones for the July meeting.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- **Tom Davis 6:09 p.m.**

Mr. Davis stated that it really bothered him that there was discussion about possible incentives being given for protecting buffers. He believes there should not be incentives for following the rules and very stiff penalties for breaking the rules.

- **Kim Oliver 6:11 p.m.**

Ms. Oliver stated that during the April meeting it was discussed that there would not be a fee if you change from open space into timberland and questioned if that is the case. Kell got Kim's contact information to follow up with this question.

4. BRIEFING –PAC Summaries (Minutes) 6:14 p.m.

Commissioner Vogler stated that she would like to see more detailed minutes and thinks the summarized version doesn't provide enough detail for the BOCC to read.

There was mention of doing a timestamp of the audio to make it easier to go back and listen if more details are needed. All the commissioners that were present agreed there needs to be a timestamp in the summary.

Kell will check with the BOCC to see what they prefer and get back to the board.

5. Continued Public Hearing: Public Benefit Rating System 6:19 p.m.

Commissioner Vogler stated that since we are not sure if the notice of public hearing ever made it in to the Journal she would like a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Smith stated that public comment can be re-opened for the August meeting.

Commissioner Bailey made a motion to close the public hearing and Commissioner Smith seconded the motion:

Vote:

5 in favor

0 opposed

0 abstentions

Motion passed

Tom Davis, citizen, stated that he doesn't think that you can close a public hearing on a matter and re-open it later. He suggested not to close the hearing.

Commissioner Cleveland made a motion to not close the public hearing, and to continue it for a later date, Commissioner Bailey seconded the motion.

Vote:

5 in favor

0 opposed

0 abstentions

Motion passed

6. WORKSESSION – PBRS Draft

Public Comment –

Ken Van Buskirk- 6:25 p.m.

Ken stated that this is confusing and suggested that all the folks that were sent a letter about the public hearing be sent another notification about the next public hearing and they need to be aware of any changes that may pertain to them as well.

He stated that he spoke to two of the three BOCC about the article in the Journal. Commissioner Thomas had stated that the BOCC knew about the article and saw it before it even made it to the paper. When he asked the two of the three BOCC about it, they stated that they had not seen the article beforehand. There are corrections that need made in that article.

He also spoke to Mrs. Iddings who is very knowledgeable about the PBRS system in King County and she would be a great one to talk with.

Ken stated the less than 5-acre rule won't make much of a difference if it is so restrictive. He encouraged the PAC to look at Kitsap and King County's PBRS system as they start at a minimum of 50% tax reduction and the Mason County Draft PBRS starts at a 10% reduction.

Work Session –

Discussion took place between Planning Staff, Kell Rowen, and the PAC regarding staff edits and suggestions to the PBRs document.

Page 2--6:29

Since Farmland/Agriculture program was not defined in the definitions section, the Timberland program definition was removed from the draft. This was done for consistency and clarification.

Page 3-- The definition of “Urban Areas” was edited to remove reference to LAMIRDs as they are areas located within Rural Areas.

Under Section A. High Priority #4, “Significant fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas” and “Aquifer Protection Areas” should be separate items, and each should have their own eligibility criteria.

Under Section B. Medium Priority, added “Rural area open space”. Eligibility criteria will be added to the next draft. Kell suggested for the PAC’s consideration to require at least five or more continuous acres of undeveloped property that is maintained in native vegetation. There are properties that may not have critical areas or significant fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and may not qualify under the Timberland program, but could be valuable open space.

A suggestion was made to add properties of at least one acre when restoration with native vegetation has been completed, unless it was required as an enforcement action or as mitigation to another action. This could go under high, medium or low.

Commissioner Vogler asked that Kell please send a word document of the draft to all the Commissioners and requested that all comments from the Commissioners be sent to Kell. A working document would be great to be able to track changes.

Ken Van Buskirk--6:39

Ken had a question about high priority open space section and what happened to the farm and agriculture lands that no longer qualify under the Farm/Ag program? It was in the original draft and it is now missing. Kell noticed that it was missing as well and will add Farm/Ag lands back in with eligibility criteria as well.

Page 4- 6:43

Kell struck out the ineligible examples under the “Public Recreation Area” and will include a full list of ineligible examples under section .040 on page seven.

Page 5--

4 a. Kell recommends striking commercial shellfish areas.

4 b. An increase in required wetland buffers should be considered using a certain percentage rather than additional feet. This will be easier for the Planners to determine. What should the percentage be? King County considers a tax reduction when required buffers are increased by at least 10 percent. Is it possible to have a 20 percent increase with a minimum of additional footage?

One thing that needs to be added is the requirement for the delineation and categorization of wetland. The regulated size of wetland buffers vary based on the Category and habitat rating of the wetland.

Page 6—6:54

Common line set back, need to add a percentage here as well or an additional buffer setback. Percentages will be easier for staff to work with versus footage.

Page 7—7:02

Kell will work to define the other shoreline environments and non-regulated wetlands.

Kim Oliver asked about “visual quality” and what is a scenic vista? (See page 2, 3.25.020 (4)). She stated it should be defined.

Kell stated that she discussed with the assessor’s office the requirement of a minimum parcel size and a minimum percentage eligible for tax reduction. Under “Ineligible lands” 3.25.040 (a) Kell proposes to clarify that properties less than 1 acres in size and with less than 25 percent set-aside, will be ineligible for a tax reduction.

It was requested by the Commission that Kell share the revised word document with the Commission members and that each member return edited documents/suggestions to Kell, which she can share with the other members through email. Commissioner Vogler reminded the members not to hold discussions by email, rather save those discussions for the meeting.

Public Access provisions give property an additional 10% reduction. This can be in addition to any of the priority resources. There will be discussion what defines public access.

Kell will be removing the text boxes that are in the draft and adding the public access portion of the point system.

Discussion about tax benefits to home owner associations (HOAs) for non-buildable lands (greenbelts). Kell will find out how the assessors tax these properties.

Commissioner Vogler stated that there is a need to make careful consideration of the point system because we want to encourage people to participate in the program.

Page 9--

Kell stated that property owners that participate in the Open Space program now will not need to pay a re-evaluation fee, although not sure about the transferring of programs and associated fees.

There was discussion on new applications and deadlines. Kell stated that she wants to determine how long the review process for an application will take to get a better idea on how long it will take for the planning department to reevaluate the over 300 existing properties in the Open Space program. There are only three planning staff members available to evaluate the applications. Processing new applications should not cause a problem. Kell will work with the Director and the BOCC for direction on that process/timing.

It was suggested that new applications could open January 1 to March 30th of each year.

Mr. Van Buskirk suggested that Kell contact Kitsap and King County to see how they did the transition.

Page 11--

Section 150 (b), Kell will rewrite this to be consistent with the assessor's office and how they monitor farm/ag lands and timber lands.

Page 14--

Review PBRs every 2 years. Strike "when the first additional 300 acres have been approved" under section 3.25.240.

We should reference the RCWs when discussing the penalties section.

Mr. Van Buskirk thanked the Commission for allowing him to be part of the work session.

This complete work session discussion is on file (via audio) and is available on the Mason County website.

7. ADJOURN

Commissioner Vogler called the meeting adjourned at 8:14 pm.