

**Planning Commission Public Meeting
Lewis County Courthouse
351 NW North St.
Chehalis, WA 98532**

**June 22, 2010
Meeting Notes**

Planning Commissioners Present: Bill Russell, Rachael Jennings, Richard Tausch, Arny Davis

Planning Commissioners Excused: Mike Mahoney, Bob Guenther, Jim Lowery

Staff Present: Glenn Carter, Phil Rupp, Barbara Kincaid

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from June 8, 2010
- Matrix of Rezone Comments
- Rezone Maps
- Chapter 17.100 Rural Development District

I. Call to Order

Chairman Jennings called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Planning Commissioners introduced themselves.

II. Old Business

A. Approval of meeting notes.

Commissioner Russell moved to table the meeting notes of June 8. The motion carried.

B. Workshop on Rezone Requests

Mr. Rupp stated there has been discussion regarding rural development district (RDD) options as part of the rezone requests and provided copies of the part of the code that refers to those districts. The first page identifies the purpose and the general guidelines and concepts which have been followed in the designation of the various RDD classifications. The matrix identifies the uses that are allowed in each RDD classification and the table on page 3 of the handout is the rural area land use zoning summary. "P" is permitted; "SUP" is a special use permit; and "A" is administrative approval. He reminded the Commission that any land that is not part of an urban growth area, resource land, LAMIRD or park falls into this rural classification and needs to be designated as such.

Mr. Rupp stated there was an error in the matrix. The numbers identifying the locator map and the numbers identifying the application were reversed.

Application #7, Map 8

This is a 40-acre parcel requesting RDD5 zoning; it is currently RDD10. Most of the property shows evidence of forest activity and the surrounding zoning is either RDD10 or RDD20. Rezoning would create a spot zone.

Application #2, Map 8

This application includes 27 parcels and 476 acres. Mr. Rupp explained that because of the existing development pattern evident in the area consideration may be given to including areas surrounding the application in an RDD-5. (That is if the recommendation is to re-designate the 27 parcels RDD-5).

Commissioner Russell asked if Mr. Rupp was considering excluding the two large parcels north of the expanded area. The two larger parcels referred to are #20932-1 and 20904, each about 80 acres.

Commissioner Russell asked about the property just north of those two large parcels, south of Sanford Rd. Mr. Rupp stated that they could be included but consideration must be given to slopes and that those are mostly undeveloped.

Commissioner Russell asked if it was known how the large tracts in the center are currently being used. Mr. Rupp stated it is all in timber.

Commissioner Russell recalled when this was designated there was discussion about where that boundary should be. The northerly part was left out and he remembered that there were steep slopes. There was a reason why it was omitted. The Planning Commission at that time tried to step down from RDD-5 to RDD-10 to RDD-20.

Commissioner Davis stated regardless of whether it was RDD 5 or RDD 10 the critical areas are going to apply to both those designations. Mr. Rupp stated that is correct but if there is a 10-acre parcel it is easier to buffer the critical area than it is with a 5-acre parcel.

Commissioner Davis asked if it is zoned RDD 5 and it cannot be buffered then it cannot be developed. Mr. Rupp stated a use cannot be stopped on a property. If there is no place else to go, a critical area can be built on. (Note that the reasonable use section 17.35A.530 was the code section referenced).

Commissioner Davis stated in order to respect the intent of developing between RDD 5 and RDD 10 it would be better to have ten acres so there is a better opportunity for buffering.

Commissioner Tausch stated he was in favor of putting this entire area into RDD 5. He asked if this would be bordered by Little Hanaford Road, Grimes Road and Salzer Valley Road. Mr. Rupp stated lines have not yet been identified.

Commissioner Russell stated from the map it appears that some of the parcels are already RDD 5. Mr. Rupp stated that is correct. Commissioner Russell asked how many applicants are involved.

Mr. Rupp stated there are 27 parcels and many of the parcels are owned by the same party. Ms. Kincaid stated there are at least 10 applicants.

Commissioner Davis stated applications can continue to come in and we can slowly move out from the city, or we can save a lot of work by blanketing them in now.

Mr. Rupp stated when we contacted property owners we found several of them did not want to be re-zoned because they wanted to maintain the lower density environment.

Commissioner Davis asked if it is an easier process to identify those folks and zone them RDD-10 and zone everything else RDD 5 or slowly let the RDD-5 applications come in.

Mr. Rupp stated it would be about the same. The burden would be on the County to notify the people if we took action to include them; otherwise they will come in as they desire.

Commissioner Davis stated he would like to see a blanket RDD-5 for the area as outlined tonight and wait for public comment. We may find there are a lot of dissenters and perhaps it is not a good idea.

Application #47, Map 10

This application has two parcels. One is north of SR 508 which was designated ARL in the last compliance review. There is no evidence that an error was made or conditions have changed since that time.

Chairman Jennings stated it would also create a spot zone if the zoning were changed. She stated she would like to see it stay ARL.

Mr. Rupp stated the second parcel is on Johnson Rd. and is currently RDD-5 and no further action is needed.

Application #43, Map 10

This parcel is within a larger block of RDD-10 zoning. It would create a spot zone to change it to RDD-5.

Commissioner Russell agreed. He stated Application #32 would be the same. These parcels staying as RDD-10 would better protect the ARL around them. Chairman Jennings agreed. Mr. Rupp stated that application will be discussed at a later date.

Application #98, Map 10

The request is to extend the LAMIRD of Onalaska. The GMA prohibits the County from expanding a LAMIRD unless it can show an error was made in its original designation. The County would need to prove that there was development on the property before July 1, 1990. There is no evidence that that is the case.

Commissioner Davis asked if there is no opportunity for Onalaska to grow their LAMIRD at some time in the future. Mr. Rupp stated no, given the circumstances that there is no previous evidence of development.

Commissioner Davis understands that it is the point of growth management to cluster and keep people in towns and not allow rural development. Mr. Rupp stated that is correct. The idea of the LAMIRD is to keep the concentration within the boundaries and infill within the LAMIRD. Eventually growth may occur and they can incorporate and become an urban growth area.

Application #122, Map 9

This consists of two parcels on North Fork Rd. The northern parcel was designated Class B ag and there is no evidence that an error was made in that designation.

The southern parcel did not meet ARL criteria and was re-zoned to RDD-10 during that process. It has significant wetlands, is subject to flooding and is in a sensitive aquifer recharge area. Re-zoning it to RDD-5 would also create a spot zone.

Application #173, Map 9

This application was made in 2009 following ARL designation. The property met ARL criteria and it is part of a larger 900 acre block of ARL with prime soils being used for agriculture.

Chairman Jennings asked about the owner's declaration that states the parcel does not have soils that are classified prime farmland if drained. Mr. Rupp stated a form was developed for the property owner to declare that the soils are not prime. The parcel appears to have 4-5 acres of prime soils that are classified prime if drained and the remaining soils are prime with no conditions. Removing this property from ARL designation would convert the current ag use within the greater 900 block by allowing a rural residential 1 in 5 development pattern to occur.

Commissioner Russell asked if there is a way they can develop that land under ag zoning assuming that is not drained. Mr. Rupp stated ag uses are still required to be applied. The declaration states that about one third of the southern property contains hydric soils; 4-5 acres are classified prime if drained which is a small portion of the 20 acres that are not drained.

Mr. Rupp stated that is the last application to discuss at this meeting.

Mr. Rupp stated an application was received for the Mineral property last week and that application has tentatively been scheduled to workshop on August 24.

Mr. Rupp stated when the entire review of the applications has been completed a recommendation will be made based on the questions and input from the Planning Commission during the workshops. The recommendations will be discussed and solidified and taken to public hearing.

Part of the consideration will be the distribution of RDD 5, 10 and 20 throughout Lewis County. When this process started, the rural lands were divided into thirds. We hope to maintain that distribution.

III. Calendar

The next meeting will be July 13, a workshop on the rezone requests for the geographic location East of I-5, north of Hwy 12 and south of SR 508.

Commissioner Russell stated earlier in this process he had asked about reviewing the uses in the LAMIRDs as part of the comp plan change. He asked if that is going to be done.

Mr. Rupp stated it would be a separate process by the Planning Commission for changing the uses allowed in a LAMIRD; it would not be a logical extension of this process. When we had a larger planning staff we intended to go through the zoning code and fix some poorly worded areas and inconsistencies and part of that may be looking at uses allowed in the LAMIRDs. It is on our list of things to do, however we have not had the staff or the time to work on that.

IV. Good of the Order

No one wished to speak.

V. Adjourn

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.