

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

**MINUTES**

**Clallam County Planning Commission**

*Regular Meeting of February 18, 2009  
6:30 P.M.*

*Clallam County Courthouse, 223 East Fourth Street, Suite 5  
Port Angeles, WA 98362*

*Teleconference: Forks City Hall, 500 E. Division, Forks, WA 98331*

- A. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.
- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.
- C. ROLL CALL: Members present were Chair Montgomery, Robert Miller, Ben Cappa, Nancy Esteb, Gary Gleason, Mel Rudin, Leo Leonard and Ron Bell. Don Myers was not present. Steve Gray, Planning Manager; and Selinda Barkhuis, Senior Planner, (Port Angeles meeting); and John Miller, Director; and Chad Theismann, Associate Planner; (Forks Teleconference), represented staff from the Department of Community Development.
- D. WELCOME: Chair Montgomery welcomed all in attendance.
- E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 4, 2009 Meeting Minutes.

Commissioner Cappa made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Gleason seconded the motion. Following a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

F. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Staff announced that Commissioner Myers' wife was coming home today, and that he plans to attend the March 4, 2009 meeting.

Commissioner Cappa reported that he met with Chad Theismann, Associate Planner, to work on a final preliminary draft of the Open Space Code update to take to the Open Space Work Group. It was his hope that following the Work Group meeting that a draft could be brought to the full Commission for review.

Commissioner Gleason reported that he attended a Trails Advisory Committee Meeting earlier today and that discussion was focused on the Trail east of Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, and along Lake Crescent and Fairholm Hill.

Commissioner Gleason reported that there was standing room only at the WRIA 18 Dungeness River Watershed Instream Flow Public Workshop conducted by the Department of Ecology tonight at John Wayne Marina, and that it was getting interesting when he had to leave.

- G. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There was no public comment.
- H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.
- I. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM: None.
- J. WORK SESSION ITEM:

**Preliminary Compliance Strategies**

Staff provided background information regarding the County's response to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board Order invalidating approximately 22,000 of Clallam County Rural Moderate (R2) and Western Region Rural Moderate (RW2) zoning as non-

compliant with the Growth Management Act. Staff also overviewed current interim controls, the County's appeal schedule, and upcoming public participation opportunities.

Handout materials included the consultants' Draft Report R2/RW2 Rural Zoning Strategies, information on how to track proceedings and contact information, compliance schedule, and regional packets containing neighborhood strategy recommendations.

Mike McCormick, Planning Consultant, began by indicating that the consultants' approach, which was developed with staff, was to look more finely with regard to recognizing the differences between eastern and western Clallam County. 37 neighborhood areas across the County's four regional planning areas were identified and analyzed for the approximately 22,000 acres of invalidated R2/RW2. Roger Wagoner, BHC Consultants, further discussed the methodology and analysis, and reviewed the strategy and strategy details as outlined in the Draft Report.

Both consultants used a PowerPoint Presentation to overview the existing conditions, local character and strategies for each of the 37 neighborhoods areas. The consultants noted that the term neighborhood is not the same as referenced neighborhoods within the County's comprehensive plan. Maps for each of the 37 neighborhood showing parcels, developed lots, and recommended zoning designation was presented. The Consultants also summarized existing conditions for each neighborhood in terms of parcel size (median, average), developed lots, vacant lots, infrastructure (e.g., roads, water systems) and surrounding character. The criteria for designation of recommended land use and zoning designations for the invalidated R2/RW2 areas were also presented.

A summary of Planning Commission and citizen comments related to specific neighborhoods follows:

### **SEQUIM-DUNGENESS PLANNING REGION (SDPR)**

#### Sequim South Neighborhood

- Palo Alto and Happy Valley are two distinct neighborhoods
- Jerry Sinn, 46 Quarter Horse Lane, Sequim, WA, indicated that his Homeowners Association has been split in half by the Bell Hill LAMIRD to the north and to the south by the Invalidated R2/RW2 area being recommended by the consultants to be zoned R5. He noted that the south area that includes his property share common facilities such as public water and City sewer similar to the LAMIRD properties to the north. He opposes the recommended R5 zoning, as not consistent with the zoning for other Homeowner Association properties.

#### Sequim Northeast 1 Neighborhood

- Battelle owns approximately 100-plus acres of shoreline parcels that do not meet the R2 criteria. Staff noted that Battelle has requested the Sequim UGA be expanded to include their existing research facilities and property so they can be served by city utilities.

#### Sequim Dungeness D1

- The question was raised why create an island of R5 zoning surrounded by areas to be retained by R2 zoning. It was noted that these parcels are very large and consist of a County and private gravel pits.

#### Central-East

- Discussion was had in regards to the recommended LAMIRD and R2 areas. It was noted that most lots within the designated LAMIRD are built out at densities exceeding R2 densities.

A general comment was made what would be wrong with being more aggressive in supporting R2 type densities.

A 10-minute break was taken.

#### Sequim West

- Robin Hill Park was identified on the map, and the question was posed as to what affect the park would have on proposed zoning for the neighborhood.

- Jim Beam, 832 Spath Road, Sequim, WA, spoke in opposition to the proposed R5 zoning with regard to his 20-acre property sandwiched between the Carlsborg UGA and areas recommended to be retained R2. Mr. Beam noted that the R5 zoning would limit him to four lots whereas nearby areas are developed at higher rural densities.
- Joan Ritchie, 363 Spath Road, Sequim, WA, spoke in opposition to the proposed R5 zoning with regard to the ability to subdivide her property.
- Several Commissioners's questioned the rationale for the checkerboard mix of R2, R4, and R5 recommended strategies for this large neighborhood and several other neighborhoods, and recommended to err on the side of R2 where a mix of lot sizes is prevalent.

#### Sequim North

- Christy Mitchell, 316 Robbins Road, Sequim, WA , expressed interest in rural clustering concept and agreed with the recommended strategy. She noted that they just came from the Dungeness Instream Flow meeting and were concerned that potential standards would limit a 5-acre property to 500 gallons of water per day.

General discussion was had regarding cluster development.

#### **PORT ANGELES PLANNING REGION (PAPR)**

No specific comments at this time.

#### **STRAITS PLANNING REGION (SPR)**

No specific comments at this time.

#### **WESTERN PLANNING REGION (WPR)**

##### Western North 1

Discussion was had regarding western region rural density and property right issues. The Consultant's noted that work will continue with the uses provision to try to accommodate property owner rights and concerns primarily relating to ancillary and accessory uses.

Discussion was had regarding density and the relationship of small pockets of development among large blocks of either public or private forest lands.

Commissioner Gleason asked whether the County could have different use tables for the various regions. Mike McCormick, Planning Consultant, replied absolutely, with consideration to size, scale, and intensity of rural uses. Mr. McCormick noted that the County already regulates use tables to some extent regionally. Commissioner Gleason supported that the R5 in the western region could have a different use table than the R5 in the Sequim-Dungeness Region.

The question was raised in regards to the strategy to consider more flexibility with accessory housing as to whether there was any limitation with the size of an accessory dwelling unit. Mr. McCormick responded that he does not know of any limitations with regard to the size of an accessory dwelling unit. Staff noted that the County's accessory housing standards were previously challenged by Futurewise in regards to density of detached units.

Discussion was had regarding the cluster density bonus being applied.

##### Western Central 1

- Diane Gaydeski, P.O. Box 802, Forks, WA 98331, indicated that she would not consider the entire area as "her neighborhood" – they have area-specific properties in this large area historically. She would like to see her neighborhood be separated between the developed areas to the north and the remaining farm. Commissioner Gleason asked if you follow Gaydeski Rd to the end, it then makes a curve, there's a series of triangle-shaped parcels that look to be 5 acre parcels – is there any likelihood that those will be developed? Ms. Gaydeski replied that future plans are unknown. It was noted that Ms. Gaydeski previously testified that the rural character of west-end areas can be retained at 1 du per 2.4 acres, and that she provided written comments regarding the history of the family farm and related development changes over-time.

Staff requested Commission members to continue to review the preliminary compliance strategies prepared by the Consultant's for further evaluation at the upcoming March 4 regular-meeting.

K. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There was no public comment.

L. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Gray  
Planning Manager