



THURSTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes July 20, 2011

1 **1. 6:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER**

2 Chair Lane called the July 20, 2011 meeting of the Thurston County Planning
3 Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioners provided self-introductions.
4

5 **Attendance:** Chair Chris Lane, Commissioners, Scott Nelson, Liz Kohlenberg, Christine
6 Spaulding, Christopher Earle , Edward Fleisher & Kathleen O'Connor
7

8 **Absent:** Jennifer Davis & Bill Jackson
9

10 **Staff:** Jeremy Davis, Scott Longanecker, Olivia Story, Andrew Deffobis, Cynthia Wilson
11 & Scott Clark
12

13 **2. 6:31 P.M. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

14
15 **MOTION: Commissioner O'Connor moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner**
16 **Earle seconded.**
17

18 Commissioner O'Connor asked to discuss an article that was in the Olympian in regards
19 to homeless encampments. **Motion carried as amended.**
20

21 The Olympian article stated that the City of Olympia was trying to modify their homeless
22 camps deadlines from ninety days to 180 days to be consistent with the County's
23 ordinance. The question from Commissioner O'Connor was when the Planning
24 Commission had worked on this issue they had attempted to mirror the City of Olympia's
25 ordinance with deadlines and now what was the difference. Ms. Story stated that the
26 recommendation from the Planning Commission had gone to the Board of County
27 Commissioners but they had decided to deviate from what they recommended.
28

29 **3. 6:32 P.M. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS (Not associated with topics for which**
30 **public hearings have been held.)**
31

32 To hear public testimony please use the following link:
33 [http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.h](http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.html)
34 [tml](http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/planning_comm_minutes.html)
35

- 36 1. *Mark Kelly – 3419 Lynn Court NE Lacey, WA 98516 – Has been concerned with the*
37 *County's discrepancies on the Growth Management Hearings Board case decision.*
38 *Also stated that the County is not using best available science in developing the CAO*
39 *and is changing policy which is in return affecting the property owner negatively.*
40 2. *Dave Lewis – 400 Valley Avenue NE Puyallup, WA 98372 – Is disappointed that*
41 *County staff has not contacted him and William Hilton to aid in the Mineral Lands*
42 *GMHB Compliance and urges them to do so that we don't have to go back in front of*
43 *the GMHB.*

1 **4. 6:38 P.M. WORK SESSION: Mineral Lands – GMHB Compliance**

2 *Staff: Olivia Story*

3
4 Ms. Story stated that within the packet that was sent out last week were the power point
5 presentation and the table that the Planning Commission had requested. Within the table
6 they will be adding in another section where they will be filling in the minimum
7 guidelines. Three WAC's were also sent and will be discussed.

8
9 The Growth Management Hearings Board Final Decision and Order is available for
10 viewing on line at:

11
12 [http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/agenda/2011-07-06/pc-](http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/agenda/2011-07-06/pc-agenda-20110706-fdo-20110523.pdf)
13 [agenda-20110706-fdo-20110523.pdf](http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/planning_commission/agenda/2011-07-06/pc-agenda-20110706-fdo-20110523.pdf)

14
15 The text that is in question says “mineral resource lands may not include lands that are
16 designated for long term forestry”. The task force recommendation was to allow the code
17 designation as long as there was no net loss. The planning commission also agreed with
18 this recommendation and in return recommended it to the Board of County
19 Commissioners (BOCC). The BOCC disagree and decided to prohibit the code
20 designation of mineral lands and forest lands because they thought that there was too
21 much to lose, that the forest would not be able to be reclaimable. Staff is recommending
22 the code designation again of forest and mineral lands because they have no valid
23 evidence through research that there was a reason to prohibit the code designation and it
24 is not incompatible. Option A would leave the text the way it is and continue to prohibit
25 the code designation. Option B was to strike out the word “not” and allow both the
26 mineral lands and the forest lands to be in the same area. Option C would allow the
27 planning commission to draft their own new language. All three of these options will go
28 to public hearing however so that the public will see the issues. A short discussion
29 ensued. After the discussion, all of the planning commissioners that were in attendance
30 agreed with the staff recommendation which is Option B.

31
32 At the next planning commission meeting staff will be discussing the critical areas and
33 the best available science and compare those to the WAC's.

34
35 **5. 6:49 P.M. SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR: Mineral Lands – GMHB Compliance**

36 *Staff: Olivia Story*

37
38 **MOTION: Commissioner O'Connor moved to set a public hearing for Mineral Lands –**
39 **GMHB Compliance on September 7, 2011. Commissioner Earle seconded. Motion**
40 **carried.**

41
42 **6. 6:51 P.M. WORK SESSION: Draft Findings for Development Code A-7 Farm**
43 **Stands and A-10 Rural Home Occupation Road Standards**

44 *Staff: Scott Longanecker*

45
46 Mr. Longanecker explained that he had drafted a letter to the BOCC of the draft findings
47 and recommendation of both A-7 Farm Stands and A-10 Home Occupation Road
48 Standards. A short discussion ensued.

1
2 The letters to the BOCC can be viewed on the planning commission website.
3

4 **MOTION: Commissioner Spaulding moved to recommend approval of amendments to**
5 **Title 20 Chapter 20.54.070 and 20.54 table 1 of the Thurston County Development Code**
6 **to promote farm stands and most zoning districts and provide uniform standards for**
7 **their placement and operation. Commissioner Fleisher seconded. Motion carried.**
8

9 Findings for Development Code A-10 were then discussed. Commissioner Earle brought
10 up a concern with clause number one, particularly where it says “all reviews and
11 activities are the responsibility of the property owners.” The commission asked that Mr.
12 Longanecker ask Jeff Fancher, the County’s prosecuting attorney to confirm that the
13 language is the way staff and the commission are interpreting it.
14

15 **MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved to recommend approval of amendments to**
16 **Title 20 Chapter 20.54.070 of the Thurston County Development Code to promote**
17 **flexibility road surface standards for home occupations and home based industries in**
18 **rural Thurston County including the findings presented by staff numbers 1-9.**
19 **Commissioner O’Connor seconded. Motion carried.**
20

21 7. **7:05 P.M. WORK SESSION: Critical Areas Ordinance: Geohazards**
22 *Staff: Jeremy Davis, Andrew Deffobis, Cynthia Wilson & Scott Clark*
23

24 Mr. Deffobis explained that the draft chapter of Geologic Hazards was being passed out
25 along with the jurisdictional comparison. The first is a jurisdictional comparison table
26 that outlines how landslide hazard definitions and buffers, among other considerations,
27 are addressed by cities within Thurston County and neighboring jurisdictions. The
28 second is a comparison table that highlights differences between the current and proposed
29 CAO provisions pertaining to geologic hazards.
30

31 The purpose of the geological hazards draft chapter is to protect public health and safety,
32 avoid or minimize property damage, avoid or minimize erosion and landslide hazards on
33 wetlands and important habitats and species and identify and map geologic hazard areas.
34 The chapter applies to erosion hazard areas, landslide hazard areas and marine bluff
35 hazard areas. The provisions of the chapter do not apply to the following three types of
36 geologically hazardous areas; seismic hazard areas, volcanic hazard areas and mine
37 hazard areas. The proposal for a standard buffer for landslide hazard areas and marine
38 bluff hazard areas are; fifty feet from toe and top of slope, or a distance measured as
39 follows: Landslide Hazard Areas. A buffer from the toe and top of slope equal to the
40 following: The distance measured from the toe of slope upward at a slope of 2:1
41 (horizontal to vertical) to a point that intersects with the existing topography of the site;
42 or Marine Bluff Hazard Areas. A distance from the ordinary high water mark landward
43 at a slope of 2:1 (horizontal to vertical) which intersects with the existing topography of
44 the site; or the minimum distance recommended by the geotechnical professional in the
45 geological assessment, measured outward from the toe and top of slope.
46
47
48

1 **8. 7:23 P.M. STAFF UPDATES**

2
3 Mr. Clark provided the following staff updates:

- 4
- 5 • The interim Prairie/Oak Renewal Ordinance Hearing went well and was properly
6 advertised. The hearing started at approximately 5:30 and ended approximately at
7 8:30. Members of the public were allowed to sign up at the sign-up sheet table at
8 a first come first serve basis. Overflow rooms were provided where the public
9 could listen and view the public hearing on a video display. 277 people signed in
10 at the hearing but only 103 signed in to speak with 92 actually speaking. 41
11 people spoke in favor of the ordinance and 49 spoke in opposition. 2 people
12 spoke with recommended changes. The Planning Commission was encouraged to
13 watch the video tape of the hearing. 224 comments were received in favor of the
14 ordinance but 17 of those were from individuals who commented twice. 56
15 comments were received against the ordinance but 5 of those were from
16 individuals who commented twice. All of the information, public comments,
17 sign-in sheets etc will be posted on the website by Thursday July 21, 2011.
 - 18 • Staff is working toward the end of October for a Planning Commission public
19 hearing on the CAO. The call to have the hearing then or not will be made at the
20 last Planning Commission meeting in September.
 - 21 • Again, the Nisqually Tribe Jail that will also house prisoners from other
22 jurisdictions is causing public concern.
- 23

24 Chair Lane commented on the comment made by Dave Lewis and how he had not been
25 contacted by staff in regards to helping with the GMHB compliance. He would like to
26 see staff follow up on this. Olivia Story will be contacting Mr. Lewis to discuss.

27
28 **9. 7:28 P.M. CALENDAR**

29
30 August 3, 2011 – Chair Lane & Commissioner Kohlenberg will not be in attendance.

31
32 **10. 7:29 PM ADJOURN**

33
34 With there being no further business, Chair Lane adjourned the meeting at 7:29 p.m.

35
36
37
38
39 _____
Chris Lane, Chair

40
41 Prepared by Carrie Toebbe, Recording Secretary