

**GRANT COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Chairman: Bill Bailey
 Vice Chairman:
 Board Members: Carol Dawson, Terry Dorsing, Ann Drader, Blair Fuglie and Kevin Richards
 Secretary: Doris Long

COMMISSIONERS' HEARING ROOM - GRANT COUNTY COURTHOUSE, EPHRATA, WASHINGTON

DECEMBER 6, 2017 @ 7:00 P.M.

2017 Attendance

NAME	JAN	FEB	MAR	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
BAILEY	P P	NM	P	NM	NM	P P	NM	NM	P P	NM	P	P
DAWSON	A A	NM	P	NM	NM	A P	NM	NM	P P	NM	P	P
DORSING	P P	NM	A	NM	NM	P P	NM	NM	P P	NM	A	A
DRADER	A P	NM	P	NM	NM	P P	NM	NM	P P	NM	P	W
FLEMING	P P	NM	P	NM	NM	P P	NM	NM	Mr. Fleming Resigned 08/2017			
FUGLIE	P P	NM	P	NM	NM	P P	NM	NM	P A	NM	P	A
RICHARDS	P P	NM	P	NM	NM	P P	NM	NM	P P	NM	P	W

P=Present A=Absent C=Canceled W=Webex NM=No Meeting Held

Chairman, Bill Bailey, opens the meeting at 7:01 p.m.
 Planning Commissioners, Ann Drader and Kevin Richards, are attending the meeting via Webex.

Mr. Floyd states that Ferdouse Oneza is also attending the workshop via Webex.

Board Action:

Approval of November 1, 2017 Planning Commission minutes.

Ms. Dawson moves to approve the minutes.

Ms. Drader seconds the motion.

ACTION: Carol Dawson moves to approve the November 1, 2017 minutes. Ann Drader seconds the motion.

Voted on and passes unanimously.

Mr. Floyd explains the plan is to review the Land Use chapter, including associated mapping, and Housing. Ferdouse Oneza has been the lead author on these chapters, making all the edits, so she will be providing the overview.

Ms. Oneza explains the overall approach of the update process has been to minimize the language, thereby creating a more efficient and user friendly document. Repetitive information has been removed, while updated data has been added, as well as relevant information to be consistent with the Growth Management Act. The Land Use Element chapter begins with some introductory discussion regarding the relationship of the Plan with other Planning efforts, coordinating with the Cities on population projections, and their Comp Plans and Urban Growth Areas.

CHAPTER 5 LAND USE ELEMENT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 Organization of this Element

5.2 RELATIONSHIP TO GMA AND OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS

5.2.1 Growth Management Act Requirements

5.2.2 City and Town Comprehensive Plans

5.2.3 Airports

5.2.4 Stormwater

5.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

5.3.1 Regional Context

Under the Existing Conditions of Grant County, the regional context, the setting, natural setting and ownership of land were all looked at.

5.3.2 Land Ownership

It was found that about 29% of the land is owned by public agencies.

5.3.3 Land Use Inventory

Types of land use looked at were Agricultural, Residential and Commercial.

5.3.4 Population Growth

Looked at past trends of growth to project future population growth.

5.4 LAND USE CATEGORIES

5.4.1 Overview

Looked at three major categories of land use, Urban Lands, Rural Lands and Resource Lands, as well as Open Space and Recreation. Each category will have sub-categories under them. Urban Lands: cities and UGAs. Rural Lands: rural densities, rural characters and types of rural land use. Resource Lands: agricultural lands, dry lands and range lands. Open Space and Recreation: natural resource and open space lands.

5.4.2 Urban Lands

5.4.2.1 Introduction

5.4.2.2 Roles of Cities and Counties

5.4.2.3 Urban Growth Areas

5.4.2.4 Urban Land Use Designations

5.4.2.5 Urban Growth Area Designation Process

5.4.2.5.1 Designation Process

5.4.2.5.2 Review of Urban Growth Areas

5.4.2.6 Joint Planning Within Urban Growth Areas

5.4.2.7 Major Considerations

5.4.2.7.1 Urban Character

5.4.2.7.2 Transition of Land Uses

5.4.2.7.3 Maintaining Livability

5.4.2.7.4 Concurrency

5.4.3 Rural Lands

Identify what Rural Land and Rural Character are. Rural Character has open space; natural areas; rural lifestyle and a limited capacity of services.

5.4.3.1 Introduction

5.4.3.2 Growth Management Act Provisions

5.4.3.3 Rural Character

5.4.3.3.1 Rural Settlement Trends

5.4.3.3.2 Rural Character of Grant County

Some of the rural characteristics of Grant County are large areas of undeveloped land and open space. Scattered low-density, single family homes and clustered dense residential housing.

5.4.3.4 Major Considerations

5.4.3.4.1 Rural Character

5.4.3.4.2 Density

5.4.3.4.3 Services

5.4.3.5 Availability of Water Supply

5.4.3.6 Rural Land Designations

The Rural Land Use Designations are Urban Reserve, Rural Residential, Rural Remote and Rural Resource. The criteria for the Agricultural land classification were looked at. As a result, some of the land was removed and re-designated as Rural Resource, which is a newly created designation for this purpose. Rural Resource will have a residential density of 1 unit per 40 acres.

Mr. Floyd states that Residential 1 and 2 have been consolidated into Rural Residential, as there is now no functional difference between the two.

5.4.3.7 Urban Reserve – 1 Unit per 5 Acres

5.4.3.8 Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development

LAMIRDs are clusters of areas with more intense development found in Rural Lands. Some of the land use categories are: Rural Community, Rural Village, Recreational Development and Shoreline Development.

5.4.3.9 Master Planned Resorts

Master Planned Resort, a self-contained community, is also a land use category under Rural Lands.

5.4.3.10 Major Industrial Developments

Major Industrial Developments is available for industrial development outside of an Urban Growth Area.

5.4.3.11 Master Planned Industrial

There is discussion regarding the Master Planned Industrial designation concerning existing designated areas, and the possibility of designating new areas.

5.4.3.12 Measures Guiding Rural Development

5.4.3.12.1 Containing Rural Development

5.4.3.12.2 Assuring Visual Compatibility

5.4.3.12.3 Reducing Inappropriate Conversion of Undeveloped Land

5.4.3.12.4 Protecting Critical Areas and Water Quality

5.4.3.12.5 Protecting Resource Lands

5.4.4 Resource Lands

Resource lands designations are Agricultural lands, Forest lands, and Mineral lands. Long-term Commercial Significance also needs to be considered.

Mr. Bailey questions where Forest Resource lands are located in Grant County. After a short discussion it is decided to leave Forest Resource Areas in the definitions, but to also note that there are none located within Grant County.

5.4.4.1 Introduction

5.4.4.2 Definition of Resource Lands

5.4.4.3 County Policy Statement

5.4.4.4 Review Procedures

5.4.4.5 Agricultural Resources Lands

5.4.4.6 Economic Importance of Agriculture

Economic Importance of Agriculture is a new section that was added.

Mr. Bailey requests to have potatoes and hay listed in this section.

5.4.4.7 Future of Agriculture

5.4.4.8 Major Issues

5.4.4.8.1 Loss of Irrigable and Irrigated Land

5.4.4.8.2 Incompatible Development

5.4.4.8.3 Increased Property Taxes

5.4.4.9 Classification and Designation

The Classification and Designation section is basically the summary of the AG Memo. Some AG lands are being reclassified as Rural Resource, and other lands are being brought in as AG land.

5.4.4.10 Forest Lands

5.4.4.11 Mineral Lands

Used DNR mapping to locate DNR surface mining permits in order to exclude those located within any designated UGA boundary, Rural Village, Rural Community or LAMIRD.

Mr. Floyd stated that he thought there would be more rock quarries in the County. The DNR data did not show many.

Discussion takes place.

Mr. Hooper suggests researching the DNR SM6 permits to get an idea of where mining sites are located.

Mr. Richards suggests also looking at the SM8 permits, which may be easier to track at the State level. He also comments the mining of pillar rock is unique to Grant County as well.

Mr. Floyd replies this information will be researched, and this section will be updated.

5.4.4.11.1 Economic Importance of Mining

5.4.4.11.2 Current Zoning Practices

5.4.4.11.3 Major Issues

5.4.4.11.4 Mineral Lands Assessment Criteria

5.4.4.12 Resource Land Residential Density Policy

5.4.5 Open Space and Recreation

The Open Space and Recreation section is a general discussion of the inventory of these areas. Grant County has one ORV Park. Most Open Space is owned by public agencies or private entities. There are plenty of recreational areas including several State Parks.

Mr. Bailey comments that the Moses Lake Park is no longer a State park, but is now a City park.

5.4.5.1 Introduction

5.4.5.2 Purpose

5.4.5.3 Open Space Designation

Ms. Drader asks if there are any areas designated for future development of trails, to protect the land from being used in other development projects.

Mr. Hooper replies that Public Works does maintain a trails fund, and often works with Cities to develop trails. Those jurisdictions seem to be more apt to develop trails. He is not aware of any concerted efforts to designate trail areas within the County.

Ms. Drader explained areas such as old rail passages, or desirable trail areas, could possibly be kept from being developed over.

Discussion takes place.

Mr. Hooper comments that trails could be addressed in the Comp Plan as an action, a goal, or as policies to support trails where they are appropriate.

Mr. Floyd adds that the existing known trail systems, in the unincorporated areas, could possibly be added as a map layer.

5.5 POPULATION PROJECTION

Analysis of future population projections for the next 20 years. It is estimated that the population in unincorporated Grant County will increase by approximately 39,000. The past rate of growth has been 1.1%. Used OFM data to coordinate with the Cities regarding their future projections.

Mr. Richards explains he spoke with the Chairman of the City of Moses Lake's Planning Commission and they are interested in adjusting their Urban Growth Area.

Discussion takes place.

5.6 FUTURE LAND AND HOUSING NEEDS

The population projection helps to identify how much land capacity will be required to accommodate future population.

5.7 MAPS AND REFERENCES

Mr. Hooper explains there are two map sets; an Urban Growth Area exhibit for each city/town within the County, and an exhibit that reflects all of the figures that currently exists in the Comp Plan, or new exhibits that are being brought in.

Mr. Floyd reviews the Draft 2018 Map Portfolio with the Planning Commission.

Figure 1: Vicinity Map

Figure 2: Publicly Owned Lands

Figure 3: Existing Land Cover

Agriculture, Grassland, Sagebrush Steppe, Sagebrush Shrubland, Conservation Reserve Program Lands

Figure 4: Existing Land Use

Dryland Agriculture, Irrigated Agriculture, Rangeland, Orchard, Commercial and Industrial, Recreational, Residential.

Mr. Hooper explains this is not necessarily predicated on existing zoning, but on DOR codes that the Assessor's Office applies to properties during the assessment process.

Figure 5: Future Land Use Designations

Two changes reflected in this map are the addition of Rural Resource Lands and consolidating the Rural Residential 1 and Rural Residential 2 designations.

Mr. Floyd encourages the Planning Commission to study the map, and identify any areas that may need to be adjusted.

Figure 6: 1981-2010 Annual Average Precipitation

Figure 7: General Soils

Mr. Hooper explains for display purposes the four major soil types found in the County were consolidated.

Figure 8: Water Resources

Shorelines of the State, Shoreline Master Program Areas, Quincy Groundwater Subarea, Water Resources Inventory Area, Black Sands Irrigation District

Figure 9: Wetlands, Rivers and Streams

Surface waters and wetlands.

Figure 10: Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas

Wellhead protection area represents a 10 year travel time of any kind of surface contaminant that could get into the wells.

Figure 11: Frequently Flooded Areas

Figure 12: Geologically Hazardous Areas

Figure 13: Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

Figure 14: Transportation-Existing Major Facilities

Figure 15: Transmission Lines and Canals

Figure 16: Parks and Recreation

Mr. Floyd comments that this is the map where the trails could be added.

Ms. Drader replies that she would also like to see existing trails displayed in the UGAs to demonstrate where those trails could possibly be expanded into immediate County lands.

Figure 17: Notable Places

Mr. Hooper explains this is the resulting attempt at fulfilling Ms. Drader's desire to include a historical element in the Comp Plan. The areas noted may not necessarily be historical, but they are significant features, which are tourism and historic based. He encourages the Planning Commission to convey any additional points of interest they feel should be included on the map.

Mr. Floyd recommends looking at the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's historic sites layer.

Mr. Floyd states the second map set displays the land uses within the Urban Growth Areas around the cities. The maps include an aerial imagery of the incorporated city, the city limits, the UGA and the land use designations.

Ms. Oneza points out these maps provide a detailed illustration of the land use designations located around the cities.

Mr. Richards asks if, on the City UGA maps, where an icon of the State of Washington with a red dot marking the City's location is being shown, an icon of Grant County with a red dot, could be used instead.

5.8 HISTORIC PLATS

CHAPTER 7 HOUSING ELEMENT

Ms. Oneza explains this was one of the most extensive detailed housing chapters she has worked with. The redundancies were trimmed out, and data was updated.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Contains information related to the types of housing found in the Urban zoning designations.

7.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

86% of the housing units are occupied. 61% are owner occupied housing units. 58% are single family housing units. (Table 7-1, census data)

Mr. Bailey asks if the mobile home number, listed in the Housing Types table, includes manufactured homes.

Ms. Oneza replies because manufactured homes are allowed in any of the zoning designations, data is not separated out anymore. The census data identifies mobile home parks, so that is what the table reflects.

Mr. Bailey comments that mobile homes are categorized as being manufactured prior to 1976 and manufactured homes after.

Discussion takes place.

Ms. Oneza will check into this.

7.2.1 Income and Affordability

The median household income for Grant County is approximately \$49,000. Approximately 27% of households have an income range between \$25,000 and \$49,000. (Table 7-3, census data)

7.2.2 Condition of Housing Stock

This section relates to the condition and age of homes. Most of the housing units were built between 1990 and 2009. (Table 7-4, census data)

7.3 NEEDS ASSESSMENT

7.3.1 Population Projections and Future Housing Needs

Anticipated future housing needs.

7.3.2 Future Considerations

Types of housing that is needed.

7.3.3 Farmworker and H2A Housing

Details related to the need of guest worker programs, and H2A housing were added, and how it is monitored.

Mr. Bailey asks if the Employment Security Department was contacted regarding the number of H2As in the County.

Mr. Floyd replies that they haven't, but that is a good idea.

7.3.4 Housing Type and Mix

Discusses clustering, manufactured housing and accessory housing.

Mr. Floyd explains the State looks at accessory dwelling units from the affordable housing stand point. This is contained in the current Comp Plan, and Commerce is pleased to see that it is already addressed.

Ms. Oneza comments that this is according to the Growth Management Act; communities should have accessory dwelling units as a way to address housing needs.

7.3.5 Manufactured/Mobile Housing

7.3.6 Housing Density

7.3.7 Housing Finance

7.3.8 Housing Rehabilitation

7.3.9 Public Housing Assistance

The Grant County Housing Authority manages various types of housing in multiple locations around the County. (Table 7-5)

7.3.10 Special Housing Needs

7.3.11 Affordable Housing Programs

Multiple resources are available, to communities in Washington State, for affordable housing. There are programs such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Washington State Housing Finance Commission and Department of Commerce Housing Division.

Mr. Floyd encourages the Planning Commission to read through the changes that were made, and if something was edited out that should not have been, let him know.

Mr. Hooper reports that during the February meeting, prior to the workshop, there will be two public hearings for proposed Code amendments.

The next workshop will be held on January 17th. The draft versions of the Economic Element, Natural Setting Element and Critical Areas section will be reviewed. The Critical Areas is basically what was previously approved in the SMP.

February 7th the complete compiled draft Plan will be presented. The remaining chapters will be covered; plan development, County profile, transportation and capital facilities.

Somewhere between February 9th and the 23rd the draft version will be issued to the State Department of Commerce for a 60 day review, and issued for public comment. The SEPA review will also be completed during that time period.

In either late April or early May, depending upon the comments received, the Planning Commission will hold their public hearing.

At this point there are too many unknowns to have a definite set schedule.

Meeting adjourned at 8:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted:


Doris Long, Secretary

Approved by:


Bill Bailey, Chairman