



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

COMMUNITY PLANNING SUMMARY MINUTES

Rural Lands Task Force Meeting #2 – June 16, 2009

Members Present: Ginger Burr, Sharon Bussler, Dan Dupuis, Russ Grattan, Doug Hagedorn, Rocque Merritt, Monty Multanen, Mike Posey, Danny Walsh, Byron Woltersdorf, Bill Zimmerman, and Robert Zumstein
Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Gordy Euler, and Jose Alvarez

The meeting began at 6:05 pm. A brief discussion was held about how public comment should happen. The group decided that they should listen to public comment rather than engage in a dialog or debate. It was also decided that public comment would happen after the break.

The group asked about having a meeting on June 30. **NOTE: The next meeting will be June 30, 6:00 p.m. at the Dollars Corner fire station.**

Ginger asked about putting the recommendations of the group into the minutes. There was also a request for a county soils map for when the task force discussion of agriculture begins.

Gordy explained the material for the meeting: the agenda, summary minutes from the 6/2/09 meeting, and a package of information about rural centers. The package included the comp plan rural center policies, the Title 40 sections on rural center residential districts (Section 40.210.030) and commercial districts (Section 40.230.010), and proposed code language for the rural center mixed use overlay district. Handed out at the meeting were maps of the rural centers, information on rural lands capacity, and a breakdown of rural land acreages.

The group began its discussion of rural centers.

Recommendation: Increase residential densities in rural centers, where appropriate, to protect lands outside of rural centers and to balance GMA goals.

Densities of a half-acre or a quarter-acre were suggested, but there was no specific size recommended. Doing away with the RC-2.5 district (minimum residential lot size of 2.5 acres) was also suggested.

The group next reviewed the comprehensive plan policies on rural centers (found in Chapter 3 Rural Element), and made the following recommendations:

Recommendation:

County 20-Year Plan Policies

RURAL CENTERS (pp. 3-17 and 3-18)

GOAL: Maintain the character of the designated Rural Centers within the surrounding rural area that is appropriate in character and scale in the rural environment.

3.2 Policies

3.2.1 Rural Centers designated on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map are distinct areas of smaller lot patterns with residential development, small-scale business that provides convenience shopping and services to nearby rural residents, have access to arterial roadways, and are surrounded by ~~protected~~ rural landscapes of generally open land used for agriculture, forestry, large lot residential, recreational and environmental protection purposes. The Rural Centers identified on the Comprehensive Plan map are: Amboy, Brush Prairie, Chelatchie Prairie, Dollars Corner, Fargher Lake, Hockinson, and Meadow Glade.

3.2.2 Rural Centers should serve the following purposes:

- provide a focus for the surrounding rural area that is appropriate in character and scale in the rural environment;
- provide appropriate commercial and industrial lands for job growth opportunity and developments to serve adjoining rural areas and for tax base to support schools districts;
- provide services to tourists and other visitors recreating in the area; and,
- provide an opportunity to develop facilities that can function as a community center in those areas where an incorporated town no longer serves that role for the surrounding area.

3.2.3 Designation criteria for Rural Centers include identification of pre-existing small lot development patterns, natural features as boundaries, and access to arterials.

3.2.4 Rural commercial development should support the needs of rural residents and natural resources activities, ~~rather than urban area uses.~~

3.2.5 Schools and related facilities are strongly encouraged to locate within the urban growth areas. Schools may be located in the urban reserve areas (URA) or rural areas where necessary to serve population growth within and outside of the urban growth boundary (for specific schools policies see Chapter 10).

3.2.6 If schools serving predominantly rural populations cannot be located in UGAs or within ¼-mile of a UGA, preference shall be to locate the schools in Rural Centers and as a last resort, rural areas.

3.2.6 Schools and related facilities are strongly encouraged to locate within the urban growth areas. Schools may be located in the urban reserve areas (URA) or rural areas where necessary to serve population growth within and outside of the urban growth boundary (for specific schools policies see Chapter 10).

3.2.7 Encourage resource based industrial development to locate within Rural Centers, consistent with rural character and levels of service.

3.2.8 Encourage uses, such as rural commercial, post offices, veterinary clinics, day care, emergency services, small medical practices and schools that provide employment, shopping services and housing opportunities within Rural Centers. The scale should be compatible with surrounding roads and utilities, which reinforce the rural character and distinct sense of community.

3.2.9 Rural Centers shall have a density of between one unit per acre and one unit per five acres based on the historical lot pattern in the area. In no case shall density exceed one unit per acre.

3.2.10 Commercial activities in rural areas should be located in Rural Centers. Commercial uses supporting resource uses, such as packing, first stage processing and processing which provides value added to resource products may occur in resource areas.

3.2.11 A new Rural Center or a boundary expansion of an existing Rural Center shall be considered and evaluated by the county through the annual review under CCC 40.560 and pursuant to RCW36.70A.070 (5)(d).

3.2.12 Before the county considers a new Rural Center the proponent(s) shall submit to the county a petition signed by at least 60 percent of the property owners of the land within the boundaries of the proposed new Rural Center.

After a break, there was public comment. Comments were made by Mark Lawecki, Lew Blakesly, William Doty, and Rita Dietrich.

There was discussion of possible new policies to add. The policy adopted by the Board in Ordinance 1998-06-20 on the rural center mixed use overlay is as follows:

Rural centers may contain designated mixed use areas in appropriate locations. These areas shall be identified with a mixed use overlay until such time as implementing regulations are adopted by the county. The regulations shall consider the unique circumstances of the specific rural center and may be different for each of the rural centers that contain mixed use designations. Regulations should involve limitations on density and contain design guidelines in order to maintain the rural character of these areas. Densities shall be limited to no more than 2 units per acre and no more than 2 units per structure.

The task force will discuss this at its next meeting.

There are about 50 parcels in Amboy, Chelatchie Prairie, and Hockinson designated with a mixed use overlay, but no implementing language was ever adopted. Gordy explained the proposed code language that would implement the overlay.

Recommendation: Adopt the proposed code language (proposed Section 40.250.060) to implement the Rural Center-Mixed Use Overlay.

Additional items of interest for discussion with regard to rural centers:

- Apply the overlay district in other rural centers but only along major roads.
- Designate light industrial where appropriate to buffer resource land from rural center residential.
- Consider alternative energy sources.
- Allow mixed use on commercial parcels as well.

These are all topics for the next meeting. Also to be discussed are the allowable residential and commercial uses in rural centers.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

NOTE: The next meeting will be Tuesday, June 30, 2009 at the Dollars Corner fire station, 21609 NE 72nd Avenue, beginning at 6 p.m.