



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

1 A meeting of the Okanogan County Planning Commission will be held March 23rd, 2015 at 7:00
2 PM. The meeting will be held in the Okanogan County Commissioners Hearing Room, 123 5th
3 Ave. N., Okanogan, Washington.

4 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS** present included: Chair Albert Roberts, Vice Chair Phil
5 Dart, Commission Member Dave Schulz, Commission Member Marlene Rawley and Commission
6 Member Tamara Porter.

7 **OKANOGAN COUNTY STAFF MEMBERS** present included: Director of Planning Perry Huston,
8 Natural Resource Planner II Angie Hubbard and Administrative Secretary Kellie Conn.

9 **OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Lennard Jordan, Kirsten Kirkby, John Crandall, Angela Safilippo.

10 Old Business

11 **Public Hearing: Revised Shoreline Master Program**

12 Chair Roberts called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM.

13 First thing is to approve the March 23 agenda, Chair Roberts made a motion to approve the March
14 23, 2015 agenda, the motion carried.

15 Chair Roberts made a motion to approve the February 23, 2015 meeting minutes the motion
16 carried with the correction of line 41 add IO and consultant Sandy Mackie.

17 Commission member Dave Schulz made a motion to approve the March 9, 2015 special meeting
18 minutes, the motion carried with the correction of line 31 which should read as 'lot size, not 'line
19 size'.

20 Director Perry Huston director of Okanogan County Planning stated that tonight is the night for
21 deliberation on the SMP. On the table is a memo from Mr. Mackie who is not here tonight, this is
22 his response. You have received the comments. In terms of process requirements, the SMP went
23 from you to the BOCC, and now back to you, we would like a recommendation with suggested
24 changes for review which will be sent back to the BOCC. We do not need findings and
25 conclusions from the Planning Commission. The final decision will be made by the Department of
26 Ecology. Once it leaves the Planning Commission the environmental review will be done by Perry.

27 Perry brought up the question of author ship. Many fingerprints are on the SMP Perry will leave it
28 to the Planning Commission to identify author ship. We can spend time debating, but it boils down
29 to what you want to do with the draft. Perry will leave it up for deliberations.

30 Commission member Rawley has questions about using the best available science. How can we
31 defend against that charge to create a clear and concise record so that we are not in remiss?
32 Perry replied that when we began this project by receiving the grant from the Department of
33 Ecology a great deal of that money went to the assessment. The initial analysis was done by
34 specialists in their field, and was done before the discussion of designations. This science was
35 geared towards our analysis of functionality of the shoreline areas of Okanogan County.

36 Commission member Porter asked to be refreshed on ENTRIX. Perry explained that ENTRIX is
37 a consulting firm. Porter wanted to know how ENTRIX differs from community groups. ENTRIX
38 is a company who did our scientific analysis, the community groups were our local eyes. The
39 objective is no net loss. It was conducted and scoring led to designations. They developed the
40 scoring system with the help of the advisory group.

41 The scientific analysis is a snap shot in time; the regulation is geared toward the objective of no
42 net loss. The BOCC will adopt the functionality. Commissioner Porter asked if there are any
43 documents saying that ENTRIX was accepted by the BOCC. Perry replied that the
44 commissioners feel comfortable with the draft and this is why they have sent it back to the PC.
45 Perry does not know if the BOCC will adopt. ENTRIX conducted the analysis and were not told
46 how to regulate; they simply conducted the analysis. Once we get into the regulatory crafting, the
47 zoning, we have room to maneuver the regulations to get to our objective, but science is science.

48 Commission member Porter made a point that she cannot read the map very well and have found
49 inadequacies throughout the SMP. Commission member Schulz replied that the studies that come
50 in will have flaws. He gave illustrations to this fact. Commission member Porter said that the
51 members should stick up for the areas that we know. Commission member Dave spoke about
52 letters from the public that the PC has received. He read a letter from a commenter who feels that
53 the PC does not have enough experience to make decisions. BOCC has to depend on legal
54 expertise. Commission member Porter feels that special interest groups are a problem. Discussion
55 between the planning members.

56 Commission member Schulz asked the other members how they feel about lot lines down to the
57 river. We have critical area ordinances with many studies; member Schulz is not in favor of lot lines
58 or fences down to the river because of the critical management of wild life. It is very complicated.

59 Commission member Rawley wanted to discuss fences. Agricultural people need deer fences
60 around orchards, she does not want to prohibit fences; she would like lot lines to run to the
61 ordinary high water mark. This creates issues for people who share the common area. We should
62 discuss a more creative solution like wild life friendly fences.

63 Commission Dart said that they build deer fences parallel to the water. Along the Okanogan River
64 they have developments with a common area, more headache than fences because of traffic or
65 nobody takes care of the common area. Dart would rather have a fence than burdock. Member
66 Rawley said that maybe the solution is to have wild life friendly fences. Member Porter gave her
67 thoughts on fences. Member Dart made a point that the agriculture people put in fences. Member
68 Schulz has an orchard with property that goes to the river; he took a copy of the RCW and posted
69 a sign, because of dumping issues no vehicles down to the area. Member Schulz says many
70 studies have been done for deer; there are maps that show the migration routes, etc.

71 Chair member Robert Alberts gave his thoughts on fences.

72 Rawley asked if that would be more appropriate to include fences in the zoning code. Director
73 Huston stated that we do not regulate fences in the SMP. Perry said that we had previous
74 discussions of this. Perry would like the Planning Commission to focus on more important matters.
75 Move on to the next issue dealing with the Shoreline Master's Program.

76 Member Dart spoke about the cumulative impact analysis and while reading it, became lost. Wants
77 to know what the negative numbers are in the chart. NR Planner Angie Hubbard explained that
78 these negative numbers or minus means. Director Huston said that they should have taken the
79 negative numbers and rounded up to 0. Math resulted in a negative number. Dart asked that if
80 the number is negative does that mean that there is no buildable area along the Twisp river? The
81 negative number means there is no development for property under the existing regulations
82 dealing with shorelines.

83 Chair Alberts asked about Residential page 91 within the conservation easement which is a prior
84 arrangement. There is a difference between designation and conservation. Angie read the
85 definition designation and conservation easement to everyone.

86 Back to the use chart on page 91; discussion between the board members. Perry said that for
87 residential in the shoreline, there is common ownership. In the past Planning Commission wanted
88 this removed from the SMP. Perry asked if they wanted to change their minds. Vice Chair Dart
89 said it has been awhile to remember. Wanted to read the old SMP and compare it to the new one.
90 Perry explained that this new version is easier to enforce on the ground, not many changes. The
91 maps are pretty much the same. Colville has no designations within our boundaries. They have
92 their own SMP. BOCC would like to look at that to see if it is simpler to extend into ours. It deals
93 with the permits we process, only fee simple land owners, non-tribal members who choose to
94 come to us.

95 Member Schulz asked about non-tribal members. We do not have many; they mostly go thru the
96 tribal planning department. It is a process with a paper trail. Member Schulz asked about the future
97 and if the tribe changes their rules will we have to do the same? Perry does not know as of yet,
98 we could include language that defaults to their SMP. Maybe use their regulations with a
99 reference. All agree.

100 Member Dart recommends that the BOCC follows up with the critical areas.

101 Perry wanted to talk about the chart showing up minimal lot sizes. Would you like to leave chart in
102 or not? Member Rawley would like to go with underline zoning. Meet frontage and minimum lot
103 size. Member Porter asked what Perry is recommending with zoning? Perry means that zoning
104 dictates lot size. Chair Roberts asked what happens with ordinary high water marks, floodplains
105 and to make sure people do not build in those situations. We have restrictions for building in flood
106 plains. Need floodplain development permits.

107 Perry asked if there were any other questions. Perry discussed Mr. Mackie's memo. Mackie
108 made suggestions where 'Definition terms' were changed. The PC would like these changes
109 made before going to BOCC. The PC recommended that these change be made. Member
110 Rawley asked if anyone else has anything specific to address. Member Porter asked about docks;
111 Perry explained that the board had many meetings to discuss this. She also commented on
112 irrigation talk of water patterns, where water comes from and flows, would like more mention of this
113 and would like it to go into the record.

114 Commission member Rawley asked that a Motion be made to submit the Shoreline Master
115 Program back to the BOCC with the recommended changes. Vice Chair Dart seconded it, motion
116 made and seconded all those in favor? Member Schulz would like to see what they do in writing
117 before it is passed on to the BOCC. 3 to 2 in favor.

118 **New Business:**

119 Interim zoning, we have begun the process at staff level and try to create a draft that we can begin
120 public review on. Rearranging staffing so we can make this happen sooner than later; so we can
121 begin the public review process. Perry will issue the DNS. Would like to present this in April but
122 maybe May. Perry reminded that this has been going on for 8 years now. Send suggestions to
123 Perry. Board member Schulz would like to see what we did on fencing years ago.

124 In a couple months we should have the new zone code which Ben Rough is working on.
125 Commission member Dart spoke about zone code. Perry would like the Zone Code and Sub-
126 division Code to go thru in tandem. Nightly rentals and others will be looked at. So far as Perry
127 knows they are in compliance. There are areas that do need fixed and we will be looking at that.

128 Perry mentioned how the Dept. of Ecology is interested in LIDAR as a way to study the shorelines
129 and other critical areas. The switch over in the DOE has been positive.

130 Critical Areas is next. Not sure if Planning Commission needs to see it again.

131 Perry discussed our planning commission membership and how many members we need. 9
132 members is the current ordinance- we will reduce this to 7 members. Chair Roberts feels the more
133 members the better. How do we get people involved? Difficult to find members. Perry will write
134 ordinance and get it adopted.

135 Member Schulz asked Perry when the last critical areas were updated. The latest data is from
136 2009.

137 Volunteer Stewardship Program will still find funding. The Comprehensive Plan is under appeal.

138 Member Rawley asked to make a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 PM. Motion has been
139 made and carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:22 PM.

140 9:22 Adjourned.

141 [SUMMARY OF MOTIONS](#)

142 ***Chair Roberts made a motion to approve the March 23, 2015 meeting agenda, the motion***
143 ***carried.***

144 ***Chair Roberts made a motion to approve the February 23, 2015 meeting agenda, the motion***
145 ***carried with the correction of line 31 which should read as 'lot' not 'line'. The motion***
146 ***carried.***

147 *Commission member Rawley asked that a Motion be made to submit the Shoreline Master*
148 *Program back to the BOCC with the recommended changes. Vice Chair Dart seconded it, 3-*
149 *2 in favor. The motion carried.*

150 *Chair Roberts asked to make a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 PM. Motion has been*
151 *made and carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:22 PM.*

152

153 **Adjourn**

154 Prepared by Kellie Conn
155 Administrative Secretary