MOSES LAKE PLANNING COMMISSION February 27, 2014

<u>Commissioners Present</u>: Vicki Heimark, Nathan Nofziger, Charles Hepburn, David Eck, Kevin Starcher, Todd Lengenfelder, Steve Schield, and Gary Mann <u>Absent</u>: Rick Penhallurick

Name	Jan		Feb		Mar		Арг		May		June		July		Aug		Sept		Oct		Nov	Dec
Eck	Р	Р	Р	Р																		
Starcher	Α	Р	P	Р																		
Lengenfelder	Р	A	Ρ	P																		
Schield	Р	Α	Α	Р																		
Heimark	Р	Р	Р	Р																		
Penhallurick	E	Р	Р	E																		
Hepburn	Р	Р	Р	Р																		
Nofziger	Р	P	Р	Р																		
Mann	Р	Р	Р	Р																		

<u>Staff Present</u>: Joseph K. Gavinski, Gilbert Alvarado, Anne Henning, Billie Jo Muñoz, Daniel Leavitt, and Sue Mahaney

CONSENT AGENDA

Minutes: The minutes of the February 13 meeting were presented.

<u>Action Taken</u>: Mr. Eck moved that the Consent Agenda be approved, seconded by Mr. Schield, and passed unanimously.

PILGRIM STREET OFFICE BUILDING - SITE PLAN REVIEW - PUBLIC HEARING

Glenn Wells submitted an application for a Site Plan Review of a 32,800 square foot office building with a possible 5,000 square foot expansion. The proposed project is located at 1651 E. Pilgrim Street, and is legally described as Lot 1 Block 1 Pioneer Commercial Park 4th Addition. The site is zoned C-2, General Commercial and Business which matches the Comprehensive Plan designation of General Commercial.

Mr. Nofziger declared a conflict of interest and exited the room.

Daniel Leavitt, Assistant Planner, explained the project and mentioned that it meets all the requirements for parking, landscaping, etc.

Glen Wells, representing the project, stated that they have exceeded all the requirements and have no objections to the staff recommendations.

The public hearing was opened. There were no comments.

Action Taken: Mr. Hepburn moved that the public hearing be closed, seconded by Mr. Eck, and passed unanimously.

Action Taken: Mr. Eck moved that the site plan be approved with the following conditions:

- A. The building, when constructed, shall appear essentially as presented to the Planning Commission.
- B. The comments of the Development Engineer will be addressed.

seconded by Mr. Hepburn, and passed unanimously.

SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM UPDATE - PUBLIC HEARING

The Planning Commission has been reviewing an updated Shoreline Master Program, which contains the local regulations for development within 200' of the water. All Washington jurisdictions with shorelines are required to have an SMP, which is adopted locally but is required to meet state standards.

Anne Henning, Senior Planner, pointed out that the Commission has been working on the Shoreline Master Program for many years and several recent open houses have been held to inform the public of the proposed plan.

The public hearing was opened.

John Herman, 3740 Thayer Road, questioned whether or not a buffer would be required when an existing dock or boat lift is replaced.

Jeff Powell, 5204 Panorama Drive NE, mentioned that there is no consistency in the level of the lake and wanted to know if the Shoreline Master Program addresses that issue.

Gilbert Alvarado, Community Development Director, pointed out that the level of the water is not addressed by the Shoreline Master Program. The level of the lake is regulated by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Arlie Updegrave, 3199 W. Lakeside Drive, wanted to know why the buffer is 25' and if greasewood in a buffer can be removed.

Anne Henning, Senior Planner, stated that if the greasewood is in the buffer it would remain but if it is outside the buffer it can be removed. The 25' buffer is based on the existing development, which is generally set back 25'. Property owners would be able to get permission to add native plants to the buffer.

Mr. Mann pointed out that the Shoreline Master Program does not mention public safety or fire prevention and he felt that they should be addressed.

There was some discussion and the Commissioners felt that something should be added to the buffer regulations to address downed trees, fire danger, etc.

Rick Serra, 117 Belair Drive, wanted to know how a home owner would know which agency to contact about work on or near the shoreline.

Mr. Alvarado stated that the home owner would start with the City and then staff would inform any agency of jurisdiction of the project.

There was some discussion on the process to obtain an exemption. Ms. Henning explained that an exemption is from the requirement to obtain a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, not from compliance with the Shoreline Master Program or Shoreline Management Act.

Mr. Herman wanted to know if an existing bulkhead would have to be removed if a home owner wants to install a boat lift and whether or not a boat lift canopy is still allowed. He felt that economics should be considered by the Shoreline Master Program. He also felt that shared docks are not feasible.

Ms. Henning mentioned that there has to be no net loss of ecological function and canopies are not mentioned in the Plan. She pointed out that shared docks are not required by the Plan.

It was pointed out that the Plan does not address economics.

Brad McMillan, 3196 W. Lakeside, wanted to know who to talk to about the failure of a demonstration project.

Mr. Alvarado stated that he would contact staff.

There was some discussion on the flood hazard areas.

Tim Rich, 1011 Laguna, stated that he was informed his home was in a flood zone but after an elevation study it was found it was not in the flood zone. With the proper documentation, flood insurance was no longer required. He felt that FEMA simply used overhead maps to determine the flood zones.

There was some discussion on the process for adoption of the Plan.

Action Taken: Mr. Nofziger moved that the public hearing be closed, seconded by Mr. Eck, and passed unanimously.

There was some discussion on the need to address public safety and fire hazard and staff was directed to address the issue and bring it back to the Commission.

Action Taken: Mr. Nofziger moved that the Shoreline Master Program be tabled, seconded by Mr. Hepburn, and passed unanimously.

CHAIR PRO TEM

Ms. Heimark stated that she and the Vice-Chair Mr. Nofziger will be out of town for the March 13 meeting so a Chair pro tem and a Vice-Chair pro tem should be elected for that meeting.

Action Taken: Mr. Lengenfelder moved that Mr. Hepburn be elected Chair pro tem, seconded by Mr. Eck, and passed unanimously.

<u>Action Taken</u>: Mr. Eck moved that Mr. Lengenfelder be elected Vice-Chair pro tem, seconded by Mr. Hepburn, and passed unanimously.

The regular meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Planning Commission Chair