Should the creation of isolated enclaves or clusters of non-residential development encouraging suburban development in the midst of rural setting or resource lands be viewed as undesirable sprawl?

If there is an area with some commercial development adjacent to a PRD and termed the whole area a mixed use RAID, Mr. Olsen asked what if there were some vacant land, should that vacant land be designated (Country Club area and Plaza on Camano Island) ? Mr. Dearborn thought the people in the area would want to know. Take the Country Club as an example, the County may want to say the land that is vacant in the residential portion stays residential and a little bit of expansion around the commercial portion.

Mr. Rose stated that west and south of the Bayview commercial area, for example, is in his mind where there would be a residential RAID and a mixed use. Mr. Dearborn indicated in that case the County would have to make a distinction which way the vacant land would go.

Mr. Rose noted that as far as the Ray Gabelein Sr. Property located on the side of a hill and west of the cemetery, that land is very clearly something that would be used for residential. Criteria question page 5, 2nd bullet, Mr. Rose sees that as the Bayview situation. Mr. Dearborn stated that 6094 expressly says in designation of RAIDS you do not have to meet the sprawl standard; this is recognized as sprawl, it is existing and allowed, and will be allowed to expand in some modest way. See page 1, lines #28-35 are measures governing rural development, exceptions: sub i line 31, ii and iii, you can see that the only standard applied to Bayview from a rural protective measure is it has to be contained with and a boundary drawn around it.

Suggestion of Chairman Shelton was to delete on page 5, lines 16-18; the question is in error, and 6094 does not require the County to in effect deal with what is already on the ground.

Mr. Dearborn stated that the only isolated new non-residential will come through those exception categories. Bullet #2 has been answered. Commissioner Shaughnessy: the answer is a simple no. Mr. Rose thought that part of no meant a PRD or some sort of cluster is desirable.

Chairman Shelton still felt the language should be deleted; it is not "should be created" it is not a creation it is already there. Mrs. Pringle and Mr. Vincent agreed. To Commissioner Shaughnessy, it demonstrates the existing condition of Island County. Mr. Dearborn noted that GMA already says it does not matter for these isolated enclaves. The language is not relevant to the discussion and could confuse people.

The bottom of page 5, line #26: should there be a minimum or maximum size of a non-residential or mixed use RAID? Related to that is intensity. Mr. Dearborn 's assumption has been that with the exception of Freeland and Clinton, these mixed use areas the concurrence is basically to continue existing intensities and not an expansion.

The Planning Commission set a minimum for those on residential, based on what the State requirements are for water hookups.

Mr. Moore thought that Ken's Corner could be designated as a RAID. The question he posed was: do we want to locate similar regional shopping centers that do not now exist? The key in terms of the pattern of development in the county is basically that you want these fairly small, contained and serving a general rural area.

Back to the example of Terry's Corner on Camano Island, there is a very clearly defined on all sides by a road; existing bank, fire station and it might be the logical extension of existing uses would allow for a proposal currently being addressed, but he did not necessarily think the County needed to be about creating new additional shopping centers such as Ken's Corner in Island County.

Observing as an outsider, Mr. Dearborn thought the County had lots of commercial areas that exist that can expand and serve commercial needs without having to site separate from the ones that exist now.

Mr. Rose brought up relief for Mark Clark bridge - many complaints from Camano about how difficult it is to get on and off the island. Those are the kinds of factors the County needs to



account for, but Mr. Dearborn thought in that case it is an existing spot (Camano Gateway) and looking at a logical outer boundary.

3rd bullet, lines 29-33 [page 5]
What are other factors for consideration in boundary location? Perhaps (a) the logical use of land considering other uses in the area (i.e. lands around Navy's Outlying Field (OLF) may not be desirable for residential uses, and may be a good location for some non-residential uses such as storage facilities) and (b) sufficient land to provide transitional buffer between non-residential uses and neighboring rural and residential uses.

The Planning Commission yesterday addressed the aquifer issue and noise zone issues for residential and Mr. Dearborn assumed for non-residential the noise zone issue did not mean quite the same thing.

The County Commissioners and Planning Commission indicated that was an incorrect assumption, that as an example, a proposed dog kennel cost went through the roof because requirements for noise sound attenuation. The Sheriff's precinct in North Whidbey is another example, so non-residential areas do have some noise zone questions. Once non-residential and residential RAIDS, there should be some special consultation with NAS about those and make sure you get good feedback they may have.

Last bullet - page 5. "What are the legal implications for those parcel(s) that may not meet the criteria for designation but have already been granted some type of development approval (i.e. permit, water rights, etc.). Should they become non-conforming uses/lots without any assurance that they would be able to expand?

Partly addressed this - these have infrastructure - it is a factor that needs to be accounted for as part of the determination. This was an attempt to get to the question about those parcels that have no development.

<u>IV OPTION [page 6]</u>

Apply GMA Criteria to the Built Environment as of July 1, 1990 and Other Lands Determined to be Appropriate. The County may designate lands as limited areas of more intensive rural development pursuant to the language contained RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) while incorporating additional interpretations made by the County. The issues and questions stated in the previous section will need to be answered with regard to the criteria for designation. The additional interpretations may be more restrictive than the strict use of the statutory requirements. Once a set of criteria is formed, the process of analyzing the County's lands will be done. It is difficult to assess the acreage and parcel totals for each separate combination of individual criteria components, because of the amount of the needed for detailed analysis.

<u>PUBLIC INPUT</u>

Leona Aaker, Loganberry Hill Reality, Greenbank, believed in the need to retain the CC zoning and not the NR - they already have a Post Office, grocery store, 3 restaurants, real estate office and we plans to expand the little shops, etc. That have been there for a long long time.

Chairman Shelton advised Mrs. Aaker that the NR designation includes the commercial zoning; it is a name change NR zone accommodates exactly what you need.

Don Jewett, South Whidbey, gave a "ditto" to his previously expressed comments with regard to TDR's. An added concern is that at the time of reaching implementing ordinances there will be some sort of a sunset condition so those who have existing TDR certificates will not be hurt and will be treated fairly. He thought there was some misunderstanding about what is low income and affordable housing and what does GMA define it as? Mr. Jewett remembered the Board having been given a letter on November 24 from a new "Island

County Citizens GM Coalition" and he had some concern that the group could be throwing object in punch bowl with idea delay. Think you should look ahead and see what happen as result this letter.

Mary Petry, Bakken Road, Greenbank, had to leave the meeting, but submitted a written statement: