Mr. Dearborn pointed to the map, specifically the red and light yellow colored areas. The density pattern around resource lands now is 5 acres or less. The general conclusion from the map is that down zoning those 9+ acre parcels around resource lands would not do anything at this point in terms of being able to preserve the ability of those farmers to operate. Ms. Fossek made that same comment, as well as the majority of the Committee, seeing no reason to further down zone. Those Committee members who disagreed with the majority explained their desire for the broader point of view or another issue related to resource lands and the question of down zoning.

Critical Areas. Series of six maps posted on the wall on the right side show parcels 9 acres and larger adjacent to streams. The streams are: Glendale, Maxwelton, Chapman and an unnamed stream. The color-coding on the map represents:

light yellow = 9 acre parcels *bright yellow = 10 acres and larger.*

No consensus reached. The Committee looked at illustrations and the pattern of development around streams and asked the question: what are the opportunities to provide further protection to the corridors? The bottom two maps on the right are Wetland Areas, where the Committee looked at the same question. As the Report indicates, the majority of the Committee concluded that a pattern of 5 acre lots was not a threat to critical areas, but members were willing to consider a down zoning proposal if consensus could be reached. The Committee then over two nights discussed the four options noted in the Report. In this case, the Committee, even after all the evidence was presented, discussed the possibility of further down zoning, and from looking at the e-mails in the hand-out packet it can be seen that this was an effort to try to reach consensus on the issue further down zoning, not because there was a reason per se to further protect critical areas.

GMA requires looking at the questions of wildlife habitat and the County made aware that stream corridors provide habitat corridors so the question: to what extent do we address the question of larger lots in steam corridors and around wetlands. The maps illustrate what the opportunities are. The Committee looked at what the consequence would be and it became impossible for the Committee to calculate acreage in order to see the impacts. Staff decided it important to know what it was the Committee wanted to look at as far as any proposal before moving on. The significant point of discussion of critical areas was the observation made by John Graham that if a solution could be found here, the rest of the questions of rural character and critical areas would not be relevant any longer, and that would for the Coalition be sufficient action to safeguard rural character provided the County dealt with the RF zone and EDUs in the RF zone.

Mr. Dearborn next walked everyone through the four options on the second page of the Report. As he noted, there was no Committee consensus reached on this subject. The issues were for many people very critical and consequential questions. The proposal that received the most support was Option #1: Parcels within 330' of a Type 2 through 4 stream and Type 5 streams that are tributary top Type 2 through 4 steams should be zoned with a 10 acre minimum lot size. The map provides illustrations for Glendale, Maxwelton and Chapman as far as what the impact would be; the gray band represents 330' from the steams [measured from the center of the stream]; 330' was the number the Committee agreed on. Sandy Roberts proposed that and explained the rationale for it as one of traditional dimension of lot patterns in the County. There was strong concern that designations 2 through 4 be fixed in time based upon maps here now and not something continually changing as time goes on. The Committee agreed there must be more detailed and comprehensive maps in order to assess the impact of including these wetlands. Discussed too was that there should be a technical amendment process similar to that for Commercial AG, i.e. a way developed so that the land owner not be trapped in an incorrect zoning classification, and there was consensus on that.

Commissioner McDowell clarified that the consensus agreement on Option #1 as reported was correct as far as his vote, except with regard to Type 5 streams. Most property owners would certainly not think that type of "stream" as a stream by definition and he did not support the concept to tie that to a Type 5 stream; as he reminded, Type 5 streams potentially are just ditches running down a property. Mr. Dearborn agreed to make that correction to the Report.

Joyce Fossek expressed her support of Commissioner McDowell's comment as well with regard to Type 5 streams.

Mr. Dearborn reviewed 1C which he noted was controversial with this proposal. The majority of the Committee felt if the property is 9+ acres located on a stream, the property owner should have the ability, if a conservation easement is provided, to create two homes; they may be clustered or not, but there should be an incentive to create a "carrot" to get permanent preservation of the stream corridor.

Commissioner McDowell did not support that for Type 5 streams at all. Joyce Fossek agreed it should be limited to Type 2 through 4 only. Mr. Dearborn did point out that the County has had a rule over time that says if your initial parcel is within 10% of the minimum parcel size you may divide that parcel.

Mr. Dearborn recalled that John Graham asked that all Type 5 streams be included as well as Category A and B Wetlands. The majority of the Committee advanced the proposal originated by Tom Roehl as a way to try to achieve consensus not because in and of itself it was needed, but in trying to seek some common ground between the various interest groups.

Responding to Mr. Osterberg's request to hear something more about the pros and cons of including Type 5 streams and wetlands, Mr. Dearborn indicated that the wetland issue of concern to those who chose not to include it, and the issue to staff, was that the wetland maps are not complete nor accurate; how do we get a fixed map? The Type 5 stream problem relates to the fact these streams are dry part of the year; some years full, others only some water; many are ditches that start somewhere and end somewhere, but not something anyone would envision as a stream and many are not tributary to another stream; ephemeral streams that just start and stop. From a public perception it is hard to understand why a property would be zoned 10 acres in size instead of 5 just because of drainage channel classed as a Type 5 stream.

Planned Residential Developments (PRDs). Mr. Dearborn noted that consensus was reached on some points, but not all. Everyone thought PRDs a good form of development and offered opportunity to preserve rural character. Paul Newman became more and more concerned whether it was a good idea or not, but Mr. Dearborn pointed out that he did not think Mr. Newman had had an opportunity to read the staff analysis of PRDs since he seemed to be focused on the density question. There was no agreement reached on bonus density or cap on PRD size. The Committee discussed a size of 160 acres down to 40 acres, and searched for a compromise and struggled with that question. Part of the discussion had included a suggestion there be two sizes of PRDs – one for Whidbey and another for Camano; there are no large PRDs on Whidbey while there are two on Camano Island. When discussion came to the possibility of a cap at 80 acres, John Graham said he never really thought about a size limit of 80 acres but felt it might be okay. The majority felt the density had to get to 2-1/2 acre lots to make a PRD work; three members could not accept that and would rather sacrifice the PRD concept but could live with density of 5 acre average on PRD, but not 2-1/2. The details of how the cap would work are being reviewed by staff. The Growth Board has said the County must create a cap on intensity, and Mr. Dearborn interpreted that to mean the total number of units in a project.

Commissioner Thorn thought it related more to the total lot size and reflects on clustering.

Mr. Dearborn recalled that the Committee did not discuss the limit question, although the Committee did have the data from last year, the PRD study and the Land Development Study.

Commissioner Shelton observed that developing of PRDS really is a red herring unless the density potential is adequate to accommodate the type of infrastructure required under the PRD Ordinance. He thought that unless the County allows some kind of bonus approaching the 2-1/2 acre density PRDs would not occur – a developer would not choose that type of development. In 1984 and the subsequent adoption of GMA there seemed to be an indication that clustering is a desirable form of development in order to preserve rural character and provide appropriate infrastructure. Somehow in developing this plan the whole concept had been called into question to the point he was not sure people still believed it was a viable mechanism to use to preserve rural character.

An upper threshold and the possibility of pushing the PRD size out to where there is a concern about impacts approaching the need for urban services was question the Committee had to look at. The Committee's discussion with Mr. Dearborn's guidance was that the urban services issue essentially was sewer—density pushed to a point beyond being able to provide on site sewage disposal. That was the perspective discussed because that has been a concern about growth management [Kitsap; Snohomish; King]. Island County's standards require demonstration of the ability to provide on site sewer or the PRD is not approved. The Committee's feeling was that with regulations in place the urban services issue was not a concern with PRDs in this county. The Committee looked at an aerial showing Camano Hills – a PRD which has the largest open space area ever achieved, something like 80 or 90 acres. The argument was the larger open space the better, as opposed to having little pockets of open space.

Mr. Osterberg brought up the problems for down hill property owners as a result of storm water runoff and raised the question: " do we get to the point we have to have urban services and if so what is the solution?".

Mr. Dearborn replied that may well be something to look into because the County now has new Storm Water regulations effective on 12/1/98, modeled after the DOE manual.

Mrs. Crider wondered if there had been any thought given about focusing more on buffers and open space rather than parcel size. One of the things she is concerned with in this County is providing affordable housing, and should try to focus especially in PRDS looking at how to meet affordable housing. She thought that each PRD could meet a certain level of affordable housing; the larger