

**Lower Valley Advisory Group
(LVAG)
Planning Meeting**

**February 21, 2008 5:00 – 8:00 pm
Methow Cafe**

Present: Bill Tackman, Beverly and Jeff Zwar, Gloria Royse, Karen Luft, Isabelle Spohn, Keith Stennes, Betty Hagenbuch

Absent: Arlan Ruf, Kathie Windle, Alex Kerr, Ken Orford, Al Hymer

Agenda

I. Housekeeping

A. “Interim” Requests (Clearing/Grading and Fire Regs)

A letter is being drafted for presentation to the BOCC and will be circulated at the next meeting for review and action decisions. The group members have been in contact with other members of neighborhood groups (particularly in the Methow) and it sounds like there is broad support for these suggested near term changes. Isabelle agreed to contact Perry Huston to inquire about the membership of other neighborhood groups, for the purpose of gauging their level of support for the suggested changes.

B. Last Meeting Notes

Reviewed and approved. Request for copies of Kurts presentation from the 2/10 Density workshop.

C. Other

After a discussion about the work ahead and the county’s request to have most feedback received by mid-May, the group decided to extend the hours of our meetings from 5 – 8 pm. This does not necessarily mean all meetings will be 3 hours long, but it gives the group more time if needed for discussion.

II. Schedule of Discussions/Decisions through May

A. Proposed Schedule – Set Dates

The following schedule of meeting dates and topics/decisions was agreed upon by the group (with the understanding that this is our best guess at how far we can get in good faith...and the schedule may need to be adjusted as we go). Basically the schedule is set up so that preliminary (draft) decisions are noted when we discuss them, and at the next meeting there is time allowed to discuss and finalize decisions about feedback to the County.

Date/Time/Location	Topic	Decision
3/6, 5 – 8pm Methow Cafe	Density: Minimum Acreage on Valley Floor, Uplands, and review Cluster Ordinance	Minimum Acreage VF, Uplands finalize feedback
3/20, 5 – 8pm Methow Cafe	Resource Lands and Critical Areas: definitions and special needs for density/allowed uses in these areas	Cluster feedback final; Resource/Critical draft feedback
4/6, 5 – 8pm Methow	Allowed Uses and locations of	Resource/Critical final

Cafe	Commercial activities	feedback; Commercial draft feedback
4/17, 5 – 8pm Methow Cafe	Allowed Uses and locations of Industrial Activities	Commercial feedback final; Industrial draft feedback
4/27, 5 – 8pm Methow Cafe	Other Feedback, using Goals/Policies from LVAG and Mid-Valley groups; prepare for Community Meeting	Industrial final feedback; Draft “other” feedback
5/1, 5 – 8pm Community Center	Community Meeting – present preliminary LVAG recommendations	Gather community feedback
5/15, 5 – 8pm Methow Cafe	Adjust to community feedback; complete discussion of “other”	Finalize “other” feedback and/or schedule additional meetings to complete
6/12 to be announced	County Growth Summit II	Draft Comp Plan release?

Following our last meeting in May and the Growth Summit in June, there should be a short break before the Draft Comp Plan is released to our group for review. The review period should start up again in July.

III. Valley Floor Density Discussion

A. Discussion/ Comments

The group discussed the 20 acre minimum in more detail. The following list separates comments into those that provide a rationale for 20 acre minimums and questions about the implications of such a designation:

Questions

- Affect on owners of 5, 10, 15, 20 acre parcels?
- How could Clustering or PD regs affect the same parcel sizes under 20 acre mins?
- Could a second family home be allowed on one lot under this min acreage?

Support/Rationale

- Community vision process supported Rural Character
- Majority of property in planning area is already in smaller parcels; rationale is to protect smaller parcels from further subdivision
- With all the existing small parcels, the area will already change significantly; rationale is to prevent more density than is currently possible with existing subdivisions.
- Planning area is wintering range for mule deer; additional density and traffic concerns re: deer migration and road kill.
- Given the amount of priority habitat and critical areas identified in this area, does it need to accommodate all the growth predicted for the county?
- Traffic concerns: Is Hwy 153 adequate for higher density subdivisions along its corridor?

B. Questions for Kurt/info for Kurt to provide at next meeting

- How many lots now? How many w/5ac min? 10? 20?

- Provide mapping that identifies (by type, eg steep slopes, wetlands) Critical Areas in planning area
- Provide mapping that identifies likely soil types and existing uses for Ag Resource Land designation (include parcel layer and ownership)
- Provide mapping that identifies potential forest resource lands?

C. Other Questions

- Request to ask John Sunderland to visit with the group and explain the differences between the PD Zone and the proposed Cluster Ordinance – *Bill T. will follow up on this and report back at the next meeting*
- Why does Perry say that the existing PD zone is not GMA compatible? What does that mean?
- Is the proposed Cluster ordinance the same as the one from Kittitas County?

IV. Cluster Ordinance Review

Due to an incident that lengthened the meeting, this subject was tabled for review at the next meeting, at which time Bill T. will fill the group in on Sunderland's response.

V. Next Steps, Next Meeting

Homework: Read the existing PD ordinance/zone from the County Zoning Ordinance, Methow Review District (available online) and the proposed Clustering Ordinance (provided prior to this meeting) and be prepared to ask questions and provide input about which parts of the existing PD should be kept.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:00pm