

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

**July 31, 2008 6:30 – 8:30 pm
Methow Cafe**

Present: Isabelle Spohn, Keith and Kevin Stennes, Betty Hagenbuch, Ken Orford, Karen Luft, Bev Zwar, Al Hymer, Joyce Campbell

Absent: Alex Kerr, Bill Tackman, Gloria Royse

Agenda

I. Updates

A. Comp Plan Feedback: What did we send and how is it being used?

Lorah provided a list recapping the feedback that was submitted by LVAG to the county in May, and attempted to describe the way that the feedback is being (or will be) used. She shared the most current Table of Contents for the Draft Comp Plan as well as her current work categorizing the Goals/Policies with the parts of the Comp Plan (or other documents) to which they will be applied. This discussion prompted several questions and requests for more information, as follows:

- When will we see updated maps of Resource Lands and Rural Lands options?
- Feedback/Recommendations should appear packaged with more than one option
- How much effort is the County making to ensure that the Public and Interest Groups are involved, that their feedback is being heard, and that appeals will be prevented?

B. Comp Plan Process Timeline

Lorah presented the “latest” timeline for the process, including one more LVAG meeting in August and a “Valley-Wide” meeting planned for September to address concerns and gain more feedback on the Draft. She admitted that in spite of the fact that Perry Huston must have repeated the process timeline to her multiple times, she is still fuzzy on a few facts. This prompted the following requests:

Please provide a bulleted timeline to the group, including:

- Anticipated date we can expect to see a more current Draft
- Anticipated date of Draft EIS release
- Tentative Scoping and Public Meeting schedule
- Anticipated process following the January release of the FEIS
- Path to Adoption

II. Draft Review: Rural Element

Overview: The group needs to review and provide feedback to the Rural and Resource Lands portions of the Draft, as these sections contain information most relevant to the expressed wishes of the committee. Because each of these sections is complex and many

questions are anticipated, it was decided to spend this meeting addressing the Rural Element, and plan to address the Resource Lands at the next meeting. The review proceeded (mostly) according to the organization of the Draft – the group reviewed and commented on each option provided for “Rural High Density”, “Rural Lo Density” and “Rural Med Density” as follows. Questions and comments are highlighted in yellow.

A. Rural Hi Density, Option 1: No Action. This would maintain the status quo in the Lower Methow, as it is currently in the Minimum Req’t District. The group does not support this option.

B. Rural Hi Density, Option 2 – Questions:

- (referring to the difference between Options 2 and 3) What is the difference between “adjacent to Urban” and “adjacent to UGA?” If UGA’s define “Urban”, what’s the difference between these options besides the clustering/PD support?
- Define “enhanced ability to provide services” more clearly. Just those listed?
- Generally the group likes the effort to make “proximity to urban” a requirement of higher density with both options 2 and 3.

C. Rural Hi Density, Option 3 – Questions:

- Would Gold Creek area count to be “infilled” even though no proximity to services? Define “infill” more clearly.
- Option 3 appears less restrictive than Option 2, but need clearer understanding of how “Urban” is being used with “UGA”
- Define “Greater Array of Permitted Uses” more clearly. Which ones are appropriate to higher density areas adjacent to urban?
- Define “Neighborhood Commercial Centers”. What do these look like? What services do they provide at what scale? Do they compete with adjacent urban services?

D. Rural Lo Density, Option 1: Status Quo. Not preferred.

E. Rural Lo Density, Option 2:

- Preferred. Group supports clustering, contingent on the development of acceptable Public Benefits Rating System.
- Group does not support clustering within 200’ of high water mark on the Methow River.

F. Rural Lo Density, Option 3:

- “Ridgeline” and “Scenic Corridor” would need more definition to make this option work.
- Defining the Lower Methow as a Scenic Corridor *would potentially* enable the 20 acre minimums preferred by this group under Option 3..

G. Rural Med Density, Option 1: Does not appear to affect our planning area

H. Rural Med Density, Option 2:

- None of the Options under Rural Med Density appear to support the group’s desire to see 20 acre minimums on the valley floor
- Option 2 does appear to have the most flexibility to allow 20 acres in some places with poor access to roads or services
- Clustering is FAR preferred over straight 5 acre lots

- What's the point of having a Medium Density option in the lower Methow when the feedback indicates a desire to see only Low or High Density areas? "These options do not describe our situation."

I. Rural Med Density, Option 3:

- Are there any areas currently designated for >1 but <5 acres currently? This seems like a confusing range of densities, at least in our planning area.

J. Rural "Compatible Uses"

This section prompted a number of relevant questions and requests:

- Define more clearly "Home Based Businesses" that would be permitted or conditional. This has been a source of controversy in other parts of the Methow.
- Open Range is an issue that may or may not be pertinent to this category. The question is whether ALL new residents and applicants for subdivisions will be required to fence out cattle?
- Define "Agricultural Processing" more clearly – which permitted and which conditional. For example, Fruit packing? Pig Farms? Big difference in impact. Do Fruit Stands fit here or under Commercial?
- Define "Neighborhood Commercial Centers" and what would be allowed here?
- Define which industries qualify for "Light Manufacturing" vs. "Resource-Based Heavy Manufacturing"? Provide examples of which of these industries would be Permitted vs. Conditional in Rural areas.
- Noise, Traffic and Pollution should be avoided in Rural areas – this should be a guiding principle as Permitted and Conditional Uses are more clearly defined. This group would like to participate in discussions that bring more clarity to the definitions.

III. Next Meeting

The next meeting will either be August 21 or 24 (email announcement to follow), from 6:30 – 8:30 pm at the Methow Café. The group will use this meeting to follow up on questions from the Rural Element discussion and review the Resource Lands section of the Draft.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:32 pm