

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Work Session: 2021 Docket
December 14, 2021**

Planning

Commissioners: Kathy Mitchell
Mark Knutzen
Vince Henley
Amy Hughes
Tim Raschko, Chair
Joe Woodmansee
Tammy Candler, Vice Chair
Martha Rose

Staff:

Hal Hart, Planning Director
Peter Gill, Long Range Planning Manager
Jenn Rogers, Assistant Long-Range Planner

Public

Commenters: Ken Deering

Chair Tim Raschko: Good evening and welcome to the December 14, 2021, special meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. ___ call to order first. I have conceded we have Commissioner Candler, Commissioner Henley, Commissioner Hughes, Commissioner Knutzen I see, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Woodmansee. Is Commissioner Rose present?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. You might note that she is absent. Everybody –

Peter Gill: Chair, I did get a message from Commissioner Rose that she wouldn't be able to attend.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you. So we'll move to approval of minutes. We have two sets of minutes, one from November 23rd. Does anybody care to make a motion to approve the minutes from the November 23rd, 2021 –

Commissioner Vince Henley: I so move.

Commissioner Kathy Mitchell: I'll second.

Chair Raschko: It's moved and seconded to approve the meetings from November 23rd. Is there discussion of the minutes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All those in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: I'm for it, not against it.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you for clarifying. Any abstentions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, that passes. The November 30th, 2021, minutes: Is there a motion to approve?

Commissioner Henley: I so move.

Commissioner Mitchell: Second.

Chair Raschko: It's been moved and seconded to approve the November 30th, 2021, minutes. All in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: Opposed?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: And no abstentions. Okay, thank you very much. Take time now for Public Remarks. This time on the agenda is an opportunity for anyone to speak with the Planning Commission about any topic except items scheduled on the agenda for a public hearing the same day or items that have had a public hearing and are still under Planning Commission deliberation. Public Remarks, which is not part of the formal public participation process for any development regulation or Comprehensive Plan amendment project, is limited to three minutes per speaker up to 15 minutes total.

So, Peter, have you any requests from the public to speak?

Mr. Gill: I did not get any email requests for any public comments today.

Chair Raschko: Okay. If anybody wishes – who is tuned in to the meeting – to speak, please say so.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, I believe we have no –

Ken Deering: Yes. It's Ken Deering. I'll turn on my camera.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Please say your name and address and go ahead, please.

Mr. Deering: Yes. Ken Deering. Address is 14129 Doser Street, Edison. And I apologize. For some reason – oh, I know what it is. So I was trying to understand – so I'm a resident of Edison

and we – a number of us locals have put in repeated comments to the Planning Commission. And I guess it's more a question I put to the Commission is we see – a number of us see this amendment to the small business zone as a get-around and a mockery, frankly, of land use policy for rezoning. I mean, essentially we have a business who has a right to request rezoning of their property but has chosen along with the Planning Department's under, let's say, collaboration, has done an end-around, which is to have all eight properties under SSB changed to permit a restaurant. And the question I have here is: Why would the Planning Commission want to countenance making a mockery of land use policy, which is – typically, if a property owner wants to change the land use, you go in for a rezoning of your own property and you subsequently go through the rezoning requirements of that, as opposed to this way, which is to say, Oh, all eight properties should become restaurant-applicable. And there is no requirement for local input or going through the single property. I mean, three of the properties in this Small Business are automotive shops. One's a fire hall. So the logic that adding restaurant to this zone is somehow going to be beneficial to the county as opposed to one specific property owner, the numbers don't add up. So I'm sorry. Just – I listened in to the last Commission report. There's a lot of good work done by the Commissioners. I'm on the local water board, which is very small-scale work compared to the complicated work you folks are doing. But it's just a lack of understanding of why this had gone this far on the Small Business zone to add a restaurant to it when really it's simply a single property rezoning application is the appropriate path forward. And a number of residents of Edison have put in commentary much smarter than me. I'm not a property person. I don't know land use policy. I've learned a little bit the last four months. But there's been some very knowledgeable people put in commentary – very diligent, detailed commentary and articulated much better than I'm doing tonight. But that's a question I told several of them I would try and put forward to the Commission, because it just – it lacks rational sense when we have an appropriate way to do this, which is single property rezoning application. And I appreciate the time you've given me to make that commentary.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Are there any other people wishing to speak?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, hearing none, we'll turn to our main topic of the evening, and that's the 2021 Planning Docket Work Session. Before we dive into there, I'd like to make one request of staff. And going through the document, the Staff Report 2021 Docket, I noticed an inconsistency in how things were displayed numerically, and particularly on page 17 where it is referring to potential notice requirement distances. They're listed as 1000 feet, a mile, and one-quarter-mile. And then on the next page, page 18, it has a table that just says "Other Counties" and they're all consistently numbers or feet, including Lewis County, which is one-quarter-mile but is listed as 1,320 feet. So I would just request that, you know, before this goes to the public that page 17 could be made consistent from one option to the next.

So thank you with that and we'll move on to the Planning Docket Work Session. Mr. Gill, please?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, and thank you for those comments – both yours, Chair, and from the public. Tonight we do want to continue our conversation on the 2021 Docket. Being this late into the year, I appreciate everyone's patience in getting to this point. But we did release to the Planning Commission and posted on the Planning Commission website the staff report. It is rather large. And so I thought it would be a good place to start to show you how it's made up because being able to navigate this efficiently and effectively is going to help in our review for sure.

So, if I could, I am going to share my screen here. And you should be looking at the Staff Report 2021 Docket. This is the front page of a 48-page staff report. I apologize for the length again. Here you'll catch a summary of what this report is intending to do, as well as a link to the website where you can get all the pre-existing docketing materials, public comments, slides from previous work sessions that we've had with you and with the Board. That's what that link is there. The items in the Table of Contents here *are* linked and so it's fairly easy to – if you are using pretty much any PDF reader, to be able to click on these items and move through. I'll just take an example. I'll look at the LR20-05. If you click on that it will drop you right down to LR20-05 and the full write-up. And then in each of those petitions I provide a summary of what the request is from the petitioner, our Department recommendation, and then an analysis of the proposal. The last part of each of these petitions is a consistency review – and I'm down here at the bottom of the page now. I guess this is required by our review proposals and 14.08 to review for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and other items, and so that's where you'll find that.

I just thought it'd be helpful to run through that. What you won't find in this part of the staff report is the actual code changes or the Comprehensive Plan amendments. Those are all in the Attachment 1, and I have that pulled up as well. And so that is another 43 pages so we're almost at 100 pages already. And again, we'll have a Table of Contents in there that'll allow you to click to that specific section and look up the specific code language changes that are being proposed.

Also you'll find in there kind of a key to how to look at the edits. Anything that is underlined in blue would be added language; anything that has a strike through it and is red would be removed. So if we go down to – let's stay with the same one, the public notice requirement amendment, 20-05, you'll see in there anything that's in black is not changed. Okay? And this is Option A. And you keep coming down the only thing that's changing is this blue section. I know it's real small on your screen so it's not important that you read it right now, but that is the part that is actually changing on the document.

So I just wanted to provide an overview of how to – at least one way to navigate through, and using this Table of Contents is really helpful, so I did want to share that. Was there any questions about how to review the documents and what's been distributed?

(silence)

Mr. Gill: Okay.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I have a question. This is Commissioner Woodmansee. When you put this document – or whoever put this document together – does this document – and maybe you've already said this and I missed it but this – and only because it's right in front of me I'll use this one. On the Notice Distance, in blue you have the one mile. So is this to represent if everything was adopted per the actual proposal this is what it would say?

Mr. Gill: That is correct. Right. If you choose to adopt it, this is what that ___ would be changed.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Straight-up as requested, this is what it would look like?

Mr. Gill: Right. Right. In that you will see –

Commissioner Henley: That's one of several options though, right?

Mr. Gill: Well, and that's what I was going to say. So what you'll see is we did present some options in some of the petitions, and so we tried to make sure we had each of those options – what the code changes might look like with each of those options.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I did miss that part in your description. Thank you.

Mr. Gill: Yeah, yeah. All right. All right, so let's get to the main event here. All right. So this is our third work session on the docket. And just to let you all know and the public that may have joined us, we did make sure that we noticed any of the petitioners to let them know that we were talking about these petitions tonight. And so they may have joined us at the meeting or may be watching on TV-21. We have gone through each of these petitions at least once, most of them twice, already, and so I'm not going to go maybe into the same level of detail tonight, but I would reserve that time for questions as well as I would also like to talk about our recommendations on each of these petitions.

I'd also like to talk about kind of how we're moving forward. At this point, we're kind of at the bottom of the pinwheel here with the Planning Commission Work Sessions, the red outline. We are wrapping up the staff report. We may make some edits based on conversation tonight, but we will put that out for public notice next week along with SEPA notices and Commerce notice. And then we would like to try to have our hearing, public hearing, then on January 11th, so that would be in almost four weeks. The one thing that I'd like to mention about that public hearing is we have not heard from the petitioners themselves at this point, and so it'd be nice to provide them a chance at the beginning of each of these petitions to provide testimony on their petition so you can hear straight from them – I think is usually the best way to learn about these.

And so tonight we've got six citizen-initiated petitions or amendments to discuss. The Nielsen Brothers Map Amendment and Rezone. This change is approximately 12 acres just east of Sedro-Woolley. The request is to change this from the existing zoning, Ag-Natural Resource Land, to Natural Resource Industrial. On the site in the image on the screen here you can see a couple of things. The yellow outline is the property that the requested rezone is for. The blue squiggly line is Hansen Creek. The road kind of on the north end, northwest end, of the image is Highway 20. And shops and the other equipment that's shown there in the image is the existing use on the property site.

The existing uses on the property include, you know, repair, maintenance, and storage of logging equipment. The Natural Resource Industrial use zone is intended to support the production of agricultural, forest, and aquatic products by allowing processing facilities, limited direct resource sales, and limited natural resource support services. Some examples of Natural Resource Industrial zone include sawmills; agricultural or forestry industry equipment, as well as maintenance; agricultural processing plants; seafood processing; and even onsite sales.

These are the existing NRI zones in the county. The petitioners' change or request is here below the balloon at the little point there. This change would support a natural resource use – that is, forestry. It's compatible with the existing surrounding uses including agriculture and salmon enhancement. The majority of the NRI zones are adjacent to Ag-NRL zones as well because these are often compatible and even complementary uses. And for that reason, the Department is recommending to approve this rezone.

Are there any questions on this one before we move on? Or Chair, I'm not sure how you'd like to do this, if you want me to go through and then come back or if you want to stop at each of these.

Chair Raschko: I think it'd be preferable to have a full discussion on each one and have any questions answered and not come back at the end unless something else comes up.

Mr. Gill: Sure. Okay.

Chair Raschko: And I would ask my fellow Commissioners to use the Chat Box if they wish to jump in. Thank you.

Mr. Gill: All right. So the next one on the list is the Small Scale Business Zone Use Modification. This is LR20-02. The petitioner is requesting to amend Skagit County 14.16.140, Small Scale Business zone, to include restaurants as an accessory to a permitted use. And there on the slide you see the proponent's location there near Edison. The red circle is the specific property that is being requested for change. There's a number of parcels all here kind of on this thumb that are all Small Scale Business. And here, just to kind of explain what "accessory" is, it's in terms of land use code: "Accessory, as applied to a use, building or structure, means customarily subordinate or incidental to, and located on the same lot with a principle use, building, or structure."

Some of the existing uses – those principle uses – in the Small Scale Business zone include business/professional offices; historic sites. The ones that apply in this situation are small scale retail and service business, provided that retail services are limited to products produced primarily on site or which are accessory to products produced on site. And the next bullet, which is small scale production or manufacture of products and goods, including food products, furniture, apparel, artwork, metal products, and wood products. And the uses go on. You can see what is existing – oh, excuse me – for existing accessory uses: owner operator/caretaker quarters. There's also administrative special uses, which is a little higher bar as far as what uses are allowed there as a primary use. And there are some other uses as a hearing examiner special use as well.

Worth noting, there are some special provisions of the Small Business zone that are required. I'm just going to read it here. 7(a)(i) is "all structures and outside activities shall be so located or screened from adjacent properties to avoid disturbance through glare, shading, noise, dirt or other nuisances or hazards." The second one doesn't really apply – about petroleum in this case – and the third one is "All development proposals within the" Small Scale Business "district shall include a plan, which shall be reviewed by and acceptable to the Planning and Development Services Department. This plan shall diagram and explain how open areas shall be maintained during and after construction to avoid sewage, drainage and dust nuisances to adjacent properties, uses, and critical areas. The plan shall also demonstrate how existing easement rights or other property ownership interests in the property are protected." So I thought those were applicable to mention in y'all's consideration.

And that is all we had on that one. The Department's recommendation is for an approval of the proposed amendment. I had nothing else on that one, if there aren't any questions.

Chair Raschko: Are there questions? I just have – I'd just like to clarify what I think I already know, but this is basically changing the statute not permitting a restaurant, and if this passes those people wishing a restaurant in Edison would still have to go through a process to permit that use. Is that right?

Mr. Gill: Yes, that is correct. They would still have to go through the permitting process. Just because there's an existing use doesn't mean that that accessory is automatically allowed on that site. So that is part of the reason why I brought up these special provisions, because any change

would require a plan. It's also important to note with accessory uses there has to be a primary use that's on the property that's already supported in the code, and that you couldn't just have a restaurant for restaurant's sake. It would have to be in support or incidental to that allowed use that's already on the property – if that helps.

Commissioner Mark Knutzen: I have a question.

Chair Raschko: And who's this?

Commissioner Knutzen: This is Mark Knutzen.

Chair Raschko: Please go ahead.

Commissioner Knutzen: Yes. Peter, I know that in Edison there's two taverns just down the street from this existing place. There's lots of different zoning designations in the town of Edison – RVC, RV, RVC. The two taverns that are there are in RVC zoning. How does that differ from the SSB that we're talking about?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, that's a good question. Those are Rural Business Commercial, I believe, zones, and so one of the things with those zones is they had to be in existence in 1990 when the Growth Management Act went into effect, I do believe. But to your point, a rezone to a different zone that already allows restaurants is an option for the petitioner.

Commissioner Knutzen: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Tammy Candler: Peter, do you know or can you easily access what is the – I just don't remember off the top of my head – what's the zone of Samish Bay Cheese that made a petition to us last year?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, that – I believe that is Ag-NRL.

Vice Chair Candler: So that would not be affected by *this*.

Mr. Gill: No, they would not.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, anybody else?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Gill: Okay? All right, moving on, Public Notice of Mineral Resource Extraction Activities. This is LR20-05. The applicant is requesting amendments to 14.06.150 and the proposal is to amend that section to allow for mineral extraction activities. "...notice must be provided within 1 mile and (be) posted at any post offices of nearby communities." So that is what's proposed. It's helpful to know what's already required. We currently require a 300-foot notification from the outer property boundaries of any mineral activity that's happening. That can be expanded to 500 feet by the

Department. Also worth noting is for marijuana facilities that notice is 1000 feet. And all proposed activities require that it's posted onsite, in the paper, and it also requires a public hearing as it is a special use permit.

The Department recommendation on this one: We do have, like I mentioned earlier, we had some options for you all to consider. And, of course, as you look at our staff report there's always a do nothing or do something different completely option that's always there, but we didn't write that every time. But you all understand that so....

The Department does recommend that the proposed amendments be approved with some modifications. And the Department recommends Option A, which is to increase the notification requirements to 1000 feet. Some of the justification with that is it's consistent with an existing use, an existing notice requirement from an existing use that we already use. It is more consistent with some of the neighboring jurisdictions that are out there. In your staff report you'll see a number of jurisdictions that we looked up and provided some background there in terms of what they require. It's also pretty close to and to your point, Chair, the quarter-mile, which is about 1320 feet. And that is the setback distance that we require for development adjacent to a Mineral Resource Overlay. Right? So if you're within that quarter-mile of a Mineral Resource Overlay, we restrict the housing density to no more than – I should – I'm not sure what the density is. It's maybe one per ten, but it may be even larger than that. But anyway, the point is we restrict the housing density a quarter-mile from any Mineral Resource Overlay for the noise and nuisance issues.

So that's Option A, is the 1000 feet. Option B is to adopt the citizen's proposed amendments, and Option C is to increase to the quarter-mile or 1320 feet as a setback distance. And that's consistent with Mineral Resource Overlay. Are there any questions on this one? Okay.

Chair Raschko: Well – nobody has any questions? I have one for you, Peter. What is the significance of marijuana to be used as a standard?

Mr. Gill: That's the only other use that we have a larger notice requirement for. So that's really about the only reason it's in here.

Chair Raschko: Are you saying it's the only one that's 1000 feet? Or it's the only other use that requires a notice?

Mr. Gill: Oh, no, it's not the only other required notice. It's just the only one that's greater than the 300 feet standard.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions/comments?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Please continue, Peter.

Mr. Gill: Okay. The next one's Accessory Dwelling Units – ADUs. Accessory Dwelling Units are typically smaller secondary residential structures where there's already a primary residence. This proposal would relax the family member occupancy requirement and the current size restrictions for *existing* structures. And by "existing structures," it means if you had a barn already on your site or a garage or some other somewhat habitable structure and you wanted to bring that up to code to make it a livable safe structure, you could do so and it wouldn't have to abide by the *current* sizing restrictions.

So that is the proposal, and a little more detail on what they're proposing: Those existing structures converted could not exceed the size of the primary residence. So if the primary residence is your main home and it's 2000 square feet, if you've got a barn that's 3000 square feet you would have to restrict the use to that 2000 feet. So it couldn't be more than that primary structure. And it would not change any of the size requirements for a new structure. So if you were to build a new building, a new house, on your property as an ADU, this doesn't touch that. And the current requirements or size restrictions on existing or new ADUs is 900 square feet or up to 50% of the primary residence.

And so our recommendation on this is to be approved with modifications. Our recommendation is Option A, which would be to remove the familial relation requirement for ADUs and remove the size limitation that relates to 50% of the total square footage of the principal unit. So you would still be capped at the 900 square feet but it wouldn't have to be 50% of the primary unit. So if your – example here that's shown on the screen or that's in parentheses is if the principal unit is 1800 square feet, under the existing code you would have to be 900 square feet. That wasn't a great example. But if your existing home were 1500 square feet, a primary residence under the existing code, 50% of that would be 750 square feet and so your ADU would have to be 750 square feet. So that's Option A, and I can explain more if that wasn't as clear as it could be.

Option B is the petitioners' proposal and Option C would be something similar to the petition's proposal but would increase new accessory dwelling unit size from 900 feet to 1200 square feet. So it would actually get at the whole new building issue as well, which isn't covered in either Option A or Option B.

Are there any questions on this item?

Chair Raschko: Let's see. We have Commissioner Woodmansee.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Peter, I'm a little confused on your new house analogy. Can you explain the new house analogy again? I didn't follow you on that.

Mr. Gill: Sure. I guess – to step back – if the existing code, if your existing primary residence is 1500 square feet excluding the garage, the largest you can make your ADU would be 750 square feet because the existing code requires that you're not more than 50% of the primary unit up to 900 square feet.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay, so let's say you have an 1100-square-foot existing house and you want to build a 2500-square-foot house and make the 1100-square-foot your ADU.

Mr. Gill: Then you'd be – then you would hit up against the 900 square feet issue because it's 50% or 900 square feet, whichever's greater. Well, not whichever's greater but whichever's most restrictive.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. I mean, I'm just asking questions for information. I mean, we're not deliberating these things all the way out.

Mr. Gill: Nope. Yep.

Chair Raschko: We have Commissioner Hughes followed by Commissioner Candler, so please go ahead, Amy.

Commissioner Amy Hughes: Thank you. Peter, I just want clarification: This is just for lots that have already been built on and they have an existing garage. If you have a brand new lot the rules – this wouldn't apply to that. That's a different set of rules?

Mr. Gill: Well, no, it could apply. So you could put a new house and a new ADU in on the property as well.

Commissioner Hughes: And is that already part of our code, or this picks that up?

Mr. Gill: That is already part of the code.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay, so this picks up all those properties that don't have an ADU but could have a sub-building that could be modified.

Mr. Gill: Correct. Yeah.

Commissioner Hughes: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Tammy, please.

Vice Chair Candler: My question – Commissioner Woodmansee asked about an 1100-square-foot house with a 2400 that you're building to be the main house. Does this matter if you have a – like a garage attached to either structure? You said irrespective of the garage's square feet, but, like, let's say the 1100 had a garage. Does that matter? Is that part of the square footage?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, that gets into a level detail I probably can't answer tonight, but –

Vice Chair Candler: Okay. That's okay.

Mr. Gill: – but I can certainly circle back around on that. So if your garage is 200 square feet, say _____ (garbled).

Vice Chair Candler: Yeah. Let's say there's 1100 square feet plus – sorry.

Mr. Gill: Right, right. I see where you're going with that. On the ADU, I don't know where the garage factors in and how that's computed. I believe it is without the garage but I will have to doublecheck on that.

Vice Chair Candler: Just basically the same question as, you know, whether or not an ADU can have a garage basically, or if it does have a garage does it have to be factored into the ___ limits.

Mr. Gill: Mm-hmm.

Vice Chair Candler: Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, another question from Joe. Go ahead, please.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So I guess, Peter, right now I'm under the assumption that a garage – that this is talking about living area. Finished, heated area – not something like a garage. In theory, you could build another shop that's 24 by 36 and it has nothing to do with living area. You've got an ADU and a house – primary house – and you could still build yourself a garage or

a shop regardless of – so I'm reading this with the assumption that we're talking about a heated living space. So if we could get that clarification, that'd be great.

Mr. Gill: Okay. Yeah, I believe you're correct and Commissioner Candler is as well, but I'll have to confirm that.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Mitchell, your turn, please.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, I think a number of us are on the same wavelength here. So let's say that we have an ADU that's 900 square feet. What does the County say about the cars for that? Are they allowed to put a portico on it or some sort of car covering to protect their vehicle, or does that ever factor into this or not?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, I don't think that's going to factor into the size requirements. I think, like Commissioner Woodmansee said, you could still build yourself a garage, whether it's attached or underneath or something to that effect. That –

Commissioner Mitchell: Or the ADU, right?

Mr. Gill: Yes. And often these ADUs that we see they are above a garage, right? And so, you know, there may be two parking spots in there. One is, you know, could be for the house, one could be for the ADU, they could all be for the ADU, they could all be for the house. But I can see if – I can look into the code and talk to our zoning folks a little bit more about this.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, if you don't mind. I'd like to know, and I realize that it's somewhat ancillary but when we get pictures I'd like to be able to see different ideas. You've been really nice about that in the past where we can see different types. The one that you mentioned was over the garage. There could be one that's attached to the house. There could be one that's attached to the garage. There could be one that's a separate unit entirely. Correct?

Mr. Gill: Correct. Mm-hmm. Yeah, we allow for attached and detached ADUs.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, great. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: I don't see any more hands up so I presume we can go on. Peter?

Mr. Gill: Okay. The next one is Clarifying the Conservation and Reserve Development Land Division and the "Reserve" Function within the CaRD – otherwise known as a CaRD. This is LR21-02. And the request is to clarify the definition and function of the Conservation and Reserve Developments within the Comprehensive Plan and the code. And there's really a few parts to this. There's looking at the definitions. The definitions in the Comprehensive Plan are less specific than in the development code but they are consistent, in our assessment.

The second bullet is: What is the relationship of CaRDs to the zoning code in the overlays? And we'll talk a little bit more about that tonight, but that mainly has to do with, you know, how much or how many developable lots you can get out of the parcel – so the density. As well as how and what that open space tract is used for. I'll come back to that.

And the third part is maybe where we focused in our staff report, which is looking at whether the reserve tract, that open space reserve tract, can be redeveloped and how that happens. And so we'll go with that.

I did want to make sure – and I probably should have done this last meeting on November 30th just to make sure we're all on the same page with what a CaRD is. It is, simply put, a subdivision. And so this is an existing CaRD that is out there on the landscape. This is an example. And what you see is the big black line is the original parcel that was subdivided, the parent parcel – that big, thick black line around the edges. And the new building lots that were put in with the subdivision are in yellow. So there's two lots that were put in approximately one acre, one-and-a-half acres. And the reserve tract is the area left over. And you'll see that this reserve tract or open space tract is called "Lot 2" here, and it has its own designation in terms of what kind of uses it is allowed. This is Open Space Recreational and Amenities, so OS-RA. And so that gets back to the zoning question: How does zoning interface with the CaRD land divisions? It helps dictate what Open Space Reserve can be used for on this site.

I've got another example that's similar. This one's a little bit bigger. Again, the wide black line around the edges – this is the – that's the parent parcel that was subdivided. Inside that you have the developable lots. There's one, two, three here and then there's a fourth here. And in this case, the buildable lot – there's a buildable lot within the reserve tract. And I don't want to get too far into the weeds on this, but in some zones with some Open Space designations you're allowed to have a building within that reserve tract.

So this is essentially another way to subdivide your land with a focus in protecting or preserving a larger open space with the development of building sites.

We did a pretty good analysis, extensive analysis, of CaRDs in existence. We looked at 155 of the CaRDs since 2000 and there was only 182 done. And what we saw is most of the open space was put into Open Space NRL or Open Space Protective Area. That's typically with a critical area ordinance, or critical areas on those open space tracts. Like we saw on the first example, there's about 600 acres in that recreational ___ open space type or designation. Rural Open, about 734. But the real subject of probably the concern or the clarification requested by the petitioner has to do with these last two open space designations shown in black. That's the Open Space Reserve, OS-RSV, and then Open Space Urban Reserve, which is OS-UR. And you'll see – I guess probably worth highlighting – the amount of area that's within these two. Together there's less than 200 acres of Open Space in these two types of designation of 4200. So it's a very small piece of the overall puzzle – or *pie*, not a puzzle.

So focusing in on those Open Space designations that can be redeveloped, the OS-RSV – that's the Open Space Reserve – is only allowed if someone doesn't use all their density when they do the CaRD subdivision. So if you would be allowed ten homes and you only wanted to create two building sites, you would put the rest of your density in this Open Space Reserve essentially. It would set it aside and that's where the OS-RSV comes in. There's not a lot of question on whether that makes sense or not. That seems pretty straightforward.

The Open Space Urban Reserve is the second one and that one is a little more complicated. This would allow future development when an area is rezoned. This designation is only allowed on land zoned Rural Village Residential, Rural Intermediate, or Rural Reserve, and only if they are located on a parcel that's within a quarter-mile of an Urban Growth Area or a Rural Village. And the Rural Village is really where the confusion, I think, comes into play, at least in my mind, because these Rural Villages cannot be expanded. There's state laws and rules around LAMIRDs. Some of you have heard that before – that statement. Those are areas that were denser than typically is considered rural in 1990 when the Growth Management Act went into effect. Those areas are not allowed to expand under state law. And so there really would be no

way to rezone one of these properties that are adjacent to Rural Village. And that's maybe where it's implied potentially by that OS-UR designation, but it's hard to see how that would happen.

And so just more on that, kind of – you know, the question is: Should it be allowed adjacent to the Rural Villages? It seems like the ability to redevelop rests with the ability to become part of the Rural Village or the Urban Growth Area. It makes sense that an Urban Growth Area could expand and that area could get annexed and therefore there could be density added to that reserve tract. But the Rural Village – again, I'm not sure how that would be accomplished unless there's a change to state law.

And so our recommendation is an order to clarify when the reserve tract could be rezoned. There's really two options, at least that I can see. Option A, which would remove the proximity to Rural Villages from the criteria that would designate the reserve parcel as Open Space Urban Reserve.

Option B would be to amend the code so the rezone of that reserve tract could only be done as part of a Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update cycle. And that is put in here because if there is a change to state law to allow a Rural Village LAMIRD to expand then you could potentially through the periodic update cycle when we have to implement any changes to state law do a rezone on those parcels.

So I know that was a lot on CaRDs. Hopefully I didn't totally lose anybody. Are there any questions?

Chair Raschko: Let's see. Commissioner Woodmansee, I think you are wanting to speak, followed by Commissioner Mitchell. So please go ahead, Joe.

Commissioner Woodmansee: So my basic question is, this is really all just about defining what the code already does and does not allow, correct?

Mr. Gill: Yeah. It clarifies in many ways that you know – if you're adjacent to a Rural Village you probably shouldn't get this Open Space designation on the reserve tract because you're probably not going to be able to rezone.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. And I realize that we're not deliberating this tonight, but...so my next question is: If you – what I really want to know is what's the meaningful change that we create here by making a change. And because if the actual end result is we're not changing anything then we're not – then it's all just wordsmithing so that people can try to read it clearer. It seems like Option B *is* changing something because it's restricting when somebody could. If all the stars align then they could actually try to do something, that they would be restricted to more of a five to eight-year cycle versus an annual.

Mr. Gill: Yeah. Yeah, the problem with Option B is that it would still allow us to designate those areas as Open Space Reserve and then, you know, people would still be under this implication that they could come in and get a rezone – which just happened this year, by the way. And the gentleman was upset, for good reason, because he thought, you know, he had this large reserve tract that he was going to be able to get ten more houses on, and, you know, we couldn't give him the zoning that he wanted on that rezone property because it's not allowed outside of the Rural Village legally.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay, so he didn't – that was his misunderstanding then. He thought he had something he didn't.

Mr. Gill: Right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: And the whole purpose of this is to make sure people understand what they have, not to actually change what we do now.

Mr. Gill: Correct. It really wouldn't change much on the ground. Like I said earlier, there's only three parcels – or three CaRDs that actually have this designation on them. And so it doesn't – yeah, like in effect it's not changing a ton. It's just going to save folks from a lot of heartache thinking they have something that they probably don't.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, and just what I'm trying to drill down to is the purpose of this is not to take away somebody's actual right they *do* have today, but to clarify what they do and don't actually have the ability to do.

Mr. Gill: That's right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah. At the risk of having you repeat yourself, Peter, because you partially answered with Joe, but I would like this crystal clear so I can go back and read it in the transcript. What are the pros and cons for Option A and the pros and cons for Option B?

Mr. Gill: So the pros for Option A would be that we wouldn't be creating that Open Space Urban Reserve on parcels adjacent to Rural Villages, in that we would not be setting people up for something that is not likely to ever be an option for them or a possibility.

The pros of Option B is it doesn't shut things down if there *is* a change to state law where a LAMIRD could be expanded. But in order to do that, you know, the state would be basically saying, We no longer care about urban versus rural densities, and therefore go ahead and expand and subdivide smaller. So I don't know that that's ever going to happen either.

Commissioner Mitchell: So Option B, what you're saying, is really pretty highly – well, that's unlikely anyway.

Mr. Gill: It is.

Commissioner Mitchell: And do you see any cons for Option A?

Mr. Gill: You know, I've tried to look at any loopholes there might be to where somebody could, you know, somehow get a rezone on that property, but there's nothing that I have been able to figure out that would allow someone to get more density than they already have. Because all of the zones where this open space designation is allowed are already as – is as broken up as they can be because they're LAMIRDs. So Rural Intermediate and Rural Village Residential, those are LAMIRDs so they already had that designation in 1990. That's the only way that someone in Rural Reserve, (in) which this is allowed, could get more density. And they can't rezone to those zone types. So it's just I just don't think – I don't see where the way – where the option is.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that help.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee, did you have something else?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah. It seems to me like the other way that more density could happen, today the Urban Growth boundaries are x, wherever they're at. In 50 years they could be three miles farther out. In 100 years maybe they'll get into some of these Rural Villages to where the Urban Growth Area gets that far out and they encompass some of these areas. And then at that point it's a whole new ballgame, I'm assuming, and it's, you know, however the annexation takes place and the conditions of the annexation and the zoning that comes with the annexation. So somebody could have a piece that's for 100 years not developable, but, you know, with the growth of a city next to one of these designations, if it were to ever grow that much and encompass it, there would be a potential change there someday, right? I realize that's far-looking, right?

Mr. Gill: Yeah, yeah! And that's a good point. I mean, yeah, that Urban Growth Area could grow beyond the Rural Village. If someone were to develop and create the CaRD, they would still be, you know, within that distance – is it half-mile, quarter-mile? – of the Urban Growth Area. So we're not changing that proximity option. Only the Rural Village section of that. But, yeah, you're right on. If that Urban Growth Area does grow that much, it could.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I mean, technically the City could grow out to one of these zones someday.

Mr. Gill: It could.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Without having a map in front of us and mapping it out. But, I mean, the possibility's there. The likelihood's probably pretty small, but...

Mr. Gill: Correct.

Commissioner Woodmansee: That would be the only other way the zoning would change, because you can't change the zoning per law right now.

Mr. Gill: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Correct?

Mr. Gill: That's true. And annexation – once it's annexed, then it goes to City zoning anyway.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Sure.

Mr. Gill: But, no, you're right.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Anything else for staff?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Gill: Okay?

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got one quick question, Commissioner Raschko.

Chair Raschko: And who's this?

Commissioner Mitchell: Mitchell.

Chair Raschko: Oh. Go ahead please, Kathy.

Commissioner Mitchell: So when we're looking at these kinds of things, Peter –

Mr. Gill: Yeah?

Commissioner Mitchell: We really – because we don't have a crystal ball – we really can't – I don't know – "can't" or "shouldn't" be looking at whether something can be annexed or not in the future, because we're dealing with situations now? It's sort of a philosophical question but you can see where I'm touching up on. We can't foresee annexation or not so is it or is it not better to deal with what we have today? I know we're planning, but –

Mr. Gill: Yeah. I mean, we have what we have in front of them, and just like the proposal tonight, you know, these land use laws change. They go through process. And so, you know, like you said, you know, what makes sense today may not make sense in 100 years – to Commissioner Woodmansee's point. So it's hard to say.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, that's a really tough question. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Let's move on.

Vice Chair Candler: We have a hand up.

Chair Raschko: Whose hand is up?

Hal Hart: That was Director Hart.

Chair Raschko: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Hart: Nope, it's okay. I'm listening very intently. Really good questions. The one thing I would say back to the question that was just raised is we always are looking for patterns, and having just reread the Rural Element of Growth Management, the pattern that they were shooting for was not a lot of people in the ag area generally. It was agrarian, kind of, to be left open and with a lot of open spaces there. So I think the concept is that you have a UGA. The UGA would be filled in and then they'd go for the next increment, and they didn't want – they did not want people jumping over the UGA into the rural area and using a tool – and that's what this is; it's a tool – in some other way than it was originally envisioned, Commissioner.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you very much.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Okay, Peter.

Mr. Gill: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Try it again.

Mr. Gill: The next one on the docket is LR21-04. This is the Agricultural Processing Facilities in the Bayview Ridge Light Industrial zone. And so the proposal is to add agricultural slaughtering facilities as an accessory use, incidental to agricultural and food processing, storage, and transportation facilities, which is a permitted use in the Bayview Ridge Light Industrial zone. And there's some caveats on that. "...provided that the portion of the premise dedicated to slaughtering is entirely enclosed within the interior of the facility" – so it's entirely enclosed – "and (2)" it "occupies less than 5000 square feet of the total processing," and so that's a limit on size as well.

The Department is recommending the proposed amendments be approved. Are there any questions on this one?

Chair Raschko: It looks like no questions.

Mr. Gill: Okay, so now we're on to the County-initiated proposals. We've got five of those. The first one is C21-1. This is the 2020 Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Plan. The Board adopted this plan on February 3rd, 2020. This change would recognize that plan in our Comprehensive Plan because the Parks and Rec Plan is a functional Plan attached to the Comprehensive Plan. So it would incorporate by reference. In incorporating this plan, we're required to look at consistency with the Comp Plan, and there's some questions about the zoning and some of the locations of existing parks within our existing zones. And so we've looked at that and there's a couple of options for moving forward to get better consistency between our Comp Plan and the Parks and Rec Plan. One is to – is Option A – is to amend the development regulations by adding parks as administrative and hearing examiner special uses in zones where they're supported by the Comprehensive Plan. Or Option B is amend the Comp Plan *and* the development regulations to add parks as a public use.

Are there any questions on that? We are recommending Option A. Sorry if I didn't say that.

Chair Raschko: Any questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, thank you, Peter. I think we can move on.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I've got one question.

Chair Raschko: Who have we got?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Commissioner Woodmansee.

Chair Raschko: Okay, go ahead, Joe.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Peter, are there zones – I'm assuming there are some zones where you wouldn't want a park – industrial areas and stuff like that.

Mr. Gill: Correct. That's right. And so there are places where under Option A we are not proposing to amend the zoning code to allow for parks. One of those would be in the Ag-NRL zone. There's nothing in the Comprehensive Plan under Ag-NRL that would point to park use, and so we have not proposed adding that.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay, thank you.

Chair Raschko: Any more questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, Peter. Just as an explanatory thing, I cannot see people on my computer so raising your hand doesn't help. The Chat Box does. Thank you.

Mr. Gill: Okay. The next one is C21-2. This is the SEPA Determination Review Timing. There was a request within the Department to allow for development proposal SEPAs to be appealed, or the threshold determination be appealed prior to the underlying development permit being reviewed. After further discussion with staff and with legal and review of the RCWs, that does not look like a legal option for us, and so our recommendation is to deny this petition.

Anyone have any questions on this?

(silence)

Mr. Gill: Seeing no questions, I can move on. Two left. C21-4 is Reduce Front Setback in Bayview Ridge Residential Zones. And that would include Class 19 roads. So what this would do is make the 20-foot setback for primary residences within the Bayview Ridge Residential zone consistent across the board to be 20 feet. The Department recommends that the code change be approved.

Are there any questions on this one?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Looks like not.

Mr. Gill: Okay. And the last one on our list this evening is C21-5. This is the Pre-Application Requirement for review of development permits. This code amendment would make the pre-application meeting optional and the pre-development meeting required. Currently there's a cost for the pre-application meeting and so people tend to look for a waiver to that application meeting and opt for a pre-development meeting instead. This would be – the pre-development meeting would still be required. It would still allow for existing input from all the different permits or review staff that need to be there, as well as even from outside agencies where it makes sense. This would be waived as it currently is for administrative interpretations, decisions, boundary line adjustments, any development that is exempt from SEPA review, including single-family homes.

The Department recommends approving this proposal. Are there any questions?

Chair Raschko: Let's see, Commissioner Henley first, followed by Commissioner Mitchell. Please go ahead, Vince.

Commissioner Henley: My question isn't on this one. It's on what happened to C21-3.

Mr. Gill: Did I miss one?

Commissioner Henley: C21-3, I don't think you covered.

Mr. Gill: Oh! I'm sorry. Let's – do you want me to – do we want to finish this one and then I'll go to –

Commissioner Henley: Yeah, I'd say finish _____

Chair Raschko: Let's finish this.

Commissioner Henley: – and then go back.

Mr. Gill: Okay. Are there any questions on C21-5?

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell has a question. Please go ahead, Kathy.

Commissioner Mitchell: Yeah, I'd like to change my question to the very end, please.

Chair Raschko: All right.

Mr. Gill: Okay.

Chair Raschko: Anybody on C21-5?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so we go to number 3.

Mr. Gill: Okay. I'm going to jump to the staff report because I don't have a slide for that. So, yeah, sorry about that. All right, let me blow this up a bit. Can everyone see that okay? C21-3 is the Hamilton Zoning & Comprehensive Plan updates. The proposal is to make changes to the zoning code to remove zones that no longer exist subsequent to the Hamilton annexations. The code sections that would be removed include Hamilton Residential. Sorry about that. This'll help. This is more apparent. So here's the first image. Hamilton Residential would be removed, as well as Hamilton Industrial would also be removed. You can see this was 2008. The City of Hamilton now includes the Hamilton Industrial. At the bottom of the screen the image shows the current planning there and you can see the city boundaries on the west side of Hamilton include this Hamilton Industrial now. So we no longer need this Hamilton Industrial zone in our zoning code, and as well as this Hamilton Residential that is no longer within the County jurisdiction as it's been annexed.

And so our recommendation is to approve the changes that would remove the zoning code sections that no longer apply. Are there any questions on this one?

Chair Raschko: Well, it looks like no questions.

Mr. Gill: Okay. And then I apologize. I'm going to have to switch back here, but I think we're just about done.

Commissioner Mitchell: I've got a couple questions for you.

Chair Raschko: Is that on the Hamilton zoning?

Commissioner Mitchell: No, this is for the whole package.

Chair Raschko: Shall we let him finish his thing and then we'll have questions over the entirety?

Mr. Gill: So this (is) just wrapping us up. Here's the pinwheel again! We are moving towards getting a published staff report out with the SEPA notice, and then a public hearing on January 11th, followed by deliberation by you all and a recommendation. And there is more information if the hundred pages of staff report is not enough. There are lots of things on the Skagit County website @skagitcounty.net/2021cpa. That is all I have tonight.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Let's open up for questions about the entirety, and, Commissioner Mitchell, I believe you are first.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you. Peter, you said you've got another set of staff reports coming before it goes out for a public hearing. The slides that you used tonight, are they different than any slides you used with us before? It sort of looks like that to me but I wasn't sure.

Mr. Gill: They're mostly the same but I did add some things, yes.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay. Would you please post what you used tonight for tonight's meeting materials then when you're done?

Mr. Gill: Sure.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you. That's helpful.

Mr. Gill: Okay,

Commissioner Mitchell: And when you do put stuff out for a public hearing, do you see any changes – you know, bigger changes coming, or is it going to look pretty much like everything we've seen so far?

Mr. Gill: Yeah. No, I don't see the staff report changing much other than the last page. We might put the details of the public hearing in there and we will look a little closer at some of the code changes and give that a last read and more legal review. So I don't anticipate much significant, but we will be crossing the t's and dotting the i's.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, and that will include the metric, right? The metric thing, the making all the – the 1000, quarter-mile, and one mile all the –

Mr. Gill: Yes, yes, definitely get the units consistent. Yeah.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, great. Well, thank you so much.

Mr. Gill: Okay.

Chair Raschko: And Joe? Commissioner Woodmansee, you had something?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yes. Peter, it would be helpful to me if we could include in the Mineral Overlay petition a zoning map that shows where those zones are located. I don't know if we could add that to the thing but it'd be helpful to have that while we're talking about it in the future – to be able to look at that map and/or identify one like you did with the other ones where you showed this is where this zoning is.

Mr. Gill: Sure. Yes, you know, the Mineral Resource Overlays are quite extensive but I can get a map incorporated.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Okay, thank you.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Commissioner Henley?

Commissioner Henley: Yes. Peter, I noticed in the copy of the staff report that I've got you've got some dates on page 1 and then again back on page 4, but they're dates in the future. And so, I mean, this is trivial but I don't think you can make claims about something that you're going to do in the future in a document that you're asking us to review now.

Mr. Gill: That's – that's – I'm glad you read! There was some spots that we typically have done some of these things prior to releasing the staff report, including the SEPA notice, but we have not done that yet for different reasons and so we had to anticipate. So, yes, that is why it's there and that's why we will be releasing a final version. And I don't anticipate those dates changing, but they may. Thank you.

Commissioner Henley: Just as long as they're in the past instead of the future might be helpful.

Mr. Gill: Yes.

Commissioner Henley: (laughing) Okay.

Chair Raschko: Any other questions?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Nobody? Okay, that'll wrap up the Planning Docket Work Session. Thank you, Peter, for all your hard work, and the rest of the staff as well. And we'll move on to the Director's Update. Mr. Hart, please.

Mr. Hart: Thank you, Commissioner. I'll ask that Peter opens the email and then puts it on the screen. If you can you do that?

Mr. Gill: Yeah. I'm almost caught up to you here. Here we go.

Mr. Hart: Thank you. Let's go ahead and do the next one. Great. So in the spirit of every development permit helps to implement our Comprehensive Plan, this year we received the bulk of our Comprehensive Plan updates all in the first 30 days when there were some changes at the state. We've spent most of the rest of the year burning that huge load of permits. We got in control of that by late September and now we're back on track. Given all that, we are seeing that we're about 25% ahead of last year in overall housing permits and similarly in commercial permits. So let's go ahead. And we are still working on how to improve and revamp our process along the way.

Commercial development: We had over 15 really significant ones. And I think one of the ones that's always overlooked is Camp Corey near Snohomish County has gone through a major influx of Seattle area capital and they've redeveloped the camp for children, they've modernized everything, and every new building has been upgraded out there.

Amazon, Legends, Sakata Seed, Vikima Seed, Skagit Transit, PACCAR: And I'll say that all these – many of these, anyway; almost all of these – are in stages or phases. So far what we know from Amazon, this is one large project. We understand that. But in other places they've continued to grow, so we're looking at that.

We've had a big year in aviation projects, Commissioners. We had three more turned in this last week. So expect to see a lot more construction at the airport over the next year. We have a new rail siding. That will allow for more companies to load and offload heavy bulk products. And that's near the Port. Vanderyacht Propane will be one of the companies that takes advantage of that loading opportunity.

Let's go to the next slide. Housing Growth: So our objective of directing new housing into the cities is mostly successful. Our goal is an 80/20 split. Sometimes I think we're getting closer to 70/30. There are three pictures. All of them were taken this last week at Nookachamps. The houses are within the 7 to \$800,000 range. They're running out of places to build. There's still, I think, a few left in Nookachamps Phase II and a few in Phase I, but they are infilling now and so there's a need for additional housing out there. There are some lands that are available for that still, even under Growth Management. So expect to see some of those developed. I've signed – in the last week I've extended a number of subdivisions for various reasons. One reason is because stormwater changes to code – statewide code – don't vest. And so if you haven't developed and you're sitting on your plans from a few years ago, you now have to update those plans. And the concept of that is mimicking kind of pre-contact what was stormwater like when it was a heavily-forested environment. So you have to hold that water and slowly release that. And so that's going to require redesigns on existing subdivisions going forward. So that was the reason why I signed a couple of those. But I do expect those subdivisions to come in and then the housing to be built beginning in '22.

Let's go to the next slide. The year ahead: Significant growth is expected to continue. The Port will continue to develop its properties. Our staff has just met with the Port and we ask those questions on an annual basis. Several firms have again expressed growth phasing with more phases expected in '22. Some of these firms, like PACCAR, were talking about doing this in 2018 but they didn't do it in 2018 due to changes in leadership and other changes.

We will see additional aviation permits. We have a number of folks that we're talking to of all sizes. We just finished a subdivision on Port property allowing for another very large hangar to go in, and then they have six medium-sized hangars. These hangars – the medium-sized hangars – are at about 25,000 square feet apiece, so maybe two or three small Lear jets could fit inside of each one of those – which is, by the way, a booming business. And they're being crowded out of all the airports to the south of us.

Westland Distillery – this morning I checked in on them. They're on the third rack house so they're at 23% of all the rack houses that are going to be out there because they're planning for 13. Our agricultural is beginning to look a little global in nature. And I think people understand from all over the world the value of our agricultural land.

Let's go ahead to the next one. This picture that you see – there'll be a groundbreaking for Martha's Place on the 16th. This is funding that comes from Skagit County and other places, but it's ___ and George Kosovich over in the Health Department is the lead for this project. This is a 70-unit supportive housing complex. The construction's already begun but the official groundbreaking will be on the 16th. The Health Department's funding efforts in various places. There's another one, Catholic Community Services has got another project coming on, and I'm

thinking about what our overall housing effort is. And we're looking at ADUs just now. That's certainly part of it. I would guide you to a really kind of unique approach – although it's becoming less unique – on ADUs in cities, and that's the city of Renton. And I didn't bring pictures with me. That's for another report. But I have them now but I didn't put them into this one. But the city of Renton has come up with about 12 different types of ADUs. They have standard plan sets that you can use as a homeowner. They're so encouraging that in some cases some cities are not requiring any permit costs for the review. So they just want to get the housing built and they want you as a homeowner to make the investment in your backyard. And they're anywhere from 500 to 800, 900 square feet. There're some plans that are 418 square feet. And so cities are doing this more and more across the state of Washington. Can you look at Fully Contained Communities as another strategy? Continue to look at County-owned lands for potential housing solutions, such as the fairgrounds is another solution. And we're seeing those solutions being replicated across the state right now.

Let's go to the next slide if there is one. Okay. This was just a few hours ago. The Governor was over at the Swinomish and online and he said, Hey, this is what – yesterday was climate change policy and what he is going to be running in the state legislature, so all 39 counties are kind of responding to this. But this was today's announcement off the governor's website. Protect and restore vital salmon habitat; build climate resilience; invest in clean water infrastructure for salmon and people; align harvest, hatcheries, and hydropower with salmon recovery. So he mentioned with each one of these projects that relate to Skagit County. Correct fish passage barriers and restore salmon access – and he also mentioned the amount of money that was going into this year's budget. This is a long-term effort but it has direct impacts on Skagit County and direct impacts on things like our Shoreline Master Program, which you just finished taking a look at. So the state is very interested in that master program. They're very interested in salmon recovery, and we're more likely to see climate change bills. And then I also think we will see a rerun of the GMA bill. I just looked at that again and including the LAMIRD portions of it, some of those LAMIRD provisions that would loosen up and allow economic development and housing – some housing – in our LAMIRD, it passed by a wide margin in the senate, but it didn't pass overall and so it died. So that could come back, Commissioners, and so I'll be busy, you know, monitoring that and bringing that back. This is a short session, so by April it should all be over.

And I think that's it. All right.

Chair Raschko: Well, thank you.

Mr. Hart: Yep. Any questions?

Chair Raschko: Any questions for Hal? I can't see because I don't have the Chat on. Okay, looks like not. Thank you very much. That was a pretty interesting report. We'll move to the Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements and we'll let Joe go first.

Commissioner Woodmansee: I don't have any announcements other than to wish everybody Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays and all that and a good new year.

Chair Raschko: Are you done?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, I'm done.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thanks! Kathy, your turn.

Commissioner Mitchell: I want to wish everybody Merry Christmas and Happy New Year, and staff and fellow Commissioners, thanks for all the hard work that you've done this past year. It's just been an incredible volume. Good job, everybody.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Mark?

Commissioner Knutzen: Just Merry Christmas, Happy New Year! That's it.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Mark. Amy?

Commissioner Hughes: Good night, everybody. That's all.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Vince?

Commissioner Henley: Yes, I'd like to thank the staff for their hard work again, and even though I think I still may submit a bill for printer ink and paper to the Commission because it's a – I've never seen a document come out of the staff that was fewer than 100 pages, I think. Anyway, Merry Christmas to you all. Have a Happy New Year and I hope that all of your wishes come true.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Tammy?

Vice Chair Candler: Happy Holidays, everybody. That's it.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. I'm going to wish just the same. Very Merry Christmas, a blessed time to everybody, and a Happy New Year. Thanks to the staff for all the hard – I mean, it was a lot of hard work – and my fellow Commissioners for all the hard work. I want to thank everybody too for their support over this past year.

So with that, hopefully everybody's going to have a really happy month and we'll stand adjourned.