

DISCUSSION	<p>water system plan and possibly serving the area north of Limestone Road. I would also like an update on the Water District 13 sewer and water plans.</p> <p>Phil: Regarding Water District 13 we have hired an engineer who is in the process of updating our Comprehensive Plan. We are also on schedule to complete the water plan by the timeline given to us.</p> <p>Richard: Regarding Water District 19, our Comprehensive Plan update is due in August. I think we will make that deadline. We did a count of our connections, which I can't quote the number right now, but we do have a number of connections available so we may be able to serve the Limestone Road area.</p> <p>Matt: Regarding fire, I understand there was a commissioner meeting on Monday. Can we find out what was discussed at that meeting?</p> <p>Skip Moore: I am a commissioner with Fire District #14. We have been working, for quite some time, with developers to try and solve quite a few problems that we have in the area. We have been working on concurrency and will serve letters for the UGA. Recently the fire district filed an appeal on the UGA review. We were advised to do so by our legal council. We aren't against growth but if we didn't file the appeal we lost all ways to have input into what is going on regarding fire service. We are a rural fire district being asked to provide an urban level of service. Within the next two months we hope to be able to issue concurrency to the developers. We know that development is going to come to this area so we are working on funding mechanisms. Right now there is legislation going through that would allow mitigation fees to be available to the fire districts. That money can be used for facilities and equipment, but not wages.</p> <p>Phil: Stormwater management should be a subject of further discussion. Our intent was for light impact development. What is in the plan is not what the committee recommendations were.</p> <p>David: County Public Works is currently working on some regulations that would be applied here. We can discuss this with them.</p> <p>The committee and staff agreed to discuss this item further at another meeting.</p>
-------------------	---

AGENDA ITEMS #6 Committee input on Planning Commission recommendations for LAMIRDs in the Foothills Subareas

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	<p><u>Deming</u></p> <p>David: The Planning Commission recommended the same boundaries that are in the Foothills Plan. They did not recommend any rezoning. In your plan you have some rezoning.</p> <p>The Committee recommended maintaining their previous proposal to expand the Small Town Commercial zone west of Mitchell Road.</p> <p><u>Welcome</u></p>
-----------------------------	--

David: The Planning Commission made significant changes from your recommendations. The Planning Commission did not see a way to extend the logical outer boundaries when looking at the 1990 aerial photos. The areas removed were zoned R10A. Staff thinks we can defend R5A zoning.

Jan: I would propose that the subarea committee support R5A zoning.

The Committee discussed R10A versus R5A zoning and could not reach a consensus. The Committee vote was 6-2 in favor of R5A.

Kendall

David: This area was slightly reduced in size from what you recommended. An area north of the Mt. Baker Highway was taken out. The Planning Commission recommended criteria that looks at community facilities that may have been built after 1990. The Planning Commission included an area to the east, which includes the proposed Welcome center.

The Committee supported the Planning Commission recommendation.

The Glen at Maple Falls

David: The Planning Commission decided not to have residential only LAMIRDs so they did not designate this area as a LAMIRD. This area is pretty much built out so the R10A zoning they applied won't have much effect.

The Committee supported the Planning Commission recommendation. However, the Committee noted that The Glen could be designated as a LAMIRD, if the new County Council decides to consider residential/recreational LAMIRDs throughout the County.

Maple Falls

David: The Planning Commission reduced the size of the LAMIRD from what the Committee proposed.

The Committee supported the Planning Commission recommendation.

Glacier Springs

David: This is the same as the Glen at Maple Falls in that it's all platted out.

The Committee supported the Planning Commission recommendation.

Glacier

David: The Planning Commission took out several areas. It was hard to find a logical boundary in some areas. The Planning Commission looked at the water system boundaries, which is part of the built environment, and they chose not to use water lines as the sole criteria for designation of the boundaries.

Jan: I have a problem with them taking out that triangle, east of Mt. Baker Rim, because in the Glacier area the only private property there is along the Mt. Baker Highway. We are totally surrounded by forest and State land. That triangle is the only area of land, of significant size that someone could build on.

The Committee recommended adding the triangular 14-acre parcel immediately east of Mt. Baker Rim to the Rural Center LAMIRD designation. The Committee did not address proposed zoning for the 14-acre parcel at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #7 Opportunity for Committee Members to Discuss Matters Not on the Agenda

DISCUSSION ITEMS

◆ Jan: What is the timeline for the LAMIRD issue?

David: We have to wait for the County Council to finish their LAMIRD decision. It is anticipated that the GMHB is going to set a deadline. I am anticipating the deadline may be in October or November. One of my goals is to take what you have done and what the Planning Commission has done so we have a consistent plan going to the Council.

Agenda Item #8 Public Comment

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Georgina Head: We are planning on starting construction of the Kendall library in the spring. (She distributed a copy of the Maple Falls Strategic Plan)

Rob Staveland: Is the subarea plan going to Council for adoption as is?

Matt: Staff is going through the subarea plan and doing edits. We would like to bring that back to the Committee for review.

Rob: There are three properties in the UGA, such as the one north of Limestone Road, that have some nebulous conditional status. Will the Committee have a chance to review that area?

Matt: I think that is an issue to look at.

Ellen Baker: Are you going to meet again to revisit some of the issues? I think there are some significant issues that the Committee never took a stand on. Are any of your goals in the Comprehensive Plan going to be revisited based on updated information?

Gary: No, we don't intend to get back together to revisit the whole plan. If you have issues you would like us to address we can consider them.

Jack Hovenier: It's my understanding that we were coming here tonight to watch the Committee try to reconcile the UGA and LAMIRD decisions prior to them going to the Planning Commission. I know that school and fire are still issues. Are those

going to be discussed?

Matt: We will be bringing back information we got from the school district. As far as the fire district I think we will have to wait and see what comes from their revised capital facilities plan.

Meeting Adjourned.