

PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION
SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM
April 6, 2006 - 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Dean Kastanis, Nathan Nofziger, Mitchell Heaps, and Tor Hartmann

Staff Present: Anne Henning and Judy Thompson

SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM

Chapter 9 - Shoreline Environment Designations - 2-22-06 Draft

Anne Henning, Associate Planner, stated that this chapter is the heart of the Shoreline Master Plan as it lists the uses that are permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited in each designation, and the development standards for those uses. She briefly explained the difference between each environmental designation.

After some discussion, the Commission felt that boat lifts should be allowed if a dock is allowed and that in some environment designations there should only be one boat lift allowed per lot. A private dock should be allowed as a conditional use in the SR-S designation for existing lots.

There was discussion on private and community boat launches. Since a boat launch essentially paves the shoreline, it was the feeling that private boat launches should be prohibited, but that community launches should be allowed in the SR-S designation.

Ms. Henning mentioned that a rail system does essentially the same thing as a private boat launch ramp but without the impact. However, a rail system is not addressed in the table.

Mr. Nofziger questioned whether there might be some commercial uses allowed in the residential zones that would want a dock and if, therefore, commercial docks should be allowed.

Ms. Henning stated that the R-3 Zone allows some commercial uses that may want a dock, such as hotels and motels, RV parks, and manufactured home parks.

The consensus of the Commission was that commercial docks should be allowed as a conditional use in the residential designations.

Mr. Nofziger questioned the requirement for a planned unit development as the only form of residential subdivision in the SR-S designation, and what would happen if someone just wanted to split an existing lot into two.

The Commission discussed that smaller lots lead to more shoreline impact.

The Commission discussed dredging and it was pointed out that there is a difference between the type of dredging a property owner may be allowed in order to continue to use his dock and the type of dredging the Moses Lake Irrigation and Rehabilitation District is planning. It was felt that "maintenance" dredging, to remove build up adjacent to a dock, would be allowed but dredging to create an area for a dock or boat would be prohibited. The "maintenance" dredging would be associated with public or private docks and/or areas along the shoreline. The dredging the Irrigation and Rehabilitation District is planning is actually sediment removal to restore the lake to a previous condition, rather than removing native lake bottom.

Ms. Henning stated that a sediment removal plan will be required for MLIRD's projects and there is still a lot of work to be done on this subject. Since the sediment removal plan is a major undertaking, it will be incorporated into the Shoreline Master Program at a later date.

The Commission discussed the tradeoff between allowing longer docks and allowing dredging to create moorage. The consensus was that they would rather see longer docks than dredging to create moorage, and that there may be some areas that are just too shallow to accommodate docks. A potential purchaser of shoreline property should research the physical condition of the property and adjacent lake area before purchasing it.

Mr. Hartmann questioned the "flood protection facilities". If that refers to dikes, levees, or the like, there is no need for them in the Moses Lake area.

Ms. Henning stated that it is required to be addressed and it was addressed by prohibiting the flood protection facilities in all the shoreline designations.

Mr. Nofziger questioned what is meant by "storm water management facilities."

Ms. Henning was unsure and stated that she would contact the consultant.

The proposed height limits were discussed.

Mr. Hartmann asked where the height was measured from.

Ms. Henning stated that height is measured from grade around the structure, rather than from water level.

Mr. Nofziger questioned whether the site coverage requirement was attainable with a standard size lot, house, and driveway. He felt that the requirement that no more than 50% of the lot be covered with impervious surfaces might create a hardship for a 7,000 square foot lot. After some discussion, the Commission concluded that most shoreline lots are larger than the minimum required, so the lot coverage would not be a problem.

There was some discussion on the proposed setbacks.

The Commission felt that a 50' setback was too much for a standard lot, since it would leave only 25' of buildable area after accounting for the required 25' front zoning setback. They felt that a 40' shoreline setback would provide shoreline protection but also allow room for a reasonably-sized house. After further discussion, the Commission concluded that leaving the setback as it is will require new plats to create larger lots, so no changes were made to residential setback provisions.

It was felt the sign setbacks should be at least as large as house setbacks, and that the setback for utility storage tanks and accessory uses should be the same as for the main utility structures.

Chapter 11 - Shoreline Protection and Restoration - 2-22-06 Draft

Ms. Henning stated that Chapter 11 concerns the actions the city should take to enhance, protect, and restore the shoreline and give a suggested time line for completion of those activities.

The Commissioners will review Chapter 11 and at the April 13 meeting determine whether a study session is needed to discuss this chapter.

The study session was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.