

City of Mount Vernon  
Planning Commission Meeting  
October 7, 2008 7:00 pm  
1805 Continental Place

Vice-chairperson **Warren Cheney** called the meeting to order. Present were Commission members **Tom Twedt, Mark Hulst, Donnie Keltz** and **Al Lyon**. CED Director **Jana Hanson**, Senior Planner **Rebecca Bradley-Lowell** and City Attorney **Kevin Rogerson** were also in attendance. Denny Legro was absent.

Minutes:

**Mr. Hulst** moved, second by **Mr. Twedt**, to approve the minutes from September 16, 2008.

Public Hearing on Essential Public Facilities Ordinance:

**Ms. Bradley-Lowell** provided an overview of the Essential Public Facilities (EPF) ordinance. Current state law, under GMA, requires cities and counties to develop criteria for siting EPFs. The City of Mount Vernon does not currently identify EPFs within the zoning code or other development regulations; and does not have a process for identifying and siting of these facilities. Examples are these facilities include, but are not limited to airports, educational facilities, regional transportation facilities, solid waste facilities, state and local correction facilities, in-patient facilities and secure community transition facilities. The ordinance will identify EPFs under two types. Type One will be regional, Type Two will be local. There are also provisions for Secure Community Transition Facilities (SCTFs).

A draft ordinance was reviewed by Planning Commission last March. The consensus then was process EPF as a Type IV permit with the City Council making the final decision; versus a Type III permit where the Hearing Examiner makes the final decision. **Ms. Bradley-Lowell** provided an article from Municipal Research Service Center on the advantages and disadvantages of using the Hearing Examiner system.

**Mr. Cheney** opened the public hearing. There was no public present, public hearing was closed.

The discussion between staff and Commissioners centered on which permit type to process an EPF.

**Mr. Rogerson** stated there are advantages and disadvantages to either permit type. Due to the nature of a facility it could become a controversial issue. Both types allow for the Hearing Examiner process. **Mr. Hulst** feels the community would want City Council to make the final decision. The disadvantage with the Type III process is a lack of accountability from elected officials. **Mr. Lyon** inquired if a Type III permit can be appealed to City Council. **Mr. Rogerson** stated yes. **Mr. Twedt** also spoke in favor of the Type 3 permit process. **Mr. Cheney** expressed concern with flexible criteria in the ordinance. **Mr. Rogerson** gave options for regulating EPFs: create a zone and permit some, or conditional use permit. **Mr. Cheney** also inquired of the noticing requirements. **Ms. Bradley-Lowell** stated noticing requirements for both permits are the same.

**Mr. Hulst** moved to recommend to City Council the Type IV permit process for Essential Public Facilities. Motion failed for lack of a second.

**Mr. Lyon** moved, second by **Mr. Twedt**, to recommend to City Council for approval adoption of the Findings of Facts and Conclusions and Type III permit process for Essential Public Facilities. Motion carried with **Mr. Hulst** opposing.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned.