Pleasant Harbor Master Planned Resort
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Agenda

Project Overview and Planning History

Development Agreement - purpose

Development Regulations - synopsis

Next Steps
Physical Location: South Jefferson County along the Hood Canal comprised of Pleasant Harbor and the southern portion of the Black Point Peninsula in Brinnon.
Physical Location: Black Point peninsula located between two major Hood Canal river deltas.
Former Campground
Former Campground Includes:

- System of Paved and Gravel Roads
- Parking Areas
- 500+ RV Pad Sites
- Buildings with Septic Tanks and Drain Fields
Black Point existing businesses include the Pleasant Harbor Marina and the former Old NACO West RV Park and Campground and associated commercial buildings and uses as well as Mt. Jupiter Auto Repair and Coldwell Banker Settlers Real Estate office on Highway 101.
NOTE: Jefferson County Code 18.15.126 through 135 sets forth local code requirements for the preparation, content, criteria for and the approval process of Master Planned Resorts, including development standards and development agreement stipulations.
• 2006: Application for MPR designation.
• **413 comments**
• Analyzed impacts of changing land use from residential to master planned resort.
January 2008: BoCC approves the MPR Designation in Ordinance No. 01-0128-08

Adopted Ordinance lists thirty (30) conditions that must be used for the planning and development of the Pleasant Harbor Master Planned Resort.

#63. In consideration of the public interest, and pursuant to the authority that is granted the County legislative authority...the Board enters certain of the following conditions....
38. The Board affirmed the appropriateness of the proposal with respect to JCC 18.15.120 on purpose and intent, and consistency with RCW 36.70A.360. A new MPR is thus appropriate at this location.

NOTE:
• Ordinance No. 01-0128-08 was appealed and upheld on September 15, 2008 by the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board

• This decision was challenged and upheld in Superior Court on June 30, 2009 and further upheld by the Court of Appeals on January 19, 2011
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ANALYSIS

- Supplemental EIS

- Analyzed MPR development alternatives, zoning regulations and development agreement

- Mitigation requirements
  - Environmental
  - Services
  - Housing
  - Traffic
  - Utilities

- November 2014: Draft Supplemental EIS.

- December 2015: Final Supplemental EIS.
In early 2016, after publication of the FSEIS, Planning Commission held a public hearing and accepted public comments on development standards for the Pleasant Harbor MPR.

- Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe (PGST) voiced concerns over proposed project
- **PGST requested formal government-to-government consultations**
- Jefferson County has rich history of collaboration with PGST on projects
- Tribal Consultations occurred while Planning Commission separately deliberate on MPR development regulations

**The Planning Commission**
- Deliberated **over 6 months**
- **Produced** recommended development standards for Pleasant Harbor MPR
- **Forwarded** their code to the Board of County Commissioners for consideration

**Tribal consultations**
- **Two meetings with developer, PGST and County** conducted in early 2017
- **Produced further** information on tribal concerns and on how development agreement could best address issues
- Consultations **continue** and are still on-going
Two key public documents set forth mandates on developing and operating the Pleasant Harbor MPR.

Collectively, Ordinance and FSEIS call for

- MOUs with community, life-safety, service agencies and groups
- Workforce development
- Consultation with area Tribes
- Cultural resources management
- Wildlife management
- Water supply management
- Water quality management
- Surface and stormwater
- Greenbelts and vegetation
- Specific mitigations

Not covered; worth mentioning: Special Reports and Studies, Public Involvement, Meetings, Hearings, Formal Consultations
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

BACKGROUND: Authorized in state law – 36.70B.170 RCW

“set forth development standards and other provisions” to govern development, specific standards and mitigation of development for a specified timeframe shall be consistent with applicable local development regulations adopted under Growth Management Act

public hearing required; adopted by ordinance or resolution

typically accompany large developments like housing developments, commercial areas, resorts

provides clarity, specificity and predictability for large developments while providing longer-than-normal timeframes and vesting to existing local code
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

For Pleasant Harbor MPR

Development Agreement will be the principal vehicle to ensure compliance with all required conditions.

Development Agreement defines phases for build-out, establishes terms and scope of vesting period.

Development Agreement articulates development standards:
- relies on existing local codes for stormwater, critical areas, land division and site development.

Development Agreement includes additional requirements where compliance with each of the thirty conditions is spelled out in detail.
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

From Earlier Slides:
BoCC approves the MPR Designation in Ordinance No. 01-0128-08
Adopted Ordinance lists thirty (30) conditions for the future planning and development of the Master Planned Resort

RCW 36.70B.030 and 36.70B.040

Development Regulations set forth the permitted uses, density standards and zoning development standards and cannot duplicate existing local codes for stormwater, critical areas, land division and site development
DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

DCD staff will:

• **Forward** Planning Commission-recommended development regulations verbatim

• **Propose revisions** to Planning Commission recommendations

• **Provide an explanation** on staff proposed revisions

• Revisions are for **clarity, consistency with state and local law** and to avoid duplication

• **Forward staff proposed revisions** separately

• Recommend that the Board invite public comment **on both**
Conclusions
Pleasant Harbor Master Planned Resort has been a planning project for over ten years.

The MPR-Ordinance requires 30 very specific conditions for the Pleasant Harbor Master Planned Resort.

The Development Agreement is the best vehicle to ensure compliance with 30 conditions.

The Planning Commission-recommended development regulations set forth standards for permitted uses, density and zoning; they contain many provisions more appropriate for the development agreement.
Next Steps

- **Tribal consultation** continues

- **Development Agreement** will be **finalized**

- **Development Regulations** to have staff proposed revisions **explained**

- **Both** documents to be presented and explained before Board decides on further action