

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Zoom Webinar

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88483404870>

OR Dial In: (253) 215-8782 Webinar ID: 884 8340 4870 Passcode: 613866

August 17, 2021 @ 5:30 pm

These minutes are intended to provide a summary of meeting decisions and, except for motions made, should not be relied upon for specific statements from individuals at the meeting. If the reader would like to hear specific discussion, they should visit Kitsap County's Website at <http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm> and listen to the audio file (to assist in locating information, time-stamps are provided below).

Planning Commission (PC) Members present: Joe Phillips (Chair), Amy Maule (Vice Chair), Alan Beam, Kari Kaltenborn-Corey, Mike Eliason, Stacey Smith, Steven Boe, Aaron Murphy
Department of Community Development (DCD) Staff present: Darren Gurnee, Melissa Shumake, Liz Williams, Amanda Walston (Clerk)

5:30 pm

A. Introductions

B. Virtual Meeting Protocol

C. Adoption of Agenda

- **MOTION:** Alan Beam moves to adopt the agenda as presented.
- **SECOND:** Stacey Smith
- **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**

D. Adoption of Minutes

- **MOTION:** Alan Beam moves to adopt the minutes of 7/20/21 as presented and corrected.
- **SECOND:** Steven Boe
 - **DISCUSSION:** Kari Kaltenborn Corey notes page 1, line 24 is a duplicated previous line, which should be deleted.
 - **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**

E. General Public Comment

- **Chair Phillips opens the floor** to speakers wishing to provide testimony.
- **SPEAKER:** Bill Palmer, South Kitsap resident, President of Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners (KAPO)

- 1 • Mr. Palmer comments regarding the Zoning Use Table.
- 2 • Chair Phillips thanks Mr. Palmer; notes this item is on tonight's
- 3 agenda.

- 4 • **Chair Phillips** calls for other speakers; seeing and hearing none, **closes the**
- 5 **floor to general speakers.**

6 **5:39 pm**

7 **F. Briefing: Zoning Use Table Update – Darren Gurnee, DCD Planning and**

8 **Environmental Programs (PEP) Planner (approx. 30 min)**

- 9 • Mr. Gurnee provides a brief review of project status, including timeline, and
- 10 public participation; noting tonight will focus on question and answer session.
- 11 • Mr. Gurnee addresses earlier concern raised by Mr. Palmer that proposed
- 12 changes added pages and regulations; noting while the number of pages
- 13 increased, content has actually been decreased by a large amount, and much
- 14 of the change is that content is moved, arranged differently, assigned different
- 15 numbering or added to different sections for clarity.
- 16 • DCD Director Jeff Rimack clarifies in previous versions, footnotes for each use
- 17 or zone were numbered and added at the base of each section; the layperson
- 18 would then have to search to look up each use to determine if it was allowed,
- 19 and hope they didn't miss any uses or zones. The new format lists everything
- 20 applicable right there. So, while there are more pages, you do not have to look
- 21 each use or zone up in multiple places, multiple times.

22 **5:59 PM**

- 23 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Phillips asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, the
- 24 comments period can be extended by one week at the PC's request.
- 25 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam asks for a summary of the regulations removed.
- 26 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Gurnee notes these items are detailed within
- 27 attachment D6, the Detailed Changes for Footnote RELOCATION.
- 28 • Liz Williams, DCD Interim PEP Manager, notes new definitions have
- 29 also been added, for clarity throughout the code to help reduce time,
- 30 ambiguity and inconsistency as staff must make determinations.
- 31 • Stacey Smith notes the provided scoping amendment outlined
- 32 proposed changes and how they aimed to make the code easier to
- 33 use, specifically on pages 6 and 7.

34 **6:11 pm**

- 35 • Mike Eliason joins the meeting.
- 36 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam asks how the ranges for the use types were determined.

- 1 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Gurnee notes there were multiple evaluations factors;
2 many of the groupings have multiple use types rolled up within, some
3 have similar classifications, some compatibility to other jurisdictions,
4 impacts to surrounding neighborhoods, multiple others.

- 5 • **QUESTION:** Ms. Smith asks about the category breakout under Group Living,
6 specifically the difference between 'J – Skilled Nursing Facility' and 'D –
7 Convalescent, nursing or rest home.'

- 8 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Gurnee notes this language resulted from input
9 regarding industry language and different state classifications; intent
10 was to be as inclusive as possible without being redundant;

- 11 • Ms. Smith notes she works in the Human Services field, and terms
12 'convalescent and rest home' are outdated and no longer used;
13 Skilled nursing care has the same meaning and has replaced those
14 outdated terms.

- 15 • Staff asks, and Ms. Smith agrees to draft some suggested language
16 that may more closely reflect current standards, language.

- 17 • **QUESTION:** Chair Phillips asks about breakdown of received permit requests.

- 18 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Rimack notes the breakdown is roughly 75%
19 residential, and there is some variety within commercial because
20 sometimes it is already in working order but may need remodel.

- 21 • Mr. Rimack notes DCD maintains a Power BI dashboard which shows
22 a drawdown window with permit styles in table format and breaks
23 down a majority of DCD business that can be forwarded to the PC.

- 24 • **QUESTION:** Amy Maule asks, of the Residential permits for new construction, is
25 it primarily developers or Single-Family Residences (SFRs) for property owners.

- 26 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Rimack notes SFRs account for approximately 60%.

- 27 • **QUESTION:** Ms. Maule notes Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) have been
28 discussed frequently, and often tie into vacation rentals; asks if there is any
29 data on whether making the ADU process easier will actually impact or
30 increase the amount of available affordable housing of people vs. an increase
31 in vacation rentals.

- 32 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Rimack notes there is some existing case law; has much
33 to do with increasing density, which is why ADUs in the rural areas
34 are harder to deal with than urban ADUs which are permitted
35 outright; if you can't put a full house on a lot, could still be
36 advantageous to add another living space.

- 37 • Vacation rentals vary a bit by jurisdiction; some require someone to
38 live on the primary site or on property, so you have two people

1 occupying the lot; this can lead to other aspects like whether people
2 who previously moved to a neighborhood may now be in what could
3 be more of a rental community; Kitsap hasn't tackled this yet.

- 4 • Chair Phillips asks, and Mr. Rimack confirms, a work group was
5 looking at vacation rentals; notes there are life safety and commercial
6 concerns aspects that must be reviewed and studied as well.
- 7 • Mr. Gurnee notes some reference to permissibility requirements and
8 ADUs in attachment D5; does not know if specific data is available on
9 the use of ADUs as Bed & Breakfast or Vacation Rentals, etc.

10 **6:32pm**

- 11 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam asks if Home Business Incidental use is allowed in all areas.
 - 12 • **ANSWER:** Staff confirms it is allowed, except where SFRs are not
13 allowed, such as Commercial zones.
- 14 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Eliason asks about City of Bremerton and Bainbridge Island,
15 where they are relaxing ADU regulations.
 - 16 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Rimack notes while DCD does not have any specific
17 report, data is available on the jurisdictional websites.
- 18 • Mr. Rimack notes modifying ADU regulations is not in the scope of this update.

19 **6:38 pm**

20 **BREAK**

21 **6:45 pm**

- 22 • Mr. Gurnee continues presentation, moving to Commercial changes; Ms.
23 Williams notes the time, this may be a good breaking point, suggests
24 continuing the review, at the next meeting.
- 25 • Mr. Eliason asks about printed copies of materials requested for some PC
26 members; Clerk confirms they were printed and made available at the DCD
27 counter last week.
- 28 • **QUESTION:** Aaron Murphy asks for staff's summary view of main impacts to
29 economic viability these changes will bring, that may be currently lacking.
 - 30 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Gurnee notes more uses allowed in zones and allowing
31 a variety of housing types; the code had a variety of zones but did not
32 actually allow a variety of uses. Also scaling uses to allow smaller
33 scale uses to develop in neighborhoods, so it is not just large stores.
 - 34 • Mr. Rimack notes the Rural Commercial zone stands out, schools as
35 an example; not everything will be a standard high school; you could
36 have a smaller Montessori or private school in that area; that
37 flexibility can be a good thing.

1 • Ms. Williams notes the ability to have walkable neighborhoods and
2 allow the market to really drive demand; in the past have had uses
3 not allowed or where a similar use determination or Directors
4 Interpretation requirement may have killed that potential use in
5 certain neighborhoods, even though there really is a demand for it.

6 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Murphy asks for an example, aside from the fee for an
7 Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP) being less than a Conditional
8 Use Permit (CUP), that will make permitting more cost effective.

9 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Williams notes something previously a CUP but now
10 permitted outright because it has standards and predictability already
11 built into the code; instead of adding associated expense through the
12 Hearing Examiner process, including time and adding on conditions
13 that are not already explicitly stated; they are quick wins that make a
14 difference on both sides, not just overall fees.

15 **7:05 pm**

16 **G. Status Update: Buildable Lands Program, Anticipated Release of Draft Report – Liz**
17 **Williams, DCD Interim PEP Manager (approx. 5 min)**

18 • Ms. Williams briefly presents a project overview and update, noting: the draft
19 Buildable Lands Report (BLR) release initiates the 30 day comment period and
20 this is not the typical process where the PC will issue a formal recommendation
21 on the report, though comments are welcome; Ms. Williams reviews the
22 format of the report including a breakdown of the chapters.

23 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Eliason asks how many measures have had to be implemented
24 because of compliance or legal issues; also, what is the mission or objective for
25 the PC, if no recommendation is required.

26 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Williams notes currently 48 Reasonable Measures have
27 been identified through Resolutions, Ordinances, various
28 comprehensive plan (Comp Plan) updates; the BLR identifies current
29 or past level of implementation; notes there is no current analysis in
30 the way the question has been framed, but will see if it is available

31 • Regarding objective, or mission, it is an opportunity for public
32 participation & stay informed; as well as the first step and foundation
33 leading up to growth targets and provides background, analysis and
34 assumptions that go into the reasoning and work for the Comp Plan
35 update in 2024.

36 • Mr. Rimack confirms the BLR is frontloading, informing, and building a
37 baseline for the knowledge needed when we start to move forward
38 with the com plan

- **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam asks which chapters show successes in areas such as annexation, growth areas, boundary lines.

- **ANSWER:** Ms. Williams notes successes can be found within growth and development trends, appendix related to reasonable measure evaluations; during this evaluation period not many significant changes have taken place in jurisdictional boundaries, but there are success stories, including achievements in densities throughout the county peppered throughout the report; some inconsistencies where you will see suggestions for reasonable measures and other incentive based measures vs. those that are more regulatory in nature;

- Ms. Williams notes this is a report driven by information and data.

7:20 PM

H. General Public Comment

- **Chair Phillips opens the floor** to speakers wishing to provide testimony.
- **Chair Phillips** calls for speakers; seeing and hearing no other, **closes the floor to general speakers.**

I. For the Good of the Order/Commissioner Comments

- Chair Phillips notes the annual meeting with the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) & PC was a success; BoCC may meet with individual district Planning Commissioners throughout the year; appreciation for time spent by staff, PC, BoCC.
- Mr. Eliason appreciates Mr. Murphy’s questions and Staff responses tonight.
- **MOTION:** Aaron Murphy moves to adjourn the meeting.
- **SECOND:** Steven Boe
 - **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor; 0 Opposed – Motion Carries**

Time of Adjournment: 7:27 pm

Minutes approved this 7th day of September 2021.



Joe Phillips, Planning Commission Chair



Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk