

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – March 3, 2020

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Administration Building – Commissioner’s Chambers

March 3, 2020 @ 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).

Members present: Mike Eliason (Chair), Joe Phillips (Vice Chair), Alan Beam, Amy Maule, Aaron Murphy, Richard Shattuck, Jim Svensson

Members absent: Kim Allen (excused), Ed Galliway (excused)

Staff present: Angie Silva, Darren Gurnee, Dave Ward, Amanda Walston (Clerk)

5:29:06

A. Introductions

B. Adoption of Agenda

- Chair Eliason proposes addition of Item F continued discussion from previous Planning Commission (PC) meeting regarding Deliberative Process.
- **MOTION:** Richard Shattuck moves to adopt the agenda as presented
- **SECOND:** Aaron Murphy
 - **Vote: 7 in Favor; 0 Opposed – Motion carries**

C. Approval of Minutes

- 02/04/20 minutes
- Requested corrections: Page 4 correction – 4th bullet, after ‘port of Silverdale has written’ insert ‘a letter’ before ‘in opposition’
- Page 7 – question on page 7
- **MOTION:** Jim Svensson moves to approve the minutes of 02/04/20 as amended
- **SECOND:** Joe Phillips
 - **Vote: 7 in Favor; 0 Opposed – Motion carries**
- 02/18/20 minutes deferred to next regular meeting

D. General Comment:

- **No speakers or comments; this item is closed.**

5:33:26

E. Work Study: 2019 Zoning Use Table Update: Darren Gurnee, DCD PEP Planner

- Mr. Gurnee briefly describes the process to date, referencing materials provided and informal briefings held prior; this will be a formal review.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Alan Beam asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, affordable housing partly prompted this discussion to remove regulations and requirements; as well as an effort to simplify tables to make it easier to understand.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – March 3, 2020

- 1 • **For Commercial/Industrial Uses:** Limited land available, allow these uses in
2 other zones, limit uses in other areas; scaling uses by size intensity,
3 occupancy; reduce permit review requirements for less intensive uses; allow
4 storage facilities in residential and commercial zones, viewed amenities to
5 be accesses.
- 6 • **For Institutional Uses:** Schools, place of worship, hospitals near or in
7 residential areas.
- 8 • **For Recreational Uses:** Allow more in and near residential areas – they are
9 amenities; also heard some objection to this because of noise, traffic,
10 aesthetics.
- 11 • **For Resource Uses:** Allow outside MRO
- 12 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, a ‘parking lot item’
13 means the department acknowledge the importance, agrees it warrants addressing at
14 a later date, needs more time for review/analysis by staff before it can be addressed.
- 15 • Mr. Gurnee reviews **internal feedback** considered.
 - 16 • **DCD Planning:** Maintaining integrity of each zone is important; Are 2
17 separate zones needed if both allow the same uses? Greenbelt/Urban
18 restricted; Urban High/Residential.
 - 19 • Concerned with limited supply of land in certain zones; Commercial
20 Industrial zones require same components at project level.
 - 21 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Shattuck asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms a project
22 level component could be a residence above and office below could be an
23 example of a primary use considered in the mixed-use residential zone.
 - 24 • **Human Services:** Long term care needs different grouping.
 - 25 • **Parks:** Discussion with Public Works, 2006 adoption doesn’t allow
26 residential in some existing zones.
- 27 • Mr. Gurnee shows a sample of format, navigation with recommended viewing and
28 instructions for the preliminary draft, and ‘cross-walk’ links between sections.
- 29 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, PC feedback on
30 user interface is encouraged and appreciated.
- 31 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Beam asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, there will be a redline
32 presentation at a later time.
- 33 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Eliason asks, and the Clerk confirms, the Microsoft Word
34 version can be emailed directly to the PC members but will not be available externally.
- 35 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Ms. Maule asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, the linking in the
36 final public version will be similar to the Code Publishing service we currently have.
- 37 • Mr. Gurnee reviews Preliminary Draft documents, noting sections, contents, footnote
38 analysis; cross-walk linking, additional categorical use regulations in Section 40; also
39 noting Section 41-42 include multi-family applicability for review tonight but may not
40 appear in final draft.
- 41 • Mr. Gurnee asks for any additional questions.
- 42 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Beam asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, there will be a
43 discussion regarding footnotes.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – March 3, 2020

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

6:09:41

- The PC requests allowance for 2 Public Hearing and Deliberation sessions in timeline.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Eliason asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, Attachment A includes the comments from the online submittal comment forms, indicated by ‘OC.’
 - Mr. Gurnee will update to include a legend for all acronyms.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Eliason asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, no specific outreach to environmental groups was done, but can still be invited to additional participation opportunities.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Beam asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, a staff comment matrix will be provided for the final draft.

6:17:11

- Mr. Gurnee reviews Attachment A noting navigation tips, settings for ease of viewing; grayed areas no changes intended; printed copies can be provided at any time, but objective is not to have multiple revision/versions circulating during the information gathering stage, which continues for another week.
- Mr. Shattuck asks to review the Urban Restricted 17.180 permitted uses.
- Mr. Gurnee notes Human Services feedback that Family Living/Group Living grouping is similar to City of Port Orchard; items in brown will be rolled up to larger category, which will move to the Permitted outright status.

6:24:15

- Dave Ward, DCD PEP Manager, notes a primary objective to get rid of as many regulatory footnotes as possible by moving them to the appropriate section. Some explanatory footnotes may be left if necessary. Also, any tied to dimensions table must remain until that table update is complete as well.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Phillips asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, all sections will be linked, so one click goes to and from associated sections; eliminate gaps in related information.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, a coded legend is at the end of the table, in addition to redline strikeouts throughout
- Mr. Gurnee notes an asterisk is shown where DCD wanted to permit outright, but updates to other dimensions/design standards would be required in order to address conditions.
- **QUESTION:** Mr. Murphy asks if asterisk moves it to parking lot or requires resolution.
 - **ANSWER:** Mr. Gurnee, Mr. Ward notes it indicates DCD identifies the need for potential change and determination needed on whether to address it now, while being mindful of scope creep; asterisk is an internal indicator, not to be included in final draft update.

6:31:25

- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, ‘Attached or Detached’ has been added as the first term before ‘dwelling’ so they group or collect within the table categories; similar to other jurisdictions making this designation.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – March 3, 2020

1 **6:34:15**

- 2 • Mr. Gurnee reviews the Footnote Analysis section, noting columns, headings,
3 how/where they are listed and applicability; footnote location (Code) & ID (#),
4 Categorical Uses; Applied to Zones; Applies to a specific Use in a Zone.
- 5 • Mr. Gurnee notes most, if not all, footnotes can be eliminated with this table;
6 dimensions and standards were not addressed in this table; highlighted terms do not
7 currently have a listed definition.
- 8 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Shattuck asks when and in what format, the public will see the draft.
- 9 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Gurnee notes a pdf version of summary documents for each
10 section will go out 3 weeks to 1 month prior to the hearing, via traditional
11 channels; format of open houses may be varied due to see of project.
- 12 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Beam asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, there will be a matrix
13 summary of changes, messaging to include scoresheet, number changed or removed,
14 to show tangible progress.
- 15 • Mr. Shattuck notes a number of times Director’s Interpretations (DIs) were
16 required due to conflicting footnotes, this would be good data.
- 17 • Angie Silva, DCD Assistant Director, appreciates the PC comments regarding
18 measurable progress; including less time spent on DIs by staff and Director.
- 19 • Mr. Gurnee acknowledges and credits DCD planners Carmen Smith and Liz Williams
20 for their massive effort on the project; PC concurs.

21 **6:44:26**

- 22 • Mr. Ward refers to slide 17, regarding Internal Feedback on whether 2 very similar
23 zones, such as Urban High Residential vs. Commercial, should be kept separate or
24 made the same; notes there are options to be considered:
- 25 • Create zones that are close but not identical, prepping them for a future
26 mixed-use zone in a future Comprehensive (Comp) Plan amendment.
- 27 • Separate the zones, identify and move them back into their separate intents
28 and purposes.
- 29 • **QUESTION:** Chair Eliason asks about advantages and disadvantages.
- 30 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Gurnee notes Urban Low and Urban Cluster as example; same
31 density requirements and almost identical meaning; Work Group feedback
32 sees Urban Cluster as more of a master planned community – so language is
33 preferable for those communities, while other developments should not be
34 held to same requirements, despite similarities.
- 35 • Mr. Gurnee notes Mr. Ward’s reference to Urban High & Commercial, if you
36 don’t require the commercial elements in one or the other zone, it does
37 drift into the Comp Plan, as it affects jobs, etc.
- 38 • Mr. Shattuck cautions past disaster caused by mandating mixed use zones.
- 39 • Mr. Ward notes both would be allowed in the zone, but no mandate.

40 **6:50:30**

- 41 • Mr. Ward also notes in some areas the use precludes the stated intent and purpose of
42 the zone, i.e. Ground-based storage units are a historically inefficient use of land, so
43 are precluded in residential zoning.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – March 3, 2020

- 1 • Mr. Shattuck notes this is an example of the need for an important policy discussion,
2 but with a 160-page document over a month’s time, it doesn’t seem possible.
- 3 • Mr. Murphy concurs this happens often with the PC, but staff schedules and
4 workloads are also getting pushed back and have timelines driven from outside DCD.
- 5 • Mr. Ward notes that there is room to add more time to this timeline, as needed. The
6 goal is to have it done and operational by the end of the year; there are no legal
7 deadline tied to this item, but available resource allocation is at play.
- 8 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Eliason asks, and Ms. Silva confirms, there is a tentative
9 timeline for other upcoming projects to be heard before the PC, such as:
- 10 • Vacation Rentals, but BoCC and legal are driving that timeline.
- 11 • Stormwater Code Manual Update coming in Spring with possible hearing in
12 June; highly technical, not so many substantive language changes, but
13 moving chapters around has tons of redlines.
- 14 • Public Works Road Standards update process will begin at the next meeting.
- 15 • While some of these items can be pushed out, the public and others are
16 looking for specific relief.
- 17 • Chair Eliason thanks DCD for the update; notes the PC trusts staff’s work and plan and
18 look to their expertise to help guide through the process to merge or leave it alone.
- 19 • Ms. Silva notes in the last major overhaul in 2006, as part of the Comp Plan major
20 update, the footnote model was changed and we are now going back to the original
21 format; kudos to staff for all the work and effort; training required will be a huge
22 impact to staff and applicants, with this culture shift away from how it’s been done for
23 many years now.
- 24 • Mr. Phillips notes an overall schedule of what is coming up would be beneficial, even if
25 in draft format. We notify the public on what we are meeting about, but don’t list
26 future topics; Mr. Murphy concurs, believes it will increase transparency, suggests
27 estimated blocks for each quarter.
- 28 • Ms. Silva and Mr. Ward will work to put together a schedule with the Clerk; keeping in
29 mind that many dates are pending and subject to change, for example, the Road
30 Standards was just directed to the PC two weeks ago, and affects other scheduling.
- 31 • Chair Eliason notes a briefing on roads was requested at a prior meeting; Ms. Silva
32 notes the request was relayed to Jon Brand at Public Works.
- 33 • Mr. Ward notes scheduling is always somewhat fluid, but we don’t want surprises.
- 34 • Mr. Svensson and Mr. Phillips note time constraints and how items fit in the schedule
35 will help; with meetings sliding and cancellations, we sometimes we feel very pressed
36 to make decisions on a tight time frame; a master outline will help.
- 37 • Ms. Maule agrees that knowing what is coming ahead of time, will help in preparation
38 for the meeting and additional schedule coordination as needed.
- 39 • Chair Eliason will work with staff on agenda planning and coordination.
- 40 **7:11:55**
- 41 • Mr. Beam notes, under Urban Restricted vs. Greenbelt, one is 1/4 the other is 1/5;
42 suggests if they are separated, clear differences should be established; otherwise
43 merge them.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – March 3, 2020

- 1 • Mr. Ward notes any actual merges would have to take place under the next Comp
2 Plan amendment (CPA); actions now would align them and prepare for that.
- 3 • Mr. Beam suggests no minimums in zones already restricted by critical areas, etc.
- 4 • Mr. Shattuck notes Growth Management Act (GMA) impacts.
- 5 • Ms. Silva notes calculations of land supplies and other impacts. As related to
6 the use table, if consolidation is desired, we can lay groundwork for that in
7 the larger comp plan update.
- 8 • Chair Eliason notes the public feedback was this table is too much; general consensus
9 is fewer zones, unless there is compelling reason.
- 10 • Mr. Ward notes there is more latitude in consolidation of uses as opposed to zones.
11 The question is how to achieve that without splitting hairs. Only recommended
12 increase in uses for some Retail Commercial, where we broke out in terms of size
13 aiming to ensure compatibility in neighborhood/residential capacity; differentiating
14 where mom and pop small business is okay, but not a large scale big box store.
- 15 • Another tricky area is group homes, adult family homes, assisted living facilities; the
16 whole grouping has been very difficult, we have looked to partners at state and
17 human services agencies; many have not been approached from that perspective.

18 **7:18:30**

- 19 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Eliason asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, the PC has
20 provided enough to achieve the stated goals in the Executive Summary.
- 21 • **DISCUSSION:** Regarding scheduling additional dates for Work Study, Public Hearing,
22 Deliberations sessions; noted concerns include technical aspect may require
23 additional time leading up to, and/or following the hearing for benefit of the PC and
24 the public; deliberations are not appropriate until the record is closed.
- 25 • Ms. Silva and Mr. Gurnee will review schedule and work with the Clerk and send
26 some dates to the PC for consideration.
- 27 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam asks if the Public Hearing may warrant a larger venue.
- 28 • **ANSWER:** After confirming with Mr. Gurnee that a number of stakeholders
29 may attend, but not in a volume that would require new venue.
- 30 • Ms. Maule notes importance in scheduling; preference that deliberations are not
31 combined with other agenda items so they do not interfere.
- 32 • Chair Eliason suggests a break before addressing the last two agenda items.

33 **7:36:00**

- 34 • Ms. Maule believes this discussion has met and addressed the intent of Item F
35 regarding the Deliberative Process.
- 36 • Mr. Shattuck and Mr. Phillips agree, noting the concern raised was the lack of proper
37 time and attention to deliberate in the right way; this discussion has taken its point.

38 **7:40:05**

- 39 • **QUESTION:** Chair Eliason asks if anything can be done to assist the Clerk in preparing
40 minutes, shorten the length.
- 41 • **ANSWER:** Clerk notes this issue comes up from time to time, and the
42 current minutes go far beyond what is defined in Roberts Rules on what

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – March 3, 2020

1 should be included which would typically be attendance, actions, motions,
2 decisions and not much more. Current format, which was requested a few
3 years back, is essentially a summary report out on what took place during
4 the meeting, landing somewhere between Parliamentary minutes and a
5 transcription. The decision to change the format could easily reduce time
6 spent but would definitely be different than what has been produced over
7 the last few years.

- 8 • Mr. Phillips notes it was the BoCC looking for more details and information
9 from PC meetings; before change or decision, we should check with them.

10 **F. Deliberative Process** – Item covered in previous discussion.

11 **G. For the Good of the Order**

- 12 • **QUESTION:** Chair Eliason asks for update on BoCC Dickey Pit/CPA recommendations.
- 13 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Silva notes it went well; the BoCC had questions on airport, countywide
14 land capacity, policy, Centers/UVC; there were comments on how well and quick the PC
15 was able to get through those, but for items like Dickey Pit, there was loud response that
16 more time was needed and requested.
- 17 • Chair Eliason appreciated the format of the documents presented to BoCC, with color
18 coding, identification of differences between staff & PC recommendations.
- 19 • Ms. Silva thanks the PC for their role and input in very large policy decisions; getting
20 through the volume of material; balancing mandates and community perspectives.
- 21 • Chair Eliason notes that some comments from the floor can be derogatory, will call for
22 end to that and disarm the speaker; compliments the Clerk on discretion and summary.
- 23 • Floor table layout is preferred for Work Study; Mr. Phillips also likes Port Blakely.
- 24 • Chair Eliason asks, and Ms. Silva provides an update on staff count and vacancies in DCD.
- 25 • Mr. Phillips, with consideration to staff, highly recommends BoCC shift from a yearly CPA,
26 which is not required by law, to 18 – 24 months, allowing more time to address the issues.
- 27 • Mr. Shattuck notes GMA removed the ability to apply for rezones except during the CPA;
28 appreciates staff consideration, 2 years is a long wait with no option to request rezone.
- 29 • Mr. Ward notes a revisit and rewrite of 21.08, dealing with CPA is likely coming back to PC.

30

31 **Time of Adjournment: 7:54:47 pm**

32

33 **Minutes approved this 21st day of April 2020.**

34

35

36

37

38

39



Mike Eliason, Planning Commission Chair



Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk