		KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION				
-	Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers					
3	July 30, 2019 @ 5:30 pm					
	maderead	e minutes are intended to provide a summary of meeting decisions and, except for motions e, should not be relied upon for specific statements from individuals at the meeting. If the er would like to hear specific discussion, they should visit Kitsap County's Website at //www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm and listen to the audio file (to assist in locating mation, time-stamps are provided below).				
		bers present: Kim Allen (Chair), Tom Nevins, Joe Phillips, Richard Shattuck, Jim Svensson, Mike				
	Elias	on?				
	Mem	bers absent: Mike Eliason, Gina Buskirk, Aaron Murphy				
	CT-EE	anneauti Daman Cumaa Daya Wand Liz Williams Amanda Walston (Clark)				
	Stan	<u>present</u> : Darren Gurnee, Dave Ward, Liz Williams, Amanda Walston (Clerk)				
		05:42:00				
	Tech	nical Difficulties caused delay in start time. Alternate recording device in use				
	Α.	Introductions				
	В.	Adopt Agenda as presented				
		Motion: Joe Phillips moves to adopt the agenda as presented				
		Second: Richard Shattuck				
		 Vote: Unanimous – Motion carries 				
	C.	Approval of Minutes				
	C.	Motion: Mr. Shattuck moves to approve the minutes of 04/16/19				
		Second: Mr. Phillips				
		Vote: Unanimous – Motion carries				
		Motion: Jim Svensson moves to approve the minutes of 05/14/19				
		Second: Richard Shattuck				
		Vote: Unanimous – Motion carries				
		Motion: Mr. Shattuck moves to approve the minutes of 05/21/19				
		Second: Mr. Phillips				
		Mr. Nevins will have comment later, but no opposition				
		Vote: Unanimous – Motion carries				
		By unanimous consent, the minutes of the 07/02/19 meeting are deferred to the				
		next regular meeting.				
		5:47:00				

1		
2	D.	General Comment:
3		 Seeing and hearing no speakers, this item is closed.
4		
5 6	E.	Work Study: Zoning Use Table Update – Liz Williams, DCD Planning & Environmental Programs (PEP) Planner
7 8		 Ms. Williams introduces Carmen Smith, new associate planner with DCD, supporting Zoning Use Table Update project through end of year.
9 10 11 12		 Ms. Williams provides a brief presentation regarding the Zoning Use Table, including background, updates on progress with timeline, public outreach efforts to date. Two surveys were conducted, customer analysis, and community wide survey and presents the following materials to the Planning Commission:
13 14 15		 Summary of Recent Customer Survey – in addition to 1st outreach survey, this aimed to understand recent customer experience with DCD, Kitsap County Code (KCC) and processes.
16 17 18 19		 Initial purpose was to find a starting point for customers coming to DCD; frame and format information provided in a useful, informative way for customers ranging from new users and landowners, to contractors and experienced professionals.
20 21 22		 Survey was simple, without many clarifying/follow-up questions. For example, if they knew a certain use was allowed, we didn't ask how or what their source of information or reference was.
23 24 25		 Ms. Smith notes 1,552 customers contacting DCD in the past year with land use or zoning questions were polled, with over 100 responses received during the two weeks survey period.
26 27		 42% had only interacted once with DCD and 50% already knew the use for their project was allowed.
28 29 30 31		 Some complaints included inconsistent information and requirements, difficulty navigating online or confusing information between in person and online listed information; learning that health district review or additional permits were required for their project; cost.
32 33 34 35		 Some requests included less regulations and more flexibility for projects; better in-person staff availability; faster processing time; lower costs and clear language regarding cost; improved online process with more information on mapping and parcel search available.
36 37 38		 Community Wide Survey - Ms. Williams notes 531 responses were received, with high response from the 55+ demographic. Reponses were also much more specific to this table update. Charts and graphs can be provided to look further at the differences.
39 40		 Comparison of Land Uses by Jurisdiction, Attachment B is a consolidated version, which visually shows there are many ways to say and list the same thing.
41 42		 QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Nevins asks, and staff confirms, the ADU use allowing manufactured home does appear in the table and Land Use policy.

requested copies of the compiled information.

All cities and counties are shown, as well as a few other jurisdictions staff had encountered, such as Eugene, Oregon and the City of Redmond.

Chair Allen notes the City of Redmond includes many words within charts.

Ms. Williams notes many of the cities contacted in this review have

consolidation and splitting from other jurisdictions; noting this is a working document.

• Looked for easy opportunities for automatic consolidation or removal **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Allen asks, and Ms. Smith confirms, only permitted uses

• Examples of splits could include indoor vs. outdoor; size by square footage

Ms. Smith discusses methodology for identifying and creating new uses, including

A checked box indicates the use is allowed in the jurisdiction.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12 are listed.

13	or number of rooms.
14	 Some jurisdictions list specific uses by size; for others listing the same use
15	but no size breakout, they were listed in the table under the smallest size.
16	• QUESTION: Mr. Shattuck asks if form-based code is be considered more user friendly?
17	 ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes Port Orchard is an example, where they have
18	defined building types, with focus on scale of structure being built, such as
19	office or general building as the type, but they also have an Allowed Use
20	Table. Traditionally form based code does not consider what is contained or
21	operates inside a structure.
22 23 24 25	 Chair Allen notes you may allow a home business in a residential zone as a home business, but not if the business is a fracking operation, so some additional tables or rules are still needed. The two were compared
26	 Mr. Shattuck asks, in the focus of improved customer satisfaction, if
27	experience shows a 'wash' between the two forms?
28	 Chair Allen notes consideration for customer satisfaction and
29	neighbor satisfaction is needed. If Kitsap says this is the envelope you
30	can have in this pocket, but we won't regulate what goes inside; that
31	can be hard to sell to a community.
32	 Mr. Ward notes other areas state it is too early to tell if newly
33	adopted form-based codes or in success.
34	 Minimized splitting where possible, unless the potential impact of that
35	specific use was great.
36	 Chair Allen notes that commercial or industrial uses and proximity to
37	residential areas are often the biggest.
38 39 40 41 42	 QUESTION: Mr. Phillips asks about listing the allowed use and the restrictions or limitations as a category. For example, the noise and dust restrictions would apply to a use that allows rock crushing, as long as they abide by the noise/dust restrictions. Roosters would not might not be allowed, but you're not regulating roosters, you're regulating noise.
	3

1 2 3 4	 Chair Allen notes the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or Administrative Conditional Use (ACUP) Permit approval process would be affected. How conditions intersect, differ, or deemed reasonable would have added complexity.
5 6 7 8 9	 Mr. Ward notes the standpoint of 'not caring what makes the nose, just don't make the noise' dramatically increases need for code enforcement. Someone says it's noisy, but not after 10pm, someone else says it's all night long. Traffic impacts are another consideration. Costco vs. a craft store have hugely different requirements because of the differences in their impact.
11 12 13	 Ms. Williams notes updates coming as framework and method is decided. Next focus will be difference between community definitions of uses and keeping true to intent and use of different zones.
14 15 16	 Chair Allen asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, clarifying prohibited uses beyond not listing them in allowed table would be helpful, especially in community presentation. Darren Gurnee, DCD PEP Planner, notes Attachment C, Zone Purpose Statements
17 18 19 20	 were used reviewing to ensure uses are compatible and appropriate with the purpose. QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Shattuck asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, there is 1 Urban Cluster Residential (UCR) zone, in the Kingston Urban Growth Area (UGA) located near the golf course.
21 22	• QUESTION: Chair Allen asks if a review of the continued need for mineral extraction sites had been done, as requested by the Planning Commission.
23242526	 ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes the last inventory was completed in 1996, and while staff agrees an update is needed, it has not been budgeted yet. Chair Allen would like the request by the Planning Commission captured in the report out.
27 28 29 30	 Mr. Ward notes the process is complex, including forecasting, sources, GMA requirements. Also considered, while there isn't necessarily a need for gravel production in Kitsap, there is income to be derived from its transport between other locations.
31 32 33	 Mr. Gurnee reviews Attachment D, FOOTNOTE ANALYSIS, which catalogs all footnotes and relative numbers. Columns show categorical use, applicability to the entire zone, and a combination of specific uses in specific zones.
34 35	• QUESTION: Mr. Shattuck asks if this review allows a look at why certain requirements such as setbacks, etc. are in place and if mitigation or alternatives could be allowed.
36 37 38	 ANSWER: Mr. Ward notes the update mainly focuses on updating the table, moving code out of the footnotes. Chair Allen notes that the variances and criteria in our code are almost
39 40	 Chair After notes that the variances and criteria in our code are almost impossible to understand and should be more meaningful and user friendly. Mr. Gurnee notes the intent is to review the zone without setback or design
41 42	requirements. • Chair Allen suggests using only single subject footnotes. Grouping together
43	two unrelated footnotes into one line is confusing.

1 2		 Mr. Gurnee notes the goal is, if any footnotes are left after the process, they are only clarifying not regulatory.
3 4		 Ms. Williams notes special provisions should be listed in the zone chapter, not as a list for each zone in the use table.
5		 Mr. Nevins notes some footnotes were included to comply with GMA.
6 7		 Ms. Williams reviews Attachment E, Preliminary draft of PROPOSED CHANGES TO LEVEL OF PERMIT REVIEW, noting this is the initial list and will grow much larger.
8 9 10		 For the first pass, internal staff independently reviewed the land use table and made recommendations on any levels of review they felt should be reduced or increased, and whether it should be prohibited or allowed if it currently is not.
11 12		 More discussion is needed, as staff had some differing opinions; also anticipate discussion after Planning Commission input.
13		 Chair Allen recommends close review of places of worship and public/private schools.
14		6:46:00
15 16 17		 Mr. Gurnee notes that staff found it most helpful to look at the zone intent/purposes, categorical uses, going left to right and then keeping that in mind while going down the zone.
18 19 20		 Mr. Shattuck asks, and Mr. Ward confirms, this draft of the document is based on opinion of staff, not direct consumers. Primarily to keep the PC informed on the process staff is following, to help guide discussions for areas of focus/interest.
21 22		 Chair Allen notes it is good to check if there is a place for everything or have we allowed a certain use but precluded any place to put it through other restrictions.
23 24		 Mr. Ward notes attention was paid to conflicting intent on encouraging use but restricting it in others, depending on communities.
25 26		 Mr. Nevins notes Manchester is an example, where they place high priority on preventing view blockage.
27 28		 QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Nevins asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, an example of 'reduced permitting' would be going from CUP to ACUP.
29 30 31		 Ms. Williams notes two additional Work Studies on 8/20 and 9/3, and outreach beginning in late September. Public Hearings and recommendation anticipated late 2019, moving to the BoCC in early 2020.
32		 PC thanks staff for their work; staff encourages input, ideas and suggestions.
33 34		 Ms. Williams notes Ms. Smith is working on a definitions document next, that will help easily cross-walk through and easily find changes or edits.
35 36 37		 Chair Allen notes the City of Redmond undertook this effort meeting weekly for a year in an update commission; kudos on good work on incredibly complicated project
38	F.	Administrative Update: Dave Ward, DCD PEP Manager
39 40	•	 Mr. Ward provides a brief update on administrative items, noting 2 Assistant Director vacancies in DCD; one should be filled by September the other recruitment will follow.
41 42		 9/3 meeting immediately follows Labor Day Holiday, Clerk will follow up with a headcount for quorum.

1		7:05:0	00
2			
3	G. For the Go	ood of the Order	
4 5			ng the 5/21 meeting, he was not in attendance, ccessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in rural areas.
6 7 8	Sc		est and discussion in this for some time defers to Engineering (DSE) Manager, who has had m other communities.
9 10		r. Nevins also notes the minutes pas hether they can be added in draft fo	st meetings have been very good, question on or or or and to the PC webpage.
11 12 13		to adoption. Once adopted,	anning Commissioners via email, for review prior signed minutes are posted to the public record, dance to specified record retention schedules.
14 15	Time of Adjournm	nont: 7:12:00 nm	
16	Time of Aujournit	ient. 7.12.00 pm	
17	Minutes approved	d this day of	2019.
18			
19			
20			Kim Allen, Planning Commission Chair
21			
22			
23			Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk

1	KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION					
2	Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers					
3	July 30, 2019 @ 5:30 pm					
4 5 6 7 8 9	These minutes are intended to provide a summary of meeting decisions and, except for motion 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).					
10	Members present: Kim Allen (Chair), Tom Nevins, Joe Phillips, Richard Shattuck, Jim Svensson, Mike					
11	Eliason?					
12						
13	Members absent: Mike Eliason, Gina Buskirk, Aaron Murphy					
14						
15	Staff present: Darren Gurnee, Dave Ward, Liz Williams, Amanda Walston (Clerk)					
16	05.42.00					
17	05:42:00					
18 19	Technical Difficulties caused delay in start time. Alternate recording device in use					
20	A. Introductions					
21	A. Introductions					
22	B. Adopt Agenda as presented					
23	 Motion: Joe Phillips moves to adopt the agenda as presented 					
24	Second: Richard Shattuck					
25	 Vote: Unanimous – Motion carries 					
26						
27	C. Approval of Minutes					
28	 Motion: Mr. Shattuck moves to approve the minutes of 04/16/19 					
29	Second: Mr. Phillips					
30	 Vote: Unanimous – Motion carries 					
31	 Motion: Jim Svensson moves to approve the minutes of 05/14/19 					
32	Second: Richard Shattuck					
33	 Vote: Unanimous – Motion carries 					
34	 Motion: Mr. Shattuck moves to approve the minutes of 05/21/19 					
35	Second: Mr. Phillips					
36	 Mr. Nevins will have comment later, but no opposition 					
37	Vote: Unanimous – Motion carries					
38 39	 By unanimous consent, the minutes of the 07/02/19 meeting are deferred to the next regular meeting. 					
39 40	5:47:00					
	-···					

1		
2	D.	General Comment:
3		 Seeing and hearing no speakers, this item is closed.
4		
5 6	E.	Work Study: Zoning Use Table Update – Liz Williams, DCD Planning & Environmental Programs (PEP) Planner
7 8		 Ms. Williams introduces Carmen Smith, new associate planner with DCD, supporting Zoning Use Table Update project through end of year.
9 10 11 12		 Ms. Williams provides a brief presentation regarding the Zoning Use Table, including background, updates on progress with timeline, public outreach efforts to date. Two surveys were conducted, customer analysis, and community wide survey and presents the following materials to the Planning Commission:
13 14 15		 Summary of Recent Customer Survey – in addition to 1st outreach survey, this aimed to understand recent customer experience with DCD, Kitsap County Code (KCC) and processes.
16 17 18 19		 Initial purpose was to find a starting point for customers coming to DCD; frame and format information provided in a useful, informative way for customers ranging from new users and landowners, to contractors and experienced professionals.
20 21 22		 Survey was simple, without many clarifying/follow-up questions. For example, if they knew a certain use was allowed, we didn't ask how or what their source of information or reference was.
23 24 25		 Ms. Smith notes 1,552 customers contacting DCD in the past year with land use or zoning questions were polled, with over 100 responses received during the two weeks survey period.
26 27		 42% had only interacted once with DCD and 50% already knew the use for their project was allowed.
28 29 30 31		 Some complaints included inconsistent information and requirements, difficulty navigating online or confusing information between in person and online listed information; learning that health district review or additional permits were required for their project; cost.
32 33 34 35		 Some requests included less regulations and more flexibility for projects; better in-person staff availability; faster processing time; lower costs and clear language regarding cost; improved online process with more information on mapping and parcel search available.
36 37 38		 Community Wide Survey - Ms. Williams notes 531 responses were received, with high response from the 55+ demographic. Reponses were also much more specific to this table update. Charts and graphs can be provided to look further at the differences.
39 40		 Comparison of Land Uses by Jurisdiction, Attachment B is a consolidated version, which visually shows there are many ways to say and list the same thing.
41 42		 QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Nevins asks, and staff confirms, the ADU use allowing manufactured home does appear in the table and Land Use policy.

requested copies of the compiled information.

1

2

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

are listed.

or number of rooms.

All cities and counties are shown, as well as a few other jurisdictions staff

Chair Allen notes the City of Redmond includes many words within charts.

had encountered, such as Eugene, Oregon and the City of Redmond.

Ms. Williams notes many of the cities contacted in this review have

consolidation and splitting from other jurisdictions; noting this is a working document.

Looked for easy opportunities for automatic consolidation or removal

Examples of splits could include indoor vs. outdoor; size by square footage

Ms. Smith discusses methodology for identifying and creating new uses, including

A checked box indicates the use is allowed in the jurisdiction.

QUESTION/ANSWER: Chair Allen asks, and Ms. Smith confirms, only permitted uses

14 15				Some jurisdictions list specific uses by size; for others listing the same use but no size breakout, they were listed in the table under the smallest size.
			OLIECTI	•
16		•	QUESTI	ON: Mr. Shattuck asks if form-based code is be considered more user friendly?
17			•	ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes Port Orchard is an example, where they have
18				defined building types, with focus on scale of structure being built, such as
19				office or general building as the type, but they also have an Allowed Use
20				Table. Traditionally form based code does not consider what is contained or
21				operates inside a structure.
22				 Chair Allen notes you may allow a home business in a residential zone
23				as a home business, but not if the business is a fracking operation, so
24				some additional tables or rules are still needed. The two were
25				compared
26				 Mr. Shattuck asks, in the focus of improved customer satisfaction, if
27				experience shows a 'wash' between the two forms?
28				 Chair Allen notes consideration for customer satisfaction and
29				neighbor satisfaction is needed. If Kitsap says this is the envelope you
30				can have in this pocket, but we won't regulate what goes inside; that
31				can be hard to sell to a community.
32				 Mr. Ward notes other areas state it is too early to tell if newly
33				adopted form-based codes or in success.
34			•	Minimized splitting where possible, unless the potential impact of that
35				specific use was great.
36				• Chair Allen notes that commercial or industrial uses and proximity to
37				residential areas are often the biggest.
38			•	QUESTION: Mr. Phillips asks about listing the allowed use and the
39				restrictions or limitations as a category. For example, the noise and dust
40				restrictions would apply to a use that allows rock crushing, as long as they
41				abide by the noise/dust restrictions. Roosters would not might not be
42				allowed, but you're not regulating roosters, you're regulating noise.
				3

1	 Chair Allen notes the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or Administrative
2	Conditional Use (ACUP) Permit approval process would be affected.
3	How conditions intersect, differ, or deemed reasonable would have
4	added complexity.
5 6 7 8 9	 Mr. Ward notes the standpoint of 'not caring what makes the nose, just don't make the noise' dramatically increases need for code enforcement. Someone says it's noisy, but not after 10pm, someone else says it's all night long. Traffic impacts are another consideration. Costco vs. a craft store have hugely different requirements because of the differences in their impact.
11 12 13	 Ms. Williams notes updates coming as framework and method is decided. Next focus will be difference between community definitions of uses and keeping true to intent and use of different zones.
14	 Chair Allen asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, clarifying prohibited uses beyond not
15	listing them in allowed table would be helpful, especially in community presentation.
16	 Darren Gurnee, DCD PEP Planner, notes Attachment C, Zone Purpose Statements
17	were used reviewing to ensure uses are compatible and appropriate with the purpose.
18	 QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Shattuck asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms, there is 1 Urban
19	Cluster Residential (UCR) zone, in the Kingston Urban Growth Area (UGA) located near
20	the golf course.
21	 QUESTION: Chair Allen asks if a review of the continued need for mineral extraction
22	sites had been done, as requested by the Planning Commission.
23	 ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes the last inventory was completed in 1996, and
24	while staff agrees an update is needed, it has not been budgeted yet.
25	 Chair Allen would like the request by the Planning Commission captured in
26	the report out.
27	 Mr. Ward notes the process is complex, including forecasting, sources, GMA
28	requirements. Also considered, while there isn't necessarily a need for
29	gravel production in Kitsap, there is income to be derived from its transport
30	between other locations.
31 32 33	 Mr. Gurnee reviews Attachment D, FOOTNOTE ANALYSIS, which catalogs all footnotes and relative numbers. Columns show categorical use, applicability to the entire zone, and a combination of specific uses in specific zones.
34	 QUESTION: Mr. Shattuck asks if this review allows a look at why certain requirements
35	such as setbacks, etc. are in place and if mitigation or alternatives could be allowed.
36	 ANSWER: Mr. Ward notes the update mainly focuses on updating the table,
37	moving code out of the footnotes.
38	 Chair Allen notes that the variances and criteria in our code are almost
39	impossible to understand and should be more meaningful and user friendly.
40	 Mr. Gurnee notes the intent is to review the zone without setback or design
41	requirements.
42	 Chair Allen suggests using only single subject footnotes. Grouping together
43	two unrelated footnotes into one line is confusing.

1 2		 Mr. Gurnee notes the goal is, if any footnotes are left after the process, they are only clarifying not regulatory.
3 4		 Ms. Williams notes special provisions should be listed in the zone chapter, not as a list for each zone in the use table.
5		 Mr. Nevins notes some footnotes were included to comply with GMA.
6 7		Ms. Williams reviews Attachment E, Preliminary draft of PROPOSED CHANGES TO LEVEL OF PERMIT REVIEW, noting this is the initial list and will grow much larger.
8 9 10	•	For the first pass, internal staff independently reviewed the land use table and made recommendations on any levels of review they felt should be reduced or increased, and whether it should be prohibited or allowed if it currently is not.
11 12	•	More discussion is needed, as staff had some differing opinions; also anticipate discussion after Planning Commission input.
13	•	Chair Allen recommends close review of places of worship and public/private schools.
14		6:46:00
15 16 17	•	Mr. Gurnee notes that staff found it most helpful to look at the zone intent/purposes, categorical uses, going left to right and then keeping that in mind while going down the zone.
18 19 20	•	Mr. Shattuck asks, and Mr. Ward confirms, this draft of the document is based on opinion of staff, not direct consumers. Primarily to keep the PC informed on the process staff is following, to help guide discussions for areas of focus/interest.
21 22	•	Chair Allen notes it is good to check if there is a place for everything or have we allowed a certain use but precluded any place to put it through other restrictions.
23 24	· ·	Mr. Ward notes attention was paid to conflicting intent on encouraging use but restricting it in others, depending on communities.
25 26		 Mr. Nevins notes Manchester is an example, where they place high priority on preventing view blockage.
27 28	•	QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Nevins asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, an example of 'reduced permitting' would be going from CUP to ACUP.
29 30 31	•	Ms. Williams notes two additional Work Studies on 8/20 and 9/3, and outreach beginning in late September. Public Hearings and recommendation anticipated late 2019, moving to the BoCC in early 2020.
32	•	PC thanks staff for their work; staff encourages input, ideas and suggestions.
33 34	•	Ms. Williams notes Ms. Smith is working on a definitions document next, that will help easily cross-walk through and easily find changes or edits.
35 36 37	•	Chair Allen notes the City of Redmond undertook this effort meeting weekly for a year in an update commission; kudos on good work on incredibly complicated project
38	F. Admin	istrative Update: Dave Ward, DCD PEP Manager
39	/	Mr. Ward provides a brief update on administrative items, noting 2 Assistant Director
40	·	vacancies in DCD; one should be filled by September the other recruitment will follow.
41	•	9/3 meeting immediately follows Labor Day Holiday, Clerk will follow up with a

headcount for quorum.

42

1	7:05:00
2	
3	G. For the Good of the Order
4 5	 Mr. Nevins asks about discussion during the 5/21 meeting, he was not in attendance, about reducing the CUP process for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in rural areas.
6 7 8	 Mr. Ward notes there has been interest and discussion in this for some time defers to Scott Diener, Development Services & Engineering (DSE) Manager, who has had discussion with tribes and interest from other communities.
9 10	 Mr. Nevins also notes the minutes past meetings have been very good, question on whether they can be added in draft format to the PC webpage.
11 12 13	 Draft minutes are sent to Planning Commissioners via email, for review prior to adoption. Once adopted, signed minutes are posted to the public record, website and stored in accordance to specified record retention schedules.
14 15	Time of Adjournment: 7:12:00 pm
16 17	Minutes approved this 17th day of 2019.
18 19	
20	Kim Allen, Planning Commission Chair
21 22	Ane
23	Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk