The Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Parks and Recreation Department, Conference Room, 1200 Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, Washington. Members Present: Laura King, Linda Rowe, Nobi Kawasaki, Chair, Val Torrens, John Ahl, Vice Chair, Richard McConaughy and Deborah Flynn. Not Present: William Matchett and Gwendolyn Shepherd. Staff Present: John Vodopich, Darryl Piercy, Karanne Gonzalez and Karen Halbeck, Secretary.

9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

(Deborah Flynn arrived at meeting.)

A Motion was made by Val Torrens and seconded by Laura King that the Planning Commission approve the Minutes of April 25, 2000. Vote: Aye: 7; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

A Motion was made by Val Torrens and seconded by Laura King that the Planning Commission approve the Minutes of May 2, 2000. Vote: Aye: 7; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

☑ Study Session to consider: 1) A review of the portion of the Zoning Ordinance specific to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU’s), which may include Accessory Living Quarters and/or Special Care Manufactured Homes.

Darryl Piercy passed out copies of the Zoning Ordinance to each of the members. He recounted for the Planning Commission that prior to the adoption of this Zoning Ordinance ADU’s were a permitted use in all zones, did not require a public hearing prior to a decision on the application, and did not contain restrictions. The February, 1999 Zoning Ordinance, which the County was still using, allowed ADU’s in the rural zones and made conditions to keep them compatible within the rural areas. He noted a memorandum from Jim Svensson, which was mailed to each of the members prior to this meeting, which specified how many ADU applications that have been approved since the latest Zoning Ordinance was approved. He reported that an application for an Accessory Dwelling Unit now goes through a public hearing process and outside agency comments are requested as well. He explained
that if the application was for placement of an ADU in an Urban Growth Area then the review is not so strict, but there is a technical review process to insure that the setback and stormwater requirements have been taken care of. He further reported that ADU’s are limited to 900 square feet and mobile/manufactured homes are not allowed in this classification. He said that in the urban zones, many create a loft above their garage; however, in the rural zones they are usually designed as small units separate from the main structure. He said that staff has received very little opposition to these applications; most are concerned about the stormwater issues. He said that staff has received a couple of applications to convert an ADU from the original structure and then build a larger structure on the site. He felt that the process has been working well and has been received favorably by the community. From the applicant, he continued, they tend to comment to staff that 900 square feet is not an adequate size for a dwelling. He said that ADU’s support the goals of the County’s Comprehensive Plan for affordable housing. However, he said, most of the ADU’s are going into the rural areas where the land is more readily available.

Linda Rowe asked if there were conditions that specified that an Accessory Dwelling Unit must be used for a family member?

Darryl Piercy said that ADU’s do not need to be used by a family member; they can be used as a rental. He said there is a provision in the Zoning Ordinance for a Special Care Mobile Home for use by a family member exclusively, but they must be a manufactured home, which would need to be removed if the family member did not need to use it any longer. He said that there are different enforcement issues to be considered.

Laura King asked how many manufactured homes have been removed under this provision?

Darryl Piercy said that 4 or 5 manufactured homes are removed each year. He said that generally, the neighbors are very aware when a special care manufactured home is set up and keep a close eye on those to make sure they are removed when the family member no longer needs them.

Nobi Kawasaki asked if ADU’s were being used for home businesses?

Darryl Piercy said that he was not aware of any home businesses in ADU’s.

Val Torrens asked if more ADU’s are being used for family members or for rentals?

Darryl Piercy said that it is about a 50/50 mix of family and rental use. He said if someone had a 5-acre parcel and planned on dividing the property the ADU’s make that possible.
Nobi Kawasaki said it was unclear to him until he re-read the Minutes when these ADU’s were originally approved whether there were illegal short plats created. He asked if the 2 units (home and ADU) had to be in single ownership?

Darryl Piercy said yes and the ADU must be no further than 100 feet from the primary residence.

Nobi Kawasaki said a big issue that was discussed when the Accessory Dwelling Unit was proposed was avoiding creating something that was a nightmare for County staff to enforce.

Darryl Piercy agreed and explained that for staff to prohibit these ADU’s from being a rental was nearly impossible. He noted that according to state law, there is a very “gray” issue on how a “family” member is defined.

Laura King asked Darryl Piercy, now that these ADU’s have been in effect for a while, what conditions would he change?

Darryl Piercy said he would like to see more development of ADUs in urban areas either by size or application review. He said that Accessory Dwelling Units encourage affordable housing.

Val Torrens asked if there was any way to avoid having 2 septic systems, one for the primary residence and one for the ADU?

Darryl Piercy said in the urban areas sewer is available but most of the rural areas are still on septic which require two separate systems. He said if there was an application submitted to the County for a Preliminary Plat in an urban area staff may request a section set aside within the plat for ADU’s, which may be an attractive market they may be missing at this time.

Linda Rowe asked why ADU’s could not be a manufactured home?

Darryl Piercy said that the concern by the neighborhood was that someone was creating mini mobile home parks.

The Planning Commission members and Darryl Piercy then discussed the difference between “stick-built” homes and manufactured homes.

Laura King asked if the size of the dwelling was the concern with the ADU application?
Darryl Piercy said yes, but the size would not be workable in the urban areas. He said there are no impact fees for these ADUs. He also felt that if there was a building permit process instead of an administrative review it might encourage more of these applications.

Linda Rowe felt that the general public was not aware of the ADUs and suggested some educational projects so that the community becomes aware that this type of housing was available.

Darryl Piercy said that the City of Bremerton regularly uses ADUs for apartments above garages and so forth.

A review of the June 5, 2000 Commissioners Meeting, specific to the hearing on the Forest Practices Ordinance.

Karanne Gonzalez said on June 5th, Commissioner Garrido had questions about the Planning Commission hearing and the discussions during the meeting. She said that Commissioner Garrido did not feel that the Minutes of that meeting adequately addressed her concerns. Further, she said that Commissioner Botkin wanted some language changes to the Forestry Ordinance specific to performance requirements, adding that staff reviewed this issue and came up with some better wording for buffers. She reported that now County staff can ask for buffering above the state standard as well as a definition of what “forest practices” means.

Nobi Kawasaki recounted that when the Planning Commission discussed the Forestry Ordinance, the members did not want to get into the specific criteria for the Ordinance and felt that was better left to the Board of Commissioners to determine.

Karanne Gonzalez reported that Commissioner Botkin felt that since the lifting of the moratorium was a privilege, the County could set the conditions that they felt were appropriate. She said that when the County looked at restoration of a particular site and proposed a conversion with intact buffers, how much more would the applicant provide for that site in order to have the moratorium lifted?

Nobi Kawasaki said that these applications usually occur when there is a project in the mill and not just lifting a moratorium and letting the property set. He felt that it would be up to the applicant to prove what they have done. He then explained to the members that the purpose of watching this videotape was to show the Planning Commission how to better communicate with the Board of Commissioners through the Minutes and so forth. He felt that this hearing would not be controversial so he did not attend.
Val Torrens expressed that if the Planning Commission made a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners, then a Planning Commission member should be present to explain the issues to them to make sure that they understand that recommendation.

Nobi Kawasaki said that the regular Board meeting was on Monday and on Wednesday there is a work-study session prior to the Monday meeting.

Karanne Gonzalez and the Planning Commission members discussed the Work Study sessions and the differences between “Essential Public Facilities” and “Public Facilities”.

The Planning Commission viewed the videotape of the Board of Commissioners of June 5, 2000.

Following the viewing of the video, Val Torrens said that staff does their report then the Planning Commission reviews it and filters the information. She felt that the Board of Commissioners raised issues that needed to be discussed with them at their meeting, because they were not present at the Planning Commission meetings.

Nobi Kawasaki said that the Planning Commission will need to have a member present when the Board of Commissioners reviews the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

➤ Work Plan Discussion

John Vodopich passed out Design Standards for the Community of Kingston to each of the members. He explained that the citizens’ committee prepared this. He said that County staff is in the process of reviewing these guidelines and suggested that there be a public hearing on this plan sometime in August. He then reported that City of Bremerton, the County and the Economic Development Council are getting together next week to set a date for a public hearing on the Port Blakely project.

Nobi Kawasaki said that there were so many policy questions that came in with this project and he felt that the Board of Commissioners and not the Planning Commission should decide those questions.

Work Items, prepared by Joseph Coppo, August 17, 1998:

Nobi Kawasaki noted that Joseph Coppo had gone through the Comprehensive Plan procedures and listed a number of issues that still needed to be dealt with following
Following discussion, the Planning Commission members came up with the following list of items for review at future study sessions:

- Develop provisions that permit clustering of residential development in Rural areas. The process for developing the provisions should include public involvement and the participation of interested property owners and Tribes.

- Within one year of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the county should work with the Kitsap Public Utility District to assess designation of additional Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas and further refine the designation of Aquifer Recharge Areas of Concern.

- Through the Surface and Stormwater Management Program, Kitsap County will inventory drainage basins to identify existing and future stormwater drainage problems.

- Kitsap County will develop a dedicated permit approval process for industrial and commercial projects.

- The County will develop standards and guidelines intended to encourage development of high-quality, higher density development in the UGA. This will include revising site planning requirements, zoning standards and design guidelines.

- A committee shall be formed within one year of the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan to review and monitor the policies contained in the Housing Chapter. The committee will include representatives of building industry personnel and citizen groups in order to successfully resolve the problem of housing affordability in our county.

- Kitsap County will review its development standards for commercial development to ensure that they address site size, use and design for different types of commercial activities. Supplemental regulations or development guidelines will be considered, as appropriate, for parking, access, signs, view protection, landscaping and other issues relating to the quality, appearance and functioning of commercial areas.

Nobi Kawasaki said that another item that the Planning Commission should look at are home businesses. He felt that it was a good idea to review this issue when they were not so rushed, as they were when they were making a decision on the Comprehensive Plan.
Darryl Piercy said that at the Planning Commission’s meeting in July, staff could bring this to the members.

Nobi Kawasaki then suggested on the Rural Villages like Suquamish and Manchester that those be handled administratively, just like in the urban areas.

John Vodopich said he would suggest this to Darryl Piercy.

No further discussion being heard, Nobi Kawasaki adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m.

### DOCUMENTS DISCUSSED AT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Design Standards for the Community of Kingston, dated May 25, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan, Status of Plan Related Work Items, prepared by Joseph Coppo, dated 08/17/98.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES approved this ________ day of __________________, 2000.

____________________________________

Nobi Kawasaki, Chair

____________________________________

Karen Halbeck, Secretary