
**M I N U T E S**

**KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**

September 16, 2003


9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions and Agenda Review.


William Matchett and Mike Gustavson had not received a copy of the August 5, 2003 meeting minutes. Lary Coppola, Chair, was the only one who had received the final, corrected version of the minutes. All Planning Commissioners should receive the corrected versions before voting on them.

A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Deborah Flynn that the Minutes of August 5, 2003 be accepted.

Vote: Aye: 5, Abstained: 2 (William Matchett, Mike Gustavson). Motion carried.

A motion was made by Deborah Flynn and seconded by John Taylor that the Minutes of August 19, 2003 be accepted.

Vote: Aye: 5, Abstained: 2 (William Matchett, Mike Gustavson). Motion carried.

➢ Findings of Fact Regarding the Proposed Adoption of the 2003 Comprehensive Plan Amendments: Interim Rural Forests

The new Findings of Fact were an improvement, the term Large Landowners having been replaced by Stakeholders of the Committee. After discussion it was agreed that, although there were groups excluded from the Committee, this terminology accurately represented all parties involved in the Committee.

Item 13 was considered to be too general, indicating that the Interim Rural Forest program language was not consistent with the thirteen statewide planning goals in the Growth Management Act. It was agreed that Item 13 would be removed with the
following language incorporated into the Findings of Fact based on Tom Nevins’ prepared statement at the September 2, 2003, meeting. The Recommendation would, however, remain unchanged.

- The Proposed Interim Rural Forest Amendments create the potential for many thousands of additional housing sites in the rural and shoreline areas. Neither the number of sites nor their impact is defined. Encouraging growth in the rural area is not supported by the Growth Management Act or by the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan. Encouraging growth in the rural area could discourage development in the Kitsap County Urban Growth Areas.

- The incentive-based land conservation programs are not complete. The Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program is not defined.

- There is no consensus position on what the “bonus” program is, either from the Interim Rural Forest Committee or the Planning Commission. The potential for negative, unintended consequences is too great. There has been no analysis of the potential impact this level of development would have in service for schools, roads, parks, public safety or environmental concerns. The “bonus” impairs the flexibility, attractiveness and motivation to define the Transfer of Development Rights program.

A motion was made by William Matchett and seconded by Mark Flynn that the Findings of Fact with regard to Interim Rural Forests be accepted as amended.

Vote: Aye: 4, Opposed: 1 (John Taylor), Abstained: 1 (Lary Coppola, Chair). Motion carried.

John Taylor noted that after the September 2, 2003 meeting, both the Bremerton Sun and Silverdale Reporter had articles on the Interim Rural Forest decision. Information was also included on a national website called “News For Salmon and Nation” indicating Kitsap County’s decision was receiving widespread, national notice.

- Findings of Fact Regarding the Proposed Adoption of the 2003 Comprehensive Plan Amendments: Kitsap County Emergency Flood Ordinance - Revising Kitsap County Code Title 15: Flood Hazard Areas.

Findings of Fact, taken directly from the Flood Ordinance, were submitted for consideration. Staff noted two grammatical corrections: (1) History, fourth line down, the apostrophe needs to be removed; and (2) Flood insurance is not a title and should not be capitalized.

A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by William Matchett that the Findings of Fact Regarding the Kitsap County Emergency Flood Ordinance be accepted as amended.
Vote: Aye: 6, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 0. Motion carried.

- Planning Commission Work Plan: Joint Meeting between Board of County Commissioners and the Planning Commission.

Discussion was primarily regarding the Work Plan for 2004 and potential timelines. There will also be two Joint Meetings a year, with the next meeting scheduled for January 27, 2004. One potential Agenda item was to discuss ways to potentially streamline the Comprehensive Plan amendment process.


The Planning Commission Retreat will be held in November 2003, to review the Bylaws, the Charter and other general issues relating to the Planning Commission. The preferred date was November 18, 2003, with the final date determined based on availability of Legal Council (due to review of the bylaws) and Staff. Laura Ditmer would prepare a list of attendees, verify availability and ensure an Agenda was developed accordingly.

Potential locations for the Retreat were discussed to include: Island Lake Community Center, Long Lake, Port Gamble and Buck Lake. Jason Rice would check availability and facilities of various locations for the Planning Commission to consider.

- Other Business: Planning Commission Meeting Dates.

Both the Planning Commission and Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council have meetings scheduled on the same dates. To allow Planning Commissioners to attend Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council meetings, the Planning Commission meeting dates were changed to the second and fourth Tuesday of each month at 9:00 a.m., beginning in January 2004.

A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by Mark Flynn that beginning in January 2004, the Planning Commission meetings be revised to the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month at 9:00 a.m.

The Joint Meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2004, which is a regular Planning Commission meeting date based on the new schedule. There should be a limited agenda for that meeting. Additionally, the meeting has been changed for this date only to 1:00 p.m. in the third floor conference room at the Public Work’s Building, to be followed by the Joint Meeting. This change requires Notice be posted in the newspaper, on the County Website and that signs be posted at the both the Silverdale Community Center and The Eagle’s Nest advising the public of the change in location and time. Holly Anderson will also verify that the Conference Room is available for the 1:00 meeting.

Vote: Aye: 5, Opposed: 0, Abstained: 1 (William Matchett will no longer on the Planning Commission in 2004). Motion carried.
Other Business: **Planning Commission Meeting Location.**

With the meeting schedule change, The Eagle’s Nest is available for Planning Commission meetings beginning in January 2004. The new location would need to be posted in the newspaper, on the County Website and a sign posted at the Silverdale Community Center advising the public of the change.

A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by John Taylor that the Planning Commission meet location be changed to the Eagle’s Nest beginning in January 2004.


Other Business: **Upcoming Meeting Dates/Agenda Information.**

It was noted that previous requests had been made that Agendas include information on upcoming meetings, to include the purpose of the meeting, date, time and location. This information should be included at the bottom of each agenda and include any meetings of possible interest within the next two to three weeks, as well as any prescheduled meetings for later in the year (such as the Joint Meeting).

October 7, 2003 - Agenda should include the subject of Affordable Housing. Staff and the Planning Commissioners are to present materials they might have in the matter. The Agenda should also include a general review and discussion of the Comprehensive Plan and policies.

October 15, 2003 - The Board of County Commissioners would be holding a meeting to begin deliberating and making decisions on the Comprehensive Plan amendments.

October 21, 2003 - Agenda should include the Findings of Fact from Kelly Robinson, to include providing any additional clarification regarding State requirements regarding accessory dwelling units.

November 4, 2003 - Agenda should include discussions between the Planning Commission and Staff regarding the 2004 process and how it can be moved forward in the coming year, with possible ways to streamline the process.

November 18, 2003 - Tentative date for the Planning Commission Retreat - Agenda should include review of Bylaws, the Charter, location, time, and clearly defining the role of the Planning Commissioners. It should be ensured that ample copies of all materials are provided at the meeting.

January 27, 2003 - Agenda for the Joint Meeting should include discussing ways to streamline the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process.

**Upcoming Hearing Items/Work Programs.**
Kamuron Gurol and Laura Ditmer have been discussing the Work Programs for the coming year into 2005. Staff shortages have limited the ability to begin new projects with a priority on completing existing projects for the Board of County Commissioners’ 2003 Amendment process to begin in October 2003. As the 2004 process is developed, it will be brought before the Planning Commission for their review and to discuss how it should be taken into the coming year.

Short Staffing was discussed in detail, noting it is not due to budget constraints. There are multiple positions currently being advertised for Kitsap County that will close in October. It is anticipated that the increase in Planning Staff will allow the following projects to be addressed:

- **Silverdale Sub Area Plan,** beginning in early 2004. This will initially involve looking at the downtown for design guidelines in the retail planning areas. Citizen Groups have been invited to attend the September 16, 2003, Short Course. Funding for a Consultant is available for this project.

- **The Port Orchard Planning Process** is underway and anticipated as part of the 2004 Amendment Process. There has been one meeting to date. The Citizens Groups have been invited to attend the September 16, 2003, Short Course. Funding is not allocated for a Consultant, although a proposal is pending before the Board of County Commissioners with a decision anticipated in September or October, 2003. With the addition of a Consultant, Project Manager and one to two meetings each month, this project is anticipated to move forward quickly.

- **An Updated Land Capacity Analysis Report** is being worked on internally and will be submitted to the Public in the next several months in follow up to the Buildable Lands Report. It is in conjunction with the Population Allocation with County numbers being taken to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council.

- **The Interim Rural Forest issue** is an optional item. The Board of County Commissioners will address whether or not that will become a project for 2004.

- **The Chico Watershed,** in combination with the Sub Area Plan, has not been undertaken due to short staffing. It could potentially be addressed over the next several months. This would be incorporated with the Fairgrounds and Barker Creek, combining the Chico Watershed in the Sub Area Planning process. Staff would work with Natural Resources, who have been very successful at obtaining grant money and would hire people to assist with that process. The watershed process is separate from the State Department of Natural Resources.

- **Kingston** may have another phase involving a proposal from John Rose and Olympic Property Group with their Arborwood Lands. The original proposal presented to the Planning Commission included one third of their 700 acres as Urban Reserve. This may be readdressed as part of the 2025 population allocations.
• Appeals to the 2003 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process will be a consideration for November 2003. There has been speculation that numerous items will be appealed, with no actual numbers known now. Although this can be an intensive process, anticipated increases in Staff will make it more manageable. Depending on the number of appeals, the project may take six months or more.

• Per the request of the Planning Commission, discussing and development of Affordable Housing programs would be a high priority for 2004.

➢ Other Business: **Population Allocations.**

Population allocation numbers through 2017 have been corrected to exclude allocations from 2012, which had already been allocated to Kingston. The new 2017 numbers resulted in a maximum population increase of 881. The reduced allocation for Kingston will be adjusted using numbers from the 2025 allocation, which is what the 2017 numbers were pulled from. Staff rescinded their initial allocation on September 8, 2003, with the Board of County Commissioners to make the ultimate decision on ULID #6 and Kingston, adopting the numbers from the corrected, accurate analysis.

The Planning Commission requested that they be provided with a detailed, clear definition of population allocations to include what is available, what the numbers are based on, where those numbers are to-date, what has already been allocated and how much growth is anticipated.

➢ Other Business: **Affordable Housing.**

Mike Gustavson noted that, although it had been mentioned, there has yet to be any real discussion on affordable housing. The governmental response to the issue was subsidized housing or the Housing Authority, which is not a realistic solution. Population Allocations are based on a variety of conditions such as the price and availability of property. The lower the forecast, the higher the property value and the smaller the actual increase in population because fewer people can afford to purchase the property. Laura Ditmer noted that this consideration was part of the Land Capacity Analysis, reflecting accurate numbers with regard to land availability.

Additionally, this year the Population Allocations for Kitsap County were being put together with the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council to provide their feedback as to where they felt the populations should be placed and what each area felt was necessary for their anticipated growth.

A standard needs to be developed to measure the effectiveness of programs designed to increase affordable housing in Kitsap County. This would include information on average incomes to help determine what is considered affordable, as well as available homes at an affordable level to determine the success or failure of the Planning Commission, Staff and Board of County Commissioners with regard to their goal to ensure affordable housing.
Multiple resources were noted that could help provide information regarding affordable housing in Kitsap County:

- Homebuilders’ Association performs analyses and tracks affordable housing.
- Association of Realtors performs analysis and tracks affordable housing.
- Multiple Listing Service (MLS) provides a monthly comparison of median and average priced homes in multiple counties in Washington.
- Washington Center for Real Estate Research has an Affordability Index for each County throughout the State.
- Land Capacity Analysis Reports could be provided as the process develops rather than a final number at the end.

John Taylor would check on getting the MLS report mailed to the Planning Commission and Staff would look into other reports, as well as ensuring that the Planning Commission is on the mailing list for the Land Capacity Analysis Report.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that the Bremerton Sun, dated September 15, 2003, indicated the median price of a home in Kitsap County is at a high of $200,000 for the first time in the history of Kitsap County. This needs to be considered whenever the Planning Commission is making decisions that could have a short or long-term impact on housing affordability.

John Taylor would like to interject a news article into public record:

- The Oregonian, dated September 7, 2003, Weekend Real Estate Edition: A home comparable to what would be found in West Bremerton or Mannette for $125 - $150,000 which was built in 1922, Tudor Style, with 1,827 square feet had a listing price of $289,000. With Portland characterized as being ten years ahead of Washington in growth management, transportation and other areas, Kitsap County should be aware of where it might be heading and begin finding ways to prevent it.

- USA Today, dated September 15, 2003, Front Page: Stated two income families are not making it anymore. Two incomes are no longer sufficient for Middle Class America to make ends meet.

John Ahl posed a question regarding personal bias, impartiality and the point at which a Planning Commissioner ceases to be a commissioner and becomes an advocate. It was suggested that this issue be included as an agenda topic in the upcoming Planning Commission retreat.
William Matchett noted that personal bias does not necessarily prevent being influenced by public testimony, as he encountered with the gun range issue, having changed his intended vote based on such testimony.

Laura Ditmer suggested that Commissioner Ahl raise is question at the upcoming Short Course in Planning.

- Other Business: **Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process.**

The Comprehensive Plan amendment process is considered time consuming, taking up at least half of Staff and the Planning Commission’s time. This issue is being added to the Joint Meeting, but needs further consideration. The Comprehensive Plan is not required to be amended on a yearly basis, but if a Sub Area Plan is in process, the applicable Code Amendments cannot be adopted outside of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process, thereby delaying the process. There can only be one amendment each year, preventing issues being addressed and resolved as they occur.

Part of the process includes an outreach to the Public requesting their feedback. Public input is taken to the Board of County Commissioners for discussion, determining what is necessary for the process and how Staff should proceed. Staff begins the process in November or December with a Public Outreach and development of any proposals for the 2004 Amendment process. Site specifics are then address by Staff, followed by applications and other related matters. This is an intensive process, but will be more manageable with the increase in Planning Staff.

John Ahl noted that perhaps there were other ways to address some of the items, rather than through the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process. An example would be that site plans are actually zoning issues and there may be an easier way to address those than the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process. As Staff begins planning for the 2004 process, the information will be presented to the Planning Commission for discussion at the November 4, 2003 meeting, following the anticipated decisions by the Board of County Commissioners for the 2003 process. This should allow sufficient preparation time for Staff to begin their external process in January 2004.

Mike Gustavson suggested the process could be streamlined by amending the Public Questionnaire. The majority of the items, however, on the Questionnaire are SEPA requirements. Staff would evaluate the form, determine if it could be streamlined and present any potential revisions to the Planning Commission.

- Other Business: **Accessory Dwelling Units.**

It was verified that a final vote and recommendation had been completed regarding accessory dwelling units with Findings of Fact and the Planning Commission’s Recommendation to be submitted by Kelly Robinson at the October 21, 2003 meeting.

Lary Coppola, Chair, understood the Planning Commission’s decision was based on input that there was a State requirement or Growth Management Act requirement prohibiting accessory dwelling units on nonconforming lots. It was now his
understanding that this was not the case. No information was located in the past minutes regarding mention of any State requirement. It was requested, however, that Kelly Robinson provide clarification at the October 21, 2003 meeting on this matter.

Mike Gustavson also noted that a promise was made to the Public when the Growth Management Act was adopted, specifically to allow accessory dwelling units. With the limited number of applications on nonconforming lots, it would not appear this was a problem prohibiting accessory dwelling units from nonconforming lots was not justified.

➢ Other Business: **Growth Management Act Implementation Statewide.**

With all counties in Washington held to the same Growth Management Act standards, it would be beneficial to get information on how other counties were addressing the resulting issues and problems. It would be helpful if the Planning Commission had information on whether the State was looking at the various county decisions with any consideration for continuity, as well as what decisions the other counties were making.

➢ Other Business: **Short Course, September 16, 2003, 6:30 p.m., Given’s Center.**

The Short Course would include a presentation on the Growth Management Act but could not be used to discuss any items that were currently going through the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process. Once a decision is made by the Board of County Commissioners, the issue could be addressed at a future Short Course. Additionally, Legal Staff would be available to help determine if a question were presented in a generic enough manner to be acceptable as a Short Course topic.

John Ahl noted that one topic for the Short Course might be at what point a Planning Commissioner ceases to become a Commissioner and becomes an Advocate, which ties into the concept of the function of the Planning Commission. Is it to look out for the Public Good and, if so, what is that? This is also set as an Agenda item for the Planning Commission Retreat.

Past Short Course sessions had been very generic. This particular session, however, was intended to be more detailed and provide more information to assist the various parties with moving forward into the coming year.

➢ Other Business: **Staff Tasks.**

Holly was advised to keep a running list of what the Planning Commission would like to address for the coming year, items to be included on future agendas and other pertinent data. All other tasks are referenced under their individual topic headings.

The motion was made by Deborah Flynn and seconded unanimously that the meeting be adjourned.
10:40 A.M.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.

DOCUMENTS ADDRESSED AT MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Copy of USA Today, dated September 15, 2003, Front Page from John Taylor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Website printout from “News for Salmon and Nation” from John Taylor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES approved this __________ day of __________________, 2003.

________________________________________
Lary Coppola, Chair

________________________________________
Planning Commission Secretary