
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

9:10 A.M.

FINDINGS OF FACT & RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNTY TOWER HEIGHT EMERGENCY ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REVISING KITSAP COUNTY CODE TITLE 17; WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY SITE DEVELOPMENT

The Planning Commission previously recommended approval of this ordinance. Following discussion, this item was continued to the November 4, 2003 meeting.

RETREAT LOCATION

Options were presented and suggestions for alternative places, dates and timeframes were discussed. John Ahl suggested legal counsel attend. Holly Anderson will check with Shelley Kneip to determine dates she is available and will also check the availability of facilities on 1) November 13th from 11 AM to 4 PM, or 2) December 2nd from 9 AM to 2 PM. John Ahl noted that the change in Planning Commission location should be clearly communicated to the public.

MASTER PLAN ORDINANCE

Laura Ditmer Recap. During the review of ULID #6 and SKIA with implementing regulations this past spring, there were two different Master Plan components. ULID #6 was master planned by zone and SKIA by sub-basin. ULID #6 was found to be a fairly complete package whereas SKIA was not quite as complete. Code amendments were lacking in decision criteria and other issues needed work. At that time, the Planning Commission asked staff to consider drafting one master plan ordinance to address all the different
areas in the County. The draft before the Planning Commission this morning
incorporates both ULID #6 and SKIA language to outline similarities and differences.
Process and decision criteria are still the same. The Planning Commission members
should still have ULID #6 and SKIA in their possession. Ditmer asked the Commission
if they wished to review the sections of the draft ordinance.

Laura Ditmer
In response to Lary Coppola’s question, yes, all future applications for master plans will
have to go through the master plan process but the requirements for how they master
plan will be different for each.

Laura Ditmer
Told William Matchett it is correct that if the draft ordinance was already enacted at the
time, it covers the requirements for both ULID #6 and SKIA. Also when staff in
Current Planning reviews the ordinance, they walk an applicant through the process
and check to see if that particular parcel of land is addressed or the sub-area is called
out in the ordinance. Not every application will require master planning.

Eric Baker
The content and intent of the draft ordinance is a consolidation of SKIA and ULID #6
master planning language. Also, language is provided for property owners outside
these two sub-areas in the event they wish to master plan projects that for years have
been hampered by the need to acquire various easements to proceed. It will provide a
uniform development plan. Lack of this has slowed down issuance of building permits
to a frustrating level. This will eventually operate on a countywide level, but the
concept began with SKIA and ULID #6.

Laura Ditmer
The County’s Code refers to a master planning process but the process was never
outlined. Therefore projects have been waiting for years with the ability to master plan
but the County does not have the process formally in place.

Eric Baker
The current application process is mostly for property-specific proposals where the
applicant wants to get through the permitting phase. Groundwork laid by the first
applicant in a situation relative to wastewater, storm water, transportation issues, etc.,
becomes cost affective if viewed on a larger scale. For example, if someone is putting in
a well, they are also doing so for another property owner at a later date, not just for
themselves. While this enhances economic development in the future, it does place a
burden initially on the first applicant doing the up-front work, yet having user fees at a
later date.

Reviewed the draft ordinance by section.
1. The standard purpose statement applicability
2. Review and approval process, similar to the existing process that establishes the
need for pre-application meetings to give the applicant full knowledge of criteria
required
3. Summary letter from the Department putting the requirements in writing.
4. Master plan scoping conference to further flush out additional requirements.
5. Scoping conference summary notice get the permit issued.

John Taylor
Pre-application meetings are good to have but the scoping conference feels like the addition of another level of control to the process after the pre-app. Thought the pre-app and the summary letter was enough. Need to address length of time it takes to get the summary letter or time between pre-app and summary letter for the scoping needs. Time frames are included after that in paragraphs C, D and E.

Eric Baker
The Procedures Ordinance will dictate time frames. Mr. Taylor is correct; the scoping conference is another level of control. The pre-application meeting lays out various issues for the applicant at a relatively low cost that in turn helps cover a certain amount of the County's review. The scoping conference requirements are so much more involved for larger projects and the cost is significantly higher. The Department wants to use the pre-application meeting as a means for people unaware of what they need to do for a master plan. Many times an applicant will see this is not doable before going through the expense of master planning. They can opt out at the pre-app level prior to additional higher fees.

Laura Ditmer
There is also a very short period of time for the applicant to respond.

Eric Baker
Additional rationale for not incorporating the two meetings together. Creates another step that increases the complexity but maximizes the developer's ability to understand exactly what is needed at the lowest cost.

Laura Ditmer
A response cannot be obtained for Environmental Review within 6-7 days. Staff needs 45-days to complete their analysis. Without the pre-app first, the applicant would go straight to the scoping component at a much higher cost when it might not even be necessary.

John Taylor
Experience has shown that to get a pre-app meeting, an engineer needs to be hired and it takes approximately three months to prepare a site-plan presentation.

Laura Ditmer
Since this is a master plan pre-app meeting, the applicant is not expected to prepare that level of detail. Just need to come prepared with questions for the pre-app. An engineer is not necessary.

Eric Baker
An applicant, who brings an engineer, usually moves forward with the scoping process. Requirements for a pre-application meeting are minimal. A hand-drawn diagram of project is sufficient.
Laura Ditmer
This additional two week step is basically a “let’s get prepared” step for both applicant and staff.

John Taylor
Recently took 30 days from pre-app meeting to summary letter receipt.

Laura Ditmer
Told John Taylor the intent is for the applicant to know this is an abbreviated, less expensive route.

Eric Baker
Told Michael Gustavson that there is a pre-app waiver available with set criteria, when an applicant wants to go directly to the scoping conference.

Laura Ditmer
Proposed language in the draft ordinance is intended for applicants unfamiliar with the master planning process.

Discussion
Continued about criteria for skipping the pre-app step in the process.

Eric Baker
If an applicant who wants to move forward with the scoping conference, as indicated by John Taylor, they should be able to skip the pre-app conference cutting about 30 days out of review time.

Laura Ditmer
Master planning process is different than process for another project. It is for a larger area of land, needing to meet specific criteria.

Eric Baker
It can take up to two weeks to schedule a pre-app conference, and another two weeks before the meeting takes place.

John Ahl
Questioned if the pre-app meeting could be made optional.

Laura Ditmer
Explained discussions involved prior to implementing the two-step process.

Eric Baker
Emphasized intent of pre-app is to be aware of what is needed if continuing on to the scoping conference.

Kamuron Gurol
When asked by Lary Coppola if this process could be improved answered that statutes have specific requirements for the pre-application conference. Believes applicant will
Laura Ditmer
Not having pre-application conference and going straight to the scoping conference has caused applicants to come in with incomplete information and requirements that hold up the process. The two-step process helps both sides be clear that once in the scoping process, expectations have already been clarified.

Discussion
• Needs, pro and con, for pre-application conference
• Information presented at the conference
• Whether or not an engineer is needed

John Taylor
Thinks pre-app meeting is beneficial to the applicant who needs to have the summary letter from the pre-application conference in order to move forward.

Kamuron Gurol
Staff will again discuss possible ways to streamline the process. Concerned if the Department is taking too long to issue the letter and schedule pre-app conferences. Said that master planning is a different process with the intent of making sure both parties have all necessary information. Discussed specifics of scoping process.

William Matchett
Would like to hear some discussion about parties involved in the master planning process. Language change reads as though one large landowner can out vote all of his neighbors.

Eric Baker
Discussions were held with the Deputy Civil Prosecutors about this issue. The strikeout language in the draft represents the majority of the property owners in the area. The opposite situation is created. If three small landowners are master planning with one large landowner, the three small landowners are the majority of the property owners. They can master plan the entire area without the big property owner’s participation.

Discussion
Continued regarding language in the proposed ordinance relative to public process.

Eric Baker
Everyone in the sub-basin should be participating in the master planning process. This will allow for the most efficient and cost affective extension of infrastructure and other amenities. With some in and other out of the process, planning can’t take place for storm water or sewer in areas where it is reasonable to put it, if the area belongs to a property owner who is not in the process. Examples were given of scattered infrastructure.

William Matchett
This seems to place the economy ahead of democracy, but maybe this has to happen.

Discussion
Continued about:
- Entire areas participating in the master planning process
- Effects of opting in or opting out of the process
- Master planning as a tool for specific areas
- If good option for smaller properties
- Need for a mechanism to handle large groups of property owners
- Ability to prevent the creation of lots that cannot be developed
- Good examples of master planning: SKIA, ULID #6 and Arborwood
- Need for all property owners in an area to be in agreement before master planning begins

Laura Ditmer
Only looking at the initial master planning application. The draft ordinance would not apply as other properties in the area opt in.

Eric Baker
Only so many sub-basins in SKIA, approximately 10-12. Once the 10-12 master plans are developed, it is then just a matter of amending for anyone who is out and wants to get in.

Monty Mahan
Questioned the language stating, “Specified by the underlying zone,” wanting to know if this will be a small piece of the sub-area that will later be based on sub-basin?

Laura Ditmer
Each smaller master plan is required to coordinate infrastructure and environmental issues with the landowners not yet in.

Monty Mahan
For clarification said that if there were a Silverdale sub-area plan, Old Town would be a zone.

Michael Gustavson
Asked if when the first property owner pays for master planning, is the next owner coming on board going to be stuck because the first one didn’t allow for enough capacity?

Eric Baker
Each landowner is required to plan for their particular sub-basin. There may be some analysis downstream beyond the sub-basin, but is relatively unlikely. The general idea of storm water detention/retention is not to be sending the water downstream at unacceptable levels. Concentration will be on the sub-basins and make sure storm water components are adequate to avoid seeing anything significant downstream.
Lary Coppola
Questioned Section F for meaning.

Eric Baker
Clarified that this is located in the SKIA regulations and indicates that when the
engineer’s drawings are completed relative to storm water, transportation, etc. they
then need to be submitted to the County in some format. Currently, most drawings are
done in AutoCAD that emails fairly easily. This could change in the future.

Lary Coppola
Restated the question wondering if applicants were going to have to own proprietary
software.

Eric Baker
This does not relate to the LIS system. Just referring to the industry standard software.
Will also be helpful when a landowner comes to the County at a later date to amend the
master plan. Staff can provide them with the necessary information rather than having
to contact each individual consultant that worked on the original master plan.

Laura Ditmer
It will also be helpful for archiving purposes.

Eric Baker
Application submittal requirements are not boilerplate but still very logical and
consistent throughout. They are also located in the ULID #6 regulations previously
review by the Planning Commission.

Laura Ditmer
Attempting today to come back to the Planning Commission as requested in early
spring, to have a draft to review for adoption to move forward with sub-area plans that
would hopefully be adopted in November. Do not want to run too far beyond that
timeframe.

John Taylor
Asked if outside engineers were involved in formation of the draft ordinance.

Laura Ditmer
Engineers used were all County employees from Public Works, DCD planning staff and
Fire Marshall’s Office; at least 8-10 staff working on the draft ordinance during several
meetings.

Eric Baker
Also pulled language from the SKIA and ULID #6 master plans that were, for the most
part, developed by independent, private engineers. Large landowners also had input.
There has not been peer review over the document at this point. The Planning
Commission is one of the first groups to see it.
Laura Ditmer
Also had McCormick’s attorneys working on this with staff. It will go out for public
hearing for public review before the Planning Commission and the Board of
Commissioners.

John Taylor
Commented that the engineers actually make regulations such as this work.

Laura Ditmer
Reviewed it with Jon Rose and his attorney.

BREAK

Eric Baker
The draft ordinance incorporates mandates that the Planning Commission provided on
the checklist, with a phasing schedule, etc. When asked if there are any specific
provisions or conditions in the draft that the Planning Commission members should be
reviewing, Baker said that no, this is a consolidation of SKIA and ULID #6 master plan
with very little removed. Page 4, Section 17.415.050, establishes technical components,
the generic ones, for landowners not in ULID #6 or SKIA. These would apply to
properties such as Twelve Trees and the industrial development located on Old
Frontier Road. It lists the technical criteria required for submittal addressing storm
water, sanitary sewer, public water, public transportation, etc. This is followed by the
sub-area specific technical components a nearly direct cribbing from SKIA
development regulations. After that, the ULID #6 development regulations are listed.
One area of interest is where master planning requires that zero tracks and easements
for rights-of-way be provided for the entire development. It is set up so that the next
person opting in has a fairly easy process. They will, however, be paying users fees for
the work already started.

William Matchett
Since this specifies ULID #6 and SKIA, how does that affect another person opting in to
use the process?

Eric Baker
The sub-area specific components will not apply to anyone outside the SKIA or ULID
#6 sub-areas. For instance, if during the South Kitsap or Central Kitsap sub-area
planning process, there is an area staff feels needs particular analysis. In this case,
possibly a section can be added applying to that area. First section applies to everyone
else except the landowners within the SKIA and ULID #6 sub-areas. The language is
familiar to the Planning Commission, addressing SKIA specific storm water facilities,
public water and open space and on page 14, the same language for ULID #6. Big
challenge was getting the two sub-area sections lined up to be consistent with one
another. In response to a question from Mike Gustavson about whether or not there
was enough difference in the paragraphs to separate them out, Baker responded that
they were different enough not to be generic and attempting to combine them was
causing more confusion. Therefore SKIA and ULID #6 must be referenced differently. Differences are distinct enough for consolidation to cause a textual nightmare.

Mike Gustavson
Using Arborwood as an example, asked if the wording needed to be site specific.

Eric Baker
Doubtful that this would be necessary since it is a single property owner and a developer who has completed a significant amount of work up front. This would most likely be lumped into a sub-area plan. Master planning would not be necessary, if all the work was completed at the sub-area plan level. Good example is Port Blakely. All the sub-area work has been done so there is no real need for master planning. Expects that Arborwood and some others will be the same case.

Mike Gustavson
Used Sidney/Sedgwick as another example for his original question.

Eric Baker
This area would likely fall into the generic, technical components unless, during the sub-area planning process or during the Board of Commissioners’ deliberation process, it was decided that something else is necessary.

Mike Gustavson
For clarification, asked if A through I, pages 4 and 5, are the same headings discussed in ULID #6 and SKIA.

Eric Baker
Yes, it elaborates on them.

John Ahl
Thought the underlying question is that given the master planner wants to use this in developing his master plan, how is he guided through the process?

Eric Baker
The master planner would go through the process previously discussed, and focus on technical components located in 17.415.050, page 4. Since the Planning Commission is still debating IRF’s, creating uncertainty this therefore may need additional analysis.

William Matchett
Understands it that a new person coming in can basically ignore regulations for SKIA and continue through the process and merely record what has been decided for SKIA and ULID #6.

Eric Baker
Yes. Master Planning has been on the books for years, this just outlines what master planning is for someone coming in with an application.
John Ahl
This could be easily solved in a final document if SKIA and ULID #6 are labeled as examples.

Eric Baker
These are not examples, rather actual specifics for master plans. However, for someone going through the scoping process, the two sub-areas could serve as examples for each project.

Laura Ditmer
If an applicant is required to go through the master planning process, each will be required to do so in its own unique way.

Eric Baker
If asking someone applying for the master planning process will have to comply, for example, with conditions on page 14 relative to storm water analysis. Concerned that if SKIA and ULID #6 were referenced as examples, then they would become shoulds rather than shalls. Reviewed requirements for sub-basin master planning. For a new application, if not located in SKIA or ULID #6, the previous section would only apply.

Monty Mahan
Suggested for clarification, that on the front page of section 020-Applicability, a sentence could be added stating that certain areas have additional requirements and then list them and where to go to find them.

Michael Gustavson
Suggested that on pages 4 and 5, reference be made to the requirement document. It would create a cross reference for ease of locating information.

Eric Baker
ULID #6 takes up a large portion of the document and stops at page 21. Responded yes to Monty Mahan’s question about when it says “Port” it refers to something that the Port wants. Third-party review is an option for the County absent enough technical experience or if the County disagrees with a consultant’s conclusions. The County can bring in a third party to assess the validity of the consultant’s work. Expense of third-party review is usually borne by the County.

John Ahl
Suggested changing the wording to “the requesting party” should be required to pay for their request.

Lary Coppola
Agreed that if the applicant doesn’t agree with the County’s decision and asks for an expert’s opinion, then the County should not be required to pay for the expert.
Eric Baker
Next addressed Modification of Development Standards. Master planning gives the
ability to modify some of the development standards in existing County Code. For
example, Urban Medium designation sets minimum lot sizes. The master plan, if
approved, would be able to modify A-F at the bottom of page 21.

William Matchett
Asked if it is spelled out elsewhere how agreement is reached on the third party review.

Eric Baker
Yes, it is particularly spelled out in the Critical Area Ordinance (CAO). Will double
check if it is specific to zoning.

William Matchett
Agreement must be reached on selection of the third party, or this provision will not
work.

John Taylor
In most cases, there is a pre-set list of qualified experts from which to draw.

Eric Baker
Will check with the Current Planning staff to determine how this is applied. Back to
discussion on Modification of Development Standards, this will give master planning
the ability to provide some flexibility in certain circumstances. Staff is looking for
innovative approaches to make master planning successful. Page 22, SEPA review of
master plans, much of the language in this section was requested by the Port, giving
examples. Intended to cut down on extra delay of SEPA review outside of other time
lines for master plan review.

John Taylor
Wondered how this interfaces with the cities.

Eric Baker
The next section is missing from the SKIA regulations. For SKIA, it is unknown what
criteria the County will use to decide for or against approval. This section does
incorporate a number of ULID #6 decision criteria. It seems likely that the Board of
Commissioners through the public hearing process, will request some SKIA specific
provisions be added, as a certain number of residential components in the decision
criteria will not be applicable to SKIA. It does give the applicant the knowledge of what
the County needs to continue on for a successful master planning process.

Lary Coppola
For discussion purposes, if someone wanted to develop a very large, significant project
in the rural areas, how would this fit into the ordinance provisions?

Eric Baker
Anyone wanting to develop a large project in the rural area would need to apply the
underlying zoning to the project to gain approval. The underlying zoning would have to
refer to the master planning section for it to be applicable. Possibly through the IRF process, a component could be added stipulating that master planning could be recommended. Believes master planning is an excellent tool for a wide variety of developments. It would improve success rates of industrial developments throughout the County as well as residential developments for multiple-property owners.

Laura Ditmer
Also an attempt to coordinate all infrastructures and bring down those costs. Subsequently should then move right into a ready stage.

Eric Baker
Reiterated that the underlying zoning would need to be changed first because this language is not going to open up a panacea of options in the rural areas to do a master plan unless the underlying zoning is compatible. The Rural Industrial zones already have this in the Code.

Laura Ditmer
Gave example of when ULID #6 was taken through every section of the Zoning Code when it was being amended, urban clusters were specifically outlined and a master-planning requirement for ULID #6 was placed in the Code.

Mike Gustavson
Problem with Item 7, page 22. Feels like pushing people in a direction that is unproven and does not work. Even at a highly subsidized level, asked how many people at today’s meeting came by bus, how many people present have ridden the bus in the past month and how many people would be willing to pay increased fares to ride the bus.

John Ahl
Correct in that if public transit is not available where you live, then it is difficult to take the bus. You can’t plan for public transportation if it is not available. There is no way to meet this requirement.

Lary Coppola
When first joined the Planning Commission, thought it a good idea to require County employees to ride the bus to work.

Laura Ditmer
This is a requirement of the GMA in that it needs to be considered and addressed. It does not say we can expect 90% participation but it does say it needs to be addressed.

Lary Coppola
Suggested, “Encourages.”

Eric Baker
The subject of mass transit is one of the essential components of affordable housing so this would be a good topic of discussion on affordable housing.
Mike Gustavson
Believes that an affordable housing component is that people have access to
automobiles to get to work and to the stores for supplies. Thinks this section should at
least be modified.

Monty Mahan
After reading the first sentence under “Decision Criteria”, is not sure it is not a
requirement.

Eric Baker
Something that will be reviewed as comparable compliance and a plus or minus will be
given. Although it is consistent with components of the Comprehensive Plan, the issue
of mass transit is a much larger discussion.

Michael Gustavson
Would like to soften the statement. There is a current move in Washington State on a
petition drive to repeal the GMA, so this mass transit might not even be an issue.

Laura Ditmer
Asked the Planning Commission members if they would like to see a bus stop provision.
Suggested removing “reduces dependency on automobiles by providing for it” and
substitute the word “encourages.”

Michael Gustavson
Reference Page 23, paragraph following “H” that says, “If no reasonable condition or
modification can be imposed to ensure the application meets the criteria set forth
above, then the application shall be denied.”

Eric Baker
Page 23 goes into more contentious issues brought forward by the Port relative to
duration of master plan approval. Throughout most Puget Sound jurisdictions, master
plans are good for a set amount of time because the goal is to protect all the up-front
work from any change of regulations during that set time (Industry standard is 10
years). For example, if the up front work is done and the Storm water Manual changes
in the third year, the master plan is still locked in unless the master plan is too far out
of compliance with new regulations. The Port wanted this provision stricken in its
entirety and have the master plan exist in perpetuity. Noted that if a master plan is
developed, no more land use approvals are necessary. The next step is the building
permit followed by site development activity permit. There are no additional public
hearings required. At the end of 10 years, the existing master plan would need to be
augmented or amended to be approved for another 10 years. This issue appears under
the section titled, “Extensions of Master Plan Approval.”

Lary Coppola
Questioned what happens in the case of a 20-year build out as in ULID #6.
This is where phasing would be incorporated. This gives the ability to extend almost de facto. Once the initial master plan is approved, amendments and extensions are easier to implement.

Michael Gustavson
Asked if some of the fast track benefits can still be maintained during the extended period or does the master plan need to be updated to accommodate a new regulation or concept and is a public hearing skipped.

Eric Baker
As long as the property owner is operating under a master plan’s existing duration or an approved extension, the best approach would be to come in during the 7th or 8th year if it is apparent development will not be finished by year ten to ask for an extension. Throughout the extension the fast track would apply. It would not be advantageous to come in at the end of the tenth year stating the deadline cannot be met, requiring one to two more years to amend the master plan and still expecting to take advantage of the streamlined approach.

Michael Gustavson
Asked if a new concept would be incorporated as a requirement for granting an extension.

Eric Baker
Yes and there are criteria listed for extensions and amendments.

Lary Coppola
Asked what happens if the regulations change drastically.

Eric Baker
Referenced Page 24, Section D, addresses significant changes.

Laura Ditmer
The Sub-area Plan also states that an applicant must abide by what was agreed to so they would be complying with regulations in place at the time of development.

Mike Gustavson
Asked if the wording could be modified to say that the applicant must demonstrate that significant changes in text of the original master plan have been accommodated as necessary to protect their investment. This is a more positive approach as opposed to a denial approach.

John Taylor
Thought that the courts have decided that at the time the applicant makes the application, the rules in place at that time apply.
Clarified using example that in the case of stronger sewer regulations when in the seventh year the applicant sees the need for an extension, the changes need to be made but the original master plan approval should still apply.

Discussion
- Clarification of definition for extensions and amendments
- Major changes to regulations
- Examples given of projects that have taken 10 years or more
- Rationale for asking for an extension or an amendment and the difference between the two options
- Up front work providing potential developers with some kind of certainty
- What happens when the time period expires
- Sub-area plan states they would be abiding by what is in place at the time of development
- Having an approved master plan for ten years, doing nothing with it, section 17.415.120 provides for a five year extension
- Implications of not anticipating the need for an extension need to be noted
- Whether fast track benefits can be retained during an extension
- Need to show good faith

Eric Baker
The Port is not under the impression that once you do the master plan up front, those are the regulations used. Believes their comment that the master plan should operate in perpetuity is that all new regulations are still being imposed after master plan approval. However, this needs to be checked out with the Port for accuracy.

Michael Gustavson
Noted that the Port is a major property owner and this is an exact example of problems ahead. In favor of a longer time period than ten years and deletion of the extension.

John Taylor
In favor of taking this issue to Region Council. This involves ten years of someone’s life. Need legal council’s opinion.

Monty Mahan
Need to look at all the aspects. This is not just regulations changing but a master plan commits landowners to building things on their property for the convenience of other property owners down the road. All implications need to be considered before a decision is made on this issue.

Eric Baker
Amendment means that if things change or other property owners want to opt in but are not in favor of what is planned for their property, they can get an amendment without having to start the process over again. In other words, piggyback off of the previous work, which re-establishes the ten-year period from the time of the amendment rather than from the original master plan approval.
Addressed “Consistency with Future Development with Master Plan,” page 24. Language is basic disclaimer that any future development must be done in conjunction with a master plan. Needs to be re-written for clarity.

Lastly, “Binding Site Plan and Concurrency Review,” page 25. In many cases, a master plan will divide up many pieces of property. This is where a binding site plan is needed. It establishes a site plan with a map of what sub-basin development will look like. This is then attached to the title. Future purchasers can view the map and see any issues they might want to address.

Attempting to take two different master planning languages, incorporate them into one section for public and staff to reference. Recapped major questions, comments and concerns heard today:

- Pre-application and scoping meetings
- Decision criteria and legal review regarding amendments and extensions
- Series of wording changes

Laura Ditmer

Staff will bring this back to work/study again after which it will go to the public hearing phase. Reiterated that the ten-year extension wording was lifted from other jurisdictions.

Eric Baker

Will discuss with legal counsel the Planning Commission’s questions, comments and concerns.

Michael Gustavson

Master planning seems similar to a permit and that the courts have ruled that once a permit is issued, it is not legal to go back and revoke it.

Eric Baker

Master Plan is similar to a land use permit for a preliminary plat.

John Ahl

Master plan should not be likened to a permit. A permit is for a specific structure and plans change. To draw the conclusion that once prepared, a plan is forever, involves risk.

Tom Nevins

Ten-year limit is a means to incorporate responsiveness into the system in order to make changes. If regulations become more or less restrictive, an applicant can decide how to proceed. Ten years is probably enough time for a master plan to be in effect before being revisited.

Eric Baker

A ten-year limitation will encourage development before potential new regulations apply. Landowners will delay structure improvements to the time frame best for them.
A ten-year window encourages creating infrastructure to facilitate economic development.

**Discussion**
- Possibility of relaxing regulations
- Advantages in selling property if regulations are less restrictive
- Stream management and possibility of buffer requirements changing
- Review at some point is a good thing
- Need for language in ordinance addressing potential of less restrictive regulations
- Wording changes needed in the amendment section further describing amendments and extension

**AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUMMIT**

A potential list of possible members for the summit was distributed to the Planning Commission.

Laura Ditmer

Staff held a productive meeting to start planning toward the Affordable Housing Summit. Asked the Planning Commission members for suggestions on who they think would make good candidates for members of the Summit. Possible date setting was discussed for sometime in the early spring. Goals and policies are being compiled from the Comprehensive Plan. Intent is to bring the Summit to a successful conclusion with tangible products by working with a variety of people in the community with different ideas and needs. Staff will work with the Planning Commission, look for outside sponsorships, look at two or three day Housing Summit and look at desired outcome. Still have important issues needing completion before working on the Summit. First is the Land Capacity Analysis update that will provide information for the Summit. Next are 2004 Comp Plan amendments. Handed out packet of information from the Comp Plan to start the affordable housing discussion. This can be scheduled for an upcoming work/study session to discuss working as a committee and develop a Housing Summit agenda. Example: Page 102 in the handout details affordable housing policies.

Discussion among the members
- Draft list was too large
- Suggestions for potential members of the Summit to consider
- Identifying people who might give valuable input but not necessarily be part of the group
- Formation of sub-groups
- Speakers and technical experts
- Variety of issues and areas of interest involved
- Need to start thinking of what the Planning Commission sees as desirable outcome from the Summit
- Specific groups needing to be considered, i.e., homeless, social service recipients, assisted living facilities
• High cost of taxes forcing senior citizens out of their homes. Need to discuss tax deferral program.

John Taylor
Requested that Holly Anderson follow up on the MLS request for information. *

John Ahl
Distributed copies the Port Townsend Planning Department’s rules and procedures. Asked the Planning Commission members to review the documents in comparison to their own rules and procedures. Also distributed a draft agenda for the Planning Commission Retreat set for December 2, 2003, 9 AM to 2 PM, at Givens Community Center, Kitsap Room.

Lary Coppola
Suggested the Planning Commission members review this information and discuss it at the next meeting on November 4, 2003.

Holly Anderson will make copies of the Planning Commission By-laws. *

No further business being heard, there was a unanimous motion to adjourn.

Exhibit No.        Description

A. Planning Commission Rules and Procedure (with suggested changes in color) – Submitted by John Ahl
B. Proposed Agenda for Planning Commission Retreat – Submitted by John Ahl
C. Land Use Chapter and Housing Chapter-Goals & Policies from the KC Comprehensive Plan and RCW’s located in the GMA – Submitted by Laura Ditmer
D. Section 17.415 – Master Plan – Submitted by Eric Baker
E. Email Prepared by Jason Rice of possible attendees for future Affordable Housing Summit

MINUTES approved this ________________ day of __________________, 2003.

________________________________________
Lary Coppola, Chair

________________________________________
Planning Commission Secretary

* Items on task list