

# SUQUAMISH CITIZEN ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, 01 December 2022 @ 6:30 in-person meeting only  
Suquamish Police Training Room, 18480 Suquamish Way NE, Suquamish

## **ATTENDEES:**

### **SCAC Board Members:**

Laurie Kadet (Co-Chair), Martha Burke (Co-Chair), Brenda Austin, Carol Larsen, Tom Curley, Kurt Olmstead, Emily Klein

**Quorum:** YES

**Kitsap County Commissioners' Office:** (none)

### **Community Members:**

Jennifer Sutton, Marcus Lang, Dusty Collings, Nora Lang

## **OPENING ITEMS:**

### **Meeting Called to Order at: 6:35 p.m.**

**Reading of the Land Acknowledgment:** We would like to begin by acknowledging that the land on which we gather is within the ancestral territory of the "People of Clear Salt Water" (Suquamish People). Expert fishermen, canoe builders and basket weavers, the Suquamish live in harmony with the lands and waterways along Washington's Central Salish Sea as they have for thousands of years. Here, the Suquamish live and protect the land and waters of their ancestors for future generations as promised by the Point Elliott Treaty of 1855. "Every part of this soil is sacred in the estimation of my people. Every hillside, every valley, every plain and grove, has been hallowed by some sad or happy event in days long vanished." Chief Seattle 1854.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Approval of the November 2022 Meeting Minutes: Tom Curley motioned to approve the minutes, and Carol Larsen seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #1**

- No public comments, but roundtable introductions

## **MEETING CORE:**

## **Suquamish Vision Statement**

Jennifer Sutton (who was a project manager for the last update, working with the City of Bainbridge Island) provided a suggested vision statement, though there isn't a state requirement to have one. A first cut. She suggested she's writing as if it's in 2044. Or maybe the Sub-Area Plan comments don't necessarily need a vision statement? Always to clean up duplications. More aspirational than actionable. Martha Burke suggested the county might want to keep a consistent format. Laurie Kadet suggested that there's lots of time, since approval will come in 2024, and review the document and come back in January or February for a deeper discussion. Jennifer Sutton suggested request the county to come up with a modified existing conditions section, and review that. That would be something the County would be tasked to do, but the vision statement and existing conditions would be different sections. A great starting point, it will be brought to the next meeting, after a comparison review with the overall Comp Plan vision.

## **Discussion of the County SubArea Plan update:**

Jennifer Sutton spoke about lots sizes, and how in the LAMIRD one would need an acre to add a second primary residential unit – unrealistic given the small platted lot sizes. If the goal is to add housing stock as a way of reducing homelessness, then that rural zoning requirement should change. She suggested recommending a change to reflect the current building pattern in Suquamish, which is on much smaller lots, often 1/7 of an acre or less- most are less than ¼-acre, or 10,000 sf. The goal in changing the development standard would be to allow a small amount of infill over time – to take advantage of the sewer, water, and transit. Currently, multi-family development (including duplexes) is not allowed. Kitsap County has under-built housing – that hasn't kept up with housing demand. She suggests the development standard should reflect the development pattern within the LAMIRD, which is small lots. Thus, if lot standards are 5,000 SF on average, then 10,000 SF would be needed for a second primary residence, like a duplex. Outside the LAMIRD, the rural standards would continue to apply and be unchanged. It would be 'infill planning' which uses existing infrastructure. She also suggested loosening rules for accessory dwelling units – the rural county rules are the most strict, compared to UGA's and cities. Currently you need to apply for a conditional use permit for an accessory dwelling unit, obtained before applying for a building permit – an extra administrative hurdle which discourages accessory dwelling units. Suquamish has three zoning categories – Suquamish Village Commercial, Suquamish Residential Low and Suquamish Village Residential. Those are changeable. Legacy lots are what were platted, and are part of the 'snapshot in time' when GMA came into law in 1990, and are able to be developed – though many are likely unbuildable or undesirable, and are constrained by setbacks and the two livable stories limitation (36'). The result would need to be looked at – greater density, probably, and increase population. A legacy lot is undersized for the zone it's in – grandfathered in. Some confusion exists if changes are possible. Can't change the boundary, but the zoning classifications could be easier to change within the LAMIRD. The rules around LAMIRDs recognize the existing building standards when they were formed – continued existing uses are fine. A portion of the memo from Alison O'Sullivan (Tribal comments) was read by Laurie Kadet, who pointed out that the SCAC has been working to improve cooperation with the Suquamish Tribe. Regarding density of Suquamish, it cannot

be a focus for population growth, as that is what Urban Growth Areas (UGA's like Kingston) are for. The Suquamish Rural Village has distinct limitations as per the Growth Management Act. A Type-1 LAMIRD is outside the Urban Growth Area and has an established logical outer border (in the case of Suquamish, area of sewer coverage) to contain existing development. Uses, densities or intensities not normally allowed in a rural area may be allowed inside the logical outer boundary of the LAMIRD, consistent with the existing development character. It was discussed that higher-density housing was not present when the LAMIRD was formed; counterpoint that neither were one-acre lots sizes. The WA State Dept. of Commerce Growth Management Services was contacted by Jennifer, about whether design standards could change to reflect current development standards. Question: does state law prohibit changing development standards to reflect existing standards? They confirmed that changing the boundary is very difficult, but change within the boundary as long as it's consistent with existing development. Laurie asked if Jennifer would send out an email link to the Growth Management Act, which is section RCW 36.70A section 070 subsection 5. Easy to find via Google. Can it be legally changed? Do we want to? Laurie Kadet wanted more public input on increasing density. Martha suggested Puget Sound Regional Council concurrence would be needed. Jennifer suggested these proposed changes to development standards would be consistent with the Council's Vision 2050 to encourage infill housing. The county could run the numbers and create a map showing all the unbuilt lots of, say, 5,000 SF – that might produce 30 more building units if the standards were changed, over time (since change comes slowly so an incremental change). Carol Larsen summarized the proposed change as modifying the development standard to realistically reflect the present platted reality. The current minimum lot size by code for one house is 4,045 SF (about 1/10 of an acre). Any newly created lots would require a minimum half acre (and at least 40' wide), so to subdivide one of those lots would require it to be an acre – the rural standard. The attempt in changing the development standard to be smaller would reflect the existing reality. Questions arose if the sewer could handle additional housing units, or parking. The Tribe, who isn't required to comply with the GMA, is building duplexes and townhomes. They also do not want to see additional density that isn't Tribal, within the LAMIRD. Additional density may not be popular with the existing homeowner population. Jennifer observed that zoning is useful for keeping industry away from housing, but has been a big contributor to social and racial stratification. The trend of short-term vacation rentals also removes housing stock from the available housing pool. The result of restrictive zoning is that the market can't respond to demand due to regulatory hurdles. The county has their own housing affordability requirements they need to meet – Household 1220, passed in 2021 – that code has to change in order to build affordable housing. So, this could be a good time to present these recommendations for infill development to the county. Suggested that the co-chairs Laurie and Martha request from the county a mapping look 5,000 to 6,000 SF lots – so, how many lots are 10,000 SF and undeveloped, to determine the potential. Another map of ADU's – probably a dozen presently across the LAMIRD. And, no guarantee that any additional housing units would be affordable. It's an interesting discussion. Compared to the densification of Poulsbo, with traffic density and impacts to schools, etc. No more intense development than what's there now – new lots would look like the development pattern now. It would be gradual, over-time infill. County affordable housing wait list is over 2,000 people.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT #2**

- No public comments.

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m. The next meeting is on January 5, 2023, with continued Sub-Area Plan discussion of zoning, and transportation.

