

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – February 16, 2021

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Zoom Webinar

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84541190788>

OR Dial In: (253) 215-8782 Webinar ID: 845 4119 0788 Password: 896660

February 16, 2021 @ 5:30 pm

These minutes are intended to provide a summary of meeting decisions and, except for motions 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).

Members present: Joe Phillips (Chair), Amy Maule (Vice Chair), Aaron Murphy, Alan Beam, Kari Kaltenborn-Corey, Kim Allen, Mike Eliason, Stacey Smith

Members not present:

Staff present: Jeff Rimack, Angie Silva, Dave Ward, Liz Williams, Kirvie Mesebeluu-Yobech, Amanda Walston (Clerk)

5:30 pm

A. Introductions

B. Virtual Meeting Protocol

C. Adoption of Agenda

- **MOTION:** Mike Eliason moves to adopt the agenda as presented.
- **SECOND:** Kim Allen
- **VOTE: 8 in Favor; 0 Opposed – Motion Carries**

D. Adoption of Minutes

- **Minutes of 2/2/21**
- **MOTION:** Amy Maule moves to adopt the minutes as presented.
- **SECOND:** Kari Kaltenborn-Corey
- **DISCUSSION:** Correct Alan Beam's name spelling.
- **VOTE: 6 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 2 Abstained – Motion Carries**

5:37 pm

E. General Public Comment

- Chair Phillips opens the floor to speakers wishing to provide testimony.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – February 16, 2021

- 1 • **SPEAKER: Bill Palmer, South Kitsap resident, President of Kitsap Alliance of**
- 2 **Property Owners (KAPO)**
- 3 • Requests feedback from email sent by Mike Gustavson on behalf of KAPO
- 4 regarding the Buildable Lands Survey.
- 5 • Asks if Department of Ecology (DOE) is likely to address citizen comments from
- 6 the public hearing on 3/2/21.
- 7 • Angie Silva, Department of Community Development (DCD) Assistant
- 8 Director, asks where the email was sent, as she is unaware whether
- 9 staff has received it; Mr. Palmer notes it was sent to Liz Williams.
- 10 • **Hearing no other speakers, Chair Phillips closes the floor.**

11 **5:44 pm**

12 **F. Status Update: Buildable Lands Program Update – Liz Williams, DCD Planning**

13 **Supervisor (est. 5 min)**

- 14 • Ms. Williams presents a project overview to date, referencing the visual
- 15 presentation, noting the two main deliverables are the Development Trend
- 16 Review and Land Supply Analysis.
- 17 • Ms. Williams discusses Step 1, which categorizes land into 5 categories:
- 18 Excluded, Pipeline, Vacant, Partially Utilized and Under-Utilized.
- 19 • Step 2 goal identifies and excludes very high value single family homes unlikely
- 20 to redevelop or subdivide, regardless of capacity for growth on the parcel.
- 21 • Step 3 goal identifies critical areas that must be protected under the Growth
- 22 Management Act (GMA) and are not generally available for development.
- 23 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam asks where Critical Recharge Areas are accounted for.
- 24 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Silva notes Title 19.600 addresses Critical Aquifer
- 25 Recharge Areas, including standards for residential and
- 26 commercial/industrial lands; does not prohibit but shows where and
- 27 when additional measures may be needed but not necessarily
- 28 affecting the developable land.
- 29 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Eliason asks how the 2.5 ratio of land vs. property value was
- 30 determined for Under-Utilized Properties.
- 31 • **ANSWER:** Ratio was developed, by Berk Consulting, based on existing
- 32 conditions and occurrence of redevelopment on some of the
- 33 underutilized properties.
- 34 • **QUESTION:** Aaron Murphy asks why hospitals are not included as likely to
- 35 redevelop, as Harrison Hospital in Silverdale just saw a lengthy redevelopment.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – February 16, 2021

- 1 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Williams notes this redevelopment is not typical for the
- 2 planning horizon, noting this is a group methodology where local
- 3 circumstances can sometimes deviate from these assumptions.
- 4 • **Chair Phillips calls for other questions or comments;** acknowledging attendee
- 5 Mr. Palmer, who has questions related to market factor and impacts of housing
- 6 const inflation; Chair Phillips thanks Mr. Palmer for his questions, noting these
- 7 topics are not being addressed at this time in the presentation.
- 8 • Ms. Williams reviews progress since last update; upcoming timeline including
- 9 release of population/employment trend and public comment period in late
- 10 March; provides overview of outreach, including with Kitsap Builders
- 11 Association (KBA) Developers Council, all City-County Coordination meeting
- 12 and briefings with the PC and Board of County Commissioners (BoCC).
- 13 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam asks if a Phase 1 lookback review report will be available.
- 14 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Williams notes a part of the Buildable Lands Report
- 15 (BLR), the population/employment trend, will be released in March.
- 16 • **QUESTION:** Ms. Smith asks how the County and Cities are evaluating fast ferry
- 17 impacts, and if there have been any mutual agreed upon methods.
- 18 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Williams notes both the lookback and future reviews
- 19 include considerations for fast ferries as part of previous effort
- 20 • Ms. Silva notes upcoming growth targets for 2040 and guidance from
- 21 Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) data and Office of Financial
- 22 Management (OFM) census data are also considered.
- 23 • Chair Phillips asks if this affects employment numbers for Kitsap
- 24 • Ms. Silva notes this is already considered in PSRC’s mid-year review
- 25 and is on the radar for Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC).
- 26 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Eliason asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, Phase 2 has
- 27 a separate public comment period related to population/employment data
- 28 that will close; the comment period will reopen with the full draft comes out.
- 29 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Eliason asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, all
- 30 comments, from the various methods of submittal, will be compiled and put
- 31 into the matrix and sent to the PC for consideration.

6:16 pm

- 32
- 33 **G. Work Study Session: Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update – Kirvie Mesebeluu-**
- 34 **Yobech, DCD Planning & Environmental Programs (PEP) Planner (est. 1 hr)**
- 35 • **Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech introduces Maria Sandercock from DOE and Leila**
- 36 **Willoughby-Oakes Planner from the consultant Watershed Company.**

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – February 16, 2021

- 1 • Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech presents a brief overview of project to date,
2 referencing Executive Summary and visual presentation, reviewing timeline
3 and phases, noting the periodic review is on target with tasks and timeframe;
4 highlighting upcoming public engagement opportunities including the
5 upcoming Open House and continued monthly project updates.
- 6 • Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech notes focus is PC questions; Kathlene Barnhart has left
7 Kitsap, so staff will gather technical questions and bring back clarification.
- 8 • Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech notes the comment period opens the day of the joint
9 DOE/DCD public hearing on 3/2/21 and the SEPA Determination should come
10 out this week so comment periods will align; Staff is still offering individual or
11 group consultations, recently made one to PG/S'Klallam tribe.
- 12 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam requests to review the comments in advance of the
13 public hearing so they can be shared with others to encourage participation.
- 14 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech notes two comments received so
15 far, one specific to climate change and the other related to vegetation
16 view blockage; comments will be compiled along with staff responses
17 to each, and provided to the PC, BoCC and DOE for consideration.
- 18 • Mr. Beam asks, and Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech confirms, no comments
19 received from the Tribes yet, though one is expected before deadline.
- 20 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Murphy asks if this topic typically receives many comments,
21 and whether volume tends to increase toward the end of the comment period.
- 22 • **ANSWER:** Dave Ward, DCD PEP Manager, notes from his experience,
23 a thin turnout is common at the mid-point of the public comment
24 period, but more will roll in at the end; it's only been a year since the
25 previous major, comprehensive update took place.
- 26 • Ms. Sandercock confirms it is common or expected to see the level of
27 comments drop off between the two different types of review.
- 28 **6:29 pm**
- 29 • **COMMENT:** Chair Phillips notes the monthly project updates, have been seeing
30 a good turnout of attendees and comments; encourages PC to attend and see.
- 31 • Mr. Ward asks Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech to bring up Views & Code Language;
32 asks for thoughts or suggestions from the PC related to subdivision of shoreline
33 parcels; where development will be occurring, but the parcel itself is outside
34 shoreline jurisdiction; draft language conflicted with Assessor's office
35 clarification; when subdivision occurs, parent lot then has 1 – 2 child lots, but
36 retains its parcel number for reference until subdivision and recording occurs;
37 at which point the child lots receive new parcel numbers and the parent lot's
38 old parcel number is retired and a new parcel number is assigned; all three
39 parcel numbers will have an association to each other.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – February 16, 2021

- 1 • Mr. Murphy asks, and Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech confirms, staff will send a copy
- 2 of redlined changes to the Clerk for distribution to the PC.
- 3 • Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech will have the Clerk distribute a copy.
- 4 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Ms. Maule asks, and Mr. Ward confirms, if parcel #1 is
- 5 waterfront, potentially divided into four lots, two waterfront (a and b) and two
- 6 non-waterfront (c and d); are 'a /b' subject to the SMP, while 'c/d' are exempt.
 - 7 • Ms. Allen notes, in these examples, it appears that this is in context of
 - 8 short plats, not larger subdivisions; agrees with Ms. Maule's approach
 - 9 that anything remaining in the shoreline jurisdiction would be subject
 - 10 to a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit. (SSDP)
 - 11 • Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Ward confirms, if any part of the new
 - 12 parcel, subject to development, falls within shoreline jurisdiction, that
 - 13 property would not be eligible for any exemption.
- 14 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Eliason asks, with upland property subdivision, are any rights
- 15 given to through the water parcels to the water access; though not contiguous.
 - 16 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Ward notes while this clause only addresses
 - 17 subdivision, not water access, if it did trigger any element of
 - 18 development, it would be subject to shoreline jurisdiction and based
 - 19 on the dollar value.


20 **6:45 pm**

21 **H. For the Good of the Order/Commissioner Comments**

- 22 • Mr. Beam thanks Mr. Ward for a great presentation on monitoring system;
- 23 recommends briefing the rest of the PC; Chair Phillips concurs.
- 24 • **MOTION:** Amy Maule moves to adjourn the meeting.
- 25 • **SECOND:** Kim Allen
- 26 • **VOTE: 8 in Favor; 0 Opposed – Motion Carries**

27 **Time of Adjournment: 6:47 pm**

28 **Minutes approved this 16th day of March 2021.**

29
30 
31 _____
32 **Joe Phillips, Planning Commission Chair**

33 
34 _____
Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk