1		KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
2		Zoom Webinar
3		https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87421320303
4		OR
5	Dial In: (	253) 215-8782 Webinar ID: 874 2132 0303 Passcode: 397118
6		September 7, 2021 @ 5:30 pm
7 8 9 10 11	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 <a href="http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm">http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm</a> and listen to the audio file (to assist in locating information, time-stamps are provided below).	
12		
13 14		
15 16	<u>Department of C</u> (Clerk)	ommunity Development (DCD) Staff present: Liz Williams, Amanda Walston
17		5:30 pm
18	A. Introduct	ions
19	B. Virtual M	leeting Protocol
20	C. Adoption	of Agenda
21	• M	OTION: Mike Eliason moves to adopt the agenda as presented.
22	• SE	ECOND: Aaron Murphy
23		<ul> <li>VOTE: 8 in Favor – 0 opposed Motion Carries</li> </ul>
24	D. Adoption	of Minutes
25	• M	OTION: Aaron Murphy moves to adopt the minutes of 8/17/21 as presented.
26	• SE	ECOND: Steven Boe
27		<ul> <li>VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries</li> </ul>
28	E. General F	Public Comment
29	• Cl	nair Phillips opens the floor to speakers wishing to provide testimony.
30 31		<b>PEAKER:</b> Bill Palmer, South Kitsap resident, President of Kitsap Alliance of operty Owners (KAPO)
32		<ul> <li>Mr. Palmer comments regarding the Zoning Use Table.</li> </ul>

1 2		<ul> <li>Chair Phillips thanks speaker; calls for other speakers; seeing and hearing none, closes the floor to general public comments.</li> </ul>
3		5:40 pm
4 5 6 7	F.	<ul> <li>Work Study: Buildable Lands Program – Liz Williams, Department of Community</li> <li>Development (DCD) Interim PEP Manager (approx. 60 min)</li> <li>Ms. Williams provides a brief review of project status, including timeline, and public participation; noting the public comment period for this report is active.</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11		<ul> <li>Ms. Williams begins reviewing items, some of which include new critical area &amp; stormwater requirements, infrastructure gap analysis, market factor or unavailable land assumptions, achievements ins employment density and reasonable measures.</li> </ul>
12 13		<ul> <li>Angie Silva, DCD Assistant Director notes a question received regarding dates on slides, clarifying dates refer to permit data collected between 2013 – 2020.</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17		<ul> <li>In review of Residential Capacity Summary, Ms. Williams notes that while unincorporated areas are falling short of targets, when the combined capacity for associated cities and unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), there is sufficient residential capacity to meet 2036 target.</li> </ul>
18 19 20		<ul> <li>Ms. Silva notes when the UGAs were originally created in 2016 they were 1500 people short of meeting targets even then; there are nuances to the numbers now as well.</li> </ul>
21		6:12 pm
22 23		<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, and Ms. Silva confirms, there are no Director's Interpretations currently under appeal.</li> </ul>
24 25		<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Alan Beam asks, and Ms. Silva confirms, Director's Interpretations are published and available on the main DCD website.</li> </ul>
26 27 28		<ul> <li>Ms. Williams notes the current status of project timeline, as well as how to submit public comments: via electronic form, department website, email, or hardcopy mail; also reviews next steps in process; calls for questions</li> </ul>
29 30 31 32		<ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Eliason asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, there is no statutory requirement that the PC provide any formal input or recommendation on this item; and the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) determines the level of PC involvement.</li> </ul>
33 34		<ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Beam asks about the exclusion of military and government employment number in the employment density calculations.</li> </ul>
35 36 37		<ul> <li>ANSWER: That is the guideline and limitation to the way this level of data is evaluated in this report; several jurisdictions are greatly impacted, Bremerton with the shipyards, Silverdale with Bangor as</li> </ul>

1		well as neighboring areas and commuters also.
2 3 4		<ul> <li>Employment density is a new measure and concept being evaluated; we looked at achieved floor area ratio; we can hone that data, but we have to follow the guidelines given.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8		<ul> <li>Ms. Silva notes, regarding commuters, other jurisdictions such as Whatcom, Pierce, King, Snohomish and Thurston are also required to do the same for their BLR, so they will also have to find ways to achieve their targets as well for highly impacted areas.</li> </ul>
9 LO		<ul> <li>QUESTION: Stacey Smith thanks staff, asks when the data might reflect that changes or impacts of 2020 – 2021 in data.</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14		<ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes the 2024 Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) will reflect some; then in 3 more years for the BLR update; Ms. Silva notes this is the 4<sup>th</sup> BLR report issued by Kitsap; with this year being the first real update since the implementation of 2017, which was the first major overhaul since the first BLR report was issued.</li> </ul>
L6		6:26 pm
L7		BREAK
18		6:36 pm
L9	G.	Work Study: Zoning Use Table Update – Liz Williams, DCD Interim PEP Manager
20		(approx. 60 min)
21 22 23		<ul> <li>Ms. Williams briefly presents a project overview and update, provides a brief review of project status, including timeline, and public participation; noting tonight's Work Study will focus on the proposed Commercial changes.</li> </ul>
24 25 26		<ul> <li>Ms. Williams reviews proposed changes, some of which include Economic Development, Encourage Public Facilities, Combine Land Uses, Add New Land Uses and Development Standards, Split Land Uses,</li> </ul>
27 28 29		<ul> <li>Ms. Silva notes when you have a new use never proposed before, you will see new standards that will help balance and improve predictability and provide balance for neighboring landowners and zones, etc. in the area.</li> </ul>
31 32 33 34		<ul> <li>Ms. Williams continues review of proposed changes, some of which include: Economic Development, Allow select new uses in Park Zone, Ease of Use, Add/Clarify Definitions to Reduce need for Interpretation/Increase predictability, Transfer Uses from Other Code Section, Port Gamble Redevelopment Plan Appendix.</li> </ul>
36 37		<ul> <li>Of note, there are 88 new, 48 revised and 7 removed definitions in this proposal; originally there were approximately 20 footnotes were</li> </ul>

1 2	proposed back in the 2016 Use table now there are over 120; The new relocation improves the ease of use and predictability
3	<ul> <li>Ms. Williams continues review of proposed changes, some of which include:</li></ul>
4	Housing and Equity Diversity, diversify allowed housing types, align
5	permissibility w/zone purpose & intent, revise urban ADU standards, Apply
6	multi-family housing standards uniformly.
7	<ul> <li>Ms. Williams calls for specific PC questions; noting a Public Outreach meeting</li></ul>
8	will be held on 9/16/21, and the Public Hearing on 9/21/2021; seeking a PC
9	recommendation no later than December of this year, earlier if desired.
10	• QUESTION: Mr. Beam asks how equity is defined and what metrics are used.
11	<ul> <li>ANSWER: As mentioned in previous briefings, the Growth</li></ul>
12	Management Act encourages to include and provide equity and
13	housing choices for all economic populations; it is part of
14	measurements defined in the BLR and Reasonable Measurements
15	Plan
16	7:01 PM
17	<ul> <li>QUESTION: Kari Kaltenborn-Corey asks, regarding home business; 3 levels of</li></ul>
18	parking could be required; how that decided?
19	<ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes it is typically determined at the project</li></ul>
20	level; based on level of permit reviewed, could include factors such as
21	number of employees or trips to site; appreciate any feedback.
22	<ul> <li>QUESTION: Ms. Kaltenborn-Corey ask for an example of what a Performance</li></ul>
23	Based Development (PBD).
24 25 26 27 28	<ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes it typically would require a modification of the standards in the code, such as a deviation or variance to the height, or number of units that is not typical to every other development in that zone, use or area, etc.; it also must go through an additional prescribed process during permit review.</li> </ul>
29 30 31 32	<ul> <li>QUESTION: Ms. Kaltenborn-Corey notes many jurisdictions are making it harder for self-storage while Kitsap seems to be expanding in some places; one instance was that it would be allowed if only for the residents of that location; such s int the lower level of building in rural area; asks for clarification.</li> </ul>
33	<ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes this is only intended for rural residents</li></ul>
34	living in that area; urban also has some specific requirements for
35	residents within a particular platted development; this would also be
36	evaluated at the project level.
37	<ul> <li>Ms. Kaltenborn-Corey asks about how to monitor or enforce</li></ul>
38	limitations or access to residents living within the area.

1 2 3 4		<ul> <li>Ms. Williams acknowledges it does present enforcement challenges, but intent is to meet the needs of residents in the area; it would be evaluated as part of the plat request with limits tied to the plat and subdivision being proposed.</li> </ul>
5 6		<ul> <li>Ms. Williams notes recent and upcoming outreach; public comment period can be extended at the public hearing, but approved motion by the PC.</li> </ul>
7 8 9		<ul> <li>Mr. Eliason suggests at the Public Hearing, based on the number of speakers present, a motion to extend testimony time limit to 5 minutes each could be made</li> </ul>
LO		7:10 PM
l1	н.	General Public Comment
L2		<ul> <li>Chair Phillips opens the floor to speakers wishing to provide testimony.</li> </ul>
L3 L4		<ul> <li>Chair Phillips calls for speakers; seeing and hearing no other, closes the floor to general speakers.</li> </ul>
L5	ı.	For the Good of the Order/Commissioner Comments
16 17 18 19		<ul> <li>Amy Maule questions whether allowing interactive chat with attendees should be allowed during meetings; finds it distracting, difficult to follow both the meeting and presentation and give attention to comments coming in at the same time.</li> </ul>
20		<ul> <li>Mr. Murphy asks what the protocol is during other public meetings.</li> </ul>
21		<ul> <li>Chair Phillips notes it is a Public Meeting, but not a Public Hearing.</li> </ul>
22 23 24 25		<ul> <li>Ms. Silva notes similar to BoCC work study, etc. if staff is able to provide answers or information to questions without disrupting the meeting, they do. Staff reviews the chat during the public comment, etc.</li> </ul>
26 27 28 29		<ul> <li>Clerk, Amanda Walston, concurs with Ms. Silva, noting most interactions should be with staff as a sidebar; not necessarily in the form of answering Question &amp; Answer sessions regarding topic or content regarding the work study at hand or in progress.</li> </ul>
30 31		<ul> <li>There is no expectation of an interactive exchange back and forth between members of the PC and the public.</li> </ul>
32 33 34		<ul> <li>The Chat panel should not be viewed as a dialogue/conversation avenue, but more often as a way for Staff to provide technical assistance, or to provide additional information/documents, etc.</li> </ul>
35 36		<ul> <li>If staff believes can be responded to easily or should be relayed, they can present it later during an appropriate time to the PC.</li> </ul>

## Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – September 7, 2021

1 2 3	<ul> <li>Staff will also provide that same level of information/service to the PC as well; if not on a higher level, since they are panelists and the Work Study/public meeting is a meeting of their legislative body;</li> </ul>
4 5	<ul> <li>Mr. Eliason &amp; Mr. Boe note attendees appreciate having staff answer questions and provide answers.</li> </ul>
6	7:20 pm
7	<ul> <li>Mr. Beam asks when in-person meetings may resume.</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Clerk notes additional technical testing still needs to take place; noting when meetings do take place, they will not be the same format as pre-COVID, new modifications will be in place and it will be a hybrid format; looking at late October earliest.</li> </ul>
12	<ul> <li>MOTION: Mike Eliason moves to adjourn the meeting.</li> </ul>
13	SECOND: Aaron Murphy
14	<ul> <li>VOTE: Unanimous in Favor; 0 Opposed – Motion Carries</li> </ul>
15	Time of Adjournment: 7:27 pm
16	Minutes approved this19th day ofOctober2021.
17	$\sim$ $\sim$ .
18	fre teens
19	Joe Phillips, Planning Commission Chair
20	Ama agas
21	- Commission -
22	Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk