

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Zoom Webinar

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82020747171>

Dial In: 253-215-8782 **Webinar ID:** 820 2074 7171 **Passcode:** 072429

November 1, 2022 @ 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, timestamps are provided below).

Planning Commission (PC) Members present:, Alan Beam, Jonathan Tudan, Steven Boe, Richard Shattuck, Stacey Smith (Acting Chair)

Planning Commission (PC) Members absent: Joe Phillips (Chair)

Department of Community Development (DCD) Staff present: Caitlin Schlatter, Colin Poff, David Kinley, Jim Rogers, Melissa Shumake, Amanda Walston (Clerk)

5:30 pm

A. Introductions

B. Virtual Meeting Protocol

C. Adoption of Agenda

- **MOTION:** Richard Shattuck moves to adopt the agenda as presented.
- **SECOND**
- **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**

D. Adoption of Minutes

- Minutes of 10/04/22
- **MOTION:** Richard Shattuck moves to adopt the minutes of 10/04/2022.
- **SECOND**
- **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**
- **MOTION:** Richard Shattuck moves to adopt the minutes of 10/18/2022.
- **SECOND**
- **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**

E. General Public Comment

- 1 • **Chair Smith opens the floor** to speakers wishing to provide testimony.
- 2 • **Chair Smith** calls again for speakers; as there are no other speakers; **closes the**
- 3 **floor to general speakers.**

4 **5:35 pm**

5 **F. Work Study: Countywide Planning Policies Update – Eric Baker, Kitsap County**
6 **Deputy Administrator**

- 7 • **MOTION:** Aaron Murphy moves to delay this item, to allow Mr. Baker more
- 8 time to arrive and present.

- 9 • **SECOND**

- 10 • **Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**

11 **G. Deliberations & Recommendations: 2022 Administrative Code Edits – Colin Poff,**
12 **Department of Community Development (DCD) PEP Planning Supervisor (approx. 60**
13 **minutes)**

- 14 • Mr. Poff provides a brief overview of the project to date, referencing previous
- 15 meetings; including Project Scope and Objectives, Timeline, Public Participation
- 16 Plan and Comments; noting one comment was received following the public
- 17 hearing, and is included in the public comments tonight.

- 18 • **MOTION:** Richard Shattuck moves to adopt the proposed 2022 Admin Code
- 19 Edits as presented by staff and amended by the PC.

- 20 • **SECOND**

- 21 • Chair Smith calls for consideration by paragraph, or section.

- 22 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Shattuck asks, and Mr. Poff confirms, the Land Use
- 23 process allows and provides opportunities to combine efforts, such as a
- 24 dimensional Variance and Critical Area Variance, with SEPA (State
- 25 Environmental Policy Act) appeal; this update would codify, what is already
- 26 County policy, and allow choice to proceed with either or both.

- 27 • Mr. Shattuck asks, and Mr. Poff confirms, the new section will not
- 28 require consecutive hearings, they can be combined. Mr. Poff notes
- 29 other sections in code, such as Title 21, allows for combination of
- 30 processes; such as a Type 2 and 3 process permit both required for
- 31 the same parcel, they can be combined and heard before the Hearing
- 32 Examiner.

- 33 • No comments or questions on sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 or 13.

- 34 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Poff confirms, sections 14 and
- 35 15 regarding the full strikeout is to remove redundancy in code, as this section
- 36 is already in place in Title 21; the only difference is that Title 16 references the
- 37 process as a revision, while Title 21 references it as an amendment. There is no
- 38 need to call out two separate types in separate sections based on terminology.

- 1 • No comments or questions on sections 15, 16, 17, 18 or 19.
- 2 • **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**
- 3 • **MOTION:** Richard Shattuck moves to consider the Findings of Fact as
- 4 presented by Staff, at tonight’s meeting.
- 5 • **SECOND**
- 6 • **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**
- 7 • **MOTION:** Aaron Murphy moves to approve the Findings of Fact as presented
- 8 by Staff and considered by the PC.
- 9 • **SECOND**
- 10 • **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**

11 **6:05 pm**

12 **H. Work Study (continued from Item F): Countywide Planning Policies Update – Eric**

13 **Baker, Kitsap County Deputy Administrator**

- 14 • Mr. Baker provides a brief overview of the project, referencing a visual
- 15 presentation; including Project Scope and Objectives, Timeline, Public
- 16 Participation Plan and Comments.
- 17 • Mr. Baker reviews Appendix B population numbers projected through 2044, by
- 18 jurisdictions for transit centers; reviews the applicable cities, areas in the
- 19 County by category included in the recently adopted update by Puget Sound
- 20 Regional Council (PSRC) which concluded the most growth is focused in
- 21 Bremerton with significant growth in Silverdale, Kingston and Port Orchard.
- 22 • Mr. Baker reviews Appendix B employment numbers, also broken down by
- 23 category – noting they are trying to maintain a 1:1 growth with employment
- 24 and housing; Kitsap is skewed by two military installations; we plan for them,
- 25 but we cannot include those numbers; they are their own entity and are not
- 26 required to share their own information or projections on growth.
- 27 • PSRC adopted changes in October; Appendix B1 and B2 are meant to be
- 28 included with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) update with included
- 29 or added 20 year horizon projections.
- 30 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Murphy asks where in the process is the time to disagree with
- 31 decisions handed down by the State GMA (Growth Management Act) or PSRC?
- 32 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Baker notes the State is governed by GMA, which
- 33 requires the County to be within a range for employment and
- 34 population; the range is wide, but if you choose to deviate from the
- 35 median number, you’re required to demonstrate why you don’t align

1 with it; deviation is a risk and you must have a reason why you would
2 not expect growth to come into a designated community.

- 3 • Kitsap and Snohomish Counties pushed back heavily to PSRC
4 decisions on growth areas, found compromise but did not prevail in
5 all areas; PSRC controls large quantity of federal transportation funds;
6 deviation from what PSRC adopted, could risk PSRC not certifying the
7 plan, which could lead to losing eligibility to receive those funds.
- 8 • Chair Smith asks, and Mr. Baker confirms, for employment numbers
9 in Bremerton and jobs so closely tied to the military, the County does
10 take that population into account even if we can't count them in the
11 planning; the military has more control over what and how they
12 share; the next Comp Plan update will be largely devoted to housing.

13 **I. Delib & Recommendation: Bike & Electric Vehicle (EV) Code Update – Melissa**
14 **Shumake, DCD PEP Planner (approx. 60 minutes)**

- 15 • Ms. Shumake provides a brief overview of the project to date, noting no formal
16 presentation; materials include draft ordinance with two changes
17 recommended based on public comments and correction of a scrivener's error.
- 18 • **MOTION:** Richard Shattuck moves to recommend adoption of the proposed
19 Bike and EV Code Update as presented by staff and amended by the PC.
- 20 • **SECOND**
- 21 • Chair Smith calls for consideration by paragraph, or section.
- 22 • Ms. Shumake reviews new changes and sections:
 - 23 • Page 3 includes a change based on William Palmer's comment, to add
24 Revised Code of Washington (RCW) & Washington Administrative
25 Code (WAC) citations which were not referenced in the draft.
 - 26 • Page 4 corrects a Scrivener's error.
 - 27 • Section 7 includes strikeout of previous bicycle references.
 - 28 • Section 8 involves how incentives work; this proposal puts them in
29 the correct place in code.
 - 30 • Section 9 is a new section for off street parking and loading.
 - 31 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Shattuck asks about section 9.a.2; using the example
32 that Costco Silverdale, with 500 parking spaces, would require a
33 football field length of bike parking within 100 feet of the entrance;
34 Comments were that staff could be biking to work, but this would
35 take up space in front for disabled or other spaces; suggests the
36 Hospital and newer development near The Trails complex will have a
37 similar situation
 - 38 • Mr. Murphy agrees the intent of the parking availability in front of the
39 building should be

- 1 • **MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION:** Aaron Murphy moves to
2 strikeout the words 'as close as possible but not further than 100 ft
3 from the entrance'; add the words 'to be' in front of '...protected
4 from motor vehicle...'
5 • **SECOND**
 - 6 • **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion Carries**
- 7 • Chair Smith calls for further discussion or amendments by paragraph.
- 8 • No changes to item 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8.
- 9 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Ms. Shumake confirms, requests
10 received in public comments could be grouped by theme; requests for super
11 charger stations, some charging network requests, but largely more about
12 what people wanted or preference, none from actual text of the ordinance.
- 13 • **QUESTION:** Chair Smith asks about the 1:10 requirement for EV station for
14 every 10 vehicle spaces; is the rounding up a state or local requirement?
 - 15 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Shumake notes the County Attorney advised based on
16 code reference to a table in section 429.2; it is referenced as 10% of
17 total parking spaces, not phrased as 1 per every 10; most concerns
18 came in related to single family homes, but homes will not be
19 required to have one, only commercial applicable.
 - 20 • Chair Smith asks if a reference to the table could be made instead of
21 spelling out in Section 10; Ms. Shumake concurs, noting Title 17 is
22 where most builders or developers would normally look.
- 23 • Chair Smith calls for Section 10 comments.
- 24 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Beam notes the interest in super chargers, and how to
25 incentivize bringing one here.
 - 26 • **ANSWER:** Ms. Shumake notes the ordinance does allow the
27 incentives to stack for up to a 25% reduction
- 28 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Jonathan Tudan asks, and Ms. Shumake confirms,
29 Section 10.b references to incentives for reduction applies to number of total
30 required vehicle parking, not limited to reduction of EV parking; If that
31 reduction would lead to a smaller total number, which would in turn reduce
32 the number of EV spaces, the calculation for requirement is based on the pre-
33 incentive reduction calculation.
 - 34 • **MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION:** Aaron Murphy moves to
35 replace Section 10.b with: 'Incentives for electric vehicle charging. When
36 incentives are used, only the amount of 34 required vehicle parking on the
37 site is reduced; the number of electric vehicle charging 35 spaces is

1 calculated from the required vehicle parking amount prior to use of any 36
2 reductions.'

3 • **SECOND**

4 • **VOTE: Unanimous in favor – motion carries**

- 5 • No changes to Section 11, 12 & 13.
- 6 • Mr. Beam asks about Public Comment # 15 which asks if these sort of
7 incentives have been looked at from an economic or SEPA standpoint.
- 8 • Ms. Shumake notes comment requested to look at impact of not doing both
9 Bike & EV, or on incentive basis; staff was directed by the BoCC not to split
10 these up; State requirement also calls for these updates; Ms. Shumake notes
11 SEPA looks at environmental impact; notes the building code changes link to
12 the electric transportation network

13 • **VOTE (on the Main Motion): Unanimous in favor – Motion Carries**

14 **6:25 pm**

15 **J. General Public Comment**

- 16 • **Chair Smith opens the floor** to speakers wishing to provide testimony.
- 17 • **Chair Smith** calls again for speakers; as there are no other speakers, **closes the**
18 **floor to general speakers.**

19 **K. For the Good of the Order/Commissioner Comments**

- 20 • Mr. Murphy commends Chair Smith's work tonight as the Chair with no notice.
- 21 • Mr. Shattuck thanks Ms. Shumake for hard work over the last several months,

22 **Meeting adjourned by unanimous consent.**

23 **Time of Adjournment: 6:48 pm**

24 **Minutes approved this 6th day of December **2022.****

25

26

27

28

29

30



Joe Phillips, Planning Commission Chair



Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk