CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2015
6:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WASHINGTON

CALL TO ORDER - Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept Public Comment on off agenda items
ORDINANCE 2015-16, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT REGULATIONS - Study Session
REVIEW PROCESS FOR 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Discussion
2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

- Review proposed changes to and make recommendations on the *Introduction*
- Continue discussion of *Land Use Element* with a focus "cleanup/updating" changes and the current Residential Growth Strategy

NEW/OLD BUSINESS
ADJOURN

CALL TO ORDER - Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
Meeting was called to order by Planning Commission Chairperson Mack Pearl. Commissioners also in attendance were Jon Quitslund, Mike Lewars, Maradel Gale, William Chester and John Thomas (arrived late). Julie Kriegh was absent. Possible conflict of interest was mentioned by Commissioner Quitslund involving a subdivision on family land that may involve ADUs. Ms. Cook stated if he was able to keep an unbiased opinion, he could vote, but if he felt unable to do that, he should abstain. Commissioner Quitslund agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept Public Comment on off agenda items
Melanie Keenan, Citizen – (Presentation transcribed. Requests for original power point presentation have been unanswered.)

Water Resource Management Protection & Sustainability
"My name is Melanie Keenan. I am a geologist/hydro-geologist and I have been compiling some basic concepts that are published documentation for the Island's limited water supply. These are concepts I would hope would be considered for the comp plan update. She displayed a map entitled "Water Resource Management Protection Sustainability," a map taken from the USGS study that showed the draw down water levels decreasing in the worst case scenarios up to forty feet in the dark blue area. Basically, we have a sole source aquifer, so as we know, in March 2013, the Island was designated a sole source by the EPA. This means we are 100% reliant on our ground water supply and as a result, we need to protect it. There was information she provided as links on her presentation to provide more

information/documentation if someone wanted to look at it and get more information about it later, they could. Essentially, we need to be accountable and responsible with our governance. We need to use common sense. Bainbridge is 100% dependent upon its aquifers. There is not another readily affordable source of drinking water at this time. The only recharge is rainfall, so we need aquifer conservation zones for adequate recharge. Right now, because we are in the fourth year of a drought on the west coast which is now inclusive of Washington as of May 15, it really brings home the point of managing our water supply. One proposal was aquifer conservation zones. There is an RCW 36.70a550 that has to come to bear since the last comp plan was developed. We need to have a really serious conversation about how much of the island do we have as aquifer conservation zones. What is the health of our current aquifers? How are we using it? Are we using more water than is recharging? We need to get on top of this and establish this before it is too late.

Water is a top priority for citizens. Last survey put a safe, adequate and clean water supply as the top priority. Being a sole source aquifer, this is really important and because the entire island is an urban growth area, it is even more essential that we develop these aquifer conservation zones as set aside in the Growth Management Act to help the only all island UGA in Washington that is a sole source aquifer. We are a very unique situation. What are some of the main concerns we need to address? Sea water intrusion. There is an Ecology Water Resource Inventory Area 15 (Kitsap County area) and the dotted area on this map shows the areas that are at risk for sea water intrusion based on this publication. As seen, the entire island is dappled with this red dot, protection for potential sea water intrusion. There is documentation of about a quarter of a mile in from the shoreline is at risk. The whole island needs to be monitored. Sea water intrusion is a complex concept but she was trying to provide an overview and this was a simplified version. Sea water intrusion is the shoreward movement from the ocean into the confined and unconfined coastal aquifers and the subsequent displacement of fresh water from these aquifers. She displayed a picture showing "up coning" where water is being drawn out of the well to a degree that it brings in the salt water/fresh water interface which would normal exist if we weren't over-pumping.

Aspect did a report in 2006 and showed historic chloride concentrations in ground water on Bainbridge Island. This map is difficult to see here. There is reporting, it is online. There are several wells that have exceeded some parameters for chloride so this isn't something that "if" it is a matter of how do we deal with it because it *is* happening. This COBI sea water assessment shows how there can be increases. Some of the wells on the last slide were over 400. The wells are usually unusable after 200. There are metrics there that are more complex that I won't get into, but the Fletcher Bay aquifer has had some chloride concentrations increasing during the dry season and that supplies about 30% of the Islands drinking water at this time. This is a matter of documentation.

So are we over-pumping? Lowering of water levels is documented in several top producing drinking wells on the Island, an indication we are possibly using more water than is being recharged with rainfall. This is all the more reason we need aquifer conservation zones to compensate for this. We need to properly manage and monitor the limited water resource for sea water intrusion, water levels and also water quality. The red squares show there are over a hundred acre feet per year being extracted from these wells. This was estimated in a 2006 Aspect report. 2005 ground water withdrawals on Bainbridge Island and you can see the red squares that are easier to observe in this format. You have to wonder. I think some people have come to me and told me about issues they are having with their personal wells and their proximity to some of the big water supply systems on the Island, COBI, North Bainbridge, etc. Are some of these wells impacting private water rights and private wells on the Island? That is another thing that needs to be addressed.

Environmental Impact Studies – One of the ways we need to figure out is for the last 10 years, records requests reveal there have not been any environmental impact studies for large projects. We need to

honestly assess instead of green lighting all development what is going on with the growth we've had to date and what is the growth based on. Responsible growth *is* evergreen. Water resources should dictate the growth of the Island not the opposite – financial management which makes the numbers for growing and setting aside growth projections. The growth projections so far for the last time was 50% over what Kitsap County grew. These numbers really need to be considered. The Growth Management Act needs to really consider the sole source aquifer island. Bainbridge is the only all island urban growth area (UGA) and really UGAs are more designed for land locked cities, not small islands surrounded by salt water. Ethically, our elected officials need to look at this and wonder, 'Is this appropriate? Do we need to shrink our UGA area on the Island? Is the whole Island appropriate for being a UGA?' What is an urban growth area? You can Google this and look at the RCW and how it relates to the Growth Management Act.

There was talk about increasing the zoning and currently the existing zoning provides for the projected growth so I don't really think we need to up-zone, we need to understand how we are impacting the Island already and we do not have enough metrics to do that. We need to demonstrate there are adequate water resources through environmental studies before increasing development and COBI needs to address the obvious critical issues about the Island's limited resources. The Planning Department already provides numerous variances and bonus incentives for more density than what is already zoned so we need to be realistic. One of the things that I heard was that we would have HDDP island-wide. I do not think enough studies have not been completed as required by the experimental program. It is not sustainable island-wide. Is this more green building or the color of money for developers versus how does this impact taxpayers who are currently island property owners? We need to consider that other areas in Kitsap and King Counties, other UGAs employ impact fees. These are outlined in the GMA for large developments like Visconsi. Let's make sure the current residents are not subsidizing the growth of the infrastructure, but that the actual projects themselves carry their own weight. Bainbridge has a very high profit margin for development and an island that has limited resources should not be one of the most profitable places to develop in the area.

The other thing we talked about were community septic systems. For example, up in Rolling Bay, building out like there is a sewer is not appropriate. We were told they were pretty cost prohibited, so doing community septic systems could put the water supply at risk. We also need to clean-up our hazardous waste sites. We need to trigger the EPA, DOE and Health Department enforcement for large corporate oil companies, big developers and some downtown property owners. That will help as well with the water supply. By maintaining the water supply, we are maintaining the value of our existing island homes and businesses. As the cost of water goes up, the cost of housing will go up. It will become less affordable to live here. There is a direct relationship between the two. When I talk to some Council people about what we will do if we run out of water, I get the response that we'll put a pipe over the Agate Pass Bridge. I call that the 'pipe dream.' The Kitsap peninsula, according to the USGS reporting has a limited water supply like Bainbridge. It's surrounded about 90% by salt water and the WRIA report also shows areas of sea water intrusion problems. Does Bainbridge Island have the costly water rights in place to extract water from Kitsap peninsula? As the region grows, will there be affordable water available to supply Bainbridge from the peninsula as they are growing and have increased demands as well? Who will pay for the high cost of required infrastructure?

Those are my concepts. I appreciate your time. I think they should be employed and really made a priority in several portions of the Comp Plan that it is appropriate to place them in including the Land Use Element."

Commissioner Pearl asked if Ms. Keenan knew about the Water Resources Workshop on June 18. She replied yes, but that she would like to see the new report from Aspect Consulting. Commissioner Pearl stated he had heard they were working on a report containing the latest information but that it would not

be out until the fall. Director Cook addressed this concern and stated there were plans to review the latest work in the fall, but because of the interest in the community about water and how it relates to the Comp Plan, an earlier workshop should be held to talk about what is already known as well.

ORDINANCE 2015-16, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT REGULATIONS - Study Session
Planner Jennifer Sutton briefed the Commission with an overview of the information provided for this study session mentioning that while accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are allowed on any home site, when on the shoreline, they are a conditional use permit.

Commissioner Pearl requested the City Attorney give the Commission information on whether it was legal for an ADU to be held under separate ownership. He canvassed the other commissioners as to whether they felt it was an important issue to be discussed at this time. Director Cook stated City Code was "silent" on separate ownership, but the basic planning premise about accessory dwelling units was that they are in common ownership with the primary unit. They are "accessory" to the primary unit which in the planning world means they are under common ownership. Siting a single family home with an ADU was considered single family housing. If two units on one lot are under separate ownership, that is considered multi-family development and it has a different permitting process.

Commissioner Chester felt that allowing an ADU to be a separate tax parcel defeats the purpose of having ADUs contribute to the affordable housing market. Commissioner Lewars felt this was a complex discussion and they should move to the other issues until they could have more information from the City Attorney. A discussion on whether an ADU must share the driveway of the main dwelling ensued with Commissioner Gale suggesting they leave the language as is and that a waiver should be allowed for really compelling situations where two driveways may lead to less impervious surface. Commissioner Chester disagreed and felt that having a second driveway could lead to having a separated dwelling that may be worth more rental money than a typical ADU. Commissioner Pearl thought they should put off discussion until they were able to determine whether it will/can be its own tax parcel. Commissioner Gale requested legal analysis by the City Attorney. Discussion continued with the subject of drain fields and whether a separate drain field was required.

Commissioner Lewars felt they needed to choose whether to move forward or wait for the City Attorney's report.

> **Motion: I move we entertain public comment at this point and put this on hold for the following meeting.**
> **Lewars/Gale: Passed 5-0**

Public Comment on ADUs

Bruce Weiland, Citizen – Sent each of the commission members, as well as Kathy Cook and the City Attorney a letter late last night. He understood if they had not had time to look at it because they had only had it in their Inbox for the last 12 hours or so. He wanted to make sure they understood the legal parameters of this whole issue about double ownership and two tax lots. He said the important thing (knowing this was just a preliminary part of the conversation and he offered himself to deal with some of these things and had spoken with City Attorney Lisa Marshall about it as well) when talking about two tax parcels, we are simply saying the State Condominium Act allows any piece of real estate to be divided into separate ownerships without changing the lot configuration. In fact, State law specifically addresses that when you create a condominium, by law, each condominium unit has a separate tax parcel number. That is just required. For example, if you own the Homestead Apartments and let's say it was one large tax parcel now, the owner of that property can condominiumize it and convert it to a condominium, which

happens all the time around the State, and when that happens, each of the hundred or so units become a separate unit that can be sold separately and then it has to have a separate tax parcel number. So what you are really saying is, are you going to recommend that you try to prohibit the application of the condominium statute as applied to a single family lot. That was the vehicle we're talking about here. We're not talking about a disguised short plat because when you build a piece of property with an ADU you have two dwellings on that lot. If you rent that to another family, you have two families living on that single lot. If you sell that to another family, you have two families living on that single lot. It's not about a change in the density, it's a change in the ownership and most importantly, it's a change brought about by the application of the State law that, frankly, local jurisdictions cannot contradict. I urge you to keep in mind two main points:

1. When you talk about a separate tax parcel number that doesn't come about because someone has a surreptitiously created another lot. There's only one lot, one ADU and one main house. What you are talking about is application of a State Condominium Statute to create that measure of ownership and in fact, is very similar to a situation where, if I own a piece of property with my brother and we enter into an agreement that says we own this all together, but you are going to live in the ADU and I'm going to live in the main house for the next 90 years. We can put that into an agreement and record it and that is the same kind of ownership split that a condominium enacts.

I would like the Commission to read my letter carefully and let me know if I can help. I am a real estate attorney and I have personally helped clients probably 6-8 times create ADU condominiums and the sky didn't fall in, it simply stated to people that you can use State Law to own your property as two units as opposed to a single lot. As you'll read in my letter, there is one question of whether it is a good policy; are you helping or hurting affordable housing by trying to prohibit that. But beyond that there is a question of legality and what you can do.

Commissioner Pearl asked if Mr. Weiland was aware of the ordinance in Mercer Island that prohibits this in some way. Mr. Weiland replied he was not but that he would look it up and get back to them.

Commissioner Quitslund asked about new construction that includes an ADU. Could the separate tax parcels be created by the developer at the time of the first sale? Mr. Weiland replied he was talking about was the difference between a new condominium construction and a condominium conversion. If he owned Homestead Apartments, he could make it into a hundred unit condominium by converting it. If he owned a piece of land without anything on it, I can build a multi-family structure if it meets all the City requirements and before one unit is sold, he could start it as a condominium. The State Condominium Act specifically allows either original creation upon development or conversion after the fact. Legally, it was the same thing.

Commissioner Pearl replied that where it seems different to all of us is that seems obvious that if you have an apartment building, you can condominiumize it and you have multi-family housing. But when you have single family housing, to make it into multi-family housing seems contrary to our understanding of what an ADU is. Mr. Weiland mentioned that a duplex as a two unit multi-family dwelling. Commissioner Pearl stated that was not allowed in most zones on the Island. Mr. Weiland felt there were policy questions about whether somehow there is some sort of gut response that this is not what was meant. He would love to be engaged in that policy conversation because he felt there were so many good things that could come from the ability to separate the ownership but more importantly, he asked them all to be attentive to what your legal requirements are because of State Law and the U.S. Constitution. Commissioner Gale stated there was not a requirement for the Island to continue having ADUs. Mr. Weiland said that was one way of dealing with the issue but that held more negatives than positives as a policy. The Condominium Act says that local jurisdictions get to control how lots are created and what their density is, but once you build something that meets all the City requirements, how you own that property, whether husband/wife, brother/brother, or co-owners as condominium owners, that's a State

Law matter. Commissioner Chester replied that the only question Mr. Weiland was really saying was that if someone builds or has a single family residence and they have an ADU on it, whether previously or are building a new one, if they wish to, they could decide to split that ownership between themselves and another relative or themselves and a friend or whatever they wanted to do for a dollar or for some equitable amount of money. On the surface of that he did not see why that would be an issue here. The issue was to have one ADU possible on one single family home. Mr. Weiland agreed and said yes, under the zoning code and the current ADU zoning, you could have one main house and one ADU on a single-family lot. You could rent one of them or any number of things and one of the things that State law allows was to create ownership segments called units. He could leave it under common ownership or he could use the Condominium Statute to create two units that may or may not stay common ownership. Mr. Weiland stated he had done that 7 or 8 times with his clients. The ADUs had been sold to other people and it didn't affect density because that same unit could have been rented to someone as well. Commissioner Pearl stated they would like to hear back from Mr. Weiland next time. He offered to answer any questions from the Commissioners.

Teresa Muzzi, Citizen – Purchased her home with a tiny ADU and her goal in buying the home was to increase the size of the ADU. She had plans written up to 800 square feet and then happened to catch on TV that the Commission was considering 900 square feet. It is very scary that the Commission was considering going to make it two tax parcels. She hoped that they would consider those who already had legal ADUs and it was stressful to think they were considering turning them into two tax parcels. She hoped that already had ADUs would be allowed to increase the size of their ADU and not have to have the tax parcel change as well. Commissioner Pearl assured her that no one would take away her single parcel status. Ms. Muzzi went on to say she was in favor of increasing the size to 900 square feet. It is hard to squeeze a lot of stuff into 800 square feet and 900 would be fantastic. She wanted to know more about what they were going to do with setbacks and everything else. She did not want any changes for people who already had an ADU where it would be an adverse effect. Commissioner Lewars assured her that she would not be compelled to create different tax parcels. Ms. Muzzi understood that it was optional. She repeated that she was definitely in favor of increasing the square footage of ADUs. She stated that she was able to purchase her property when she otherwise would not have been able to because she could rent the main house and live in the ADU.

Robert Dashiell, Citizen – Opposed increasing ADU size to 900 square feet. He understood all the arguments but he felt the main argument to increase the size was to allow a two bedroom ADU instead of a one bedroom. Mr. Dashiell stated that ADUs dilute residential zoning. There are so many houses per acre, but as ADUs are allowed they double the number of residences. He further stated that residential zoning became less meaningful as ADUs are built. Bainbridge land cost and housing is increasing. To live here, one of the options is to buy a house and then put an ADU on your property and try to pay for your house. But most of these ADUs go in the 2.5 density area but as we continue to put more houses into the less dense areas, he sensed that it would decrease one of the actual reasons people move here in the first place. What makes Bainbridge really special was that it was not dense now. ADUs will increase density and as the size of the ADUs increases, there will be a move in an incremental way, to build more ADUs because they will be more valuable. If you are a property developer, that's also going to increase the price of land and Bainbridge Island will become less affordable. He felt in the big picture, by increasing and making ADUs larger, he thought they were playing with the special character of the Island they were trying to preserve. What he would like to preserve was a less dense island and he thought what they were doing was putting a carrot out there to increase density in the less dense areas.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – He was part of the original citizen's group who worked on the original zoning ordinance and they never thought of having the ADU as a separate sale. What came to his mind was that they all felt they worked well in rural areas. Imagine if a developer built 20 homes with 20 ADUs and you have all these driveways so all of a sudden you have a development with all these ADUs

that are salable that you can make money from. If you were looking at the price, that would certainly be a consideration.

REVIEW PROCESS FOR 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE – Discussion
Planner Sutton introduced the subject by showing where the Commission was currently in the Comprehensive Plan process. She mentioned Commissioner Lewars had called her with concerns about the actual Planning Commission meeting process. She stated the new process would be continued. All Commissioners agreed.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

- Review proposed changes to and make recommendations on the *Introduction*
- Continue discussion of *Land Use Element* with a focus "cleanup/updating" changes and the current Residential Growth Strategy

Public Comment

Eric Kuhner, Citizen – Wanted to remind the Planning Commission that the first overriding principle originally read "Preserve the rural character of the Island" which, as we remember, had to be removed. But it was still rural and with respect to the items you were asked to give input to today, with respect to item one, he felt it was a shame the new Vision Statement has lost the original language that outside of Winslow and Neighborhood Centers, Bainbridge should preserve its past rural heritage. The Comprehensive Plan was the only document that speaks to land use outside of population centers which each have or will have their own sub-area plan, it's very challenging to produce a consistent plan that covers all of the Island because the goals and policies appropriate to population centers and to rural areas can be conflicting and even diametrically opposed. Unfortunately, the new Vision Statement glosses right over this challenge by eliminating most of the specific language of the original. He requested the Planning Commission restore some language better reflecting the rural character of the Island. He had a specific objection to the phrase in the Vision Statement "People of Bainbridge aspire to accommodate inevitable growth." There is no evidence of the supposed aspiration. In fact, the evidence is the opposite. There is a reason the word "growth" does not appear in our existing vision statement and principles. Results from the last significant surveys done on the Island in 1992 and 2000 concluded that residents appeared to have mixed feelings about past growth and little enthusiasm for future development. Bainbridge Island residents opposed improved services, road expansion, manufacturing, shopping facilities and other infrastructure improvements that support growth. He proposed modifying the language in the vision statement to read: "The people of Bainbridge aspire to protect the wildlife habitat, watersheds, shoreline, open spaces and the air and water quality of the Island by planning for unavoidable increases in population in a way that minimizes impact on these precious natural resources." He objected to the Vision Statement as it was and request that you not approve it tonight.

The second action item was regarding the Framework Goals and Policies. In his opinion, policies do not belong in the Introduction, they should be moved to an appropriate section. In any case, most of the items labeled as policies here are taken directly from goals and various plan elements. It made no sense to him to pull out these goals, label them as policies and stick them in the introduction. He suggested putting them back where they belonged. With respect to Framework Goal 1, he strongly objected to replacing "bordered by dense vegetation" with "supporting all forms of transportation." Supporting all forms of transportation is only appropriate to population centers and some arterials. The majority of roads on the Island support all forms of transportation by virtue of the case that there is little traffic and we share the roads. The relevance completely changed the meaning and intent of the principle. If it needed to be changed, he suggested landscape buffers. With respect to Framework Goal six, he felt it should be removed because references to priority budgeting did not have any place in their Comprehensive Plan because priority budgeting was a specific process implemented by this Council and a manager and may or

may not be used by future Councils and should be replaced by general language if it needed to be there. But secondly, the priorities were developed as part of strategic planning for the City as a governmental entity and the priorities should reflect the goals of the Comprehensive Plan as expressed by the citizens. Further, they were not appropriate in the Comprehensive Plan because according to the City, they were developed by Council, staff and consultants. In other words, without public input. They had no business being in the Comprehensive Plan. They were also labeled as policies, but they were not policies. They were simply strategic priorities developed by the City to which had been appended a convenient verb to make them sound active. The entire section makes a joke of public involvement in the planning process and I ask that it be removed.

Commissioner Pearl asked Mr. Kuhner to submit the statement about the Vision in a letter form because the Vision Statement had moved on but would be available for change at the end of the process.

Olemara Peters, Citizen – Had e-mailed her comment on the Comp Plan but also wanted to speak it out. Please uphold and strengthen the overriding function of the five overriding principles. Please do not allow them to be subsumed among the proposed six additional points all of which are euphemism such as the Planning Department and friends have already consistently demonstrated interpreting in developer speak exactly opposite to the intention of the five overriding principles. As opposite as, for instance with "grow a vibrant economy, nurture a healthy and attractive community, grow a green, well-planned community." For example, the Safeway center with its historically and perpetually empty units and the Visconsi further debacle flying in the face of the Planning Commission's own unanimous decision. If this direction is allowed to continue to be applied, our water resources and everything else of real value about Bainbridge will be logged off, paved over, dried up and withered along with our public process. Please keep the five overriding principles separate and primary. She especially liked Eric Kuhner's proposed re-languaging for the Vision Statement.

Ron Peltier, Citizen – Briefly commented on the five overriding principles having become the five framework goals without you really deciding you were going to change the name. He felt the difference was significant. He mentioned the poster of the five overriding principles poster that used to hang on the wall of the Council Chamber and that there was something compelling about overriding principles. They obviously carry more weight than five framework goals. He did not understand why they would be changed other than to make them less compelling and less important. He hoped they would consider that when they were talking about the five overriding principles and maybe not just assume they would be changed to the five framework goals.

Jacqueline Young, Citizen – Was very concerned about what was happening with the Comp Plan. She was concerned that people potentially not even residents of the Island are turning it into a managerial exercise (when you start using words like framework). She stated she knew because she is a consultant and a project manager. She had studied the books and knew the terms and had seen them before and expressed it was very sad seeing them be applied to what should be a reflection of the vision for the people living on this island. She felt it was important to remember that this island, Port Madison, was the local city for the Puget Sound originally. That the lumber mill was the largest lumber mill in the world when it was down at Port Blakely. We were the center of strawberry growing for the U.S. She wanted to know if this place would be turned into another Burien, another Kent or Puyallup. You know, a center where Amazon goods can be stored. She did not feel the changes that were happening to the Comp Plan would protect the Island from going down that path. She was looking at the Constitution of the United States, her country and the Commissions, quoting the opening line and asking if that was written by consultants. Ms. Young stated it was written "by the people." She asked the Commission to keep in mind what this country stands for and ask whether Bainbridge was becoming just another mass market or whether Bainbridge was still a vision.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – Submitted his comments in writing. He felt the words framework goals did sound like administrative things and that when it was said the goal was to protect the water resource of the Island or force the diversity that was really a principle (looking at the English of it). He would like to see the word landscaping (since vegetation was removed) because that word was in the ordinances and it would be good to have it in the principles as well. He also felt framework goal five should not just say development but "low impact development." He also wondered about putting a reference in about maintaining Winslow's downtown small town atmosphere. A lot of cities do not have that downtown feeling and through really good planning, Winslow's small town atmosphere had been kept. He felt they needed to go back to the listening sessions because a lot of the changes in the Comp Plan were not brought up by citizens at those sessions.

Pegeen Mulhern, Citizen – Wanted to follow up on a couple of things that had already been said to reinforce them. She had written and sent her comments about the framework goals and did believe they were really overriding policies and hoped that would be respected differently from goals and frameworks that were being worked on. She felt, like Charles Schmid, that the word landscaping should be kept in because it was easy enough to make compatible road for bikes, people and cars, but if the roadways started losing that look and feel, that was part of what makes Bainbirdge Bainbridge. She felt that was part of the Planning Commission's charge and agreed with Mr. Schmid that no one in the Listening Sessions said they should ditch these things (vegetation, landscaping, etc.) She had the sense in the Listening Sessions that they would be making some revisions to the plan in following those principles and she hoped they would hold onto them.

The Planning Commission took a short break at 7:11 PM.

Joe Tovar, City Consultant – Began discussion by speaking about the actual structure of the Comprehensive Plan. He introduced the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Vision and Goals, citing a lack of narrative explaining the relationship of the goals to the five overriding principles that guide the Plan. He showed the 2004 Overriding Principles side by side with the proposed 2016 Plan Framework Goals stating that it didn't really matter what you called them, it was the content that was important. Comparison and Contrast of each Framework Goal was discussed. Continued dialogue resulted in retaining the title Five Overriding Principles and Policies (not Framework Goals).

Discussion continued with the Land Use Element. Planner Sutton introduced the three categories for reviewing the Land Use Element that staff wanted the Commission to give input on:

1. Housekeeping/Clarifying Changes (Agreed with methodology)
2. Current Growth Strategy (
3. Policy Direction

Growth strategy was discussed and an explanation of how population numbers are calculated (2.5 people per single family home and 1.7 people per multi-family dwelling).

> **Motion: I move that we change the City's current residential growth strategy to remove numerical quotas and rely on our existing zoning to place the population around the Island. Gale/Lewars: Passed 6-0**

Commissioner Gale started the conversation on the replacement of the word "shall" with "should." She argued that since the US Constitution uses shall, so should the Comprehensive Plan. They agreed that each one needed review. Mr. Tovar requested the Planning Commission define each so there would be a reference point to decide each use. It was also decided that the Comprehensive Plan would replace the

growth strategy and that neighborhood service centers would still require a special area planning process for increased growth or zoning changes.

Public Comment

Olemara Peters, Citizen – She informed the Commission that the International Building Biology Institute would be having their international annual meeting in the U.S. at Island Wood July 10-12, 2015. This group was the only group she knew of working for green that included substantive standards of bio-compatibility for both natural systems and humans. That conference would possibly be of interest to anyone involved in planning and sustainability.

Jacqueline Young, Citizen – Was very concerned about Framework Goal 6, "Support the Island's Framework Goals through the City's priority based budgeting decisions." Commissioner Pearl informed Ms. Young that the words "priority based" had been eliminated.

Ron Peltier, Citizen – Wondered if the 6th Overriding Principle regarding the character of downtown as the center of commerce and culture Citizen Charles Schmid had recommended could not be added to the 1st Overriding Principle. He asked the Commissioners to think about that.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS
Commissioner Pearl asked the public how they thought the new format of public comment at the beginning and the end of the discussion period. The public did not have any concerns and the Commission felt it worked well.

ADJOURN
Meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Minutes accepted by:

J. Mack Pearl
J Mack Pearl, Chair

Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
PLANNING COMMISSION – REGULAR MEETING
June 11, 2015

PLEASE PRINT

Name	Address	Phone/ E-Mail	Join ListServ Yes/No	Would like to speak	Subject
Eric Kuhner	15355 Sunrise Dr NE	eekgnr@hotmail.com	y	y	Comp Plan
PETER BANNISTER	1855 SAKAI VILLAGE LOOP	pb8037@gmail.com	y	n	
Scott Anderson	6620 NE Bayview Blvd	scott@charlesanderson.com		n	Comp Plan
CHARLES SCHMID	ABC PO Box 1094			Y	COMP PLAN
Robert Dashiell	6370 NE TOE	[illegible]		Maybe	ADU
Jacqueline Young	927 Blue Heron AVE NE	SEAMUSIK@HOTMAIL.COM	Y	Y	comp plan
DIEMARA PETERS	7280 BAKER HILL RD, BI PO BOX 222, REDMOND	BIOMUSIC@FRONTIER.COM		Y	COMP PLAN
Mary Clare Kerston	11645 NE Sunset Loop	206-780-3257/ mckerston@gmail.com		N	Comp plan & Water IT
Olaf K. Ribeiro	10744 Manitou Bch	206-842-1157		N	
Peter	11156 Valley HB. Circle				Sewer/dye