

CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure  
REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 11, 2016  
PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items  
AQUACULTURE LTD. SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM AMENDMENT – Public Hearing  
PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

- Water Resources Element
- Housing Element

PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
NEW/OLD BUSINESS  
ADJOURN

---

**CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure**

Chair Mack Pearl called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM. Planning Commissioners also present were Michael Lewars, Jon Quitslund, William Chester and Michael Killion. Commissioners Lisa Macchio and Maradel Gale were absent and excused. City Staff in attendance were Attorney Lisa Marshall, Planning Director Gary Christensen, Senior Planners Jennifer Sutton and Christy Carr and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes. City Consultant Joe Tovar was also present. The agenda was reviewed and no conflicts were disclosed.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 11, 2016**

**Motion: I moved we approve the minutes.**

**Killion/Lewars: Passed Unanimously**

**PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items**

None.

**AQUACULTURE LTD. SHORELINE MASER PROGRAM AMENDMENT – Public Hearing**

City Attorney Lisa Marshall provided history of the SMP process and the appeal that brought the City to this public hearing. She described the purpose of the public hearing as a time to receive testimony and deliberations would occur at a later date after proper thought could be given to the information most recently received within the last few hours before this meeting.

The public hearing was called to order at 6:09 PM.

**Public Comment – Transcribed Verbatim**

**Jesse DeNike, Plauche and Carr** – “Good evening, members of the Planning Commission. My name is Jesse DeNike and I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide comments to you this evening. I am here on behalf of the Pacific Coast Shellfish Growers Association (PCSGA). As you might imagine, we have many serious concerns about the Aquaculture Limited Amendment that is currently before you. We did submit a comment letter earlier today that sets forth our concerns and recommendations in detail. I am not going to take the time tonight to go over all those, rather I am going to hope and trust that you will take a careful look at our comment letter and seriously consider our concerns and recommendations. I would, however, just like to take a couple minutes to emphasize a few key points. First, there are very few circumstances under which it is appropriate to even consider a limited amendment to a shoreline master program. Those circumstances are specifically set forth in State guidelines. We have seen no information demonstrating that the Aquaculture Limited Amendment satisfies the criteria for when it’s appropriate to consider a limited amendment. In fact, based on analysis, it’s quite clear that those circumstances have NOT been met which means that it’s really not even appropriately being brought up at this time. Second, even if those circumstances were met, even if it was appropriate to consider this limited amendment at this time, the limited amendment would still need to comply with State law and policy pertaining to shellfish aquaculture. It would also need to be supported by current scientific and technical information. It is not, it does not. It is inconsistent with the law as well as the science. Third, as Ms. Marshall pointed out, PCSGA is a party to the pending appeal before the Growth Management Hearings Board concerning the aquaculture regulations that are in the currently affected SMP. I believe Ms. Marshall made this point clear, but I do want to emphasize that the Aquaculture Limited Amendment does NOT reflect an agreement of the parties to that appeal. As of this time, there has been no agreement of the parties in that appeal. In short, the Aquaculture Limited Amendment is unwarranted, is inconsistent with the science, and it is unsupported, also inconsistent and in violation of State law and policy. We strongly urge you to carefully review our comment letter and suggestions. We believe the Aquaculture Limited Amendment should either not be adopted or that it should be revised consistent with the recommendations in our comment letter. That is all of your time I will take tonight. I do want to thank you for your time and attention to this very serious matter.”

**Doug Steding, Icicle Seafoods and American Gold Seafoods** – “I am actually Doug Steding. I am outside council for Icicle Seafoods and Kevin Bright is a representative of American Gold and he asked me to speak on his behalf and our client’s behalf. Once again, Doug Steding. I represent Icicle Seafoods who is the parent company of American Gold Seafoods and the operator of net pen facilities in Washington State so we’re not talking shellfish aquaculture, we’re talking fin fish, salmon aquaculture. We too have submitted written comments. I’ve copies here today that I will give to Ms. Marshall when I am done and we are recently aware of this issue. We became aware of the outright, the proposed outright ban on new net pen facilities

as a result of the review of the March 24, 2016 Planning Commission packet. I won't take up too much of your time, I just want to hit some of the highlights in our comments. First, we agree with the PCSGA that a limited amendment is not warranted in this case. Second, with respect to this proposed outright ban on new net pen facilities that is part of this proposed limited amendment, we would note that we believe that is inconsistent with State goals in terms of fostering of aquaculture and it's inconsistent with the SMA. It is also not supported by any of the best available sciences out there and I've got a number of papers that are included in the cd that are coming in with our comments. And finally, it wouldn't be consistent with State and Federal laws that are intended to promote fin fish aquaculture for a number of reasons including balancing trade and balances in terms of fish and meeting increasing demand for a good source of protein. There is a wealth of information that shows that properly sited and properly managed facilities like my client's, have little to no adverse impacts to the environment. There's been extensive Shorelines Hearing Board decisions on the subject, PCHB decisions on the subject and I will provide those to Ms. Marshall as well. My comment on this is that we would respectfully request that the Planning Commission NOT proceed with sending this limited amendment to the City Council later in May as proposed now and, as relatively new outside observer, I will admit that I am somewhat scratching my head about this because I think, the City of Bainbridge Island is setting itself up for needless litigation on the back end of this if they proceed. If Ecology goes forward and approves this limited amendment, which I doubt they will, there will certainly be litigation around that and an appeal around that and if they don't, like they did last time with your last amendment, there's going to be litigation around that and, believe it or not, as a lawyer I like to see people avoid litigation. I like to see public resources used wisely and I think this is not being setup to do that in this case. So, I thank you for your time. I appreciate you taking the time to review our comments and I will give them to Ms. Marshall now. Thank you."

**Elise Wright, Citizen** – “Hi. I am Elise Wright. I am here tonight to give you some information. As you know, I'm a member of the Bainbridge Alliance for Puget Sound which has been in settlement negotiations with the City, with PCSGA, with the Department of Ecology and with an Assistant Attorney General and I am really sad to hear that the industry and some of the aquaculture partners around the Island feel so strongly that this is a bad idea because that is really sort of the first I've heard of it. We've all been working very hard to reach an agreement that would both protect our shorelines and would leave the City in good legal shape, so I'm really feeling flummoxed. My original reason for coming to speak to you was to sort of walk you through the revisions that our Alliance made to the last draft revisions that we saw. I don't know if that's necessary to do at this point, but I do have two colleagues who are here to speak to specific issues. I sent you a cover letter and a summary of the six major points or areas of concerns and at this point, it's permitting and monitoring which have been very ably addressed by Christy Carr. There are still a few things we would like you to look at and we understand that now that we're not in discussions, we need to present those to you. Wayne Daly is here to talk to a couple of them and Marci Lagerloef, who are scientists, is here to talk to permitting and monitoring and I think I put them next on the list...In Section 5.2.4.6, I'm talking mainly about

specific language changes, in that section and in 5.2.4.6d, we recommend the word ‘may’ be changed to shall and if you go through this rather long annotated version of the recommendations, you will see that there are some places where our attorney has also followed our comments and given backup for them. In that case, he cited a State law and said that was a stronger way to say it. In 5.2.4.6g, we’d like the words ‘and other equipment’ added because this has to do with identifying equipment that is lost during the process of commercial aquaculture and that, as you know, if you make a list, other things are excluded so we are trying to just be inclusive there. And then the most important one for us is 5.2.5.1. That’s where I said, I can see erroneously I said, part of the agreement reached was the cap on the amount of commercial aquaculture allowed on the Island. That was incorrect. We were in discussions and that was a suggestion that was made by industry so that’s why I’m sort of flummoxed by all this. It needs to be clear that the cap applies to the totality of the Island that it’s not just on one permit or something. I’m sure that’s what’s intended, I just want to be sure it’s not misunderstood. Then there were a couple of things to protect property owners and boat drivers. One is increasing the property site setback. In 5.2.5.1i, to increase it from 10 feet to 20 feet from commercial aquaculture because as you know, many of the tidelands on the Island follow a non-linear pattern so your neighbor’s tidelands may end up in your front yard, so to speak. And then corner markers need to be on commercial aquaculture at low tide and as part of the former Harbor Commission, I wanted to be sure that’s not a hazard to navigation for people in rubber boats or canoes or kayaks, so we just suggested the markers be low enough that they’re visible but not a hazard. And there’s probably more, but I’ve forgotten and I’ve seen my time.”

Commissioner Lewars asked Ms. Wright why 150 square foot limitation was the right number and not something in between 150 and 500 feet. Ms. Wright responded by saying 500 square feet could produce 6800 oysters per year which was far more than a family would want to eat. She said Betsy Peabody would be able to clarify whether there was an amount between 150 and 500 feet that would be a better number.

**Wayne Daly, Citizen** – “As Elise had just commented on the concern of the 150 square feet versus 500 square feet, I’d just like to point out a couple of facts or figures here that you can consider as you deliberate on this in the future. 150 square foot lot would provide 10 bags. One bag of oysters will produce about 200 oysters. That takes you to the number Elise had commented on concerning the numbers of critters that would be involved in a 500 square foot area. I support exactly what Elise has indicated. If we are talking about a community of several families where they’re putting their project together in terms of the number of square feet that is appropriate because it is a community garden. But my concern is that we make sure that if we’re going to have 2500 or 3500 square foot sites on the Island that total area counts towards the 5 acre limit for the entire Island that is in the documents that we’re considering. We don’t want to prevent the community garden concept, it’s a great idea, but we need to make sure that we are protecting the shoreline of Puget Sound and the shoreline of Bainbridge Island. In light of that, I’d like to go on to the issue of where we are allowing the shellfish industry to occur and we are

arguing that the area that needs to be considered on Bainbridge Island for any of this shellfish activity needs to be on the shorelines where we have armored banks. The reason for this is because where you have an armored bank, you have essentially no forage fish spawning habitat. The armoring, the wave action and the currents that are developed with an armored bank completely destroys the habitat for forage fish to spawn and utilize that area, so this is an area that can be used for the shellfish industry. So be it. But let's protect those unarmored shorelines that we have on Bainbridge Island. It's critical. And we do have an issue in terms of forage fish. Forage fish is what supports our salmon industry. It supports our entire fishery within Puget Sound and then within the Salish Sea. Anything that we can do to protect that is critically important. The other issue that I'd like to address is the issue of mussel rafts. They're not specifically mentioned in the document but in terms of the areas they would be used, they're not immediately located in a forage fish habitat, but they are in an area where they are providing water quality impacts as well as potential for shading activities that might occur with a mussel raft. When I made my slide presentation a couple of weeks ago, there were several images of the mussel raft concept. They're huge and they do have a very significant influence in terms of footprint and in terms of what they're doing within the watershed itself. We need to make sure this is an issue that is looked at very carefully with the science to support that a located mussel raft anywhere around the Island is properly researched and that the proper amount of evaluation of the site from the environmental impact is done. Those are my critical areas of concern. It's the forage fish. We need to protect our forage fish and our shoreline so that we can make sure we do have a population of salmon to support in Puget Sound. You are all aware, if you read the newspapers, they are considering a total shutdown of salmon fishing on the ocean coast because of the lack of fish. This morning I saw an article in one of the science journals I get that it's not only here, it's the climate change that is occurring is impacting the Columbia River Basin as well. I realize we're not in the Columbia River Basin, but anything we do with the salmon industry, is going to impact all us. When you have the total sockeye salmon population for the Upper Columbia River destroyed with drought conditions, then we have something to worry about and I hope we don't have to worry about that here on Bainbridge Island because I think we can protect our resources and protect our salmon resources."

**Marcia Lagerloef, Citizen** – "I am the third member from BAPS speaking tonight. I haven't been part of the settlement discussions but I was part of the development, I was on one of the work groups for the shoreline plan. I'm going to speak to permit requirements and monitoring and ecological functioning. I think that a conflict I don't know a way to resolve is we have a State that has an avowed support for aquaculture and we have a Shoreline Management Act that was revised before we started this revision to our plan to put in a whole new section that really emphasized no net loss of ecological function. The crux that I'm speaking to is, how do you determine if there's no net loss of ecological function? So, I'd like to speak to a couple of parts of the regulations and I really appreciate all the detail that has been added in terms of what would go into permitting because that's something that hadn't been fleshed out before. I want to speak to a section that's found under Regulations General. I know you get tired of numbers, but it is

5.2.4.4 and speaks to when a new permit is issued for commercial aquaculture. BAPS has some concern about the fact that it is a five year permit but if there's some sort of hold-up in legal actions or administrative appeals, that doesn't count against the five years, so I don't know how long it could go out. To cover our concern that there could be new information that becomes available, we've added a Section E which says, 'One reason why you might want to re-open and revise a permit is new information on threats to the ecosystem are documented in the scientific literature, new techniques are available to mitigate harm or other information becomes available that was not taken into account the original permit issuance.' So we feel like we are in a situation where we, as a City and as regulators and managers, need to keep learning about the impacts of this kind of activity in our shorelines. The best way to do that is to allow ourselves to be able to revise permits if we get new information that suggests a problem. That's called adaptive management. We have also requested an addition in this particular section of the regulations that says that another reason why you might want to re-open and revise a permit is 'if the applicant proposes to change the species being cultivated under the permit.' Turning to Section 5.2.4.6 which speaks to the conditions that would be applied by the administrator, we've again suggested some language that would strengthen this ability to go back and re-open, revise or revoke a permit if monitoring information showed that there was a problem. Again, adaptive management. Under Section 6A, we've added the language (shown in parentheses), 'The City may revoke the permit if it is determined the aquaculture operations are not consistent with the terms and conditions of the permit (including monitoring requirements) and/or the aquaculture operations are not within the original scope and intent of the original permit (or if the environment is being degraded beyond what is allowable under the permit based on required ongoing monitoring of the permit site).' Again, we're simply trying to create enough places in here where if there's new information in the scientific literature and the monitoring that shows a problem, we can actually act and not just let things slide, but go back in and make adjustments as appropriate. It's our effort to really be consistent with the overriding concept in the new Shoreline Management Act which is no net loss of ecological functions. Thank you."

**Charles Schmid, Citizen** – "Take a look at Ordinance 2016-06, Exhibit 1, turns out to be Table 161203-1 Shoreline Use Modification. If you go over to Priority Aquatic and look at A and B, you'll find out it's 'Prohibited' that's been added to Commercial Aquaculture Geoduck. Exhibit 2 on the next page of Ordinance 2016-06, Priority Aquatics, Heights over the Water, Accessory Uses. It's been crossed out 'prohibited' and put in 'three feet.' I'm not really sure if that's just an interpretation to say on one hand they're prohibited and the other hand three feet tall. I'm sure Staff will figure that out and find out Charles Schmid is wrong or perhaps this is wrong. I also like listening to my colleagues remind you three years ago when we started the SMP and we broke into groups and had people from all diversion points of view which we can easily find on this Island. Experts like Wayne, Marci and Jim Brennan that really understand this, the draft was sent down to Ecology, came back and was changed as far as aquaculture. That's the basic thing. Just a year ago, we were told this would be a community affair. I remember Barbara Nightingale from Ecology saying, 'This is a community plan. Let's all work together.' Then to hear all of

sudden it's all going to be part of litigation with people coming in last minute. We worked hard to work on combining to get this common understanding and then to just say litigation's going to decide it. This was a community decision and it IS a community decision and I hope you look at it that way."

**Kevin Bright, American Gold Seafoods** – "I am Kevin Bright. I'm with American Gold Seafoods. I live up in Anacortes, but we have operations down here in Rich Pass. I've been with the company for over 25 years. I started growing salmon up in Cypress Island. I've got a Marine Biology degree. I love the salt water. I grew up around here in Bremerton and Hood Canal. My dad took me fishing up at Point No Point in Hansville and so I have a lot of affinity for the salt water and marine environment. I love making a living working on the water, working in the water. Aquaculture gets a bad rap, there's no doubt about it. People either like it or they hate it and there's people out there that really, I think, I don't want to get too far into this but, they take a very narrow view of aquaculture. It's farming. It's essentially no different than what you're doing on land. You're growing something in the water. You're growing oysters, you're planting them, you're harvesting, you're growing clams, you're growing fish. So this is how you put food on the table. This is how we've evolved over all these years. Go to the grocery store. Everything there on the grocery store shelf comes from a farm, so I just want to put that out there. That's what got me into this business. I figured we better figure out how to grow this stuff if we're going to eat it. I just want to make a quick comment and I know some of your heads are spinning with all these provisions that are in there. They're overly proscriptive and Ecology cautions in their guidelines about being overly in your SMP guidelines. When you have five pages of conditions that I can hardly read through and figure out how I would run a business growing an oyster on your beach there, it's basically a de facto ban that's going on here. I understand there's concern about the environment and there are experts in the Department of Natural Resources and Department of Ecology that look at these things and look at what is going on in the shorelines. You aren't the experts in this field. It's a very complicated environment out there. Ecology setup these guidelines, basically the SMA is written as an overall look at how we are going to treat the marine environment, not how the City of Bainbridge treats it and Kitsap County treats it and King County treats it. It's all connected. You've got to look at the big picture and that's what the SMA tries to do. It tries to say here's the big picture. Protect it, but also utilize it. It's a balanced approach. You need to keep that big picture in your mind as you go through this and not get caught in the weeds of a 500 square foot community oyster bed or a 5,000 square foot commercial oyster bed. There's agencies that are in charge of regulating this industry. My job as a permit coordinator for the company now, I used to feed the fish, but now all I do is work on the regulations for the company and compliance with the amount of regulations, i.e., discharge permits, fin fish permits, etc. Essentially, every agency has a regulation for us to follow. It's a very well regulated industry. Just briefly, on the ban or prohibition of net pens, Jefferson County went down this road in 2011. They tried to ban net pens in their SMP. Ecology threw it back to them and said you cannot do that and I'll just quote Ecology's record on this is clear in a letter to Jefferson County dated January 27, 2011: "There

is not a conclusive science basis on the record to support such a ban of net pen aquaculture. We, Ecology, further determine that from a legal standpoint, there is not authority for an outright ban through an SMP.” So, Ecology is very clear on that. What happened to Jefferson County is they spent three years twisting in the wind hung up over trying to ban net pen aquaculture and they hung up their whole SMP process in the process of that. Bainbridge Island’s SMP must comply with the State Shoreline Management Act. It’s a community thing, but it also has to comply with the State Shoreline Management Act. You have to follow the rules. I would ask the Planning Commission that, this thing is a very complicated issue, and I don’t think you should pass it forward at this point as it’s written to the City Council. Pardon my emotions, but thank you for your time.”

The Public Hearing was closed at 6:43 PM. Chair Pearl stated they would hold the Public Hearing over to another night to allow for proper reflection on the information presented.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**Charles Schmid, Citizen** – “We were talking the other day about getting to the heart of matters in the Comprehensive Plan and I would like to add a line to the Water Resources Element Existing Conditions and Future Needs. I would like to add, ‘Island residents, farms and industry are dependent on groundwater resources now and for the foreseeable future. Without it, their gardens, their kitchens, their bathrooms would be useless and homes virtually worthless.’ That’s where it gets to the heart of water here. All we say is groundwater is the sole source of drinking water and then we talk about ways to measure it. Really, what does that mean from the Comprehensive Plan how it affects our residents. I think it is the most valuable resource this Island has. Imagine our homes without water. Our industry without water. So that’s why I would like to add that line. Thank you.”

#### **2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

Ms. Sutton gave an overview of the previous meeting’s discussion pointing out the Commissioner’s changes were highlighted in yellow on the draft presented in their agenda packet. She went on to show Commissioner Killion’s new draft of the Vision Statement for the Water Resources Element. Discussion centered on sentences referring to aquifers and Low Impact Development.

Chair Pearl spoke about aquifer recharge areas and felt some should be further defined as “high” aquifer recharge areas in order to better define the different areas on the Island as opposed to the idea that the whole Island is equal in terms of being an aquifer recharge area. The subject of surface water runoff was also discussed. Commissioner Quitslund stated he felt the Water Resources Element should be in accord with the aquaculture regulations of the SMP. It was decided there would be a reference that pointed to the SMP regulations to keep the two in

agreement. The Commissioners also agreed there should be reference to the Island being dependent upon ground water as well as a sole source aquifer.

**Motion: I move that following tonight's discussion we have at least preliminarily agreed upon the language and the intent in the Water Resources section and we're ready to move onto the Housing Element  
Lewars/Killion: Passed Unanimously 4-0**

The City's new Planning Director, Gary Christensen, was welcomed by the Commissioners.

City Consultant Joe Tovar presented the Housing Element with some general organization and a plan for how the Planning Commission may want to proceed with reviewing this element. He brought their attention to the Neighborhood Service Centers (NSCs) being only 11% of the Island as a whole and how they may want to concentrate future growth in these areas in order to retain the rural character of the Island. Mr. Tovar also mentioned the Bainbridge Island Housing Assessment would be included as an appendix to the Housing Element. He then went on to review the "16 Potential Tools to Increase Supply of Diverse Housing Types and Affordable Housing" saying this would be a good place to start their discussion. The HDDP program was described with information about the different tiers presented by Ms. Sutton. In regards to cottage housing developments, Chair Pearl asked what the ideal number of homes per acre would be. Mr. Tovar thought no more than 10 homes per acre would be best.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

**Doug Rauh, Citizen** – Commented on the Greenwood Avenue cottage. He wasn't sure what was meant by dwelling units per acre, but if 8 houses were on 1.25 acres, that would be 6 units per acre, not 10 per acre. When looking at opportunities like air space, look at an aerial map of the core area. Most of the open land is parking lots. He felt the Planning Commission should look at placing housing over the parking lots if they were going to look at open space. If you're going to look at air rights for the police station, you're going to build a police station once in a half century and there's no housing on top of it, why would you bother to put it in your housing code? He said there would not be another opportunity in anyone's lifetime. When looking at zoning the Island, if a parcel is purchased and a house is built assuming that the zoning applies to yourself and your neighbor and then you put those clustered houses (say in an R-2 area) 10 to an acre, trust has been voided. He felt they should look at the ambiance. Mr. Rauh mentioned that Miami's housing market prices were dropping rapidly. He stated other people had a vision of Bainbridge Island like Mercer Island and they had to be very careful what they did if they were going to have dense housing. People would expect it in the downtown core, but do not expect it in the conservation area. People's perception of Bainbridge Island would be changed. Mr. Rauh went on to say if the housing at Rolling Bay was quadrupled, the next question would be how to move the people around which would lead to expansion of the transportation infrastructure. The

extra cars would become a problem because there were not buses every 15 minutes. He mentioned that people at the north end of the Island find it just as convenient to go to Poulsbo because they cannot find parking in Winslow. Mr. Rauh finished by saying there needed to be a core area with retail and business and people.

**Charles Wenzlau, Citizen** – Thanked the staff for their good work thus far. Mr. Wenzlau stated multiple tools were necessary. He felt that even given the best intentions in the Comprehensive Plan, there was very little to show in terms of affordable housing. He stated what was needed were incentives for developers. Mr. Wenzlau thought the HDDP tool was the best incentive and it was super important to begin adjusting it if necessary but it should be considered a critical tool. He went on to mention that there was a draft Cottage Ordinance already stating former Planning Director Kathy Cook and Staff put it together 5-10 years ago and he considered it a great tool that had been crafted very specifically to control the outcomes. Mr. Wenzlau went on to speak about the recent kickback of what the character of High School Road should be saying he saw it as one of the most significant opportunities for increase rental housing on second and third floors of buildings. The last tool he mentioned was appropriate in-fill in Winslow such as ADUs, tiny houses and small footprint homes that could allow for walking to close-by shops.

**Jonathan Davis, Citizen** – Thanked Consultant Joe Tovar for the presentation and agreed with everything Mr. Wenzlau said and then pointed out that all the tools outlined were extremely useful. He felt if each one was adopted, they would be very useful in one or two projects here and there where they were appropriate. If they were all left alone, there'd be nothing except the HDDP, if it stuck around, so the tools presented could be specific to areas of the Island so there were options about what to do with a site and how to create some benefit for a landowner that may increase density slightly but also gave back to the community in the way of conservation, small houses or affordable houses. Mr. Davis thought the tools were important and if there were not a variety available, they'd be stuck with a few clunky tools except for the HDDP. He supported in depth study of the proposed tools and find where they were appropriate along with appropriate wording of ordinance to support them. He mentioned the High School Road area and thought it could be a second commercial center with a specific character by bringing housing and other mixed uses that would allow a greater density. He saw it as a way to conserve the nature and character of downtown Winslow and Winslow Way. He thought it would bring great benefit in a lot of different ways.

**Charles Schmid, Citizen** – Stated the 1994 Comprehensive Plan had Randall Arendt come out and do quite a bit of consulting. He said they looked at a lot of houses and clustering them but not much in affordable housing. He asked if there didn't used to be a sweat equity land which was quite successful (Strawberry Lane). He felt they had to be sensitive with neighborhoods and how all of this could be put together. Mr. Schmid thought there had been a lot of mistakes made in trying to increase affordable housing but he felt focusing on including affordable housing as the primary goal for density bonuses in developments would help.

**Ron Peltier, City Council** – Thought this was an issue that would take some creativity and the more consensus they could build around how to address this, the better. There was some conflict around the values Bainbridge Islanders hold dear. Mr. Peltier stated there were about 45 people who spoke at the Suzuki Meeting the previous month and no one was against affordable housing, but they were also concerned about ecological function and what was done to address housing needs would impact the rest of the Island and the sustainability of its environmental and ecological resources. He thought as they looked at the issue, they needed to build consensus around strategies that all the people who were at the Suzuki meeting could agree on. He mentioned they would be speaking about affordable housing at the May 17, 2016 City Council meeting and it would be nice if there could be consensus and strategies that were agreed upon by environmentalists and members of the development community. He liked the idea of focusing the approach to providing more affordable housing units in Winslow, micro apartments without parking as a way to keep cost and congestion down offering people an option to live on the Island with built in affordability. Mr. Peltier thought if they could come up with strategies that recognize the other values Islanders have, come energy would get going behind it to come up with creative solutions.

**Robert Dashiell, Citizen** – Was delighted that the inclusive housing ordinance didn't work on Bainbridge Island since HDDP came along as some members of the community fought the inclusionary housing ordinance. He stated what that would do would create pockets of development all over the Island and he would like to see the inclusionary ordinance put to bed permanently. Mr. Dashiell went on to say that a viable model for a public transportation system was about 4,500 population per square mile and the Island was about 850 population per square mile. It could be had if it was funded by more than just passenger fares, but he thought the Island was more than 50 years away from having a viable density for public transportation. He felt one of the key criteria that should be imposed on affordable housing was how long it would be affordable. He said the U.S. standard was moving toward 50 years and he hoped the Comprehensive Plan would adopt that policy. Mr. Dashiell stated one thing that really bothered him about affordable housing was that most of it did not have adequate storage and that each house in the Ferncliff project had a little storage house. He also disliked when he drove through many affordable housing projects that there were not garages. He thought seeing a line of cars up a street was not very attractive and that should be given consideration in the Affordable Housing Element.

#### **NEW/OLD BUSINESS**

None.

#### **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 PM.



**Planning Commission  
Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, April 14, 2016**

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Mack Pearl, Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist



