PLANNING COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER’S HEARING ROOM, COUPEVILLE, WA
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Members Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Hillers – Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Enell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Joselyn – Vice Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Wallin</td>
<td>Leal Dickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Saul</td>
<td>Wayne Havens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scott Yonkman</em></td>
<td>Beth Munson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chair Hillers.

**ROLL CALL.**
Mike Joselyn, George Saul, Dean Enell, Val Hillers, Jeff Wallin, Scott Yonkman

**Minutes:**
August 26, 2014
Commissioner Yonkman moved to approve the minutes as written, Commissioner Joselyn seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Planning staff present: Dave Wechner – Planning and Community Development Director, Will Simpson – Long Range Planner, Brad Johnson – Long Range Planner, Amanda Almgren – Long Range Planner

**ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**

*Garrett Newkirk, 170 West Frostad Road, Oak Harbor*
- Population Projection: discussed mortality rate increase in North Whidbey.
- Seven additional squadrons.
- He feels there will be an exodus in North Whidbey due to increase of Navy presence.
- He feels it is a public health issue to the citizens.
- Building is only for military people and not its citizens.
- Encourages to deny permits and any ecology permits.

Commissioner Enell asked Mr. Newkirk for the cross street on Frostad Road.

Mr. Newkirk responded to Commissioner Enell Frostad Road is the entire road. He stated the Commissioners should solicit a 911 call from 2 weeks ago he placed and the difficulty 911 had; they could not hear him and could not respond.
Lou Malzone, 5428 Pleasant View Lane, Freeland
He is the Water/Sewer District Commissioner in that location. He wanted to bring the Planning Commission up to date on what the Water/Sewer District is doing.
- In cooperation with the Planning Department, is looking forward to the UGA in Freeland being reduced. It was welcomed to see the perspective boundary.
- They are going to move forward to analyze a piece of property to put a sewer treatment center on and should be able to supply service to the downtown core, with hopes to expand it to include the rest of the UGA boundary that is now proposed.
- He hopes the property will be acquired by the end of the year.

Commissioner Enell asked Mr. Malzone if the boundary would be presented today.

Mr. Malzone responded to Commissioner Enell he believed it will be presented in the meeting.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT
Dave Wechner briefly discussed some of the development activities and other activities in the Department:
- Revenue – up 18% in building and 19% in planning.
- 177 land use permits in review as of October 15, 2014.
- 20 new land use applications in the last month.
- New Code Compliance Planner started on October 6, 2014 as Tess Cooper moved to the Critical Areas Planner position.
- Monthly meetings have been established for review of the Public Works and Utilities Projects to coordinate permitting processes to assure faster turnaround for infrastructure of publicly funded projects.
- Commerce Checklist review for evaluating the Comp Plan Elements is the next task to be worked on through the end of the year.
- Public Works is working on the Transportation Planning Element and are taking the lead on Parks and Recreation Element Review as well.
- Outreach materials are being prepared and there is an appointment with a website developer to do a Comp Plan Website that will be specific to the Comp Plan Update.
- Building activity and new housing starts in September issued 12 permits for single family residences compared to 14 last year.
- Smartgov Portal – it is a public portal where the status and development activity in Island County is accessible. There are 2 views through the public portal; one is a general public portal and the other is more specific for account holders that may log in to see if fees have been paid, status updates, staff reviewing permits, and if there are any notes they need to be aware of. The public portal in Smartgov will be tested by some industry testers to see if there are any glitches in the program before the actual launch of the portal.
- Administrative Staff, Paula Bradshaw, Virginia Shaddy and himself participated in Records Management Training and will be making changes in storage retrieval systems to achieve better access, more efficient retrieval of records in response to requests.
- Fee schedule changes are being recommended to the Board of Commissioners to get a capture of services that are being provided. Some of those services are currently being
provided for free and they are being used for private commercial benefit, contacts with real estate agents, appraisers, etc. There are other things done that the general public pay for out of the general fund for that service being rendered and would like to capture some of that cost to the County in revenue.

- Budget was approved with more help for development review, the Growth Management effort and records management.

Commissioner Enell asked Director Wechner how the Smartgov Portal will be accessible.

Director Wechner responded to Commissioner Enell it would be online through the Planning Department site.

Commissioner Hillers asked Dave if the portal was just for Planning or is it broader.

Dave replied to Commissioner Hillers the portal will be opened up in segments. The first segment will be Building Permits, followed by Planning, Public Health and Public Works. Anything that involves a permit that is being applied for or is required by the County would be accessible through the public portal.

**NEW BUSINESS –**

Brad Johnson presented the two topics to be discussed:

- Preliminary results of the Buildable Lands Analysis.
- Preliminary draft of the Countywide Planning Policies.

Last year the Planning Commission and the Board created a Preliminary Schedule and Public Participation Plan to guide the Comprehensive Plan Update. The plan was divided into two fundamental phases. Phase I was to culminate in a report to the Planning Commission and the Board in the scope of the changes necessary to bring the Comprehensive Plan into compliance with the Growth Management Act and to provide an opportunity for the Planning Commission and Board to identify other changes they would like to see in the Comprehensive Plan or Development Regulations. Three of the six tasks identified in the Phase I of the Public Participation Plan and Preliminary Schedule, including establishing a Public Participation Plan, completing a Countywide Population Projection and allocating that population to the Planning Regions have been completed. Two of the three remaining tasks which are the Buildable Lands Analysis and the Countywide Plans Analysis will be discussed and are considered to be extremely important not only to Island County but also to the other jurisdictions since much of their work is dependent upon the result of these efforts. These two tasks have taken longer to complete than the others due to in depth discussions with the other jurisdictions which are still ongoing.

**Public Meeting** – Presentation of the results of the Buildable Lands Analysis in support of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update.

Amanda Almgren presented the results of the Buildable Lands Analysis. In August, the methodology was presented to the Planning Commission, the Board of Island Commissioners
and other jurisdictions. The comments received during that period were incorporated into the results. There is no formal action required from the Planning Commission at this time but want to further explain the methodology and results.

Outline

- 2016 Comprehensive Plan Schedule
- Purpose
- Summary of Findings
- Changes in Assumptions
- Results
  - Rural and RAIDs by Planning Areas
  - UGAs
- Next Steps
- Questions

Amanda offered further explained when discussing Planning Areas it does not include the cities that are actually in those areas.

Phase 1 Comprehensive Plan Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation Plan &amp; Preliminary Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036 Countywide Population Projection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Growth Trends &amp; Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildable Lands Analysis Methodology</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Revisions to County Wide Planning Policies</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Review of Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

- The results will be used to help inform the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan
- Rural Areas: analysis will be used to inform impact assessments
- UGAs: analysis will be used to determine if UGAs are adequately sized

- The methodology will be included in the County Wide Planning Policies to provide a consistent framework for future buildable lands analysis
The idea behind the consistent framework is that any jurisdiction within Island County may be able to do a Buildable Lands Analysis following the framework.

Buildable Lands Analysis:
Summary of Findings

› RAIDs and rural areas have adequate area to accommodate non UGA population growth.

› There is enough buildable land in each UGA to accommodate the projected population growth.

› Adequate land is expected in each UGA to accommodate projected employment growth with the exception of Coupeville.

There is a caveat to the Oak Harbor UGA, due to their zoning being written in such a way that there is a minimum and maximum allowed density for each zone. The entire city built out at the minimum allowed density there would be a potential short fall of land. However, if it built out at the high end there would be an acceptable amount of land. Island County is working with the City to see what kind of density they have been achieving recently to be able to make a decision where within that range actual development will fall under.

Changes to Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Assumption</th>
<th>Revised Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Zones: 20 Employees/Acre</td>
<td>17 Employees/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Zones: 9 Employees/Acre</td>
<td>8 Employees/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The sample size for industrial land in Island County is extremely small, therefore the rounded average of the assumption used by Slagit County (6.5), Clark County (9) and Unincorporated Pierce County (8.2) was used.

Current Average Employees per Acre in UGAs in Island County

- The average employment per acre was calculated by taking the average of the ratio for the Oak Harbor, Langley and Coupeville UGAs.
- Freeland was excluded given the current development restraints due to a lack of sewer systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Employees/Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
<td>4126</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeland</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupeville</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Employees reported to ESD for October 2013.

There were questions received and direction to revisit the assumptions for employees per acre both in Commercial and Industrial zones.
Planning Areas:
Rural North Whidbey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity at Build Out (Housing Units)</th>
<th>Capacity at Build Out (People*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIDs</td>
<td>1,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Ag</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Ag</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant &amp; Redevelopable Acres</th>
<th>Potential Jobs Accommodated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light MFG</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Household Size = 2.3 people per household

In North Whidbey there is enough land to accommodate approximately 9,000 additional residents, which would be about 4,000 additional housing units. This includes lands and RAIDs. These numbers do not include any analysis on the Base.
Planning Areas:
Rural Central Whidbey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Capacity at Build Out (Housing Units)</th>
<th>Capacity at Build Out (People*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAIDs</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>7,810.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>7,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Ag</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Ag</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>16,473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacant & Non Residential Redevelopable Acres Potential Jobs Accommodated

| Airport | 10 | 86 |
| Light MFG | - | - |
| Total   | 10 | 86 |

*Household Size = 2.3 people per household

In Central Whidbey would allow about 16,000 additional residents and about 86 additional jobs.

Planning Areas:
Rural South Whidbey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Capacity at Build Out (Housing Units)</th>
<th>Capacity at Build Out (People*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAIDs</td>
<td>4,419</td>
<td>10,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4,864</td>
<td>11,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Ag</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Ag</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>22,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacant & Non Residential Redevelopable Acres Potential Jobs Accommodated

| Airport | 382 | 3,438 |
| Light MFG | - | - |
| Total   | 382 | 3,438 |

*Household Size = 2.3 people per household

In South Whidbey would allow for 22,000 additional residents and about 9,000 homes and 3,000 potential jobs.

Planning Areas:
Camano Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Capacity at Build Out (Housing Units)</th>
<th>Capacity at Build Out (People*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAIDs</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>9,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>5,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Ag</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Ag</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,991</td>
<td>16,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacant & Non Residential Redevelopable Acres Potential Jobs Accommodated

| Airport | 45 | 359 |
| Light MFG | 39 | 309 |
| Total   | 84 | 965 |

*Household Size = 2.3 people per household
Camano Island has plenty of development potential, 16,000 new people in theory and 965 jobs.

The take away from the Rural Analysis is that there is a lot of land in Island County. It may not be reasonable to assume that 16,000 people can get on and off Camano or that clean drinking water can be provided to them. The Planning Department will be taking these numbers and see if they need to make any changes.

**Urban Growth Areas:**

---

**Oak Harbor**

There was an analysis for Oak Harbor that broke out the low and high density estimate. The Planning Department is working with City of Oak Harbor to find out what is actually being developed there and the density is being achieved, in order to decide what range the development will fall and if there is plenty of capacity for jobs based on the assumptions.
Urban Growth Areas:
Town of Coupeville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coupeville</th>
<th>Housing Capacity (Housing Units)</th>
<th>Additional Housing Units Needed*</th>
<th>Employment Capacity (Jobs)</th>
<th>Estimated Employment Increase</th>
<th>Excess Capacity to Accommodate Housing Units &amp; Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1 (10) Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the estimated population increase and an average household size of 2.3 people.

The projection for Coupeville is fairly low population growth. They have adequate land to accommodate the population growth; there are not a lot of commercial jobs. There are discussions with the Town of Coupeville to address the shortage of commercial jobs.

Urban Growth Areas:
Langley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Langley</th>
<th>Housing Capacity (Housing Units)</th>
<th>Additional Housing Units Needed*</th>
<th>Employment Capacity (Jobs)</th>
<th>Estimated Employment Increase</th>
<th>Excess Capacity to Accommodate Housing Units &amp; Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,245 Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Limits only</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>857 Housing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the estimated population increase and an average household size of 2.3 people.

City of Langley asked the Planning Department to look at both the UGA and their city limits only.
Urban Growth Areas: Freeman (NMUGA)

For study purposes, Freeman is shown with an adjusted UGA. In both cases the Freeman UGA has adequate land for employment and housing needs.

UGA Summary: Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Capacity (Housing Units)</th>
<th>Additional Housing Units Needed Based on Estimated Population Increase</th>
<th>Excess Capacity for Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langley Residential</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Limits only</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman Residential</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupeville Residential</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Harbor Low Estimate Residential</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Harbor High Estimate Residential</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the UGAs have enough land for estimated population increases. Oak Harbor has a caveat that requires additional information to make a decision.

UGA Summary: Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Employment Capacity (Jobs)</th>
<th>Estimated Employment Increase</th>
<th>Excess Job Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langley Non-Residential</td>
<td>22.5 Acres</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman Non-Residential</td>
<td>73 Acres</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupeville Non-Residential</td>
<td>26.3 Acres</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Harbor Non-Residential</td>
<td>651.8 Acres</td>
<td>6,832</td>
<td>1,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coupeville is the one UGA the Planning Department will need to make a decision about moving forward to accommodate employment growth.
Commissioners and staff discussed:

- Access capacity in the UGA areas.
- How the goals of the Growth Management Act will be met.
- Planners responded it would depend on how land use policies are addressed in rural areas.
- Decision of UGA size as part of Phase II task.
- A range of options will be presented in terms of maintaining the status quo or increasing the percentage of growth occurring within the UGAs.
- Commissioners asked where the projected housing growth numbers came from.
- Planners stated the percentages of the UGAs where derived from the historical growth trends.
- Commissioners asked for clarification about the phrase surplus land in the rural areas.
- Staff was asked of the land available, how much of the land has been deemed buildable. Staff responded the available land is under the assumption a septic system can be place on the lots.
- Commissioners asked if development rights were taken into account.
- Accuracy of buildable lots was discussed by staff and Commissioners.
- Commissioners asked for a comparison of the analysis introduced today and 1998 analysis.
- Percentage of reduction used for critical areas.

Director Wechner informed the public of the availability of the buildable lands analysis and policies on the Island County website. This is a land capacity analysis; the other layers are extra steps that are not a part of this presentation.

**Public Meeting** - Review of Countywide Planning Policies and recommended policy revisions.

Will Simpson presented a brief overview on Countywide Planning Policies. The Long Range Planning Division has been working with the Town of Coupeville, the City of Oak Harbor and the Town of Langley on revision the existing Countywide Planning Policies for over two years. They now have a draft available for review by the Planning Commission which has been transmitted to them and the Board of County Commissioners who will be discussing it on November 5, 2014. Staff believes this will improve the manner in which Island County and the municipalities in the County engage in the update of the Comprehensive Plan process. He recommends that one more workshop style meeting be held in November.
Outline

- Purpose
- History
- Rationale for Revisions
- Adoption Process and Timeline
- Primary Policy Considerations
- Other Additions
- Questions

Countywide Planning Policies: Purpose

- Ensure consistency between the comprehensive plans of cities and counties sharing common borders or regional issues

Countywide Planning Policies: History

- Island County adopted Countywide Planning Policies on 6/22/1992
- Island County amended the Countywide Planning Policies in conjunction with the adoption of the 1998 Comp Plan
- Island County adopted a GMA compliant Comprehensive Plan on 9/29/1998
- The County negotiated subsequent interlocal agreements with the municipalities to implement the policies
Countywide Planning Policies:
Rationale for Revision

The Planning Department is recommending an update for technical and practical reasons:

› Opportunity to improve the planning process during the 2016 update and intergovernmental planning efforts in subsequent review cycles
› Existing policies identify years and figures which are outdated or not applicable
› Existing policies lack specificity
› Joint Planning Area policies with the City of Langley have created confusion and uncertainty for property owners
› Proposed policies will provide more clarity on the process of reviewing and amending UGA boundaries

Countywide Planning Policies:
Adoption Process

› Opportunities for public review before the Planning Commission, Council of Governments, and elected officials
› Staff will request a recommendation from the Planning Commission on proposed policies
› Elected officials will consider a resolution in support of revised policies

Primary Policy Considerations

› Urban Growth Areas
› Urban Development
› Rural Development
› Public Facilities and Services
› Facilities of Countywide or Statewide Significance
› Transportation
› Housing
› Public Health
› Economic Development
Other Proposed Additions

- Purpose
- Applicability
- Definitions
- Goals
- General Planning Provisions
- General Administration
  - Countywide planning group
  - Procedures for adopting or amending policies
  - Population and land capacity analysis
  - Monitoring and reporting

Items discussed by Planning Commissioners and Staff:
- Page 3.2 Item C – Areas of Rural Significance.
- Page 22 – 4.1 Countywide Planning.
- Importance of affordable housing.
- Staff was asked if there have been any common struggles in the intergovernmental meetings.
- Discussion of linkage between the Countywide Planning Policies and the Economic Development effort and the purpose of providing input to the Economic Development Council where there are opportunities for growth.
- Commissioners asked questions regarding Page 11 Item C, Freeland UGA and urban services.
- Discussion regarding the characterization of Freeland’s downtown area, boundary changes and which areas where excluded from the boundary charge.
- Commissioners commented regarding the growth in Freeland and should be taken into consideration.

Dave Weyehner wanted to remind the Public the PowerPoint presentations are available on the County Planning and Community Development website.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lou Malzone, 5428 Pleasant View Lane, Freeland
Freeland Water/Sewer District Commissioner
- The study area for Freeland’s reduced UGA boundary should be taken into serious consideration by the Planning Commission.
- Difficulty to put in sewer infrastructure.
- Considering the purchase of 77 acres that can serve the downtown corridor.
- Reducing the NMUGA will help Freeland.
Cac Kamak, 865 SE Barrington, Oak Harbor
Senior Planner for City of Oak Harbor
- Wanted to commend the County staff for all the work they have done toward the Countywide Planning Policies and Buildable Lands Analysis.
- One of the primary functions is to achieve consistency within policies and jurisdictions.
- Still working with Planners, there are minor tweaks but no major changes or shifts.
- Will be presenting the document to Oak Harbor Planning Commission.

Sami Postma, 180 NW Coveland Street, Coupeville
Island County Economic Development Council
- Commended the effort put into the plan.
- Discussed the increase of non-military jobs from 40 to 50 percent. In order to achieve that goal there needs to be more diversified zoning, like light manufacturing and IT office space. There is a lot of residential zoning and that does not provide a lot of job opportunities.
- In order to have living wage jobs in the County there needs to be an opportunity for that and zoning maybe be one thing to keep in mind.
- If the Council decides to do the economic development strategy part of the plan they are willing to provide any assistance they can.

Commissioner Hillers asked staff if they have been working with the Economic Development Council in terms of the zoning for jobs.

Brad responded in the future steps they will be coordinating with everyone involved. There have been some preliminary discussions with Mr. Nelson from the EDC in the past.

Steve Erickson, Box 53, Langley
Whidbey Environmental Action Network
- Interested to see the results of the analysis in Oak Harbor, he would recommend that Island County review the numbers since in previous efforts Oak Harbor has had considerable quantitative inaccuracies in such analysis. Policy decision by Planning Commission and Commissioners should drive it as with any historical trend has been since that is where a policy can intervene to affect what is happening on the ground in terms of actual development density.
- He thinks the concept of Rural Lands of Long Term Significance is an excellent potential overlay. It intersects with the GMA requirements for designation of greenbelts that has never really happened and the landscape scale analysis and planning that needs to occur regarding critical areas.

Commissioner Hillers discussed a written comment suggesting food production needed to be considered as well in the Rural Lands of Long Term Significance.
Angie Homola, 2362 Happy Lane, Oak Harbor
S.C.W.P.G
• She would like to encourage the Planning Commission and the staff to look very carefully at the analysis that is done by the City of Oak Harbor. There was a problem in the past where the consideration for zoning was not adequately tabulated and wound up in this problem.
• As looking at military numbers for incoming platforms, when considering this added level of 2000 or more houses needed are average fluctuations in the past or did they just capture a number.
• She asked to please take a careful look at how Oak Harbor is adding in military housing and which parts they are adding and which parts are being taken out. There seems to be some variation of how that has happened in the past.
• Encourages proper public notice on project versus non project action. Typically people do not get notified of changes until the zoning has changed. To address the issue proper signage is needed; the overlay zone for the Accident Potential Zone is an example of the need for proper notification.
• It is absolutely critical to think about the connectivity of open space and biodiversity so that all jurisdictions Countywide are being looked at and what corridors are being established.

Garrett Newkirk, 170 West Frostad Road, Oak Harbor
• He stated the Buildable Lands Analysis seems short sighted and not very well thought of.
• Not using the actual overlay zones is incomprehensible. The APZ zoning layer has taken thousands of acres off the buildable lands.
• The County in conjunction with Navy and Washington State bought a 10 acre parcel at 2.2 million dollars and let the rest of everybody else hang.
• It is important to use the overlay zones.
• The County needs to prove to the citizens that their lands are buildable and the County should incur the costs.

Commissioner Enell commented he likes the goals and the goals of the GMA. He hopes that there is money to fund the goals. Some examples:
• Affordable housing.
• Transportation.
• Adequate pedestrian facilities.
• Provisions for connections between different modes of transportation.
• Sewer in Freeland and the infrastructure.

Will Simpson informed the Planning Commission that on November 5th, 2014 staff will bring the the Draft Countywide Planning Policies to Board of County Commissioners. The City of Oak Harbor will be presenting the Draft Countywide Planning Policies to their Planning Commission also. There may be some minor changes but it might be helpful to work through some of the policies in a more open work session style of meeting. November 18, 2014 would be a Special Session meeting due to the holidays.
The Planning Commissioners agreed November 18, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. would be a suitable meeting date.

Commissioner Enell spoke about the APA Planning Commission books and he for one will use one of the books to read since, they can be doable and beneficial to the County.

Commissioner Yonkman moved to adjourn, Commissioner Enell seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Shaddy