

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

June 3, 2003

The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County Fairgrounds, Eagle's Nest Hall, 1200 Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA. Members Present: Deborah Flynn, Tom Nevins, Mark Flynn, Lary Coppola, Mike Gustavson, William Matchett, John Ahl, John Taylor, Monty Mahan. Not Present: Staff Present: Laura Ditmer, Jason Rice, Kelly Robinson, Shannon Bauman, Clyde Stricklin, Eric Toews, Pamela Younce.

4:00 P.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions and Agenda Review.

Lary Coppola, Chair, called the meeting to order as a Work Study and asked Staff to begin the discussions. Jason Rice asked if they were going to begin with the Sub-Area Plan discussion or just go right into the Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Laura Ditmer noted she would like to briefly go over the Findings of Fact. These were sent out previously to the Planning Commission, pending Legal Review. The Findings had since been reviewed by Legal and were being distributed at this meeting for the Planning Commission's input.

Mike Gustavson asked for clarification as to which paper they should be looking at with Laura noting she would be handing out the final Findings of Fact for the Sub-Area Plans.

➤ Work Study review of **Findings of Fact – Kingston Sub-Area Plan.**

Laura Ditmer noted there were no substantial revisions made to the Findings of Fact, only clarification requested after legal review.

Shannon Bauman provided a brief history of the Kingston Sub-Area Plan. On October 9, a draft Kingston Sub-Area Plan with the draft containing four alternatives and integrated documents was prepared with no preferred alternative identified at that time. After release of the draft plan, the Planning Commission held two Public Hearings, receiving Public Testimony, and held four work/study sessions. On May 6, 2003 the Planning Commission voted to approve and incorporate Alternative B for the draft Kingston Sub-Area Plan. Alternative B was determined to be a logical extension of the existing Urban Growth Area boundary based on an analysis contained in the plan, as well as community input and community desire. The proposed Sub-Area Plan would accommodate a population of approximately 2000 people for the period of 2013 to 2017. The area contained in Alternative B can be served by sewer and water, as well as a number of public facilities, including community services such as county parks and

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 schools. The Plan also provides protection of critical areas along the shoreline and
2 Harborview Creek. With that in mind, a copy of the final version, including Legal
3 Review, was distributed to the Planning Commission members.

4
5 William Matchett asked if there were any substantive changes. Shannon Bauman noted
6 there were no substantive changes; just minor wording changes requested by Legal.
7 The Findings of Fact were based on the recommendations made by the Planning
8 Commission related to Alternative B, Kinston Sub-Area Plan. If the Planning
9 Commission has any questions about changes, she would be happy to address them.

10
11 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any questions.

12
13 William Matchett asked that Kitsap County incorporate an automatic correction to the
14 wording “on _____ date, and following timely...” the “and” is intrusive and is
15 throughout all the documents. Additionally, Item 21 should have the word “to” should
16 be inserted before “deliberate.”

17
18 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any other comments.

19
20 William Matchett noted that, since they had just received the document, he had not had
21 the opportunity to review it completely.

22
23 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any other questions or concerns.

24
25 John Ahl asked if the Planning Commission could adopt the Kingston Sub-Area Plan.
26 Laura Ditmer stated that if the Planning Commission could adopt it at this time and if
27 there should be any substantive changes from the Public Hearing those could be
28 incorporated into the document prior to finalizing and signing it. John Ahl and
29 Deborah Flynn both noted they felt the Findings of Fact were well prepared and
30 accurately reflected the Planning Commission’s intent.

31
32 Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other questions or concerns and they could
33 move on to the next item.

34
35 ➤ **Work Study review of Findings of Fact – The South Kitsap Industrial**
36 **Area Kingston Sub-Area Plan.**

37
38 Once again, the Findings of Fact were previously provided to the Planning Commission,
39 pending Legal Review. The final version, after Legal review, was distributed to the
40 Planning Commission members.

41
42 Darryl Piercy began the discussion on the South Kitsap Industrial Area by confirming it
43 was an area most of the Planning Commission members were very familiar with, since
44 it had been in the review process for approximately two years. The original version
45 actually began in 1988 when the Comprehensive Plan was validated, with the concept
46 of the South Kitsap Industrial Area discussed at that time. The process began in
47 earnest, however, about two years ago. What was now being presented to the Planning
48 Commission were the actual steps of the Sub-Area Plan, including action that had been

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 taken in November 2002 when the Planning Commission adopted Findings of Fact,
2 including the Sub-Area Plan document itself. Since that time, ordinance revisions had
3 been developed that would be consistent with the policies set forth on the Sub-Area
4 Plan.

5
6 The Planning Commission was now being asked for a few actions in regard to this
7 matter. First, they were being asked to formalize or memorialize the action they took in
8 November 2002 in terms of the adoption of the Sub-Area Plan and Findings of Fact.
9 Additionally, they were being asked to formalize implementing regulations that the
10 Planning Commission have reviewed and voted on at previous meetings. The previous
11 record from November 2002 and implementing regulations now needed to be
12 formalized as part of the review process by adopting the Findings of Fact.

13
14 Another action would be to provide a recommendation to the Board of County
15 Commissioners to actually adopt the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan to include the
16 appropriate codes for implementation of the Sub-Area Plan and regulations
17 themselves. Therefore, the Planning Commission should view this as a formal process
18 that is consistent with action and review that the Planning Commission had previously
19 undertaken. Staff believes the Findings of Fact are consistent with previous review and
20 directions in that regard.

21
22 Before receiving questions and comments from the Planning Commission, Darryl
23 Piercy noted that Page 4, Item 19, the “p” was dropped from Public and Staff would
24 ensure that was corrected.

25
26 William Matchett noted the draft Findings of Fact sent to the Planning Commission
27 had 25 items; the one presented at the meeting had 22 items. After some discussion, it
28 was noted by Jason Rice that the final version was numbered incorrectly and that Page
29 2 should start with #5. This would be corrected by Staff as that incorrect numbering
30 was reflected from Page 2 throughout the remainder of the document.

31
32 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked for clarification that an additional finding had been added
33 to the final version and what exactly was added with the new finding. Jason Rice noted
34 there was an additional finding, which was added as part of the implementing
35 regulations and code changes. Jason noted that the change related specifically to any
36 dates after the November 2002 Sub-Area Plan implementation; everything relating to
37 development regulations and code amendments specific to the South Kitsap Industrial
38 Area.

39
40 Darryl Piercy clarified all the additions to the original Findings of Fact had already been
41 approved at various meetings by the Planning Commission. Additions since November
42 2002 were included from Item 15 on. They represented actions specific to what the
43 Planning Commission had undertaken since the previous Findings of Fact were actually
44 adopted by Board of County Commissioners. Laura Ditmer noted that the previous
45 Findings of Fact were signed September 24, 2002 and Item 15 started with October
46 2002.

47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 William Matchett noted two minor corrections, noting that he was using the “incorrect”
2 numbering when referencing the items needing correction.

3
4 Item 13, Line 3 - “Notice of Adoption of Existing...” should have either “a” or “the”
5 inserted before “Existing.” Staff agreed and noted they would make that correction.

6
7 Item 17, Line 1 - The word “after” should not be capitalized. Staff concurred and agreed
8 to make the correction.

9
10 William Matchett further stated that the three Recommendations all stated, “adopt”
11 which was repetitive. He suggested that Recommendation 1 should be the only one that
12 stated, “adopt.” Laura Ditmer noted that Recommendations 2 and 3 were adopted on
13 September 24, 2002 and that, although it may seem repetitive, it was restating the fact
14 that they had been adopted.

15
16 William Matchett questioned how it was determined that the Findings of Fact items
17 had been approved, since they had not actually voted on them yet. Darryl Piercy noted
18 that the items addressed in the Findings of Fact were based on unanimous decisions at
19 previous meetings and that the Findings of Fact presented were for the purpose of
20 formalizing those previous decisions.

21
22 John Ahl asked for clarification regarding blanks in the Recommendations. Jason Rice
23 noted those blanks would be filled in once the Findings of Fact were actually adopted.
24 Laura Ditmer further clarified the final Findings of Fact were presented to the Planning
25 Commission for signing; the applicable dates would be included.

26
27 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any other questions.

28
29 Deborah Flynn noted she had not had the opportunity to review the documentation
30 since it had only just been provided and was, therefore, uncomfortable asking questions
31 or providing recommendations.

32
33 Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other questions or concerns and they could
34 move on to the next item.

- 35
36 ➤ Work Study review of **Findings of Fact – South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan**
37 **ULID #6.**

38
39 Laura Ditmer noted that a draft, pending Legal Review, had also been provided prior to
40 this work/study on these Findings of Fact. After Legal Review there was one revision to
41 Item 21 on Page 4. That Item had left out a previous Citizen Review Committee
42 meeting relating to ULID #6, which was now addressed. Other than that, there were no
43 substantive changes. Laura Ditmer noted that the Planning Commission should keep
44 in mind when reviewing the package that Staff had attempted to capture the wording
45 and intent of John Ahl’s motion at the last Work Study on Page 7 with the
46 Recommendations.

47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 Mike Gustavson asked that all actions be deferred to another meeting after the
2 Planning Commission had time to review the materials. He expressed frustration with
3 being provided with documentation on the day of the meeting, noting that although
4 they were being told there were no substantive changes, when he compared his draft to
5 the final version that was distributed, there appeared to be completely different
6 wording. He stressed that it was a time consuming effort to review the materials as it
7 was. To receive materials at the last minute and be asked to act on them was
8 unconscionable. He again asked that all matters be deferred pending further review of
9 the new materials with the meeting readvertised.

10
11 Jason Rice noted that if this was related to documents that had been placed in their
12 binders before the meeting began, those were all relating to the July 1, 2003 meeting.

13
14 Lary Coppola, Chair, confirmed the materials added to their binder just prior to this
15 work/study were not being discussed at this meeting. They were being provided in
16 advance of the July meeting for the Planning Commission to review.

17
18 Mike Gustavson continued to express his frustration with having things handed to him
19 at the meeting with a request for a response. He noted that without time to review
20 materials he had concern about what might be slipped through at the last minute.
21 Laura Ditmer noted that the only item inserted into the Findings of Fact was Item 21
22 and everything else was unchanged from the draft provided the week prior to the
23 meeting.

24
25 Lary Coppola, Chair, confirmed for Mike Gustavson that the Planning Commission had
26 been given the document previously in Draft form and that they appeared to be the
27 same document, given the noted revisions.

28
29 Mike Gustavson stated that if the handouts at the meeting were supposed to be the
30 same, it didn't appear that way to him.

31
32 As an aside to that discussion, William Matchett noted Item 24 should have the year
33 corrected from June 3, 2002 to reflect the year 2003. Laura Ditmer concurred and
34 noted Staff would make the correction.

35
36 Tom Nevins noted he had looked over the final version and felt that Item 25,
37 essentially, reflected John Ahl's motion. Items 26-28, however, he felt were putting
38 words in the Planning Commission's mouths. As an example, he noted the language
39 indicates the Planning Commission feels this is in the best interest of the Citizen's of
40 Kitsap County, and that the Findings of Fact support the Growth Management Act.
41 There were more areas, but that was just some of the verbiage that he was not
42 comfortable with. Tom acknowledged what the attempt was, but was still
43 uncomfortable being a part of it. It helped that their original Findings would be
44 attached to the new ones, as this would helpfully help indicate what had occurred in the
45 process and clarify why they had voted they way they had. He was not, however,
46 prepared to vote on these Findings of Fact without some substantive changes.

47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 Laura Ditmer noted that Staff would need more input from the Planning Commission
2 on the changes they would like made.

3
4 The matter of changes in the draft when compared to the final version was again noted,
5 with Laura Ditmer asking for specific clarification of the differences in question.

6
7 Mike Gustavson noted that perhaps he was looking at the wrong paper. After review by
8 Laura Ditmer it was noted that the one he had been looking at was from last year and
9 was the original Findings of Fact, signed on January 8, 2003, that would be attached to
10 the new Findings of Fact.

11
12 William Matchett, Lary Coppola, Chair, and John Ahl verified they were comparing the
13 correct documents, the draft from last week and the Findings of Fact distributed at the
14 meeting.

15
16 Deborah Flynn noted she was also uncomfortable with the wording, although she had
17 not had time to prepare specific revisions. She felt that Item 25 was close to the Motion
18 by John Ahl that they had agreed to. Item 26, however, had a lot of language that did
19 not reflect her understanding of their agreement. Essentially, it was under
20 understanding that they were agreeing to the Sub-Area Plan because that Boundary had
21 already been adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. Because of that, they
22 had no real choice about making recommendations about the Sub-Area Plan boundary
23 itself. Laura Ditmer asked for further clarification as to where the specific concern was:
24 content or how it came out of the ordinance.

25
26 Deborah Flynn noted they were supporting the Urban Village Center concept, given
27 that the area was already identified as an Urban Growth Area by the Board of County
28 Commissioners. They did not, however, want to indicate support the Urban Growth
29 Boundary itself. Deborah Flynn stated she did not feel that was reflected in this
30 document.

31
32 Laura Ditmer noted the wording could be changed, taking Item 25 with it's current
33 wording, attaching the previous year's Findings of Fact to the new ones. The Planning
34 Commission's acceptance of the Village concept was what Staff had intended to address
35 more succinctly through the subtopics of Item 26. When the Urban Village Center
36 master planning began, those issues would be addressed. Item 26 was an attempt to
37 flesh out the goals and further modify the Findings. If it did not represent the intent of
38 the Planning Commission, she asked that they provide input on what they would prefer
39 to have presented.

40
41 William Matchett noted he agreed with Tom Nevins and Deborah Flynn. His issue with
42 regard to Item 26 was that it represented the Board of County Commissioners' ideas
43 when they adopted the Urban Growth Area, against the Planning Commission's
44 recommendations. It does not reflect the Planning Commission's thoughts on the
45 matter. If Item 26 was intended to flesh out Item 25, reflecting John Ahl's motion, it
46 should clarify that the Planning Commission had said the Board of County
47 Commissioners didn't act in accordance with their recommendations and that the
48 Planning Commission was therefore not going to work or comment on the matter

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 further. It would appear Item 26 is backing up what the Board of County
2 Commissioners did, not what the Planning Commission intended.

3
4 Laura Ditmer asked if there were goals and policies that the Planning Commission
5 expected to be established, based on what had been done since last year's Findings of
6 Fact. In addition to the Board of County Commissioners decision and John Ahl's
7 motion at the last meeting, the Planning Commission had also made recommendations
8 regarding approval of changes to the ordinance over the past year. Staff needed the
9 Planning Commission to clarify what they were actually supporting as they go forward.
10 If that was not indicated in the existing wording Findings or Recommendations, Laura
11 would need more clarification; was it the specific goals in Item 26 that were at issue, or
12 did they have some other concerns.

13
14 Deborah Flynn noted that on Item 28, she felt it would be accurate if the sentence were
15 stopped after "effectively implement the proposed final sub area plan." Delete the
16 remainder where it indicated it promoted the public interest...

17
18 William Matchett noted that, if the public interest portion were to be deleted, the
19 sentence should be revised to "...implement the proposed final sub-area plan
20 effectively" with the word "effectively" moved to the end of the sentence.

21
22 Mike Gustavson asked if they were going to approve the Findings of Fact. William
23 Matchett noted it was being suggested that they permit it as Findings. Mike Gustavson
24 again asked if the Planning Commission was agreeing that the Findings of Fact not be
25 approved yet. Removing the "promotes public interest..." would, made sense, but he
26 still questioned whether the wording "and should be approved" should be left in.
27 Deborah Flynn felt it would be fine either way.

28
29 Deborah Flynn noted that, in general, they should delay taking action on this particular
30 item. They should not spend time word-smithing the document at this work/ study
31 when they had a lot of items to address. She recommended reviewing it and each
32 Planning Commission member submitting their comments in writing to Laura Ditmer
33 to prepare a document that would be more acceptable.

34
35 Mike Gustavson stated he agreed and that the same thing applied to Item 27.

36
37 Laura Ditmer clarified all items after Item 25 were deemed to need further work.
38 Deborah Flynn noted there might be some input regarding Item 25, as well. William
39 Matchett felt that Item 25 made sense and reflected their intent.

40
41 With regard to the earlier Findings, John Ahl noted there appeared to be a problem on
42 Page 2 at the bottom, Item 8. It specifically states that "notice was not published by the
43 BoC to indicate that the sub-area plan had been adopted..." It may be that Notice is not
44 legally required, but it is certainly encouraged. Based on the lack of Notice, it would
45 appear to indicate that it had not been formally adopted by the Board of County
46 Commissioners. That left open the question of whether they were really approving or
47 finalizing the Plan; potentially including the Planning Commission's approval of the
48 area.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1
2 Laura Ditmer clarified that the Planning Commission was not being asked to go back
3 and readdress boundaries, size, location and such. They were just reaffirming what had
4 already occurred.

5
6 John Ahl noted he was okay with the wording until the point where the wording begins
7 enumerating goals of the law. He agreed with earlier portions relating to decisions
8 regarding the original Preferred Alternative, while having concerns with zoning being
9 consistent with the Urban Growth Area, Goals #1 and #2. Mike Gustavson noted he
10 disagreed with Goal #12.

11
12 John Ahl noted it might be possible to be a little less specific there. Eliminate all the
13 specific goals and just make a general statement. Laura Ditmer asked if they were
14 comfortable with Goals #4, #9 and #10.

15
16 Lary Coppola, Chair, recommended removing the word “following” from the last
17 sentence of Item 26 and just say “consistent with the goals set forth in...”

18
19 John Ahl noted that perhaps it would be better if they went with the original suggestion
20 postponing a decision and providing input to Staff after further review.

21
22 Laura Ditmer agreed to take the recommendations into consideration at this point and
23 work on it. She then asked the Planning Commission to look at the last page,
24 Recommendations. Staff would like to have the Planning Commission’s input on that.

25
26 Tom Nevins commented he was not comfortable with Recommendation 1, Line 5 where
27 it states “nevertheless recommends approval...” There are a lot of items that were
28 moved in with objections over the last couple of months and he is not comfortable with
29 recommending approval of the narrative text. If that line were stricken, it would read
30 “while declining to provide a specific recommendation on the proposed inclusion of this
31 area within the expanded UGA, removing the part about nevertheless recommending
32 approval. There is a lot in the narrative text that countermands or goes against all the
33 things found in the original Findings of Fact, that this is a logical extension of the
34 Urban Growth Area, etc.

35
36 Monty Mahan asked for and received confirmation that Tom Nevins was requesting
37 removal of the “narrative text” portion.

38
39 William Matchett noted concerns about Recommendation 1 in that it was referred to as
40 a “Recommendation” when they weren’t actually making a recommendation. Lary
41 Coppola, Chair, essentially agreed. William Matchett noted the heading was inaccurate
42 and should possibly be reworded to indicate the “Board of County Commissioners
43 adopted...” The Planning Commission was going along with amendments, not
44 recommending the final Sub-Area Plan or adopting it. The question was raised again as
45 to whether the Board of County Commissioners had already adopted it or if it was
46 merely expressed as their legislative intent.

47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 John Ahl noted that they could work around that, but the reason the wording was there
2 was it was sort of a halfway ground. There had been no formal adoption but the Board
3 of County Commissioners had clearly indicated their intent to do so. Lary Coppola,
4 Chair, asked if that was factual, with John Ahl noting Page 2 seemed to support it.

5
6 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any other questions.

7
8 John Taylor requested that in the future, if they were to receive documents they would
9 be asked to vote on and approve, they should be provided to the Planning Commission
10 several days in advance to allow for a thorough review. He noted that the document
11 before them made reference to Exhibits with which he was unfamiliar.

12
13 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if John Taylor had read all the materials regarding this
14 issue over the last year. John Taylor noted he had spent his entire Sunday afternoon
15 and evening attempting to read up on the necessary paperwork. After that effort, he
16 found he was presented with all new materials with the ones he had been reviewing
17 being discarded. That left him wondering why he had spent so much of his time
18 attempting to familiarize himself with everything if it was going to be changed at the
19 last minute at the meeting.

20
21 Lary Coppola, Chair, welcomed him to the Planning Commission. He also noted, with
22 Staff confirmation, that since John Taylor was new to the Planning Commission and
23 had not attended the meetings addressing these issues, he would not be permitted to
24 vote on this item. John Taylor stated that this would still not appear to be a good use of
25 everyone's time to review the material at the meeting as opposed to a thorough review
26 beforehand.

27
28 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked him to clarify the reason for this concern. John Taylor
29 noted that they should have already had the material to review and come to the meeting
30 with questions or concerns noted and prepared to vote.

31
32 Lary Coppola, Chair, provided clarification of the process. The initial work is done at a
33 Planning Commission work/study or even a Public Hearing, with Staff then providing
34 documentation based on decisions and findings. The materials are provided at the next
35 meeting for further review by the Planning Commission and, as necessary, submitted
36 back to Staff for further revision. The process goes back and forth until the applicable
37 materials meet all parties' requirements, the Planning Commission, Staff and Legal.

38
39 Lary Coppola, Chair, then asked the Planning Commission and Staff, what was
40 necessary to get this finished. The process had been going on for such an extended
41 period that it would be good to decide once and for all what was going on. The
42 Planning Commission needed to get it done and off the docket. It appeared everyone
43 had indicated where he or she felt the issue was. Wording needed to be provided to
44 enable Staff to complete the document and close the matter. He recommended going
45 around the table one time and to get each Commissioner's input.

46
47 Monty Mahan noted that it made sense and a lot of the modifications went back to
48 previous history. He had no real problems with the document as it was presented, but

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 also was agreeable to the issues raised by the other members. His main concern was
2 that the matter move forward.

3
4 Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that in the past they had been critical of an applicant for
5 changing the plan and delaying matters, they were now getting to the point where they
6 had talked about it so much that they were doing the same thing.

7
8 Monty Mahan noted they needed to establish a final date for approval and move on.
9 Lary Coppola, Chair, confirmed that was his point. Monty Mahan restated he was fine
10 with the presented document, but also had no issue with the comments other members
11 had made, as long as they developed a way to get this finalized.

12
13 Lary Coppola, Chair, noted they should all agree on what should be done. Get it written
14 down and back to Staff so they could make those changes and the Planning
15 Commission could vote on it. Laura Ditmer confirmed this would also be addressed at
16 this evening's Public Hearing and could also be presented at the Work Study on June
17 17, 2003.

18
19 Mark Flynn noted that all the concern seemed basically to relate to word-smithing. He
20 wanted to know if Item 26 was actually necessary; could it be excluded since it seemed
21 to be the major hold up.

22
23 Laura Ditmer noted that any time Staff prepared a Findings of Fact and
24 Recommendations from the Planning Commission to the Board of County
25 Commissioners, they needed to reference the Growth Management Act, Kitsap County
26 Comprehensive Plan and the County's policies. Those were all relevant to this process.
27 To the extent that the Goals were very general on Item 26, they specified their relation
28 to the Growth Management Act goals. Under any plan process Staff was required to
29 reference the specific goals to indicate they are in keeping with what's required by the
30 Growth Management Act.

31
32 Lary Coppola, Chair, clarified that Item 26, with the listing of goals, was actually a
33 requirement of the Growth Management Act.

34
35 Laura Ditmer noted the requirement was that Kitsap County plan under Growth
36 Management Act and that was what Staff intended. It is not required to be too specific,
37 only that they must reference the Growth Management Act in some manner.

38
39 William Matchett wanted to know if the second-to-last sentence, "Therefore, the
40 proposed final sub-area plan..." could have the word "more" removed. Laura Ditmer
41 noted the intent was to reference how they were trying to address how they were
42 dealing with the past ordinance.

43
44 William Matchett noted that this was headed to the courts either way. Mike Gustavson
45 noted that the six Goals under Item 26 weren't gong to help Staff.

46
47 Laura Ditmer agreed that was possible. She stated that in working with this over the
48 last year, Staff had attempted to recognize what was done and what was planned. If the

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 Planning Commission wanted the wording changed or more general, that could be done
2 to a great extent. Staff requests that the Planning Commission provide direction to
3 Staff with regard to what they are required to do. The Planning Commission was asked
4 to recognize that there are concepts that are very useful in terms of addressing
5 coordination of open space and infrastructure, urban cluster designations and other
6 areas. This clarification would enable them to plan better, to create the future village as
7 envisioned by the Planning Commission. That was Staff's intent with Item 26,
8 attempting to do a better job with the input they had received thus far.

9
10 Tom Nevins noted that, as William Matchett had mentioned, this was likely to be
11 headed to the courts. The Planning Commission is being asked to pass on this
12 document. He would not want to be in a position of being brought before the court
13 noting they had supported something in the public interest according to the Findings of
14 Fact, when they did not in actuality favor it. He has really been dissuaded off the
15 findings that the Planning Commission originally submitted to the Board of County
16 Commissioners. He does believe the work that has been done since that time has been
17 useful and Staff has done a good job of defining how it could be better. Regardless, this
18 is still not the plan he would prefer to see implemented.

19
20 Deborah Flynn noted that she had been working on the language. She recommended
21 that on Item 26 had the following deleted: Line 3 – more, Line 4 – greater, Line 5 –
22 greater, Line 6 – greater, and Line 7 delete “than the original preferred alternative
23 dated October 26, 2001.” Additionally she would agree with what was originally
24 proposed, deleting specific goals, so that Item 26 reads:

25
26 ***The Planning Commission specifically finds that within the***
27 ***limits of the proposed South Kitsap UGA/ULID #6 Sub-area***
28 ***endorsed by the BoC in Ordinance 269-2002 the proposed final***
29 ***sub-area plan (dated April 22, 2003) makes efficient urban use***
30 ***of the land, provides protection to the natural environment,***
31 ***provides recreational and open space opportunities, and grants***
32 ***assurance regarding the coordinated provision of necessary***
33 ***urban infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed final sub-area***
34 ***plan is found to be generally consistent with the goals set forth***
35 ***in §36.70A.020 RCW.***

36
37 Deborah Flynn noted that she would be comfortable with that wording. Mike
38 Gustavson agreed. It would give some legal support and if Staff wanted to list specific
39 goals, maybe the BoC could add those when the Findings of Fact come before them.

40
41 Lary Coppola, Chair, requested that they review the changes to make sure everyone was
42 in agreement. John Ahl noted that on Item 27 and 28, the wording should be removed
43 “promote the public interest and welfare of the citizens of Kitsap County, and should be
44 approved.”

45
46 John Ahl further noted that in Recommendation 1, on the final page, he recommended
47 deletion of the wording “of the narrative text, goals and policies of the proposed.” That
48 would approve the plan, but would not indicate the Planning Commission's support or

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 endorsement of the Board of County Commissioners decision. Additionally, he noted
2 that the Planning Commission had still not adopted the plan as yet. Notice had not
3 been published, therefore, the plan had not actually be adopted.

4
5 Laura Ditmer confirmed that with the revisions indicated by the Planning Commission
6 at this point, the Findings of Fact would not need to be readdressed at the June 17,
7 2003 Work Study. Staff will implement the requested changes to be consistent with the
8 Planning Commission’s comments.

9
10 John Ahl noted that Legal might still have some problems with the revisions. Lary
11 Coppola, Chair, asked if Laura Ditmer wanted to run it by Legal again and bring it back.
12 Laura Ditmer noted that the Planning Commission was welcome to adopt the changes
13 they had outlined, stipulating that it would be pending Legal Review and it would then
14 just be a matter of the Planning Commission signing off on the final version. If there
15 are any substantive changes after Legal Review, it could be brought back before the
16 Planning Commission at that time.

17
18 ➤ Work Study review of **Comprehensive Plan Amendments**.

19
20 Jason Rice noted that there were two different issues to be addressed and he would
21 attempt to cover both items prior to the Public Hearing.

22
23 Before the Planning Commission was an Initial “Draft” Docket dated 06/02/03
24 replacing the copy dated 05/19/03. Copies of the handout were also provided to
25 audience members who requested it.

26
27 Jason Rice provided a brief summary of what was included in the draft. There were
28 text or area-wide amendments and Potential Policy Revisions. The Draft was
29 specifically designed to allow space for Planning Commission comments on each item
30 covered.

31
32 **General Text Amendments:**

33
34 Item 1 – Health Department was revised to Health District for the sole purpose of
35 reflecting the correct title.

36
37 Item 2 – Changed wording from Vision 2020 throughout the Comprehensive Plan to
38 Destination 2030.

39
40 Item 3 – Clarifies the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council’s position in that they are
41 responsible for making recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

42
43 Item 4 – Removes an expired date while continuing to state the policy’s direction for
44 continuing the monitoring effort.

45
46 Item 5 – Removes a specific date reference, revising it to reflect a 20-year planning
47 process.

48

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 Item 6 – Reflects a general population forecast planning period rather than a specific
2 date.

3
4 **Specific Text Amendments:**

5
6 INTRODUCTION:

7
8 Page 1, Paragraph 3 – Revises the Tables that reflect current census 2000 numbers.
9

10 CHAPTER 1: LAND USE:

11
12 Page 13: Table LU-1 is updated with the specific numbers to reflect the allocations for
13 Kingston and ULID #6.

14
15 Page 24 – Considers deleting a policy and enables Staff, wherever possible, to make
16 mapping corrections an administrative process. This change basically outlines
17 recommendations to reflect the process under the Comprehensive Plan Amendment
18 Process.

19
20 Page 25 – The Health District recommended updates to LU-2 to reflect some recent
21 purchases of park property. Parkland changes to identify Urban Growth Areas have
22 been modified and will also need to be modified on Planning Commission
23 recommendations for site specifics. If the Planning Commission recommends approval
24 of a sub-area change in density zoning, those changes would now be reflected in Table
25 LU-2.

26
27 Page 26 – The Urban Restricted designation and its textual description have been
28 clarified. This will provide Staff with guidelines when establishing Urban Restricted
29 densities. Right now there is a range on the Zoning map of 1-5 homes per acre with
30 Urban Restricted. Projects are often presented with higher densities and Staff will now
31 use this clarification to determine whether to allow those higher densities on various
32 projects. Proximity to critical areas and categories, impervious surface, etc. are all
33 guidelines that will help Staff determine an overall number of homes allowed on a given
34 setting.

35
36 Page 32 – Staff is modifying LU-12 relating to development along Highways 3 and 16
37 relating to commercial development. Essentially, Staff has concluded it is not going to
38 anticipate or plan for this type of use along this corridor at this time.

39
40 Page 34 – There was a discussion last year about business park areas and the
41 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process, relating to property meeting development
42 standards. It was determined that the minimum acreage requirement was not
43 necessary and existing requirements would be addressed through the master planning
44 process.

45
46 CHAPTER 2: RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS:
47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 Page 61 – This discusses limitations for determining LAMIRD (Limited Areas of More
2 Intensive Rural Development). Those areas will be referenced as part of an overall
3 growth policy indicated in the Growth Program that the Board of County
4 Commissioners adopted as part of Findings of Fact on 2001 Comprehensive Plan
5 Amendment Process. These revisions just make this section consistent with that
6 program.

7
8 Page 64 - This is minor word-smithing dealing Port Gamble and allowing the Planning
9 Commission to establish an Advisory Committee, if necessary.

10
11 Page 65, RL-24 – Staff is recommending that Policy RL-24 is no longer applicable as it
12 references demonstration projects that were completed in Manchester and Suquamish.

13
14 Page 65, RL-26 – Revisions have been made in an effort to clarify this policy. If it is
15 determined that there are no significant differences between Rural and Urban
16 Industrial development standards, this policy could be deleted altogether.

17
18 Deborah Flynn asked why the maximum impervious surface was revised to a minimum
19 impervious surface; the text didn't seem to read right. Jason Rice noted rural industrial
20 areas with greater setbacks were what Staff was attempting to address. The minimum
21 impervious surface, attempts to indicate there would be less impervious surface in the
22 rural areas than in urban industrial areas. William Matchett noted that maximum
23 impervious surface would make more sense. Jason Rice proposed that it be changed to
24 maximum allowable? Mike Gustavson recommended that the policy be deleted
25 altogether.

26
27 William Matchett asked if this was going to be addressed at a Public Hearing, which
28 was confirmed by Jason Rice. Once public testimony had been received, they could
29 discuss it further. At that point they could discuss alternative wording, but this was
30 what was being put forward for public testimony and Planning Commission review at
31 this point.

32
33 Page 71, RL-51 – Creates an adjustment allowing for the combination of other
34 geological studies.

35
36 **CHAPTER 5: HOUSING:**

37 Staff went through this portion as far as part of the Growth Management Act
38 compliance process so it is part of the codification. Next year this will be part of the
39 Growth Management Act requirements and Staff will address more revisions at that
40 time.

41
42 Page 105, HS-24 – This is a generalized policy to maintain a commitment to addressing
43 the issue of housing affordability; this just clarifies the overall intent. Lary Coppola,
44 Chair, asked for further clarification. Jason Rice noted that this eliminated the original
45 HS-24 to establish a Committee, with Staff taking on the responsibility of reviewing
46 policies pertaining to this Chapter as part of Growth Management Act compliance.

47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked who was responsible for determining affordability. Tom
2 Nevins and Mark Flynn both stated that there is an existing standard. Lary Coppola,
3 Chair, noted he was unfamiliar with that standard.

4
5 Mike Gustavson said the definition of affordability should be included in this portion.
6 Jason Rice noted it was already provided in other sections. Mike Gustavson and Lary
7 Coppola, Chair, stressed that it should be addressed at some point and appeared to be
8 applicable to this section.

9
10 It was further clarified that the definition was specifically included in the Growth
11 Management Act. Lary Coppola, Chair, stated that he would like to see some reference
12 as to how it's defined and Jason Rice agreed.

13
14 ➤ Work Study review of **Interim Growth Forest Plan Amendment**.

15
16 Clyde Stricklin noted that a Consultant, Triangle Associates, Inc. had been hired as a
17 facilitator to meet with the Interim Growth Forest groups of landowners, tribes and
18 environmental interest with their Consultant Report provided to the Planning
19 Commission. Clyde Stricklin also distributed two letters that were received after initial
20 consideration, as well as proposed amendments based on the combined information
21 and input to-date.

22
23 Page 67, Paragraphs 6 and 7 – These two paragraphs relate to the status of the Interim
24 Growth Forest plan and the process that has been developed through various meetings
25 and Staff's recommendations. The revisions apply to the whole of the Interim Growth
26 Forest designated areas and maintain that existing designation. It allows for
27 development of clustering, exempting the limit of one unit per five acres, provided the
28 clustering retains a minimum of 75% of Interim Growth Forest. There are a lot of other
29 items to be discussed, to design aspects of rural areas and shoreline discussion, which
30 are a major part, but the discussions have not reached that point to-date.

31
32 It was noted that Staff was not being asked to make a decision regarding this matter at
33 this Work Study. It was intended that they would review the material with input
34 provided to Staff at the June 17, 2003 meeting.

35
36 ➤ Work Study review of **LAMIRD (Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural**
37 **Development) – North Kitsap**

38
39 Jason Rice noted that the Planning Commission could always continue this matter until
40 July 1 when site-specific amendments came forward. With the decision to proceed,
41 Jason provided two handouts to the Planning Commission. One was a Power Point
42 presentation that he had intended to review in more detail but would summarize due to
43 time constraints. The second document was the actual Staff Report.

44
45 For clarification, Jason Rice, noted that during the first Comprehensive Planning
46 process the Board of County Commissioners provided Staff with additional direction
47 with regard to two amendments and rezones. One area is known as George's Corner,
48 the other is Pioneer Way near Edgewater Estates. Both had rezone, site-specific

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 requests converting from Rural to Industrial and Commercial zoning. Commercial
2 zoning was being requested at the SE Corner of George’s Corner. Industrial zoning was
3 requested just north of Pioneer Way near Edgewater Estates, just north of Poulsbo.

4
5 The Board of County Commissioners had approved both of those for consideration as
6 rezones with further direction to Staff to landline those areas as potential LAMIRD
7 properties. In order to be consistent with the Growth Management Act requirements,
8 Staff was required to provide a detailed analysis of the properties in question. The
9 initial process involved looking through old permits to determine a number of issues.
10 The Staff Report, on Page 3, identifies potential boundaries of those areas, thereby
11 eliminating sprawl and piece meal properties. The intent was to enhance the existing
12 properties beyond what already existed and was established prior to 1990. The logical
13 boundary process would assist with determining how to identify these areas in order to
14 limit further expansion. The Board of County Commissioners will use these proposed
15 boundaries and the associated information as a method for retaining those areas while
16 preventing future sprawling into non-Urban areas.

17
18 State Statute identifies four areas that Staff is required to address, as indicated on Page
19 3, Item (iv):

- 20
21 1. The need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and
22 communities.
23
24 2. Physical boundaries such as bodies of water, streets and highways, land forms
25 and contours.
26
27 3. The prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries.
28
29 4. The ability to provide public facilities and public services in a manner that does
30 not permit low-density sprawl.
31

32 William Matchett and Mike Gustavson asked for clarification as to which document
33 they were looking at. Jason Rice noted it was the document handed out today titled
34 “Limited Area of More Intensive Development George’s Corner Pioneer Way Staff
35 Report” with maps from 1992 and 2001 on the cover.

36
37 John Ahl asked for clarification as to why these two areas were being spotlighted for
38 consideration. Jason Rice noted that Staff was specifically directed to review these two
39 areas by the Board of County Commissioners.

40
41 John Ahl also noted that LAMIRD identified them as limited commercial. Jason Rice
42 noted the Planning Commission should keep in mind that the Planning Commission
43 had not received public testimony on this matter and any designation of LAMIRD
44 would require a Public Hearing. John Ahl noted it seemed like LAMIRD would be a
45 term nobody would understand. Jason Rice noted one of the other areas discussed was
46 Keyport and was being referred to as a mixed-use area.
47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 John Ahl asked if there were any other properties on the list for consideration, such as
2 Hansville. Jason Rice noted that Hansville was not under consideration at this time.

3
4 Mike Gustavson noted that the underlined phrase “permanent boundary” could be
5 excessive. Jason Rice clarified that it was one of the requirements that the boundary be
6 permanent in accordance with Urban Growth Area; it could not be adjusted. The Board
7 of County Commissioners were familiar with the area and the requirement for
8 permanent boundaries. Those boundaries would remain in effect for as long the law
9 stands.

10
11 Jason Rice noted that, keeping in mind the four requirements previously mentioned,
12 the starting point on this was determining existing development prior to the Growth
13 Management Act in 1990. Both George’s Corner and Pioneer Way had some
14 development prior to 1990.

15
16 Regarding George’s Corner, staff noted a blue area in the northeast corner and
17 southwest corner as having existing development prior to 1990 with industrial areas
18 included on those properties as well as a corner gas station and business established
19 prior to 1990. This was the baseline used for beginning a boundary around George’s
20 Corner. Last year there was a rezone on the southeast corner for the North Sound Bank
21 that included the potential for another development there. Albertson’s was not include
22 as they were a major regional shopping center with a number of uses associated with it
23 and a strict type of development to include restaurants, dry cleaning, banks, etc.
24 Additionally, that all occurred after 1990 so didn’t meet the qualifying requirements
25 with regard to the boundary determination. Based on the information, Staff is
26 recommended a small boundary to contain the commercial area at George’s Corner.
27 They haven’t drawn an actual boundary at this time due to an issue dealing with the
28 property on the northwest corner and an application that is currently before the
29 Planning Commission. How that application is resolved will be a determining factor for
30 the final boundary recommendation.

31
32 William Matchett asked what the circle indicated on the map indicated if a boundary
33 had not been determined. Jason Rice noted that was the boundary based on current
34 information, pending a decision on the application before the Planning Commission.
35 The yellow line on the map presented by Staff was used to identify a radius around
36 those properties developed prior to 1990. The red box indicated the extreme if all four
37 corners were to be taken to a cornered intersection. Staff used natural limitations to
38 help determine the boundary issues. An additional map was provided which showed
39 parcels at the intersections, headwaters to Grover Street, as well as some lake areas,
40 Gamble Bay on the westerly portion. The proposed area is a plateau with urban spaces
41 on either side.

42
43 William Matchett noted that the biggest development, Albertson’s, was not included.
44 That was confirmed. Jason Rice noted there were a couple of decisions before the
45 Board of County Commissioners that would allow provisions for infill development, but
46 they were not currently allowed. Staff was limited to developments existing prior to
47 1990. The Staff report addresses issues such as like water, road infrastructure and
48 existing buildings. The process involved going through the Assessors Records and

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1 identifying buildings that were permitted prior to 1990, as listed on Page 6 of the Staff
2 report.

3
4 Deborah Flynn noted she had heard a rumor that North Sound Bank was no longer
5 planned as part of George's Corner and that there might be a gas station put in at that
6 location instead. She stressed that the Planning Commission could make a decision
7 based on a specific presentation, only to have the zoning change they agreed to lead to a
8 different circumstance altogether. Staff noted they were not aware of any such change
9 in planned development, but that it was true that zoning changes did not limit
10 development to an exclusive use. Laura Ditmer and Shannon Bauman both noted that
11 when Staff analyzes property for rezoning, they attempt to take potential uses into
12 consideration, not just what is being proposed because of that type of possibility.

13
14 Pioneer Way was addressed next and noted to be a more difficult property to analyze
15 with the established guidelines. The majority of development occurred after 1990 with
16 the Industrial Park permitting starting in the early 1990's. It was suggested that there
17 may have been discussions about pouring of concrete prior to 1990 but there were no
18 permits to substantiate that. The earliest permit appears to have been issued in 1994.
19 There were three parcels with existing buildings; one being at the intersection of
20 Highway 3 and Pioneer Way, another identified as Old Hilltop Tavern and a
21 Community Youth Center associated with a cemetery. There was also an industrial
22 storage area associate with a sheetrock facility to the south. All of these were in
23 development prior to 1990. The area was indicated on the map for the Planning
24 Commission. An additional map was provided indicating the impact from an
25 environmental perspective is noted in the Findings based on what was already
26 established. Staff is recommending that this area remain Industrial with no boundary
27 established. Future opportunities to discuss this area as part of the Rural Policy
28 discussions would be a more appropriate place to take up this issue. At this point Staff
29 is recommending no action with regard to the Pioneer Way boundary by the Planning
30 Commission at this time.

31
32 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any questions.

33
34 Deborah Flynn asked about the submittals, were they the same except for the front
35 page (which had showed only two maps, the newer handout had four maps). Jason
36 Rice noted that they were not the same. The initial document contained a brief
37 analysis, whereas the more recent handout had detailed findings after further study had
38 been done.

39
40 Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no there were no other questions.

41
42 Laura Ditmer noted there were two additional handouts; one was an agenda for the
43 Public Hearing, the other was from Shannon Bauman relating to a draft environment
44 impact statement addressed to the Planning Commission for their review.

45
46 John Ahl asked if the new handout had anything substantive. Laura Ditmer noted that
47 it was only informational and that if they wanted to review it and provide comments the
48 Staff would like to hear them.

1
2 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if the Joint meeting between the Board of County
3 Commissioners and Planning Commission had been set and Laura Ditmer noted that it
4 had not been confirmed. Holly Anderson would be advised to follow-up with Lary
5 Coppola, Chair, in determining an appropriate date. It appeared the joint meeting
6 would occur in either August or September. The next work/study was confirmed as
7 June 17, 2003 at 9:00 a.m. There would not be an afternoon joint meeting with the
8 Board of County Commissioners on that date.

9
10 Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was any other business and there was none.

11
12 **5:30 P.M.**

13
14 **No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.**

15
16
17 **DOCUMENTS ADDRESSED AT MEETING**

18

19 Exhibit No.	Description
20	
21 A.	Findings of Fact... Proposed Adoption of the Kingston Sub-Area
22	Plan
23 B.	Findings of Fact... Proposed Adoption of the South Kitsap
24	Industrial Area Plan and Corollary Amendments to the Kitsap
25	County Comprehensive Plan and Implementing Regulations
26 C.	Findings of Fact... Proposed Adoption of a Proposed Final South
27	Kitsap UGA/ULID #6 Sub-Area Plan, Corollary Amendments to
28	the Comprehensive Plan and Implementing Regulations, all as
29	Directed by County Ordinance 269-2002.
30 D.	2003 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Initial "Draft" Docket
31 E.	Interim Rural Forest Lands Consultant Report dated 6/2/03
32 F.	Letter dated 5/20/03 from Alpine Evergreen Re: 2003 Interim
33	Rural Wooded Incentive Program and Shoreline Preservation
34	Program
35 G.	Letter dated 6/3/03 from Tom Donnelly Re: Proposed Zoning
36	Ordinance Changes for Interim Rural Forest
37 H.	Interim Rural Forest Plan Amendment
38 I.	North Kitsap Analysis – LAMIRD Presentation
39 J.	Limited Area of More Intensive Development – George's Corner &
40	Pioneer Way Staff Report dated 5/20/03
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 3, 2003

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____, 2003.

Lary Coppola, Chair

Planning Commission Secretary