

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Work/Study Session

June 27, 2006

1
2
3
4
5
6 The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County
7 Administration Building, Commissioners Chambers located at 619 Division Street Port Orchard,
8 Washington 98366. Members present: Deb Flynn, John Ahl, Tom Nevins, Dean Jenniges, Brian
9 Bekeny, John Taylor, Mike Gustavson, and Lary Coppola. Staff Present: Eric Baker, Scott
10 Diener, Angie Silva, Scott Diener, James Weaver, and Planning Commission Secretary, Bryan
11 Pierce.

12
13 9:15AM

14
15 Approval of Minutes

16 Chair Flynn set the minutes of June 13, 2006 aside for approval for the next Planning
17 Commission Meeting.

18
19 **Eric Baker:** Informed the Planning Commission of the very tight schedule for the 10-year
20 Comprehensive Plan Update. The next steps are focused on Alternative 2. Friday the Planning
21 Commission will receive a new packet of information including a preferred alternative from the
22 Silverdale Citizen Advisory Group, a recommendation from the Port Orchard City Council
23 regarding the Port Orchard/ South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan, and an order of magnitude analysis.
24 The Order of Magnitude Analysis is a miniature Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The
25 Order of Magnitude does not include the Silverdale or Port Orchard recommendations. The next
26 meeting will be on July 10, 2006 which is a joint Public Hearing to receive written and oral
27 testimony on the alternatives. At the meeting you will hear from individuals about the Land Use
28 Reclassification Requests, the Illahee Forest folks, and there will be discussion about the South
29 Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) and the International Speedway Corporation (ISC).

30
31 **Lary Coppola:** Feels that Alternative 2 is what the Planning Commission is supposed to
32 approve and it sounds like it is a done deal.

33
34 **Baker:** Informed Coppola that is not the case. For better or worse, the Planning Commission
35 needs to focus on Alternative 2, which needs to be tighter to do an accurate EIS. Through the
36 approval process, there will be opportunity to make amendments to the alternative. What ever
37 comes out of July is not the final document; although, if you are looking at large expansions of
38 properties like in the Royal Valley area North of Waaga Way, that should be included in
39 Alternative 2 in July. If you are tinkering 40 acres here and there, that can be included through
40 out the process. We are getting to the point where we need to make sure all of the major areas
41 have been discussed. Fortunately we have Citizen Advisory Groups that work very hard.

42
43 **Mike Gustavson:** Stated there is a Capital Facilities cost associated with the Alternatives,
44 and in some cases the Capital Facilities are already installed in part on one area, but not
45 the other. Gustavson asked Baker if that topic will be discussed with the public.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Baker:** Informed him Capital Facilities have been discussed with numerous Stakeholder groups.
2 The order of magnitude will have some discussion about costs.

3
4 **Gustavson:** Stated that the subject was in the paper about the cost rising for the
5 Manchester sewer.

6
7 **Baker:** Stated that Growth Management tends to look at urban densities and urban growth areas
8 that require sewer. Staff has heard a wide variety of opinions on the matter and there will probably
9 be public testimony on the idea of not having to sewer and entire Urban Growth Area.

10
11 **John Ahl:** Asked if the Planning Commission will be expected on July 11th to propose and
12 vote on changes to Alternative 2 based on the public testimony.

13
14 **Baker:** Informed him that the meeting will be an open ended discussion between the Planning
15 Commission and hopefully there will be some kind of consensus as to which area to look at. One
16 issue may be what if the Planning Commission is torn between including or excluding an area.
17 Staff would most likely take both to the Board saying the Planning Commission is split on this
18 area.

19
20 **Ahl:** Asked if the Planning Commission has a meeting on the 12th.

21
22 **Baker:** Informed him that it was the work/study session for the Board. Baker said this is not the
23 final decision, but just a way to get closer incrementally, rather than pound it all out at the very
24 end. Baker also informed the Planning Commission that staff will have a recommendation on the
25 Alternatives.

26
27 Dean Jenniges arrived.

28
29 **Baker:** Reiterated to the Planning Commission that the July 11th Planning Commission meeting is
30 to refine Alternative 2 and generally meet the population projections for the area. You will also
31 have the opportunity to take into account the Citizen Advisory Groups recommendations. The
32 Planning Commission has deferred very often to the CAG discussions. Things that will
33 complicate this will be the City of Port Orchard's recommendation for South Kitsap which has an
34 impact, so it will be an interesting discussion on which one of the alternatives we look at, or if we
35 take certain pieces of the alternatives. The importance of this is to improve the EIS and Capital
36 Facilities Plan. The closer the range, the better off we will be in regards to getting funding
37 mechanisms and cost. Baker feels Silverdale will be contentious and Central Kitsap and South
38 Kitsap will be time consuming.

39
40 **Ahl:** Recalled at the last meeting North West Bremerton and Silverdale were hot items
41 and asked Baker if it has been solved.

42
43 **Baker:** Stated the Urban Separator has been recommended to be included by the Silverdale
44 Citizen Advisory Committee. It is there recommendation and the recommendation of Alternative
45 2 that the separator be included. Staff is still formulating their recommendation on the idea of
46 East Bremerton and Central Kitsap banking of population, but we have the expectation that we
47 will be recommending some sort of banking.

48

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Gustavson:** Stated the meeting in Seattle to discuss the racetrack made Commissioner
2 Angel hold off on any recommendation. Gustavson would like some feedback as to what
3 Commissioner Angel learned early on.
4

5 **Baker:** Is under the impression that Commissioner Angel had concerns about process; with this
6 being the 10-year update, this may or may not be the appropriate place to do this. With that being
7 said, Commissioner Angel recommended that be included in Alternative 3 so that it would at least
8 get an environmental review at a business center level. It is unknown if it will be rolled into
9 alternative 2.
10

11 **Coppola:** Asked what the impact would be on all of the alternatives if I-933 passed.
12

13 **Baker:** Stated he will only speak as a staff member, there a lot of concerns about down-zoning, or
14 the decreasing of property values with I-933. A number of people would be pleased, because this
15 would actually accentuate the property values. The dollar would come before the planning. When
16 you are trying to do Community Planning as a whole, putting a dollar amount first, will be
17 extremely difficult.
18

19 **Coppola:** Stated that he is curious because the pass or fail of I-933 will happen in
20 November, and the 10-Year update is supposed to be finished in December.
21

22 **Dean Jenniges:** Stated that the GMA still takes precedence. You are still required to have
23 two decades of pre-planning identifying urban growth areas. Jenniges feels the only thing I-
24 933 will have an impact on the properties with critical areas on them where they are
25 almost useless. The Planning process is dictated by the State, not County Government.
26

27 **Chair Flynn:** Is concerned about the increase in value and how the County is working with
28 TDR's ordinance being in conjunction with that. Flynn does not want to lose any
29 opportunities there by up-zoning properties before there is a TDR ordinance in place.
30

31 **Baker:** Generally when a jurisdiction adopts a TDR program, it takes a few years for it to actually
32 get tinkered with appropriately to work. The TDR program is being developed right now by
33 attaching site specifics or UGA expansions to it.
34

35 **Chair Flynn:** Asked if there is a policy that can be added to identify the UGAs, but not re-
36 zone anything yet without the TDR.
37

38 **Baker:** Said the issue can be discussed and would probably be a land mine if it were to be utilized
39 at this point.
40

41 **Chair Flynn:** Asked if the land could be designated urban but when the TDR Ordinance
42 is adopted, it will take affect.
43

44 **Baker:** Stated that could be accomplished with language, but TDRs have not had the public
45 involvement process and there are two, two-year planning processes that this has not been
46 discussed at.
47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Jenniges:** Commented that he thought once the Urban Growth Areas are taken into
2 consideration, the citizen’s advisory committees had taken sewer, transportation, etc into
3 consideration, and if the population moves in the zoning would take care of the issues,
4 instead of having the TDR program on top of it.
5

6 **Baker:** Stated that is how it has been slated to work in the past throughout the citizen advisory
7 group processes. A draft is coming out in July to show that any future site specifics, any desires for
8 higher densities can be accomplished through TDR.
9

10 **John Taylor:** Asked if there are any adjustments being made to population allocations
11 because the school districts are complaining that the population allocation is going down
12 and it makes it seem that the adult population is going down as well.
13

14 **Baker:** Stated there have not been any changes to the population projections that were approved
15 through the county-wide planning policies in 2004. Baker understands the school districts are
16 concerned about the flux, but class sizes do flux up and down. The middle range of the office of
17 financial management projections is the conservative way to go.
18

19 **Taylor:** Asked if the Planning Commission will have an opportunity to vote upon the 80
20 reclassification requests.
21

22 **Baker:** Stated that is something the Planning Commission as a body will need to discuss. There
23 will be citizens coming on the 10th of July, in September, and before the Board of County
24 Commissioners to discuss their personal property.
25

26 **Taylor:** Asked Chair Flynn if the Planning Commission will be discussing that matter.
27

28 **Chair Flynn:** Stated that it is up to the staff’s process.
29

30 **Baker:** Recommended voting upon the requests at the meetings in September.
31

32 **Ahl:** Asked if a great number of the requests will become moot as a result of adoption of
33 one of the alternative.
34

35 **Baker:** Agreed that it would be moot.
36

37 **Ahl:** Has a fear that the Planning Commission will consume all of their time listening to
38 individual reclassification requests rather than the larger planning issues, which really need
39 to be focused on in the 10-Year Update.
40

41 **Baker:** Stated that prioritizing that would be beneficial. If you are going to take on site specifics,
42 you need to take them on last, after all of the big ticket items. This way you will also have the
43 ability to asses each one of the reclassification requests is inherently in opposition to anything you
44 have decided on.
45

46 **Chair Flynn:** Reminded the Planning Commission that on July 10th there will be a joint
47 hearing to allow people to speak where Commissioner Angel will be the chair. She will be
48 the one to decide if people are allowed to speak about their properties or not.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Baker:** Informed Chair Flynn that the meeting is to allow the public to speak.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

Gustavson: Supports what Ahl is saying. He stated that there have been a number of instances where people want to make double sure that their property is included, and if there is a way to filter those out who are already included and only let the people who are not included yet speak, it would be very helpful.

Jenniges: Stated that the citizen's committees have all taken into consideration those outside of the urban growth area.

Coppola: Disagreed with Jenniges and reminded him that Port Orchard passed the 85 land use reclassifications on.

Jenniges: Recalled the Planning Commission discussing the properties.

Coppola: Reminded him that they were discussed, but not acted upon.

Baker: Staff will most likely take all of the requests and insert them into a table to set them aside to talk about all of the big ticket items. Baker informed the Planning Commission that the idea of the upcoming meetings is to refine alternative 2. Any large areas from alternative 3 that you feel should be in alternative 2, is the type of thing that needs to be discussed. Staff would like to get an idea of where the planning commission stands as far as if you are split or not. The Commissioner's met the following day.

Jenniges: Asked which alternative 2 is going to be refined.

Baker: Explained that each UGA has three alternatives, 1, 2, and 3. The Planning Commission will be receiving two additional things. The first is a map of the proposed Silverdale UGA that the citizen's advisory group decided upon. The second is the City of Port Orchard recommendation on the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan. Silverdale and Port Orchard will have a 2A to accommodate the additional maps. Baker reminded the Planning Commission of the big ticket items which include testing 4 dwelling units per acre for all urban low and urban cluster land; currently the standard is 5 dwelling units per acre. This has two affects, the first; it allows people to develop on ½ acre lots in the urban growth areas. It still requires them to locate on sewer, but it would allow for a larger lot size and a slightly different housing stock. The other affects are it could inflate the UGAs, or cause additional upzoning.

Jenniges: Asked for clarification about requiring sewer.

Baker: Stated that according to the Health district, 12,500 square foot lots are roughly the size lots needed to entertain septic systems. Once you get to a ¼ acre lot, the Health District is not going to approve sub-divisions without a sewer availability letter on it.

Jenniges: Questioned that if there is sewer on the property, 4 dwelling units per acre will be in affect.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Baker:** Stated that this will allow developers in urban low and urban cluster zones do develop on 4
2 instead of 5 dwelling units per acre. 4 dwelling units per acre are consistent with GMA and the
3 hearings board bright line.

4
5 **Gustavson:** Asked for clarification on whose standard is being tested. Weather it is the
6 County's or the Hearing's Board.

7
8 **Baker:** Informed him that Kitsap County's is being tested as consistent with the Hearing's Board
9 determination on GMA.

10
11 **Gustavson:** Stated that the Planning Commission voted for 5 dwelling units per acre and
12 the bright-line was really 4.

13
14 **Baker:** Asked Gustavson if he is referring to 1998 or recently.

15
16 **Gustavson:** Said it was about five years ago.

17
18 **Baker:** Stated that in 1998 and with the Sub-Area Plans that have been followed up, Kitsap
19 County has utilized 5 dwelling units per acre as the minimum due to the cost of extending sewer.
20 People can still do 5, 6, or 7, if they reduce it to 4.

21
22 **Gustavson:** Asked at 4 clustered dwelling units per acre, is the proper amount of drain
23 field provided.

24
25 **Baker:** Informed the Planning Commissioners that the Comprehensive Plan will likely discuss a
26 number of alternative systems beyond single onsite septic systems and community drain fields.
27 We will also be looking at a wide variety of sewer options including package plants.

28
29 **Taylor:** Stated that he would testify that you cannot put a septic system on ¼ acre lots.
30 There is not enough room for a septic or reserve system and stormwater containment.

31
32 **Taylor:** Asked for clarification if Baker said 12,500 square feet is the bright-line to have
33 sewer.

34
35 **Baker:** Stated that he would not use the term "bright-line", but would indicate that is where the
36 health district has their cut-off for sub-division approval in an urban growth area.

37
38 **Nevins:** Stated that he thinks the question that Mike Gustavson and John Taylor are trying
39 to ask is; can an acre of land accommodate the sewage of 10 people?

40
41 **Baker:** Informed the Planning Commission that he will ask the Health District for clarification of
42 the question.

43
44 **Baker:** Reminded the Planning Commissioners of the last meetings discussion of Parks Zoning.
45 There is a parks designation on the Comp Plan, meaning anything County owned all have a parks
46 designation; but then, they have an underlying zone on the zoning map. There is a concern that
47 under hard times, the County could take the land and sell it. Some groups are concerned about
48 taking part of park land and leaving open the option to convert to residential. They would like to

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 see park zoning, which strips out anything other than parks and open space uses on the property.
2 There are pluses and minuses to that. The pluses are when you move next to a park, it will stay a
3 park until the zoning changes. The minuses are; if you are purchasing a piece of property because
4 of the underlying zoning, then you wipe away the zoning, having wiped away the value underneath
5 of it.

6
7 **Jenniges:** Questioned what Baker just stated. He was under the impression that property is
8 valued at its potential use.
9

10 **Baker:** Stated that the issue would arise when the county goes out to purchase new parks that
11 have an underlying zone, at 5-9 dwelling units per acre then the zoning would be purchased at
12 that. Then, the zoning would acquire a parks zone that would have the ability to take away the 5-9
13 dwelling units per acre; leaving you only with parks and open space, which can be viewed as
14 reducing property value.
15

16 **Coppola:** Stated that if the county buys the land, it comes off the tax rolls leaving the
17 property value becomes a moot point.
18

19 **Ahl:** Asked if the potential capacity of park land visa vis underlying residential zoning is
20 included in the capacity analysis for determining the urban growth areas.
21

22 **Baker:** Stated that at this time it does. In the Illahee Forest, for every acre developed we are
23 counting one dwelling unit.
24

25 **Ahl:** Asked if that is a determinate for determining the boundary for the UGA.
26

27 **Baker:** Explained that is not true.
28

29 **Baker:** Responded to Lary Coppola's comment regarding the tax rolls. The County is trying to
30 make sure there are no bonding capacity issues and we are not de-valuing property to potentially
31 fund other county services such as the actual development and maintenance of the parks.
32

33 **Chair Flynn:** Commented that it seems like a home equity loan; where we don't want to
34 necessarily reduce the equity.
35

36 **Baker:** Stated that could be the issue, but the complexity of government funding issues is beyond
37 that.
38

39 **Baker:** Informed the Planning Commission that the use of urban restricted zone is between 1 and
40 5 dwelling units per acre and it is one of the few ways in which we can allow development below 4
41 dwelling units per acre in an UGA. The hearings board has allowed significantly critical areas
42 constrained properties to be reduced to 1-5 dwelling units per acre. It has been an interest to both
43 sides of the issue. The urban restricted zone is to be utilized on only those properties with critical
44 areas constraints on them. The urban restricted zone is also meant to apply to those properties
45 inside the UGA. The area north of Wagga Way is being proposed urban restricted. Additionally,
46 the CAG has recommended that the Apex Road area be zoned urban restricted. The last general
47 topic is the idea of allocation banking. Certain UGAs such as East Bremerton and Central Kitsap
48 are restricted by where they can expand to. The City of Bremerton has indicated that both of

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 these urban growth areas are in their 20-year plan annexation. It is the department's
2 recommendation that any residual population that cannot be accommodated through up-zoning
3 in either of these UGAs, and expansion into the urban restricted area have the population be
4 banked for discussions in 2008 with the City of Bremerton. The City has interest in annexations.
5

6 **Jenniges:** Commented that he disagrees with East Bremerton's lack of desire to be
7 residentially expanded.
8

9 **Baker:** Stated there is a lot of development currently going on around properties, but there are
10 little pockets in the UGA that have difficulties due to development pattern around it without
11 sewer.
12

13 **Jenniges:** Has heard from a few of the Bremerton City Councilmen that Bremerton
14 cannot annex because people do not want to be annexed towards Kitsap Lake.
15

16 **Baker:** Stated there are multiple ways to annex property, including the petition method and the
17 resolution method. Jurisdictions are hesitant to use the resolution method.
18

19 **Ahl:** Feels population banking is an intriguing concept and asked if it passed muster with
20 legal.
21

22 **Baker:** Stated that it is something that will take some explaining. There are a number of good
23 reasons why this is necessary, but is not rock solid according to GMA.
24

25 **Ahl:** Commented that it seem it recognizes that you are dealing with imprecise numbers
26 no matter what you do.
27

28 **Baker:** Stated that the fun part of the 10-Year update is that there have not been a lot of updates
29 completed and even fewer challenged at this time. Snohomish County is the only one that has
30 been challenged and it is still being decided on. As usual, Kitsap County will possibly be breaking
31 ground on the 10-year update. One of the issues will be if we have to allocate every stitch of
32 population or if we can bank a certain amount of it for later discussions.
33

34 **A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by Lary Coppola that planning that goes
35 forward from the Comp Plan be done under the rules of the contiguous city.**
36

37 **Nevins:** The Planning Commission could make that recommendation, but do they need
38 to?
39

40 **Gustavson:** Reminded Nevins that the Planning Commission is here to make
41 recommendations to the Board.
42

43 **Ahl:** Does not disagree with the idea, but feels it is key to understand that Poulsbo wanted
44 this, and there had to be a negotiation, and besides the fact that it is a good concept, Ahl
45 will have to vote against the motion because the Planning Commission is pre-mature to
46 start voting on things for the 10-Year update.
47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Jenniges:** Agrees with John Ahl and feels the Planning Commission may be putting the
2 cart before the horse. The Cities need to figure out which way they want to go and how
3 they are going to do it. Jenniges knows the Bremerton City Council is in turmoil and
4 would vote against the motion.
5

6 **Baker:** Stated that staffs perspective would be to encourage the development of the Urban Growth
7 Area management agreements which would include utilizing the component of development
8 standards. These things need to be negotiated through the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
9 and through inter-local agreements with the cities themselves.
10

11 **Gustavson:** Asked Baker if he felt they should wait until the update is over to decide on a
12 vote such as the one on the table.
13

14 **Baker:** Stated the negotiation of an inter-local agreement to this scope, would likely take a year of
15 solid negotiation with just one city. The City of Poulsbo was relatively easy because they were the
16 only game in town. Their UGA was their UGA. When the County starts talking to the City of
17 Port Orchard about their UGA, McCormick Woods, SKIA and Gorst will also be brought up
18 because they are big ticket items that will take a lot of negotiation between Bremerton, Port
19 Orchard, and the County.
20

21 **The Vote: Motion failed.**
22

23 **Baker:** Stated that in regards to banking it is primarily going to be used in East Bremerton and
24 Central Kitsap. It would make sense to potentially bank anything left over in West Bremerton,
25 except there are interested parties in the expansion areas. There is interest in when the sewers will
26 come down to do urban medium or urban low which would likely absorb the remaining
27 population. As sewer is running through, it would likely be staff's recommendation to
28 accommodate the population allocation in the West Bremerton UGA, due to the fact that there is
29 enough quality planning concepts and ideas that can be put on the map at this time that would
30 keep us from doing a future process. This has also been supported by the City of Bremerton.
31

32 **Chair Flynn:** Stated that if the population allocation is determined by the minimum
33 number of units per acre rather than the average, and then declaring we are under, is a
34 misperception of what is really going on. Flynn asked why we have to use the
35 minimum rather than the average.
36

37 **Baker:** Stated that the Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA), establishes the minimum as the
38 means in which we determine what a zone can handle due to the fact that is all the County can
39 require. If you look at urban densities over the past 5 years, you are looking at them being closer
40 to 4 -5 dwelling units per acre, not 7-9. While there is a turn to that, it is too early to say that will
41 be the predominant land pattern. It would also be a little late in the process to make a change like
42 that. We have the ability to look at the population allocation five years from now and our urban
43 growth areas, 10 years from now. If we find that we are absorbing the land too fast or too slow,
44 changes could be made.
45

46 **Chair Flynn:** Commented that land is probably not going to be taken out of the urban
47 growth area.
48

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Baker:** Stated that has not happened before.

2

3

Nevins: Commented that another large element in the decision to use the bottom scale of the dwelling units per acre is that it has been encouraged heavily by the development community to use the largest dwelling unit possible.

6

7

Jenniges: Asked what Nevins' point was.

8

9

Nevins: Explained that is why we are the low end of the zoning allowance to determine the capacity.

10

11

12

Taylor: Asked if staff would speak with the City of Port Orchard about getting parking passes for the Planning Commission meetings.

13

14

Baker: Informed the Planning Commission that it is being looked into.

16

BREAK

18

Baker: Informed the Planning Commission that there is a new zoning near the Central Kitsap Junior High and High School that requires mixed use. For years mixed use has been encouraged and allowed in all commercial zones. That would be between 10 and 24 dwelling units per acre. The mixed use zone would have the requirement that mixed use go into this zone if it were to be re-developed. Mixed use to many people means commercial on the bottom floor and residential on the top floor. This zone would take mixed use to another level. This would allow commercial and industrial on the same site without necessarily having one be over the top of the other. As long as they are integrated into one another in one project, that should be adequate enough. The idea behind the mixed use zone is to create a walk-able community located around the school campus. The requirement to have one above the other doesn't seem necessary. There are people concerned that the zone has not been documented as to exactly what it will be. There will be testimony about the mixed use zone on the 10th and throughout the process. The development regulations will be done the end of August. We will be working with the stakeholders groups for input on what they like and don't like.

33

34

Gustavson: Asked if the area being bulldozed near the Junior High and High School is the area Eric is referring to.

35

36

Baker: Stated he is unaware of any development going on in that area.

38

39

Gustavson: Clarified the area he is referring to as near Target.

40

41

Baker: Informed him that area is half commercial and half urban medium. The development is going to be senior housing in the back and commercial in the front.

42

43

Brian Bekeny: Asked Baker for examples of mixed use in the area.

45

Baker: Stated there are two proposals going in Manchester for large scale developments. Kitsap County is not an established market for mixed use. Generally you will see a variety of office spaces, coffee shops etc. and residential on top. Gig Harbor has some mixed use as well as

48

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 Bainbridge Island and Tacoma. We are looking for a diversity of housing stock. We understand
2 Kitsap County is very single family residence oriented, but we want to provide a few other hosing
3 options. Not necessarily what would be considered affordable hosing in all instances, but starter
4 homes have moved out of the single family residence availability to young people.
5

6 **Gustavson:** Stated that under the objectives in affordable housing, the Commissioner's said
7 we are going to define affordable housing as the bankers and realtors do, so we know what
8 affordable hosing is as opposed to subsidized housing.
9

10 **Baker:** Stated that the County is looking to clarify affordable housing.
11

12 **Gustavson:** Feels affordable should be what you can pay out of your paycheck.
13

14 **Baker:** Said mixed use is going to be something that will be discussed. We are currently doing an
15 adequate amount of analysis for the State Environmental Policy Act that will allow individuals
16 doing mixed use or infill development to receive a SEPA exemption. They would no longer have
17 to go through a SEPA for the project. This is allowed under the State Environmental Policy Act
18 with a set of analysis done up front. Additionally, County-wide, we are doing Environmental
19 analysis to allow exemptions of developments 9 lots or fewer for additional SEPA review.
20 Currently that threshold is 4 units or less. We now have a 9 lot short sub-division ordinance.
21 Neither of these exemptions will change the Environmental Review. This will hopefully help fill in
22 the properties with development issues at urban standards.
23

24 **Coppola:** Asked if that is what the City of Tacoma did, which allowed the speed up of
25 permitting time.
26

27 **Baker:** Stated Tacoma did it for the industrial zone located down town for a single use. It is
28 actually an environmental check list. If you meet these five components, you are basically free to
29 go. The Home Builder's Association is pushing for us to do that on a UGA level. That is
30 something that has not been done in Washington with mix of uses. When you have one zone with
31 a specific area with a specific number of property owners, it's a lot easier. We will be looking at
32 what it will take to do this on a larger level to help spur infill, mixed use, and economic
33 development in the areas of Silverdale, Port Orchard, and whatever becomes of the Bremerton
34 UGA.
35

36 **Chair Flynn:** Asked how the Environmental Review could be done upfront for a site
37 specific project.
38

39 **Baker:** Explained that it establishes thresholds.
40

41 **Flynn:** Asked if someone would be able to get a variance with Critical Area without going
42 through that?
43

44 **Baker:** Said no, because the critical area regulations are addressed through SEPA and they will
45 still need to adhere to the stormwater manual and all of those issues.
46

47 **Nevins:** Asked if the analysis is based on the bottom or top end of the zoning.
48

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Baker:** Stated that it is being looked at by another banking mechanism. We are allowing x
2 number of units to utilize this infill development standard. The number is going to be in the 500-
3 600 unit range and there will be an environmental analysis just for that amount and we are
4 showing the worst case scenario.

5
6 **Taylor:** Stated for the record, that he feels that it is his duty to remind his fellow Planning
7 Commission Members about cost. There is a piece of property on Old Frontier Road that
8 is within a few days of going under contract. It is a little over 7 acres of farm land with a
9 house on it. The developer is saying he will pay 1.1 million dollars for it. Taylor feels this
10 is not affordable housing. That is over \$150,000 per acre.

11
12 **Nevins:** Asked Taylor if he is looking at residential land or industrial/commercial land.

13
14 **Taylor:** Stated the property is currently zoned residential, and this is just another example
15 of developers paying a lot of money for raw ground.

16
17 **Nevins:** Stated that it seems that someone is looking ahead at the maps for future
18 development.

19
20 **Gustavson:** Informed the Planning Commission that he has done some research on
21 process and passed around a case study in preparation for tomorrow's meeting with the
22 County Commissioners. The case uses the CAO process as a platform.

23
24 **Nevins:** Asked Baker to speak a little more about the challenges presented in SKIA.

25
26 **Baker:** Stated there isn't really anything new. At the last meeting Baker indicated that McCormick
27 Land Company has withdrawn their request to be removed from the business center zone. SKIA
28 will be one of the biggest challenges.

29
30 **James Weaver:** Asked for clarification under the discussion of mixed use, there was talk about
31 commercial and industrial, but there has not been a proposal for industrial in mixed use.

32
33 **Chair Flynn:** Commented she was curious about the same statement.

34
35 **Baker:** Stated that commercial uses will be looked at. Certain commercial uses have some modest
36 manufacturing components to them which would be allowed as they are allowed in commercial
37 zones, but it is meant to largely be a commercial retail service and office.

38
39 **Chair Flynn:** Asked if the industrial would be located on the top of commercial, or if the
40 top is reserved for residential uses.

41
42 **Baker:** Informed her the mixed use zone would allow for mixing and matching.

43
44 **Chair Flynn:** Asked for an example of industrial in a mixed use zone.

45
46 **Baker:** Gave the example of a beer distiller and a winery.

47

Kitsap County Planning Commission – June 27, 2006

1 **Bekeny:** Asked if there was any documentation of recommendations from the Planning
2 Commission. There was a comment made when Bekeny became part of the Planning
3 Commission that the Board does not listen to the Planning Commission’s
4 recommendations.
5

6 **Baker:** Stated that it depends on how someone would like to measure that. If you looked at the
7 recommendations in their entirety or individually. Each document is different. Staff does not have
8 a document of that nature.
9

10 **Ahl:** Stated that under the charter, the Planning Commission recommends to the
11 Department of Community Development, then those recommendations get forwarded to
12 the Commissioners.
13

14 **Gustavson:** Asked Baker if he could provide a document with staff’s charter.
15

16 **Baker:** Stated that it is vaguely established in the RCW.
17

18 **Scott Diener:** Informed the Planning Commission that staff has prepared a document that
19 lays out their duties.
20

21 **A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.**

22 **The Vote: Unanimous**
23

24 Meeting adjourned.
25
26

27 **EXHIBITS**

- 28 A. June 27, 2006 Planning Commission Agenda
 - 29 B. June 27, 2006 legal notice
 - 30 C. June 13, 2006 minutes
- 31
32

33 MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2006.
34
35

36 _____
37 Deborah Flynn, Chair
38

39 _____
40 Brynan Pierce, Planning Commission Secretary
41
42