

1  
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

MINUTES  
**KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers**  
**February 26, 2008, 9:00 am**

These minutes are intended to provide a summary of the meeting flow and content and should not be relied upon for specific statements from individuals at the meeting.

---

**The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County Administration Building – Commissioner's Chambers located at 619 Division Street, Port Orchard, WA 98366.**

Members present: Chair Fred Depee, John Taylor, Vice Chair Linda Paralez, Michael Gustavson, Tom Nevins, Lou Foritano and John Hough.

Staff present: Scott Diener, Mike Barth, Nicole Ellis, Larry Keeton and Planning Commission Secretary Amanda Walston.

Others present:

8:59:49

**A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions:**

*Depee introduces John Hough, the new District 2 (South Kitsap) Planning Commissioner.*

**B. Adoption of Agenda:**

*Depee: This will be a regular Agenda Item which ensures we are all using the most current agenda.*

**A motion is made by Commissioner Foritano and seconded by Commissioner Gustavson to adopt the agenda for today's meeting.**

**The VOTE:**

**Yes: Unanimous**

**The Motion Carries**

**C. Public Comment:**

*Depee: We will also regularly be calling for open public comment on items not already appearing on the adopted agenda. (Calls for public comment, hears none).*

9:01:28

**D. Approval of Minutes:**

*Depee reads a proposed process, from an email sent by Commissioner Paralez, for submitting corrections to minutes Amanda in advance of meetings and limiting comment during public meetings to substantive and content related issues. Grammatical, spelling or format changes to be done outside the public's time and can be addressed directly to Amanda when she sends out the initial draft.*

**A motion is made by Commissioner Foritano and seconded by Commissioner Paralez that all format and grammatical changes to the minutes be sent directly to Amanda in advance of the meeting and to limit discussion, when possible, during public meetings to substantive and content related issues pertaining to past meeting minutes.**

9:03:27

**Gustavson:** *I disagree with the new process. Words have meaning, and people have to live by these words. As eyes of the citizens, we are often the only ones that look critically at these documents. I try my best to get everything reviewed and submitted early, but am unable to do it every time. Some of the minutiae can be cut off, but we should be able to discuss any part of the minutes.*

**Foritano:** *I believe the goal and spirit of the proposal is simply to focus live discussion on items of substance and content.*

**Depee:** *Yes, the intent is to clean up our discussion so that we are not dragging the public through the little details like grammatical, spelling, typographical or page numbers or other issues that we can just send to Amanda.*

**Commissioner Gustavson proposes an amendment to the motion that we specify that the process only apply to typographical and page numbering errors. Hearing no second, the Motion fails.**

**The VOTE: (On the motion to incorporate the new procedure regarding corrections to minutes)**

**Yes: 6**

**No: 1 (Gustavson)**

**The Motion Carries**

**A motion is made by Commissioner Foritano and seconded by Commissioner Paralez to approve the minutes of February 12 Nevins, Paralez**

**The VOTE:**

**Yes: Unanimous**

**The Motion Carries**

9:08:08

**E. Work Study: Addressing Ordinance – Michael Barth, Building Manager, DCD**

**Barth:** *Brings forth an addressing ordinance that was created by a group of Stakeholders from Cencom, Department of Community Development, the Cities, and the Fire Districts in county. The process began in late 2006 and was finished in late 2007 with active and cooperative participation from all stakeholders and unanimous agreement and approval on the final language and ordinance.*

*The goal is consistency in addressing and road names across the county that is addressed with one universal ordinance adopted by each jurisdiction. This is a vital issue for emergency responders who face increasing difficulty and confusion when dealing with similar addresses and roads as they cross different boundaries throughout the county.*

*One bigger change is naming roads and rights of way. We want to avoid duplicate or similar sounding naming of roads in different areas of the county. The goal is not to re-name all existing roads that have duplicate or similar sounding names, but to try to prevent future instances by running them through a central review that compares to other jurisdictions within the county.*

9:10:35

**Hough:** *Can you give an example of a problematic road name?*

**Barth:** *Anderson Hill has two different roads with the same name. We will probably not rename either Anderson Hill, but we do want to avoid instances like this in the future.*

*(Discusses differences in building code definitions for commercial, residential and group occupancies and how the proposed language in the ordinance will provide clarification).*

*To avoid duplication or similar sounding names, any proposed road names in each city or county will be sent through Cencom; they will check it against the other jurisdictions and send their recommendation. If they recommend against the proposed name,*

9:14:10

**Paralez:** *One difficulty mentioned is multi-word road names. How will we handle requests to name the road after a person, such as Martin Luther King Road?*

**Barth:** *Page six of eight, top paragraph, states “road names shall be one word whenever possible”, and in number eight “except where historically significant, road names shall not include proper names”. These situations are not prohibited; there is an exception for reason of political or historical importance. The Director has the ultimate decision whether to allow such cases.*

**Taylor:** *Historically, Kitsap Way ran from 6<sup>th</sup> and Callow all the way to the north end of the County. Each area renamed their piece with their own name, Viking Way for Poulsbo, Chico Way in Chico and they did. It was hugely expensive and confusing. Will this ordinance cause more of that?*

9:17:54

1  
2  
3 **Barth:** *Hopefully none. The goal of this language is to clarify the naming process. We*  
4 *don't go out looking to rename streets, we discourage that. We are focusing on streets*  
5 *not yet named.*

6  
7 **Foritano:** *Does the process for specific naming requests go straight to the Board*  
8 *or to the Director directly? If a community wants to incorporate a theme, such as*  
9 *Poulsbo's Scandinavian theme, how would that request be handled?*

10  
11 **Barth and Foritano discuss that this would be addressed with the entire**  
12 **community group and the Department in the development stages of the**  
13 **community itself and then we would work together to determine whether it will be**  
14 **a workable request.**

15  
16 **Hough:** *What is the issue with allowing multiple word roads? More descriptors*  
17 *may be beneficial, especially with a limited number of single word names*  
18 *available.*

19  
20 **Barth:** *I think the issue arises when a name sounds like it could be one word or two,*  
21 *such as Clear Lake or Clearlake Road. It throws the Cencom systems off because when*  
22 *they enter a name and it is not exact, it takes time and confuses the system if a space is*  
23 *entered or not entered.*

24  
25 **Hough:** *An example would be the Wildcat Lake area; why not name the main*  
26 *road Wildcat Lake Road. I don't see the multiple words as being an issue.*  
27 *Perhaps more care can be taken in data entry at Cencom.*

28  
29 9:22:44

30  
31 **Nicole Ellis:** *As the addressing technician for Department of Community Development,*  
32 *I have been very involved in this committee for the past several years. A good reference*  
33 *would be Silver Pine in Bremerton. There are differences in what we have in our*  
34 *database, what the residents of the area believe it is and what the street sign says it is.*  
35 *We had three different versions. Silver was spelled two different ways, the sign showed*  
36 *one word, but it was recorded as two words. When we have short plats, we are required*  
37 *to use the legally recorded name.*

38  
39 *When adding a clearly distinguishable word that is unique on its own, this is not an*  
40 *issue. Adding the word View, such as Clearview or Lakeview, to the end of a word can*  
41 *be more problematic and would have to be looked at.*

42  
43 **Hough:** *Going forward, taking care entering the names will alleviate this problem.*

44  
45 **Ellis:** *One big problem is getting everyone on the same ordinance and the same*  
46 *database. Right now, we are all using something different to retrieve what they believe*  
47 *to be the official address. That's what we are trying to do with this effort. Cencom will*  
48 *be on the same database we use, and hopefully that won't be a problem in the future.*

1 9:24:25  
2

3 **Taylor:** *In my experience searching a system by address, it sounds like these*  
4 *are computer or system issue. I can just enter the first part of a word and pull up*  
5 *all the possibilities and search that way, but a lot of systems won't allow that,*  
6 *they may have stricter parameters. So are we trying to fix the computer*  
7 *problem?*  
8

9 **Barth:** *Our system runs the same way, but I'm not sure how Cencom's systems operate.*  
10 *We are moving to that, but this comment was driven by Cencom. I just don't know how*  
11 *to answer on their behalf.*  
12

13 9:26:14  
14

15 **Gustavson:** *(References questions forwarded via staff email). The problem to*  
16 *be solved is primarily emergency response?*  
17

18 **Barth:** Yes, that is the primary factor.  
19

20 **Gustavson:** *Global Positioning System technology is fairly common and is*  
21 *available to Cencom right now. They get a call and the information is delivered*  
22 *instantly to their computer. Transferring that information to the Fire Districts*  
23 *would be much less costly than re-naming one road. Do you have a list or a total*  
24 *number of all the county roads?*  
25

26 **Ellis:** No. We have a list of County maintained roads only, not the cities.  
27

28 **Gustavson:** *We have five jurisdictions, all with their own streets and roads. It*  
29 *seems that from a cost perspective, it would be cheaper to finish the technology*  
30 *bridge from Cencom to the Fire Districts.*  
31

32 **Barth:** *That technology is nice, but not all calls that come in are from land lines.*  
33 *Because of the cellular communication, that technology doesn't cover everything now.*  
34

35 **Gustavson:** *Technology will catch up in six months to a year, but this is a multi-*  
36 *year, hugely expensive project. There are a lot of roads that are the same and*  
37 *the cost is going to be enormous to fix that.*  
38

39 9:29:38  
40

41 **Barth:** *There is no intention to go in and rename these existing roads.*  
42

43 **Gustavson:** *If we are not going to correct the mistakes, why bother with this*  
44 *project? There aren't that many new roads that are going to be named.*  
45

46 **Depee:** *I think what this pertains to is the creation of new roads. As an example,*  
47 *Gallagher stops and starts in the county in two different places. The fire*  
48 *department went out there twice and could not find the house that was burning.*  
49 *The bigger point is, cost is irrelevant when dealing in human lives.*  
50



Kitsap County Planning Commission – February 26, 2008

1 9:38:20  
2

3 **Gustavson:** *Why can't we have one rule for numbering throughout the county?*  
4 *It says here that there are two sets of rules.*  
5

6 **Keeton:** It addresses the future issues.  
7

8 **Barth:** *This ordinance utilizes the existing addressing grid, which splits the county into*  
9 *six sections. If we make any change to those sections, it would necessitate*  
10 *readdressing.*  
11

12 **Ellis:** *An example is that when you cross through the six sections, as you cross each*  
13 *section crosses zero and numbering re-starts. As you go down Pine, the numbers stop*  
14 *and restart and it splits into Southwest, North and there are duplicate numbers. The*  
15 *prefix is important and people don't always know what it is, they just know that they are*  
16 *on Pine. This ordinance says that we want to maintain the same numbering sequence all*  
17 *down a road. It can make a difference and affect people's lives.*  
18

19 9:42:00  
20

21 **Taylor:** *Compliments Nicole on her knowledge of the entire county. At the initial plat*  
22 *meeting, is the addressing tech present?*  
23

24 **Ellis:** *No, but we are trying to change the process so addressing is involved at the initial*  
25 *submittal. We are trying to be proactive and prevent problems.*  
26

27 **Depee:** *You could specify in this ordinance that it be handled at the preliminary*  
28 *application and initial submittal instead of in the end of the process.*  
29

30 *Secondly, you already have jurisdiction drawn up to correspond with the*  
31 *Commissioners' Districts? Can you add directional distinctions to roads that are*  
32 *currently doubly named such as Anderson Hill road North, South and Central?*  
33

34 9:46:52  
35

36 **Ellis:** *The pre-approved address list was mentioned and we are implementing that. If a*  
37 *developer submits a list of 20 possible names, but only needs four, we add the rest of*  
38 *the names, once approved, to a list for future use.*  
39

40 **Gustavson:** *Can you come back to my questions on what the R and U*  
41 *designations mean? Can you add a description in parentheses?*  
42

43 **Barth:** *They correspond to building code classifications, and we can add a descriptor,*  
44 *explanation.*  
45

46 *Currently developers do use their own numbering. We are trying to keep the numbers*  
47 *together, in 100 series or 200 series. We want to stick to consistent, sequential numeric*  
48 *series'.*  
49

50 **Gustavson:** *How homonymous do names have to be? Who decides?*  
51

Kitsap County Planning Commission – February 26, 2008

1 9:50:30  
2

3 **Barth:** *Cencom will decide; they are the ones who need to listen and hear it. We will*  
4 *route names through them to get their recommendation.*

5  
6 *The question on contrasting colors or letters, we could list white on blue as an example.*  
7

8 **Gustavson:** *Has the county now become the permit grantor for all road names in*  
9 *the city as well?*

10 9:52:39  
11

12  
13 **Barth:** *No. Each jurisdiction will govern its own road naming and addressing, but we will*  
14 *all adopt the language and use the same grid under this universal ordinance. Cencom*  
15 *will be the central step we get clearance or recommendation from.*

16  
17 **Gustavson:** *Maybe you could include in the ordinance that Cencom will act as*  
18 *gatekeeper, because that wasn't clear.*

19  
20 **Depee compliments Nicole and encourages incorporating addressing step in**  
21 **preliminary application.**

22  
23 **Gustavson:** *What about the notation on the civil infraction and fine?*  
24

25 **Barth:** *That is not a change, it is the standard civil infraction language used in all county*  
26 *ordinances.*

27  
28 *Nicole has done a wonderful job through the whole process and working with this very*  
29 *diverse group of people and bringing everyone to consensus.*  
30

31 9:55:48  
32

33 **Foritano:** *Is there any strong dissent from the stakeholders?*  
34

35 **Ellis:** *No they are all in agreement, and the city of Bremerton and Cencom are already*  
36 *putting this ordinance in place.*

37  
38 **Taylor:** *Educating the public will be a big part of this. I'm a little concerned that*  
39 *the gatekeeper is Cencom, why wouldn't it be the individual jurisdictions?*  
40

41 **Barth:** *The final approval does rest with each jurisdiction, but will contact Cencom first*  
42 *for a review and recommendation.*  
43

44 9:57:30  
45

46 **F. For the Good of the Order – Chair Depee**  
47

48 **Depee:** *The items on the agenda will be given a time allotment to the best of our*  
49 *ability in an attempt to better manage our time. Some individuals have more*  
50 *questions or want more background information, which can prolong discussion to*  
51 *a point where it is no longer beneficial to the group as a whole.*

**Kitsap County Planning Commission – February 26, 2008**

1 **Depee:** *If there is a position or a topic with a large amount of questions and*  
2 *details, they do not all need to be presented here as a matter before the public.*  
3 *You can schedule additional time with staff or the speaker or address it via email.*  
4

5 *I would like the ability to call for a straw vote to defer the items that you feel has*  
6 *taken enough time before the public and the straw vote will help determine if we*  
7 *are at that point.*  
8

9 **10:01:01**

10  
11 **Diener:** *I think that is a fair representation of the discussions we have had. If*  
12 *someone has an extensive list of questions or a heightened interest on a project*  
13 *or topic, if we can get them in advance, we will also try to prepare to address*  
14 *them in advance, or at least make time to*  
15

16 **Hough:** *I believe this is a very reasonable request and comment.*  
17

18 **Gustavson:** *Who decides when enough time has been spent?*  
19

20 **Depee:** *I want us all to be able to initiate a straw vote. I want this to be*  
21 *cooperative and productive and am trying to be considerate of time and*  
22 *productive discussions.*  
23

24 **Discussion that**  
25

26 **Taylor:** *It's a constant balancing act to get everything prepared and addressed,*  
27 *but the information needs to be sent to staff ahead of time.*  
28

29 **Gustavson:** *We also need to receive information ahead of time as well.*  
30

31 **10:04:01**  
32

33 **Depee:** *It is an effort that will include everyone. Amanda tries to get us the*  
34 *information and we try and get her our information. Everyone takes a part and*  
35 *it's an effort we all need to make.*  
36

37 **Paralez:** *Can we make a practice of going over the agenda for the upcoming*  
38 *meetings. Many of these topics and issues raise comments that we haven't had*  
39 *enough time, but we see the same issues more than once. We have plenty of*  
40 *time to review it over the course of the project.*  
41

42 *If we go review what is coming up, we can prepare ourselves and also review the*  
43 *protocol of what happens at each stage, such as a public hearing versus a Work*  
44 *Study.*  
45

46 **10:06:06**  
47

48 **Gustavson:** *On that exact point, Code Amendments doesn't specify which*  
49 *sections we will discuss.*  
50

Kitsap County Planning Commission – February 26, 2008

1 **Taylor:** *Is our suggestion for a longer meeting on Code Amendments still in the*  
2 *works?*

3  
4 **Diener:** *Yes, he is agreeable; he has not indicated that he is ready for an*  
5 *extended meeting yet.*

6  
7 **Foritano:** *The idea is to get everything done and finished, not to debate the*  
8 *minutiae. The work must be done upfront, so we can have the preparation time*  
9 *and be able to achieve our goal, not just extend it again.*

10  
11 **10:07:40**

12  
13 **Diener will ask Baker to present a long-term plan on how to handle Code**  
14 **Development and approval.**

15  
16 **Gustavson:** *It would be nice to know which amendments will and will not be*  
17 *addressed.*

18  
19 **Diener:** *He has created a full table of code changes that are needed and*  
20 *segregated into what will be moved forward and which ones will not be examined*  
21 *in this revision.*

22  
23 **Paralez:** *Please review what is expected at the Public hearing.*

24  
25 **10:09:08**

26  
27 **Diener:** *Depending on the nature of the issue, there may be time limits given to*  
28 *the public wishing to speak. At that hearing portion, the Planning Commission*  
29 *will take testimony, but not necessarily direct questions to the public, unless for*  
30 *clarification purposes.*

31  
32 *Deliberations come after the hearing portion has been closed, and the Planning*  
33 *Commission directs its questions to staff and speakers on the item.*

34  
35 **Taylor:** *Public hearing is a chance to hear the public. And we should avoid any*  
36 *kind of comparison on testimony given. We shouldn't compare or debate the*  
37 *merits of one testimony to another.*

38  
39 **Depee:** *The minutes of January 12, 2008 noted that you would get back to me on*  
40 *the County Commissioners' process for measuring and allotting time to people*  
41 *wishing to speak based on need. We cannot go from the testify list alone,*  
42 *because there are always people who do not sign up, and then want to speak at*  
43 *the end.*

44  
45 **Diener:** *I will clarify and get you an answer.*

46  
47 **10:12:32**

48  
49 **Foritano:** *The Chair should have the discretion to assess when we are getting to*  
50 *a level of redundancy, or when testimony should be limited.*

51

