

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers
August 12, 2008, 6:30 pm

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, Mike Gustavson, Tom Nevins, Lou Foritano, Jim Sommerhauser, Linda Paralez and Robert Baglio

Staff present: Scott Diener, Pete Sullivan, Katrina Knutson and Planning Commission Secretary Amanda Walston

Members absent: John Hough, John Taylor

6:29:35

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

B. Adoption of Agenda

Depee adopts the agenda as posted.

C. Public Comments

(Depee hears none, moves to next item.)

D. Approval of Minutes

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Paralez to approve the minutes of July 22, 2008

The VOTE:

Yes: 6

Abstain: 1

Motion Carries

E. Public Hearing – Perry Site Specific Application: Pete Sullivan, Associate Planner, DCD

Sullivan reviews the staff report and recommendation of denial.

Sommerhauser questions and Sullivan confirm that there is an option to approve or deny parcels individually if decided.

Depee opens the floor and calls speakers to the podium from the sign-in sheet.

6:36:37

1
2
3 **Depee:** *Based on the number of speakers who have signed up and the time frame for*
4 *this hearing, three minutes will be the time allotted.*

5
6 **The first speaker, Mr. Perry, indicates that two other property owners, Carl Neitzel**
7 **and Roy Daniels, that signed up to testify would rather give their minutes to him**
8 **for a combined nine minutes. The Planning Commission will allow this based on**
9 **the limited number of speakers, but it is not standard practice.**

10
11 **Rolland Perry, Applicant:** I'm one of five small property owners in Manchester who are
12 requesting that our properties be rezoned from the current two houses per acre to four
13 houses per acre. We are making this request for a number of compelling reasons;
14 reasons that are framed under the Growth Management Act; reasons that we think will
15 have merit before the County and the community. The growth that we refer to under the
16 Growth Management Act is 1.7 million people who are expected to settle in the Puget
17 Sound Area over the next 30 years, and of that number, 150,000 additional people are
18 expected to settle in Kitsap County.

19
20 We are seeking a property density designation consistent with the properties that
21 surround us. For example, Manchester's four houses per acre zone starts at Mile Hill
22 and Nebraska and sweeps north until it covers all of Manchester Village and continues
23 north past Manchester Commercial center for a block or two and abruptly stops at our
24 southern property line where zoning turns to two houses per acre. To our immediate
25 West is a large area currently zoned two houses per acre, but in fact was platted in 1909
26 with hundreds of lots at 11 houses per lot. Right now, there is a project in development
27 that is 76 homes on 12.6 acres for a density of six houses per acre. So it's four houses
28 per acre to our south, six per acre to the west, and to the north it is a variety of plats,
29 including many of those 1909 plats that were platted at 11 houses per acre, but are
30 being built out at six houses per acre. To the east is Clam Bay and the Manchester
31 sewer plant.

32
33 Our zone has caused our properties to be an island, an enclave of low residential
34 density, surrounded by much higher density. This circumstance is contrary to the state's
35 Growth Management Act, of which the fundamental goal is to limit sprawl by
36 concentrating growth within the borders of established communities. This concentration
37 not only limits growth but allows for the most effective, efficient and least inexpensive
38 use for the community's existing service infrastructure. That is power, water, sewer,
39 transportation, fire and police protection, access to the library, the post office and the
40 community's entire entire commercial center. Another important objective of the Growth
41 Management Act is to develop affordable housing. Large houses on large lots, such as
42 our current half acre lots do not speak to the question of affordable housing. Smaller
43 more efficient homes on smaller lots, such as our proposed four houses per acre
44 coupled with the close proximity to the community's existing service infrastructure allows
45 for the possibility of more affordable housing. The housing market is tilting toward
46 smaller homes and that market is being driven by first time home buyers or retirees who
47 would like to stay in the community but are ready to give up their large homes for
48 something smaller and more manageable.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 12, 2008

1 **Perry:** Most property in Manchester currently zoned four houses per acre do not offer
2 what our properties offer, which is tremendous views and an easy five to ten minute walk
3 to Manchester's commercial center, where residents are going to find groceries,
4 restaurants, shops, transportation, the library, the post office and access to the beach at
5 the public boat launch and next door, Pomeroy Park. Creating large lots, large half acre
6 residential lots so close to the commercial center of an established community is
7 contrary to the intentions and objectives of the Growth Management Act and should be
8 corrected by a zoning amendment like ours. Thank you.

9
10 **6:45:02**

11
12 **Loren Johnson, Applicant:** I purchased my property in 1990 and it was zoned R5 MH,
13 which allowed 5 units per acre Mobile Home with sewer abutting my property. I put in for
14 a plat called Manchester Islands in the early 90's with 13 units on approximately four
15 acres and was stopped by the Growth Management Plan and watched my property
16 bounce from two units to two and a half acres, to one for five acres and to end up two
17 units per acre after the Growth Management Plan. Some of the people who've applied
18 for this didn't even know that their zoning had been changed in this process. Unless you
19 went and participated and found out the bad news later, you didn't know what went on
20 there. The LAMIRD (*Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development*) allows for
21 higher intensive rural development. These properties have views of Seattle, the
22 surrounding areas are small lots in Manchester. You can call it four units per acre on the
23 west side, but those are 40 foot lots. There are like 300 owners on 40 foot wide lots and
24 there is going to be a time when those might be combined to two, but it's still going to
25 end up six units per acre and you can see that in your map. All those areas marked red,
26 west of Alaska are 40 foot lots.

27
28 The area surrounding us is already developed at a higher density. When the
29 Manchester Plan, when it was done, originally and when it was redone, never addresses
30 large parcels. They didn't talk about large parcels at all. They talked about smaller lots
31 and those properties, but no thought was really given to the large parcels, and we feel
32 that more thought should have been given to it and in fact that the zoning designation
33 there was actually a mistake to begin with. This has been pointed out and has fallen on
34 deaf ears. The rezone we've requested simply puts our property in a potential position
35 to match the existing zoning surrounding. It does what Growth Management wants, all
36 the utilities are there, the views are there, people want to live in Manchester and my
37 contention is that the zoning originally and today was a mistake. I don't think it will set a
38 precedent for future zoning.

39
40 The site specific amendment is really unique to Manchester and I'm really surprised
41 about the process.

42
43 We found out that staff wrote a report of denial on July 28th. We just got this about a half
44 hour ago so we could review it. That's not a fair process; we should have had advance
45 notice of that. In our process with staff, they had no opinion either way. And then
46 everything we've put in paper and everything that they've said indicates a denial. And
47 the process isn't fair. This property should be, fairly, four units per acre.

48
49 **Sommerhauser asks to have a map displayed at the podium to allow speakers to**
50 **identify where they live. Sullivan displays map.**

1
2
3 **6:50:45**

4 **Steve Childers, Resident:** My wife and I own 62 acres on Long Lake Road and my
5 father-in-law is also one of the applicants. Basically, we really support it because we are
6 really into the environment. We have a 50 acre permanent conservation easement
7 we've put into our property and we like the idea of having density being where there is
8 water and sewer already available instead of having houses spread out all over
9 everywhere. Also I read Business Week and other magazines and stuff quite
10 extensively and it seems that the current housing prices and the current gas prices,
11 people are moving into, they want lower cost houses which mean you have to have
12 higher density. They're also looking for areas that are closer to everything, like stores,
13 restaurants and transportation. That's basically all I have to say, I apologize for the cut-
14 offs, it's all I have that will go over my cast. It wouldn't have been my first choice, but I
15 didn't want to cut up a good pair of pants.

16 **6:52:15**

17
18 **Mike Friedman:** I want to apologize because I really came here unprepared, but in
19 being here and listening to the three people before me, I and my wife and a number of
20 people here live on Indianola Lane. And we have houses that we purchased over the
21 past, I think the whole development was built in 1995 by Chaffey, and they are all nice
22 houses. And I've heard these people talk about putting in affordable and going down to
23 the beach for a nice walk and a lot of this stuff really isn't true.

24
25 My concern is when you start putting in manufactured homes or lower quality homes in
26 this area where there are already large houses in here, where there are 2,400 or 2,600
27 square foot homes then, we are going to lose a lot of our value. I'd like to address the
28 point where they're talking about lower cost housing. Right now there are more houses
29 out there on the market and the builders can't afford to build the houses right now
30 because there are just not a lot of people buying because of the bank pricing and issues.

31
32 With that being said, I do not mind at all, four houses per acre as long as they are built
33 by a quality builder. I would not want to see somebody like, a builder who built the
34 house right down the street from us who couldn't afford the sewer. The sewer stops at
35 the end of our street, all these other houses that would be put in, it's private, they would
36 have to tap into our sewer, our retention pond, streets would have to be put in. Our own
37 road is private. We have to pay for the maintenance and the upkeep for it. When you
38 start addressing the issues of what these people would have to do in order to go ahead
39 and develop their housing or houses, I'd be very concerned about the quality. This one
40 house that's been for sale right now that was passed by our board here, American
41 Homes, I'm going to go ahead and mention his name got permission from us to go
42 ahead and put in sewage along our street and as of yet, he has not been able to do that.
43 So he's marketing a house right now that has absolutely no sewage treatment, no septic
44 tank, nothing and his house is just for sale right there and not being sold. Maybe you
45 people are aware of it, I don't know, but I'd just be very concerned about the quality of
46 the houses. Like I said, I don't begrudge anybody for trying to make money or trying to
47 sell their properties and trying to get the most that they can, all I want to do is see quality
48 homes. If it is Chaffey built homes or something like that, no problem, but I don't want to
49 see somebody come in and build manufactured homes and bring down the value of our
50 houses or anybody else's house around us.

1 **Sommerhauser asks Friedman to identify his house on the map.**
2

3 **6:56:**
4

5 **Celia Johnson:** I'm kind of nervous, I made notes, so if I read them I'm sorry. I am one
6 of the property owners. I do thank you for your time and I thank everybody who has
7 interest in doing this well, because I also think that's important. I am bothered by the
8 date we received this report, because it was at 6:10 pm tonight. I understand you had
9 another meeting, but we were never informed of that meeting and the people who really
10 know about these properties are those of us who own them. And none of us have been
11 short-term owners; I mean there is no flipping going on here. We have all owned these
12 properties for a long, long time. Mr. Steiner, Mr. Neitzel and Mr. Perry, I mean decades.
13 The meeting, if I understand it took place on July 22nd, and maybe I just don't
14 understand the process, but I don't see how you can have a process that doesn't have
15 the people who really know about this land and have cared for it for all these decades
16 involved somehow, or at least give our perspective. And we made a group application
17 because we form a community; it's just a community of a different kind. And who on
18 earth could ever navigate this alone quite frankly, or undertake the expense? Because
19 you've made this, not you, but it's become very complicated for us.
20

21 You know, when we bought our land it was zoned five houses per acre, and it has
22 moved about 10 times in the last two decades and I get dizzy just trying to keep up with
23 where we are. I heard the last gentleman who talked, I didn't get his name, but I am a
24 fifth generation South Kitsap resident, I'm quite convinced I'm the only person in the
25 room who can say that. My great-great-grandparents were homesteaders, the original
26 homesteaders on Bainbridge Island, my grandfather was superintendent of Central
27 Kitsap schools for 30 some years, there is a building on Silverdale Way named after him.
28 We live here on purpose; we've raised our children here. We are not going to do
29 anything here isn't going to contribute to the community that we love and have every
30 interest in protecting for our children and their children and the next five generations of
31 Johnsons who choose to live here. We're not interested in doing this poorly; we're
32 interested in doing it well. That is another reason we are doing this together, because it
33 does become possible to do something well or better because you have economies of
34 scale when you do that. These aren't small lots. A quarter acre lot is not a small lot by
35 any measurement. Certainly in a village, in a city, in a county there is no way they are
36 small lots. Four per acre is not an unreasonable request. Thank you for your time and I
37 hope I did all right.
38

39 **7:00:10**
40

41 **JB Bartel:** I am opposed to the four units per acre. I have been a member of the
42 Manchester Community Council for over 10 years and a charter member of that. I
43 understand in talk of affordable housing, I am a licensed realtor and I know about
44 affordable housing. On our inventory right now, which is huge, there is tons of affordable
45 housing which will take another few years to accommodate that. Our listing time out is,
46 according to the Multiple Listing Service, is eight to ten months out for a listing at this
47 time. Nowhere have I heard mention from the would-be developers is the quality of life.
48 I happen to live on Caraway, right next to the sewer treatment plant, and from that our
49 property which is, half of it is trees the other half is Open Space, there is a red-tail fox,
50 behind our property is an eagle's nest that has been there for several years.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 12, 2008

1 **Bartel:** And we have deer that, mom and dad and two little baby fawns that are there, in
2 fact they were there laying in a neighbor's yard yesterday, so the quality of life is rather
3 important to the living of Manchester. We formed a Manchester Village a few years ago
4 and unfortunately it seems like whenever new development wants to come in, we were
5 involved with The Anchors, 28 feet versus 35 feet well, that was something else and we
6 appeared before you then, and The Anchors was built. And two of the condos are
7 beautiful inside, but that wasn't what our anticipation was when we formed the
8 Manchester Community Council for Low Residential. Same with this, two units per acre
9 which still provides adequate housing to enjoy the quality of life and that's what is so
10 rampant in Manchester and what is so desirable. Increasing the density of houses
11 changes the quality of life. Beach Drive is a two lane highway, there is Clam Bay there,
12 that bicycles and it is becoming more attractive to bicyclist and it becomes more
13 dangerous with bicycles and people moving to that area. Thank you for your time and I
14 appreciate what Staff has already done in denying this.

15
16 **7:03:02**

17
18 **Jeff Laatsch, Resident:** I have been a resident here for 18 years, not in this specific
19 area, but the Port Orchard vicinity. This is the first council meeting I've been to and the
20 reason is that there are similar proposals to what's being proposed here to increase
21 density, which again, doesn't increase quality of life. From what I've heard and what I've
22 seen so far without reviewing everything that's been proposed, I think the key indicator
23 that we continue to lose focus on is the quality of life. I've had relatives visit me over the
24 18 years that I've been here that have lived in Michigan and other dense areas, because
25 that's where I grew up at and I've traveled extensively prior to settling here, and again,
26 the reason I settled here and raised my four children in this area is the quality of life. I
27 live on a half acre.

28
29 I have seen from a quarter acre and lower, to housing issues where even though what's
30 been stated comes across as quality and possibly good housing situations, etcetera, I've
31 seen first hand where a development may have been there, but after years of living in
32 that area, the quality of life goes down. It just simply isn't easy even with the half acre
33 where I live now in housing and with the nature around it the greenbelt and areas. I'm
34 seeing an unprecedented growth in this area and it scares me. I simply don't
35 understand how, as Commissioners and Planners, it's an opportunity for developers.
36 Simply said, I'm glad to see that this is being denied, because it's a point of where it's
37 the quality of life that counts, not how much money you can get out of it.

38
39 **7:05:30**

40
41 **Carole Leininger, Resident:** I am a Manchester resident, I don't live in the immediate
42 vicinity of these properties, but I was a member of the committee that wrote the original
43 Manchester Plan where we set the zonings and I was also a member of committees
44 where we reinforced the zonings, as was Mr. Johnson. To say that they are surrounded
45 on all sides by denser zones is somewhat incorrect (refers on map), here's the proposed
46 land, and you can see that the whole area that it's in is also zoned Village Low
47 Residential. The reason for that was to keep the density somewhat low. A number of
48 Manchester folks and various organizations worked long and hard to accomplish both
49 the original and the update to the plan and it meets the approval of the regulatory
50 agencies as well as the residents, or most of the residents of the community.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 12, 2008

1 **Leininger:** Doubling the potential of the number of residents on the land that currently
2 has a perfectly legal and acceptable zoning is just unacceptable. It would cause the
3 destruction of one of the few remaining Manchester forests, which you can see in this
4 picture and it's a loss of existing environmental quality as was mentioned earlier.
5 Wildlife, eagle habitats, putting houses and things in there would cause water absorption
6 issues, and it just is not what the community had planned. As mentioned, Manchester is
7 not a UGA (*Urban Growth Area*) so we are not responsible or expected to handle a large
8 portion of the growth in the county. We are a LAMIRD (*Limited Area of More Intensive*
9 *Rural Development*). Thank you very much.

10
11 **7:07:45**

12
13 **Stewart Lombard, Manchester resident for 19 years (points to property on map):**

14 Let me start by saying that that is a one third lot adjacent to two of the properties in
15 question and we had a devil of a time fitting that house on a third of an acre and meeting
16 the setbacks, the easements, the requirement for storm retention from the roof drain and
17 the requirement for less than 50% of impervious surfaces. If you go to a quarter acre lot,
18 it's going to be extremely difficult and your organization is going to be besieged by
19 requests for variances because you can't put a decent sized house on a quarter acre lot
20 and meet all the other requirements. I work for the Department of Ecology in the little
21 office right next to the pub in beautiful downtown Manchester and I walk to work and
22 home every day. The street system is just really limited at this point and to add 40 more
23 homes to the plan is certainly a quality of life issue.

24
25 I'd like to exception for a minute to Rolland Perry's comment that he's in an island, or
26 trapped in an island of low density. If you look at the whole Manchester area, about half
27 of it maybe more, is MVL R (*Manchester Village Low Residential*) so this is not a single
28 little isolated area. I sent a letter on July 1st, stating my objections to this to Ms. Ashcraft,
29 (*gives copy to Planning Commission Secretary*) and since then I took a look at the code
30 and I was looking under Title 21 and there are two areas, this discusses what the
31 Planning Commission should consider. Two of them are whether circumstances related
32 to the amendment have substantially changed since the adoption of the plan or whether
33 the assumptions that the plan is based on is no longer valid. Well, this plan, as I
34 understand it was just incorporated into County Code last December so there hasn't
35 been time for anything to change from what the people of Manchester tried to put
36 together in this plan. So I don't think that criteria is met. And there is another area
37 where it states is the goal of the amendment consistent with the goals and policies and
38 objectives of the plan and clearly this is not consistent when Manchester intended when
39 they put together this plan. So I think this is just not a reasonable request given the
40 amount of effort that went into the planning for the future quality of life and the character
41 of Manchester. I'd also point out that two of the five applicants don't even live in the
42 Manchester area so they really don't have a vested interest in maintaining the quality of
43 life there. I think that's all I need to say, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you and
44 I hope that you'll uphold the recommendation of your Planners. Thank You.

45
46 **Depee calls for any additional speakers, several hands are raised**
47
48
49
50
51

7:11:32

1
2
3 **Lyle Burbidge, Resident:** I live in Manchester and have been a very active part of the
4 Manchester community plan, working with community members looking at how we can
5 make and preserve the quality of life as rural and maintain the character of the ruralness.
6 You know, it's kind of interesting to me and I am a little bit frustrated because we spent
7 so many hours and so many nights working on this Manchester Plan with the county,
8 people who gave us really good advice and what we should do. We spent hours and
9 hours here, and we spent those hours hoping that we could convey to the county that
10 Manchester, being part of the LAMIRD (*Limited Area of More Intensive Rural*
11 *Development*) we wanted to preserve the ruralness and the characteristics that we've
12 enjoyed for years and years. No sooner, as Stew mentioned, did the Manchester Plan
13 get into place and suddenly now, we have all of these people asking for exceptions. It is
14 not the flavor; it is not the desire of the majority of Manchester people to have more
15 density.

16
17 I live right in the middle of Manchester on 1st Avenue East, and every day cars go up the
18 hill and it's hard to sleep. I'll honestly tell you, the traffic is dense now, let alone with the
19 condominiums and with 40 new homes coming into the area. The infrastructure of the
20 roads will not sustain that kind of action. They portray it as an easy walk to the beach
21 and that's not what it is. There are no sidewalks, there are no places where people can
22 safely walk or bike to the beach, there is no store right now, hopefully with the new
23 development there will be one. Traffic is such that it's too congested, and every time we
24 talk to the county, I'm sorry to say, and they tell us, "well, that's something we'll have to
25 look at in future development." Well, there is a time when we need to stop and look and
26 say, what can these roads handle. So we are definitely opposed to the density being
27 more dense, you know, two per acre is sufficient.

28
29 7:14:22

30
31 **Will Longman, Resident at 2589 2nd Avenue East:** I'm just a little bit south of this cul
32 de sac here and in an area considered adjacent. We're strongly opposed to the
33 proposal and highly recommend that you do follow the recommendations of staff. Many
34 of the neighbors have gotten together in our area, and we did send letters in that I
35 presume have been made available to you through some means, that included myself.
36 So there is significant opposition that perhaps not everybody knows about. We're
37 concerned and I do have a question for the board, 2nd Avenue East being right here, I
38 understand that this perhaps is going to be made into a throughway instead of the
39 existing road?

40
41 ***Depee responds that the Planning Commission does not have knowledge of***
42 ***Transportation projects and is here to receive testimony on the application.***
43

44 **Longman:** Our concern is if that were the case, which we understand it is, we would be
45 subject to a traffic flow that we are not accustomed to now and our streets are in bad
46 shape. It's the same thing you just heard, there are no sidewalks, and we've got elderly
47 people and children everywhere. You know, to have this be one of the conduits to an 84
48 home development, we find to be totally unacceptable. We are strongly for maintaining
49 the quality of life as emphasized by the low density. Thank you.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 12, 2008

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
46
47
48
49
50
51

7:16:15

Bruce Qualm, Resident: I have a house next to these properties (*shows on map*). So, I purchased the property from Mr. Johnson and I see Mr. Perry out running and I see Mr. Daniels out riding his bike when I'm running. My wife and I like to walk our dogs so we've taken a walk down through Mr. Daniels', I don't know if you guys know, I've talked to Mr. Sullivan on the phone, but there is a path that comes down here through this property. The reason I am opposed to this, and there are several reasons, but number one is because I am unsure as to whether the infrastructure can really support the additional homes. The roads are very dangerous to run on and very dangerous to bike on. On Alaska Avenue, when we walk our dogs, people come whizzing down there, and it's, I just can't see any more homes being in there. We tried to get speed bumps on Alaska Avenue and that was turned down, so I can't see where we can cram more homes in here.

I also had a problem getting my house on the lot. I originally had an attached garage and then I had to separate it because the lot was too small and I had tremendous stormwater runoff issues. I have five systems on my property to handle stormwater runoff, so I'm just not sure how we can get more homes in there. The other thing is, if you walk down the property, like right down here there's a stream that comes down on kind of the southern end of Mr. Daniels' property; so for instance that acre, I mean you can't build on that acre, there's a stream there; and there's a pond on Mr. Perry's property so I don't think you're going to want to build there. Then right next to my house is where all the bald eagles hang out, so I can't see a home going in there either. Mr. Johnson has a big hill down here, so I just don't think you can get that many homes in there, and I also don't think that the infrastructure would support it. Thank you.

7:19:09

Debra Rada, Resident: I own the parcel here (*shows on map*) in the middle of everyone. My family and my four sons grew up there. We have loved the wildlife there and feel like the eagles are part of our family; the deer, the red fox, we had chickens and the red fox ate them and we called the forestry guys and they said, "oh, you don't have any red fox in your area." So we said you're going to have to come tell us what's in this cage that we got from the, and they said it was a red fox and we helped relocate them and we felt bad for, anyway, that was twenty years ago that we caught a red fox and the family is still growing. If we crowd them all out, we're going to end up like they are in Belltown or Bellevue with raccoons killing everything because they have no place to be. You know, let's give the wildlife a chance to survive here so the families can enjoy it. My sister and brother in law are going to buy one of my parcels and they have triplets and they are six years old, going to Manchester and they think they live in paradise and I'd like to see them continue to believe that. As my sons come home and see that too that we have this place. Mr. Daniels piece is the property that we rode our horses up and down and not that we have horses anymore, but it's a bit of paradise there and I'd hate to see it all turned into homes.

7:21:07

Brian Reedy, Resident: I am Debra's brother-in-law, father of the triplets. Aside from living in paradise, just as a practical matter, two weeks ago today, my house caught on fire and it was at 6:30 in the morning so it wasn't really a high demand time.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 12, 2008

1 **Reedy:** It took 12 minutes for the fire department to get there from the station up by
2 Village Greens. It doesn't seem like much, but that's a long time when your house is on
3 fire and I think it would be very irresponsible and inviting tragedy to increase the density
4 there without considering having resources like that a lot closer. Thank you very much.

5
6 **7:21:52**
7

8 **Denise Burbidge, Resident:** I live on 1st Avenue in Manchester, and I don't understand
9 this map at all, but I live somewhere right in here (*shows on map*). It looks like an old
10 map to me, but anyhow, I do oppose increasing the density of these properties. I've
11 lived in the area since 1973 and used to enjoy riding my horses down Colchester, and of
12 course, times have changed but I still see kids trying to do some of the same things and
13 it's very dangerous. I was running on Colchester the other day and there were cars
14 going 60 miles an hour and I made a call to the sheriff's department and I would just love
15 to have more support or resources to our area. You can imagine with the amount of
16 condominiums or residents going in with these new three story condominiums how much
17 more traffic is going to be using these same resources.

18
19 It is, I know you've heard this and it sounds probably, I don't know repetitive, but it is a
20 quality of life. I live in the Manchester View Residential area and it is a much smaller lot,
21 and of course when we first moved in there we had the ability to enjoy, probably what a
22 lot of people do too, with some peace in the evening time and that has really changed.
23 We have semi trucks going up and down the road to the fuel depot, I have Kitsap Transit
24 now that has regular routes that go up and down our roads, and you know living on one
25 of those smaller lots as much as I love Manchester and I don't want to leave there, with
26 all this increased density I can tell you I agree with what that gentlemen said that 10 or
27 20 years down the road, it's not so nice. You now, you can hear a gentleman who is
28 yelling at his kids a block down the road and it does change the quality of life. We are
29 not a UGA (*Urban Growth Area*) we are a LAMIRD (*Limited Area of More Intensive Rural*
30 *Development*), and we should be looking for ways to protect that. That designation is
31 intended to protect the character of rural areas and we are unique. We have beautiful
32 views of Puget sound nearby; we have Clam Bay which you know, has just recently
33 some of those clams which were thought to have been gone, are starting to come back.
34 If we continue to develop we are definitely impacting and having a negative effect on our
35 environment as well as the wildlife and the quality of life and the Manchester residents'
36 way of life. Thank you.

37
38 **7:25:31**
39

40 **Theresa Longman, Resident:** I am a longtime resident of Manchester and I've lived
41 there are worked there for quite a while. My home is right there where that little circle is
42 (*shows on map*) in that little cul de sac. I've lived there long enough to have seen all the
43 homes and that cul de sac put in there, when that was all trees and when that gentleman
44 behind me built that home he's living in now. The bottom line is, Manchester is a
45 desirable place to live, everybody want to live there. These people own property and
46 they should be allowed to do what they want to do because they are going to build it
47 there anyway. That stretch of forest is probably going to go away, and let's face it, the
48 bottom line here is finances, and they're going to build their homes there. But two to an
49 acre should be fine, we don't need double density. There is so much traffic in
50 Manchester right now that we can't support it sewage wise, we can't support the streets,
51 and they're damaged from all the construction going on Main Street, 1st and 2nd Avenue.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 12, 2008

1 **T. Longman:** If anybody wants to get an idea of what this will look like, you can look at
2 Little Clam Bay an area that's been stripped there and what it looks like now. We can't,
3 quality of life, there won't be any life if this proposal goes through and I appreciate that
4 you have taken the time and really looked at this and denied it thus far. Thank you.

5
6 **Depee closes the public hearing.**

7
8 **7:27:30**

9
10 **F. Deliberation and Recommendation – Perry Site Specific Application: Pete**
11 **Sullivan, Associate Planner, DCD**

12
13 **Depee asks Scott Diener about the issue regarding notice of the Staff Report and**
14 **recommendation.**

15
16 **Diener:** *I believe the issue is the staff report, which was available on July 27th or 28th and*
17 *the availability of that report was noticed to all the interested parties. We did not contact*
18 *the applicant when the report was made available. We did have a moment today where*
19 *we wondered if the applicant had obtained a copy and we called to check. We can offer*
20 *to extend the written record for one more week if the planning Commission would like to.*

21
22 **Foritano believes based on the comments that there is a potential**
23 **misunderstanding about the criteria that must be met in order to recommend**
24 **approval and asks Diener to review them.**

25
26 **Diener:** *There are a set of tests in Title 17 that lists all factors to be met, and it is a*
27 *requirement that all items must be met. Pete can speak to these specifically.*

28
29 **Sommerhauser:** *I went out and drove the area this afternoon, several of the*
30 *comments and testimony in question deals with the roads. Alaska and 2nd*
31 *Avenue are both pretty narrow. Planning standard is 10 trips per day per home,*
32 *so we would be looking at an increase in potentially up to 400 additional trips?*

33
34 **Sullivan asks for clarification of the question and Sommerhauser asks about trips**
35 **per day, Levels of Service and what the potential increase would be.**

36
37 **Depee:** *The road standards themselves will be addressed when the application*
38 *goes through zoning.*

39
40 **Sullivan:** *Yes, there are Levels of Service under current zoning at a 20 year projection,*
41 *we reviewed this at a programmatic level and the Levels of Service would accommodate*
42 *and would remain unchanged. Chair Depee is also correct that on a project level, these*
43 *will be addressed at time of application.*

44
45 **7:33:15**

46
47 **Nevins:** *I think we should put a motion on the table. I don't believe it is fruitful to*
48 *continue the debate this way.*

49
50 **A motion is made by Commissioner Nevins and seconded by Commissioner**
51 **Sommerhauser to endorse Staff's findings and recommend denial.**

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 12, 2008

1 **Nevins:** *I understand the property owners' interest and rationale. Many of the*
2 *criteria are met under this proposal, but some specifically have not been met.*
3 *One is that circumstances have not substantially changed since the adoption*
4 *of either the Manchester Plan or the Comprehensive Plan. Another: The*
5 *assumptions upon which these plans are based are still valid. Simply not enough*
6 *time has passed.*

7
8 **Sommerhauser:** *I went and drove it this afternoon and talked to staff and it*
9 *strikes me that stormwater will be difficult. Stormwater would be one objection*
10 *and the other part is a real clear community plan that has a very clear*
11 *demarcation between densities. I'm just not convinced that creating an oddly*
12 *shaped new density zone is beneficial.*

13
14 **7:36:22**

15
16 **Gustavson:** *I live in this area and lived in Manchester a number of years ago not*
17 *far from this. I appreciate the concern about the stormwater issue. My concern*
18 *is when we mandate lower density for close in lots; 20 years later we have*
19 *leapfrog development and parcels built at lower density developments that are*
20 *not torn down to accommodate the higher densities. So I will not support Staff's*
21 *decision.*

22
23 **Paralez:** *I appreciate what you are wanting and trying to do. My bias is to*
24 *support the community plan and all the efforts that went into that.*

25
26 **7:37:32**

27
28 **Baglio:** *I actually built Mr. Qualm's house and it was tough getting it on there and*
29 *I live on Woods Road, so I'm not too far away either. The way the proposal is a*
30 *little bit segmented is certainly a little different in the way we are viewing it*
31 *because the portion in the middle would not have the increased density in the*
32 *zoning so it would be a little odd. Buildable lands, stormwater and critical areas*
33 *are reviewed as part of each proposal submitted, so whether you can meet the*
34 *zoning and setback requirements is still yet to be seen. Maybe reviewing the two*
35 *larger lots to the south separately could be discussed.*

36
37 **Gustavson:** *Are the number of parcels along the road that goes east and west*
38 *half a lot south of the proposal zoned four to the acre or two to the acre lots?*

39
40 **Sullivan confirms they are four per acre.**

41
42 **Depee calls the vote.**

43
44 **The VOTE:** *(to endorse Staff's findings and recommend denial)*

45 **Yes: 4**

46 **No: 1 (Gustavson)**

47 **Abstain: 2 (Depee, Baglio)**

48
49 **Motion Fails.**

50

1 *Foritano questions the abstentions. Depee clarifies that he lives right next to the*
2 *property and Baglio clarifies he was the builder on one of the interested*
3 *properties.*

4
5 7:40:57
6

7 *Depee: The proposal will go forward to the County Commissioners without a*
8 *Planning Commission recommendation. I'd like to remind the public that they*
9 *can appear before the Board of County Commissioners to give their testimony*
10 *there as well.*

11
12 *Comments from the floor are made (but not attributed to any specific speaker) that*
13 *availability of the staff report and date and time were included in the notice sent to*
14 *the interested parties, but not clearly called out.*

15
16 *Depee does not wish to address the conflicting Comments, but suggests that*
17 *those interested stay informed of the Board of County Commissioners' agenda*
18 *schedule. Diener offers clarification that the hearing will be noticed to the Public*
19 *via newspaper and the County Website.*

20
21 7:42:35
22

23 BREAK
24

25 7:54:15
26

27 **G. Public Hearing – Highland Woods Rezone Application: Katrina Knutson,**
28 **Associate Planner, DCD**

29
30 *Knutson reviews the staff report and recommendation for approval of the*
31 *Highland Woods Rezone application.*

32
33 *Depee calls for any speakers.*
34

35 **Barry Margulies, Development Manager for the Applicant, 1087 Jackson Avenue,**
36 **in Seattle:** We have approached DCD and are requesting the downzone, which may
37 be the first time I have ever done that, to respect the development and the heart of what
38 this project is all about. We hope the Planning Commission would approve the
39 recommendation of Staff.

40
41 *Depee closes the public hearing.*
42

43 7:57:20
44

45 **H. Deliberation and Recommendation – Highland Woods Rezone Application:**
46 **Katrina Knutson, Associate Planner, DCD**

47
48 *Knutson shows building limitations map and identifies the tributary and fish-*
49 *bearing stream, very steep slopes and the critical aquifer recharge area.*
50

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 12, 2008

1 **Gustavson asks about the buffer identification, Knutson offers to get the Critical**
2 **Areas map. Nevins questions the relevancy. Gustavson retracts the request.**
3

4 **Sommerhauser believes in this proposal, but questions the Growth Management**
5 **Act goal that discourages creating island zoning.**
6

7 **Knutson:** *This does create an island, but the Growth Management Act doesn't*
8 *specifically oppose islands, it just does not encourage them. Staff weighed that against*
9 *the benefits of this proposition before recommending approval.*

10
11 **Gustavson:** *If we looked at the topography of the zoning, we probably would say*
12 *we got it wrong to begin with.*
13

14 **Knutson:** *When you go through large processes like the 10 year Update, it is difficult to*
15 *look at parcel specific instances, which is much easier when we have Sub-Area Plans*
16

17 **A motion is made by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by Commissioner**
18 **Sommerhauser to approve Staff's recommendation.**
19

20 **The VOTE:**

21 **Yes: Unanimous**
22

23 **Motion Carries**

24 **8:01:57**
25

26 **F. For the Good of the Order: Chair Depee**
27

28 **Diener:** *Due to a conflict in Shelley Kneip's schedule, we will have to reschedule the*
29 *work session on minutes from August 26th to a meeting in September.*
30

31 **A motion is made by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by Commissioner**
32 **Baglio to adjourn the meeting.**
33

34 **The VOTE:**

35 **Unanimous**
36

37 **Motion Carries**
38

39 **Time of Adjournment: 8:02:40**
40

41 **EXHIBITS**

- 42 A. Perry Site Specific Staff Report
43 B. Highland Woods Rezone Staff Report
44 C. Letter to the Record submitted by Stewart and Charlotte Lombard
45

46 **MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2008.**
47

48 _____
49 **Fred Depee, Planning Commission Chair**

50 _____
51 **Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Secretary**
52