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, John Hough, John Taylor and Robert Baglio

Staff present: Eric Baker, Angie Silva, Katrina Knutson, Scott Diener, Larry Keeton, and Planning Commission Secretary Mary Seals

Members absent: Linda Paralez

9:02:00

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

B. Adoption of Agenda

Depee adopts the agenda as posted.

C. Approval of Minutes

A motion is made by Jim Sommerhauser and seconded by Lou Foritano to approve the minutes of August 26, 2008.

The Vote:
Yes: 7
1 abstention

The motion carries

D. Director’s Update: Larry Keeton, Director, DCD

Keeton gives an overview of the changes in DCD including the realignment of work, code revision, and financial status. He informs them of the loss of staff, including the Planning Commission Secretary and one Planner with the possibility of losing one to four more Planners. He reviews the departments cost saving measures, such as staff report simplification and workload allocation, and consolidation of work.

Discussion is held about self certification.

Comments are made about the fiscal state of other jurisdictions. Keeton notes that surrounding counties are experiencing lay offs in their Permitting departments too.

Discussion is held about the economy and how it affects the building department. The construction industry is not at work. The question is raised about improving
efficiencies in the department. Keeton assures that this is now and has been an ongoing effort.

Concerns were raised about loosing established safeguards and experienced staff. Keeton discusses some of the areas that will remain intact and how it will be handled. He discusses the value of the staff he has in both permit related and regulatory related positions. Clarification is made about the process for eliminating positions and his awareness of what needs to get done in the future. He needs to keep the right people on staff and keep them focused.

9:36:15


Baker: Reviews the background of the Waaga Way Connector Roads that the Commission heard public deliberation about two weeks ago. He recommends that discussion and decisions be broken down into three categories: The Purpose of Roadways, Location of Roadways, and Design Elements.

Baglio: For the record. I did assist Mr. Rosenwald on the JR Boulevard improvements that access Lowe’s. I haven’t worked with him on this project at all, but I wanted to state for the record so everyone is aware of it.

Chair Depee asks if there are any objections. None are made.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Hough to approve 4A (4 revised) as presented at the last meeting; including the entire packet, location, alternatives to the roadway, and revision to goal 26.

Baker: This is revised 4A. It has the cul-de-sac component at the northern portion. It included the south of the extension roads to shorter extension roads that provide connection to the corners of particular properties. They do not connect to one another and they are generally outside of any significant topographical feature. To the west there is no proposed connector road. This is 4A revised, otherwise known as 4A. Is the motion only for the location or for the location and the proposed design?

Sommerhauser: It was your entire packet; locations of the roadways, the two design alternative with one having the possibility of parking and the revision to the goal 26.

Baker: Staff recommendation is alternative A with sidewalks on both sides of the street. That packet would indicate that the Planning Commission’s recommendation is; two lanes, two sidewalks.

Nevins: I wish to speak against this motion.

Depee: I am in favor of it. Not only after reviewing it myself, but talking to some of the landowners who were very pleased with it.
Nevins presents why he is speaking in opposition of alternative 4A and distributes written document (Exhibit B).

Nevins: There is not connectivity with this. This does, perhaps, serve the property owners, but it does not serve the citizens of Kitsap or the future citizens who will be living in the areas that we have designated as Urban Growth Areas. Connectivity to Old Frontier Road would offer an option for traffic to move in a shorter distance to where they are headed. He explains the details of traffic routing. It's good for safety to get to their destination by the shortest route. That suits our mission for the County. The Kitsap County Transportation Planning division calls for interconnectivity and we should follow the divisions we have and make our policies follow those visions. APA supports connectivity very strongly. These roads will be maintained by Kitsap County. It's nice to support the property owners, but we serve as a body that is to look at the service to the community rather than to the person who is developing a particular piece of property. I strongly urge a no vote on this.

9:47:14

Gustavson: I have a question for Tom. When you are talking about connectivity, there are two potential places. Which connectivity are you talking about?

Nevins: There's a stub that could go into Bison, it's already on the map or it could go north. I just recommend we establish connectivity. I don't care if it's Bison or north of Bison.

Gustavson: I support what you're saying. Requests clarity from developers.

Depee: States public comment is closed and only questions to staff are allowed.

Baker: If you are talking about the areas to the south, it was not the property owners that requested the stub out at the end; it was all the neighbors who participated in the process. Everything Commissioner Nevins said is correct. As for the question associated with the stub out in the southern end, the reason for that is that there is a level 2 critical area body located in-between those two roadways. And connection between those two roads creates a duplication of the extension road.

Hough: If we were to propose the connectivity, could we do it in a phase 1, phase 2 styles so it would initially show a cul-de-sac, but the plan would show a future connection?

Baker: Likely, this is going to be a phased roadway to start with. All are in that format.

Hough: I support this connectivity idea, I just looking for a way to soften the impact for the neighbors who opposed it.

Baker: This is a programmatic document; we have phased SEPA going on. That is where the ability to take into account the concerns of the neighbors.
Baglio: Clarifies phasing.

Baglio: A portion that is zoned industrial; I would question the need for sidewalks on both sides of the street for industrial.

Baker: With the number of office type uses allowed in the industrial zone and the fact that we've seen a lot of office type uses occupy out industrial zones, historically; it was staff's perspective that we would want to error on the side of those uses being more likely than a smokestack type usage.

Foritano: I was also moved by the developer's notion of a grand master plan given the fact that there doesn't appear to be an existing master plan for Silverdale.

Depee: These additional extensions put out could be kept by developers as private roads unless they are dedicated to the County under County standards. Correct? These will be maintained by the County?

Baker: They could be left as private roads, although they'd need to be developed at a County sub-collector standard. Maintained by the County is the expectation.

Sommerhauser: My reasoning for revised is that the property owners in the area wanted 4 revised.

Baker: There was not a consensus by the community. A lot of the concerns of people not in the area were impacts onto the Old Frontier Road. A concern of people inside was overall cost of the project. What you see here is the competing between what are medium and long term needs. Medium term would be the provision of an access road to all these areas. Long term similar to the component we see in Silverdale now. What worked out for 25 years, now we're seeing some significant issues. He discusses in detail the communities concerns.

9:58:31

Taylor: He states that everyone seems to be in favor of 4 revised and that he is going to vote for that. Discusses the reasons for his vote.

Sommerhauser: Eric presented to the CK Community Council last week about this. There was a large amount of discussion about potential stop lights and concern about connectivity. It was against it. There is not an improvement plan for Old Frontier.

Baker: There is an improvement in the far end of the 20 year period. He discusses how they came to the recommendation of 4 A.

Nevins: Economical. One of the things that has happened due to the up-zoning of this property and due to the development of the Waaga Way extension road is that the value of these properties has gone way up. I'm not too concerned about how much more it is going to cost to develop it; I'm concerned that it is developed properly. If it is a major thoroughfare, I'm not sure that is going to be the case, but if it does become a major thoroughfare that is an indication of the need for
such a development. It is a choice that people make. My concern is that if we
don’t put on paper that this is our intention the likelihood of it coming up again
and it being too expensive, now it’s really inexpensive. It doesn’t have to happen,
but if we don’t put something on paper, the opportunity is lost, the choice is lost
and the people who will suffer the traffic congestion that will occur as we have
further development.

Taylor: I don’t know what your traffic projection study says, but I think this is
going to become one of the heaviest used pieces of road in the Silverdale urban
area. Once it is open it is going to be a joy.

An amendment to the original motion by Commissioner Hough and seconded by
Commissioner Gustavson to include the connectivity that Commissioner Nevins
has proposed to include staff recommendation for placement of the connectivity;
which is the connectivity shown on the north road alternative 1.

The Vote:
Yes: 6
No: 2
Abstain: 0
Motion Carries

Depee calls the vote on the motion with the approved amendment.

The Vote:
Yes: 6
No: 2
Abstain: 0
Motion Carries

10:10:45

Baker: Now we need to discuss design as a whole. The staff report includes 2
illustrations and one staff recommendation that is not consistent with either of the
illustrations.

He reviews the illustrations and recommends alternative A with sidewalks on both
sides of the street.

A motion was made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by
Commissioner Hough to accept the staff recommendation to use the design in
Alternative A with the addition of sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Baglio: In industrial I don’t see the need for sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Baker: The location that you just described doesn’t include any connector roads that
run through the industrial property; it runs through the business center property which
has additional ability for offices, other smaller retail type facilities, and mixed use.

Baglio: Is what we are doing here going to actually apply to when they do extend
off of that road. Is what we are doing here going to apply to that or is it going to
be silent to it?
Baker: I expect it is going to be silent to the design of the additional road. The one you are picking today is associated with the blue lines and blue lines only.

Sommerhauser: Clarifies that the motion is about the connector that goes through the commercial, not industrial. He stresses the importance of having sidewalks on both sides in commercial and mixed use, with increased traffic.

10:16:04

Hough: Agrees with Commissioner Sommerhauser.

Taylor: Discusses past impact for the cost of sidewalks on both sides and does not see a need for sidewalks on both.

Nevins: As we evolve we don’t need to repeat the errors of the past. Let’s go with the sidewalks.

Amendment to motion by Commissioner Gustavson that it becomes a 3 lane street to allow a two way left turn on the sections that are through.

No second amendment, the amendment fails.

Depee calls for a vote on the motion.

The Vote:
Yes: 5
No: 3

Motion Carries

Break

10:22:33

RECONVENE

10:39.32

F. Deliberation & Recommendation – Illahee Community Plan: Katrina Knutson, Associate Planner, DCD

Knutson reviews revised final draft plan and results of the Illahee survey. One correction, Chapter 6 figure 6.1, the map was intended to show existing sewer. Timber’s Edge has not been finalized through the Hearing Examiner yet. She reviews the proposed deliberation sheet and gives staff recommendation on one of the three presented.

Sommerhauser: Requests Knutson outline differences in the revised package.
Knutson indicates that most changes are grammatical and identifies a change in chapter 3, page 36; the change occurred while meeting with legal council to clarify language of what citizen advisory group means by the process in which the County could vacate a right of way; she reads the paragraph. She indicates that also clarified was the building height at 28’, two stories.

10:48:20

Depee: Trying to stop some of the mistakes from before with regard to terminology. For example, the voluntary heritage tree ordinance language on page 4.26 (page 61). He requests the word voluntary be taken out due to subjectivity.

Knutson explains that the voluntary language was the intent of the community.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Gustavson adopt plan as submitted subject to any amendment for changes.

Gustavson: Page 3-12, the section on public right of way and tax title strips. He expresses concern about more County owned and maintained property.

Amendment to the motion is made by Commissioner Gustavson and seconded by Commissioner Hough that this section be held in advance until the community comes forward with a proposed trail system that would accommodate these tax title parcels, and identify them. The rest of them would be up for typical acquisition as people would desire.

Nevins: The properties can be disposed of according to the language within this. I particularly like this section. I would encourage that we retain this language.

Discussion is held about parcels issue and that the trails issue is covered in the document and there is a procedure already in place. The process is clarified by Commissioner Sommerhauser.

Depee calls for vote on the Amendment to the Motion.

The Vote:
Yes: 2
No: 6
Motion Fails

Gustavson: I’ll speak to this in a general sense. How many community plans to we need? Details out the question of why each community needs their own plan.

Depee: That is what the beauty of Kitsap County is all about. Discusses the uniqueness of the county and that the uniqueness calls for community plans.
Sommerhauser: Agrees with Chair Depee. Admits that it costs more, but the residents have the right to ask for some say so in their community.

Discussion is held about the large community support for the plan.

Gustavson: Brings up the financial impact of community plans.

Foritano: States that the cost is more from a lack of regulation and explains why he believes that. He supports a balance in the spirit of operational efficiency, but do need to have public participation.

Depee calls for a vote on the motion

The Motion
The Vote:
Yes: 7
No: 1
Abstain 0
The Motion Carries

G. Work Session – Minutes/Staff and Planning Commission Roles & Responsibilities: Scott Diener, Policy & Planning Manger

Diener discusses the role of minutes/staff and the Planning Commission.

Discussion was held about the Planning Commission minutes and the importance of the notes. They are intended to be a synopsis of discussions, not meant to be a transcript. He points out that the role of the Planning Commission Secretary has been eliminated and the duties will be rotated among different staff.

Diener clarifies that that motions, actions, and the reasons for the motions need to be detailed. The official record of the Planning Commission meeting is what is adopted by the Planning Commission. The audio recording can be referenced, but is not the official record.

Clarification is made that the October 14th meeting is at 6:30 pm and the October 28th meeting will be at 6:30 pm. The October 21st meeting to discuss code development has been canceled.

11:24:15

Diener reviews the role of the staff and of minority reports. He states that the role of staff is to provide the Planning Commission and the Public with enough information, background, and accountability of the public process to enable the Planning Commission to formulate a defensible recommendation to the Board and to the Public. Staff is generally neutral, but provides a recommendation in the process. He asks that the Planning Commission take into consideration how they formulate feedback to staff.

Diener explains that minority reports are submitted by the individual or individuals of descent, there is not usually a vote, and they should be submitted alongside
the findings of fact. Minority reports should be reflected in the record, but not be expanded to include any discussion which was not carried on during that discussion of descent.

Discussion is held about the intent and process for minority reports.

Clarification is made that documents are emailed to the Planning Commission with the exception of Commissioner Taylor, who receives documents by mail.

Sommerhauser requests clarification of the status of 4 vote vs. 5 votes. Diener states that that will be coming in the rules and procedures.

Gustavson requests a briefing of Thurston Co. vs. Western Washington Growth Management Board. Diener states that he will put that on Shelly Kneips agenda.

H. Public Comment

Vivian Henderson discusses the importance of both the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.

I. For the Good of the Order

A motion is made by Commissioner Hough and seconded by Commissioner Sommerhauser to adjourn the meeting.

The VOTE:
Unanimous
Motion Carries

Time of Adjournment: 11:39:18

EXHIBITS
A. Comments to the Kitsap County Planning Commission on Waaga Way connector Roads
B. Revised Alternative 4 is not the best option for Kitsap County
C. Illahee Deliberation Option Sheet

MINUTES approved this _______ day of _______2008.

___________________________________________
Fred Depee, Planning Commission Chair

___________________________________________
Mary Seals, Planning Commission Secretary