Kitsap County Planning Commission – October 28, 2008

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers

October 28, 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: Co-Chair Linda Paralez, John Hough, Lou Foritano, Jim Sommerhauser, Lou Foritano, Tom Nevins, John Taylor and Robert Baglio

Staff present: Katrina Knutson, Pete Sullivan, Dennis Oost, Scott Diener, Larry Keeton, and Planning Commission Secretary Mary Seals

Members absent: Mike Gustavson, and Fred Depee

6:30:00

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

B. Adoption of Agenda

A motion is made by Commissioner Baglio seconded by Commissioner Sommerhauser to adopt the agenda as posted.

The Vote:
Unanimous
The motion carries

6:31:52

C. Public Comment

Paralez asks for public comments.

D. Approval of Minutes

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Foritano to approve the minutes of October 14, 2008.

The Vote:
Yes: 6
Abstain: 1
The motion carries

6:31:52

E. Deliberation & Recommendation – Kingston Sub-Area Plan

Update/Append: Pete Sullivan, Associate Planner, DCD
Sullivan reviews the work program and related documents.

Foritano: Given the situation with the budget, these are very big ticket items, what’s the likelihood we will see any of this in our lifetime.

Sullivan explains that this is a wish list for what the community would like to see. When it comes time to look at doing improvements, the decision makers can look at this as see if it is desired in that area and satisfies comp plan goals.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and second by Commissioner Foritano to adopt the Kingston Sub-Area plan Update and associated documents.

The Vote:
Unanimous
The Motion Carries

6:38:25

F. Work Study – Silverdale Design Standards: Katrina Knutson, Associate Planner, DCD

Knutson present a brief overview of the Silverdale Design Standards. She introduced Dennis Oost, Senior Planner, DCD.

Paralez requests explanation of the replacement of will with shall.

Knutson explains that it was done for semantics. Shall and will are both mandatory.

Foritano: As it relates to the Waaga Way town center, there was a big development company that has a couple major lots. They suggested that they intended to try to be the master developer. Have they been involved in terms of input?

Knutson: Yes, they are one of the only developers that have consistently provided input into this document.

Sommerhauser asks about existing buildings would then become non-conforming? Is there any update to the buildings that didn’t include the entry would still require they come into conformance.

Knutson explains that it is a certain percentage of the value. She reads the design standards section 1.4 on page 3, regarding non-conforming existing structures.

Sommerhauser clarifies that it is a one time less than 50% or a cumulative value over three years.

Baglio: How is the value determined?

Knutson: The Assessor.
Discussion was held about the location of Business Parks in the design.

Paralez requests Knutson reiterate the process and schedule.

Knutson does so. She clarifies how the public has been notified of the meetings.

Discussion is held about the public’s awareness of the Silverdale Design Standards process and meeting schedules.

Paralez: When is this scheduled to be on the BOCC?

Knutson: I believe it’s on December 22nd it’s scheduled to adopt.

Discussion is held about when the Planning Commission’s deliberations and Public Hearings should end.

It’s decided that they close the hearing and vote at the November 12, 2008 meeting.

Diener clarifies that the valuation of a structure is determined through the building permit process.

Discussion is held about allowing 5 days after the 12th meeting for writing response to the hearings.

Knutson assures the Planning Commission that there will be various and many notices for the public hearing.

Baglio: I have a comment about the value. Right now when we go to submit for a commercial building permit, the person submitting the application actually assigns the value and that’s what the fee is based on. Is that going to change?

Diener: No, I don’t believe the valuation process of permitting is going to change.

Dennis Oost reviews 3 projects that have been submitted to DCD in the Silverdale area.

Foritano: Let me see if I understand. If you allow laxity or a voluntary view towards guidelines the development examples that you’ve expressed would suggest that the developers in play here are going to build to the max; without consideration of the overall macro view. What I’m hearing you say, is a pretty powerful for first tightening up and clarifying where it is appropriate mandatory design guidelines and making them mandatory as opposed to leaving to developers the aesthetic view of their properties. I want to make sure I understand the purpose of this detail here.

Oost: I understand your point; there is some validity to it. We want to have flexibility in the development community so that they can be creative. So that they can do things that don’t pin them down…
Foritano: I don’t hear creativity; I hear building to the max. I hear balconies over sidewalks, I hear 0 lot lines. Where it certainly does not have to do with respect to the global intent of the guidelines but honoring the way they are written within a very narrow scope, allowing maximum building.

Oost: Exactly right, the definitive regulations that protect the aesthetics of a place and neighboring properties, unless they are solid regulations and not a requirement, it’s more square footage for the building to get closer. There are a lot of current examples out there that really show what the lack of that regulation can do.

Paralez: Are you saying that the zoning is not the overarching regulation of the design guidelines?

Oost: The top of the line of regulations is the Design Guidelines. They trump Title 17 if there is ever a conflict. That’s in 1.4.2 under Conflicts. These are the first three examples I encountered after the Design Guidelines were in effect.

Sommerhauser: Are all three of these vested?

Oost: They’re not vested on a Pre-App, they are vested on an application. One of them is an application. The other two have not come in as applications.

Baglio: He gives an example of Design Guideline limitations problems with Cosmos on Bethel corridor.

Oost: I think the setbacks and the requirement for the landscaping to establish one of the overriding goals like a pedestrian walkway around Dyes Inlet; that should be a regulation that is pretty stiff. A lot of these areas should be treated differently, they want a different character, but to protect neighboring residential properties it’s very important to have setbacks within the commercial zone so that you can get some trees and shrubbery to buffer that commercial function from where people live.

Baglio: It did catch my eye on page 17 section 3.4.3; “onsite parking lot shall be located to the rear or side yard or both, access by an alley driveway.” Once again we are mandating where the parking is going to be located. A little different than the examples you gave. We need to be careful how we’re requiring the site to be laid out, specifically with parking location.

7:17:28

Foritano: Most of the examples you gave, was the parking not underneath?

Oost: The parking was underneath in most examples, but when it came to residential. This one, the whole ground floor was parking, so when you are walking along the sidewalk you’re just looking at parking through the building. He continues with more detail about parking in the examples he presented.

Knutson addressing the parking inquiry and clarifies the different in the parking requirements in different design districts.
Taylor requests to have the three examples sent to the Planning Commission members.

Knutson requests that questions, comments, and concerns are forwarded to staff prior to the public hearing. She notes the two new districts.

Sommerhauser expresses concern about working on three different, but related areas and keeping them consistent with each other; Phase 3 Code Development, Waaga Way Connector Roads, and Silverdale Design Standards.

Knutson assures him that staff is working very closely together and the BOCC will be able to view all three together.

Sommerhauser asks if any of the changes they made with Phase 3 development has caused any issues in the Silverdale Design Standards document.

Knutson identifies one issue that needs to be worked out internally; when permits come into within the Design districts the Land Use reviewers will need review for Design Standards only.

Foritano requests that Old Town Silverdale residents are amply notified.

Paralez points out Knutson’s email address and requests comments are sent prior to the November 12 meeting.

7:32:17

G. For the Good of the Order

Diener: I spoke with Loren Johnson regarding his concerns with the 8/12/2008 minutes. He gives an overview of the meeting he had with him last week and had Mr. Johnson’s issues addressed as best as they could be.

Discussion is held about the Committee of the Whole.

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

The VOTE:

Unanimous

Motion Carries

Time of Adjournment: 7:39:04

EXHIBITS

A. 18.2 Kingston Sub-Area Plan Implementation
B. Chapter 12. Kingston Sub-Area Plan
C. 8.0 Implementation
D. Kingston Sub-Area Plan Draft Work Program
E. Silverdale Design Standards- Fact Sheet
F. Staff Report: Draft Amendments to the Silverdale Design Standards
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G. Map of Proposed Design Districts with Zoning

MINUTES approved this _______ day of _______2008.

___________________________________________
Fred Depee, Planning Commission Chair

___________________________________________
Mary Seals, Planning Commission Secretary