

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

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

1 **Sullivan reviews the work program and related documents.**

2
3 *Foritano: Given the situation with the budget, these are very big ticket items,*
4 *what's the likelihood we will see any of this in our lifetime.*

5
6 **Sullivan explains that this is a wish list for what the community would like to see.**
7 **When it comes time to look at doing improvements, the decision makers can look**
8 **at this as see if it is desired in that area and satisfies comp plan goals.**

9
10 **A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and second by Commissioner**
11 **Foritano to adopt the Kingston Sub-Area plan Update and associated documents.**

12
13 **The Vote:**
14 **Unanimous**
15 **The Motion Carries**

16
17 **6:38:25**

18
19
20 **F. Work Study – Silverdale Design Standards: Katrina Knutson, Associate**
21 **Planner, DCD**

22
23 *Knutson present a brief overview of the Silverdale Design Standards. She*
24 *introduced Dennis Oost, Senior Planner, DCD.*

25
26 *Paralez requests explanation of the replacement of will with shall.*

27
28 *Knutson explains that it was done for semantics. Shall and will are both*
29 *mandatory.*

30
31 *Foritano: As it relates to the Waaga Way town center, there was a big*
32 *development company that has a couple major lots. They suggested that they*
33 *intended to try to be the master developer. Have they been involved in terms of*
34 *input?*

35
36 *Knutson: Yes, they are one of the only developers that have consistently provided input*
37 *into this document.*

38
39 *Sommerhauser asks about existing buildings would then become non-*
40 *conforming? Is there any update to the buildings that didn't include the entry*
41 *would still require they come into conformance.*

42
43 *Knutson explains that it is a certain percentage of the value. She reads the design*
44 *standards section 1.4 on page 3, regarding non-conforming existing structures.*

45
46 *Sommerhauser clarifies that it is a one time less than 50% or a cumulative value*
47 *over three years.*

48
49 *Baglio: How is the value determined?*

50
51 *Knutson: The Assessor.*

1
2 **Discussion was held about the location of Business Parks in the design.**

3
4 **Paralez requests Knutson reiterate the process and schedule.**

5
6 **Knutson does so. She clarifies how the public has been notified of the meetings.**

7
8 **Discussion is held about the public's awareness of the Silverdale Design**
9 **Standards process and meeting schedules.**

10
11 **Paralez: When is this scheduled to be on the BOCC?**

12
13 **Knutson: I believe it's on December 22nd it's scheduled to adopt.**

14
15 **Discussion is held about when the Planning Commission's deliberations and**
16 **Public Hearings should end.**

17 **It's decided that they close the hearing and vote at the November 12, 2008**
18 **meeting.**

19
20 **Diener clarifies that the valuation of a structure is determined through the building**
21 **permit process.**

22
23 **Discussion is held about allowing 5 days after the 12th meeting for writing**
24 **response to the hearings.**

25
26 **Knutson assures the Planning Commission that there will be various and many**
27 **notices for the public hearing.**

28
29 **Baglio: I have a comment about the value. Right now when we go to submit for a**
30 **commercial building permit, the person submitting the application actually**
31 **assigns the value and that's what the fee is based on. Is that going to change?**

32
33 **Diener: No, I don't believe the valuation process of permitting is going to change.**

34
35 **Dennis Oost reviews 3 projects that have been submitted to DCD in the Silverdale**
36 **area.**

37
38 **Foritano: Let me see if I understand. If you allow laxity or a voluntary view**
39 **towards guidelines the development examples that you've expressed would**
40 **suggest that the developers in play here are going to build to the max; without**
41 **consideration of the overall macro view. What I'm hearing you say, is a pretty**
42 **powerful for first tightening up and clarifying where it is appropriate mandatory**
43 **design guidelines and making them mandatory as opposed to leaving to**
44 **developers the aesthetic view of their properties. I want to make sure I**
45 **understand the purpose of this detail here.**

46
47 **Oost: I understand your point; there is some validity to it. We want to have flexibility in**
48 **the development community so that they can be creative. So that they can do things**
49 **that don't pin them down...**

50

Kitsap County Planning Commission – October 28, 2008

1 **Foritano:** *I don't hear creativity; I hear building to the max. I hear balconies over*
2 *sidewalks, I hear 0 lot lines. Where it certainly does not have to do with respect*
3 *to the global intent of the guidelines but honoring the way they are written within*
4 *a very narrow scope, allowing maximum building.*

5
6 **Oost:** *Exactly right, the definitive regulations that protect the aesthetics of a place and*
7 *neighboring properties, unless they are solid regulations and not a requirement, it's more*
8 *square footage for the building to get closer. There are a lot of current examples out*
9 *there that really show what the lack of that regulation can do.*

10
11 **Paralez:** *Are you saying that the zoning is not the overarching regulation of the*
12 *design guidelines?*

13
14 **Oost:** *The top of the line of regulations is the Design Guidelines. They trump Title 17 if*
15 *there is ever a conflict. That's in 1.4.2 under Conflicts. These are the first three*
16 *examples I encountered after the Design Guidelines were in effect.*

17
18 **Sommerhauser:** *Are all three of these vested?*

19
20 **Oost:** *They're not vested on a Pre-App, they are vested on an application. One of them*
21 *is an application. The other two have not come in as applications.*

22
23 **Baglio:** *He gives an example of Design Guideline limitations problems with*
24 *Cosmos on Bethel corridor.*

25
26 **Oost:** *I think the setbacks and the requirement for the landscaping to establish one of*
27 *the overriding goals like a pedestrian walkway around Dyes Inlet; that should be a*
28 *regulation that is pretty stiff. A lot of these areas should be treated differently, they want*
29 *a different character, but to protect neighboring residential properties it's very important*
30 *to have setbacks within the commercial zone so that you can get some trees and*
31 *shrubbery to buffer that commercial function from where people live.*

32
33 **Baglio:** *It did catch my eye on page 17 section 3.4.3; "onsite parking lot shall be*
34 *located to the rear or side yard or both, access by an alley driveway." Once*
35 *again we are mandating where the parking is going to be located. A little*
36 *different than the examples you gave. We need to be careful how we're requiring*
37 *the site to be laid out, specifically with parking location.*

38
39 **7:17:28**

40
41 **Foritano:** *Most of the examples you gave, was the parking not underneath?*

42
43 **Oost:** *The parking was underneath in most examples, but when it came to residential.*
44 *This one, the whole ground floor was parking, so when you are walking along the*
45 *sidewalk you're just looking at parking through the building. **He continues with more***
46 ***detail about parking in the examples he presented.***

47
48 **Knutson addressing the parking inquiry and clarifies the different in the parking**
49 **requirements in different design districts.**

50

1 *Taylor requests to have the three examples sent to the Planning Commission*
2 *members.*

3
4 **Knutson requests that questions, comments, and concerns are forwarded to staff**
5 **prior to the public hearing. She notes the two new districts.**

6
7 **Sommerhauser expresses concern about working on three different, but related**
8 **areas and keeping them consistent with each other; Phase 3 Code Development,**
9 **Waaga Way Connector Roads, and Silverdale Design Standards.**

10
11 **Knutson assures him that staff is working very closely together and the BOCC will**
12 **be able to view all three together.**

13
14 **Sommerhauser asks if any of the changes they made with Phase 3 development**
15 **has caused any issues in the Silverdale Design Standards document.**

16
17 **Knutson identifies one issue that needs to be worked out internally; when permits**
18 **come into within the Design districts the Land Use reviewers will need review for**
19 **Design Standards only.**

20
21 **Foritano requests that Old Town Silverdale residents are amply notified.**

22
23 **Paralez points out Knutson's email address and requests comments are**
24 **sent prior to the November 12 meeting.**

25
26 **7:32:17**

27
28 **G. For the Good of the Order**

29
30 **Diener: I spoke with Loren Johnson regarding his concerns with the 8/12/2008**
31 **minutes. He gives an overview of the meeting he had with him last week and had**
32 **Mr. Johnson's issues addressed as best as they could be.**

33
34 **Discussion is held about the Committee of the Whole.**

35
36 **A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by**
37 **Commissioner Foritano to adjourn the meeting.**

38
39 **The VOTE:**
40 **Unanimous**
41 **Motion Carries**

42
43 **Time of Adjournment: 7:39:04**

44
45 **EXHIBITS**

- 46 A. 18.2 Kingston Sub-Are Plan Implementation
47 B. Chapter 12. Kingston Sub-Area Plan
48 C. 8.0 Implementation
49 D. Kingston Sub-Area Plan Draft Work Program
50 E. Silverdale Design Standards- Fact Sheet
51 F. Staff Report: Draft Amendments to the Silverdale Design Standards

Kitsap County Planning Commission – October 28, 2008

G. Map of Proposed Design Districts with Zoning

MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2008.

Fred Depee, Planning Commission Chair

Mary Seals, Planning Commission Secretary

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10