M I N U T E S

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

February 1, 2000


9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order - Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

➢ Discussion of the Kitsap County Rural Policy with staff.

Bruce Freeland said there were a lot of activities that have bearing on the rural areas. He recounted that comment was made to the Central Puget Sound Hearings Board that Kitsap’s Comprehensive Plan was not a complete plan, but a plan to plan. He reported that our Comprehensive Plan requires staff to come back and review several issues of the Plan during the yearly amendment process.

Carl Walske asked if staff would explain the purpose of the Rural Policy Paper and how it would be used in the future.

Bruce Freeland said on Page 4 of the Rural Paper there was a listing of the activities planned for this year that have bearing on this rural policy, which included: The Open Space Plan; Non-motorized plan, which overlaps the Open Space Plan; work on Interim Forestry, Phase II; the Kingston Subarea Plan, an expansion of the Urban Growth Area; the Manchester Subarea Plan, an area of more intensive rural activity; the Shoreline Master Plan update; the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area Subarea Plan, an expansion of a UGA into an Urban Reserve area; Endangered Species Act (ESA), 4(d) rule; Watershed planning issues; and the Chico Basin Plan. He said that out of this list staff would make changes to County regulations in ESA, Forestry, and the Shoreline Master Plan. He said this would require that many of the County’s ordinances would need to be amended. He said he would prefer to gather up the various changes to the ordinances and make all the changes to the individual ordinances at that time, probably late summer to fall on the work plan for this year. He said that there also need to be an amendment to the County’s
Comprehensive Plan, following the changes that will take place in the ordinances. He reported that the Comprehensive Plan could only be amended once a year. He said that to date there is no agenda prepared to outline changes to the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that there would be some items that will not be changed in the Comprehensive Plan this year, but will need to wait until year 2001. He said this would include the overall rural element. He said that the Manchester Plan would clearly need to be produced by the residents of Manchester. He explained that it will not be possible to tie all of these parts together; they will need to be reviewed as individual projects, adding that through the policy paper and the public process there will be some guidance provided on this program.

Carl Walske asked if the Rural Policy Paper was a working document to be used by staff as a “road map” and guidelines that would have no force by it?

Bruce Freeland agreed, adding that the Rural Paper will have a quick summary of the current adopted policies and will address some new policy ideas. Eventually, he continued, these ideas will be incorporated into the Rural Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Carl Walske said on Page 4, in 3 places, the Paper states that the Planning Commission will update... He expressed that the Planning Commission was an advisory body and that language should be revised. He felt that a global tasking of the Planning Commission be addressed at the bottom of the page. He also asked about the term “non-motorized plan”, and the meaning of that.

Bruce Freeland said that Bill Zupancic will explain the Non-Motorized plan and Rick Fackler and Joseph Coppo of the Parks Department will explain the Open Space plan. He then explained that through a series of activities the Greenways Plan will be adopted this year; not in its current package but through the Open Space plan. He reported that the term “greenways” addresses bike paths, horse trails and so forth and that has been labeled Non-Motorized. He said if it were off the public right-of-way it would be part of the Open Space plan.

John Ahl noted on Page 10 of the Rural Policy Paper, that individual members of the Planning Commission should be involved in the various committees in the County on a continuing basis.

Carl Walske noted the Memorandum from Bruce Freeland that was received with the Draft Rural Paper. He said that one of the questions asked was if there were projects that were not addressed in the Paper? He said that there was no statement that addressed whether Kitsap citizens could create another development like McCormick Woods, for example. He asked if there might be situations where the County wants a certain type of development but were prevented from that by the Growth Management Act? He recounted that when the Shorelines Management Plan was approved, one of the
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requirements was for 5-acre minimum lot sizes on waterfront. He felt that it was
more important to define the size by front-feet of waterfront instead of acreage and that the County was working with the wrong numbers. He stated that there were other issues going on in this County besides land use planning, such as property tax revenue. He said that the waterfront and view property produce large quantities of taxes, which are important to the County and by requiring front footage of waterfront land instead of acreage, it will bring additional revenue into this County.

Nobi Kawasaki said that the Board of Commissioners has the responsibility to determine the overall vision of the County regarding Rural Policy. He felt that the problem that occurred with the Comprehensive Plan process was that all the UGAs. Forest and Mineral land in the Plan were reviewed in succession without looking at the whole, and the rural acreage is what was left and basically undefined.

Bruce Freeland said that part of what Carl Walske brought up was addressed in the Policy Paper. What he would like to look at further was clustering and density transfer, which may take place later on in the year. The immediate concern, he continued, was that the Board of Commissioners will be reviewing this Draft Rural Paper on February 3, 2000 and he needed to make any changes that the Planning Commission felt were necessary to this Paper before his presentation to the Board of Commissioners.

Carl Walske said that he found language such as: will do nothing to encourage development in rural areas, very startling.

Nobi Kawasaki said that the Open Space Tax should be listed as a separate item.

Bruce Freeland said that the next issue will be the public process and that Bill Zupancic will review the Non-Motorized portion of the program.

Bill Zupancic of County Transportation Planning said that it has been over 3 years since he has discussed the Greenways Plan with the Planning Commission. He recounted that in 1991 a bicycle and improvement plan was developed, adding that .05% of the gas tax can be used for that process. He said that this tax generates about $20,000 per year for this purpose. He said that this revenue is set-aside for the Special Purpose Path Fund and early on it was decided to use that money for planning of bicycle paths. He said that the Indianola Greenways Plan was created by the Indianola community and presented to the County, which was designed to use trails and greenways in Indianola. He said that this Plan has had the largest public involvement that the County has undertaken during the past 8 years. Following that, he continued, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) Plan came about through the legislature, which makes federal highway dollars available for paths and greenways. The greenways term has become very
confusing. He said that the Greenways Plan actually houses 4 separate plans: the Transportation Element; the Non-Motorized Element; the Recreation/Off Road Plan; and the Scenic and Natural Resources Element. He stated that these are 4 stand-alone plans. He said that now it is time to break this Plan up into its necessary parts. He reported that the Public Works Department has used this Non-Motorized Element for road widening and so forth as though it was an adopted part of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that the Recreation Element belongs in the Parks Department, which will be included in the Open Space Plan, and the Scenic Plan will roll over to the Department of Community Development to be implemented there. He said that there is still work to be done on the Non-Motorized Plan. He said that the Puget Sound Regional Council requires this element in the County’s Transportation Plan and ultimately in the Comprehensive Plan. With some of the projects, he continued, the staff has been hindered by the inability to obtain grant funding to complete them. He recounted that during the planning process for the Greenways Plan the Mosquito Fleet Trail was never brought up in detail, adding that the favored places followed the County’s shorelines. Currently, he said, staff is currently delineating the Mosquito Fleet Trail for road widening and so forth on our maps.

Bruce Freeland asked how the term “non-motorized” came about?

Bill Zupancic said that the emphasis at the time was not just on moving cars but moving people. He said this term encompasses transit, pedestrians and bicycles.

Carl Walske asked how much of the Mosquito Fleet Trail was located in the County’s right-of-ways?

Bill Zupancic said that some of the Trail is located in County right-of-ways. He said that they were planning to leave the right-of-ways and make additional trails to the parks and so forth. If systems were built in the right-of-ways, he continued, and segregated from the roads with curbing, it would be very expensive. Otherwise, he said it would be a matter of signage and being delineated as the Mosquito Fleet Trail, which could be expanded later on, adding that they were planning to do these trails as small projects, one at a time. He explained that staff could use some of the County Road Fund for this project, but they would be competing for the local dollars, adding that now the attitude is there to make some of these improvements locally. He said there is some funding included in the 6-Year Road Program designated as “GC” on the listing. He said that hopefully, there would be more improvements made this year. He said the Mosquito Fleet Trail process should be done by this summer and then the Capital Facilities Element will need to be updated, with the Non-motorized process ready for review in the fall of 2000. He said that staff would like this to become part of the County’s Comprehensive Plan during this year, if possible.
John Ahl said that the Planning Commission does not like surprises, and asked if this could be presented to the members in a Work Study Session prior to the public process it would be much preferred.

Bill Zupancic said that the public involvement process on the Mosquito Fleet would be presented to the Board of Commissioners very soon.

John Ahl said he would like to be educated ahead of time, before the public process begins.

Nobi Kawasaki said that even though the Comprehensive Plan Amendments will be forthcoming, he would like the Planning Commission to be involved in the Mosquito Fleet process as well.

Bruce Freeland said that the Non-Motorized Plan should be adopted into the Comprehensive Plan and that will involve the Planning Commission.

Carl Walske noted Page 4 of the Rural Paper and said that in the past there has not been enough cohesion to pull all these plans together.

Bruce Freeland said that there is an interdepartmental task force working on pulling this whole concept together and this group has reviewed the draft Rural Paper and made an outline specifying how this should all fall into place. He said that the staff is ready to get going with Interim Forestry as soon as the Planner position is filled to replace Joseph Coppo who has transferred to the Parks Department. First, he said, staff will clean up the County’s Comprehensive Plan and then a committee will review the Interim Forestry Plan. He explained that this year’s work plan was to have some Comprehensive Plan amendments go before the Planning Commission, with a Land Use Map revision on Forestry included in that Plan, which should not be too difficult to prepare. He reported that the Manchester Subarea Planning Committee began on January 29, 2000 and they will take about a year to complete the entire process; the Kingston Plan will be continuing review through mid-summer and the Poulsbo Plan is into its final draft. Further, he reported, the Chico Study is a comprehensive study of the watersheds and Renee Beam will prepare the Shoreline Master program, with buffers and setbacks, and a new inventory of the different shoreline categories.

Rick Fackler of the County Parks and Recreation Department said that there was an Open Space Plan that is being used in this County and now in order to continue funding for grants, this Plan must be completed by June 23, 2000. He reviewed the list of the upcoming meetings on this Plan for the members and explained that in early May, following the draft of the Plan, there will be another series of meetings. He further explained that the Planning Commission will be involved as an element of the Comprehensive Plan but not as part of the expedited process, which is being done for the IAC process. He said that open spaces are preserved in many different ways and there are many roles
that the Planning Commission needs to have in this process. He said that the staff's intention was to have a vision of what this County should look like in the next 50 years. He said that the Parks Department portion of that would be land acquisition at the end of the process, which can be accomplished by a Capital Facilities Plan.

Carl Walske asked in its current form, how much impact does this Plan have on the County; as he understood it, this program is to preserve special places?

Rick Fackler said that the Open Space Plan could have some impact on the property purchased. He said that currently staff is trying to find ways to purchase the Banner Forest and some other smaller parcels.

Nobi Kawasaki asked how this Plan would come before the Planning Commission on the short-term basis?

Joseph Coppo said that the draft Plan will be published May 1st, 2000, and then there will be a hearing process with the Planning Commission and a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners by June 2000.

Bruce Freeland said the in terms of public process each Plan will have some sort of public participation, which will have a relationship to the Planning Commission. He said that it was important to ask those who are working on this to have a policy framework. He explained that the Rural Paper gives a capsule summary with the opportunity to give policy guidance, so that these are part of the interests of the County as a whole. He further explained that there would be some publicity about these issues and public meetings in March 2000, adding that he would like the Planning Commission members who live in those areas to come to these meetings, which will also be publicized by the local newspaper, if possible. He explained that these meetings will present an opportunity for the community to connect with staff who will be putting together each of these Plans.

Carl Walske asked if this Rural Paper could be the centerpiece of the Work Plan meetings that are coming up?

Bruce Freeland agreed. He said that the University of Washington and Stuart Elway would be doing presentations at these meetings. He said Mr. Elway would be doing a poll at these meetings using electronic voting devices that will immediately tally a vote of the audience, which would be an energetic way to get immediate ideas back from the public.

Linda Rowe asked what size of group would be able to participate in a process like this?
Bruce Freeland said that Mr. Elway would be able to poll about 100 people at a time, so it may be a first-come-first-serve basis if more than 100 people attended each meeting.

Carl Walske said that he did not like the breakout groups that were used for the salmon summit meetings. He would rather allow people a chance to give their individual opinions.

Nobi Kawasaki expressed that he did not want this rural process to be confused with the ESA process that will be going on at the same time.

Bruce Freeland agreed that if these Rural Policy meetings were not done by March, then there would not be any purpose for holding them. He said that if they can hook up with the local newspapers then they could get a survey out to the people and get early responses back.

William Matchett said that the ESA process, in some way, connects with all of the issues listed for review.

Bruce Freeland said that if staff can pull this off, it would be a very good way to get additional public participation.

Nobi Kawasaki asked if the members go out to the public, what should they tell them that the County is planning for Rural Policy?

Bruce Freeland said a good response would be awareness and getting input from the public on what has been done to date. He said that there could be a follow-up meeting after these meetings in March.

Nobi Kawasaki asked if they should tell the community that these meetings would be held to make amendments to the County’s Comprehensive Plan?

William Matchett said that if there were going to be amendments to our Comprehensive Plan that the issues would need to be very focused.

Bruce Freeland asked how the Planning Commission would like to be involved in this process?

Carl Walske said if there is a topic that will go before the Board of County Commissioners, then the Planning Commission would like to have a public hearing beforehand to make a recommendation to the County Commissioners.

Bruce Freeland would like to see a liaison between the individual Planning Commission members to attend meetings on some of these issues. He said that he would like one of the members to be involved in Poulsbo Plan.
John Ahl said he would do that.

Bruce Freeland said that the Non-Motorized Plan would come before the Planning Commission.

William Matchett said that his wife Judy was involved in the meetings with OSPAG so he would prefer to attend the meeting on the Shoreline Master Program.

Bruce Freeland said that the Shoreline Master Program would be coming to the Planning Commission in its entirety for a public hearing.

Deborah Flynn said that she would like to be involved in the Forestry issue.

Rick Fackler said that a few years ago there was a Public Facilities Committee as well as a Greenways Committee and so forth, and these have been combined into the Open Space Parks and Greenways Committee (OSPAG), which is also known as the Parks Board. He reported that OSPAG meets monthly and they make recommendations on property purchases and open space in the County to the Board of Commissioners.

Linda Rowe said that she would attend the OSPAG meetings.

Bruce Freeland said that this Rural Policy Paper would be shared with the different issues to be used as a guideline. He said that he would pass along any recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners that the Planning Commission had.

William Matchett said in the Policy Framework there are many verbs and then in the Groundwater Section, where are the verbs? Have we had no groundwater policy?

Bruce Freeland said that the Plan points to the area of concern.

Deborah Flynn said that many of the aquifer recharge areas are not mapped and mainly it is just the area in Hansville; however, the wellhead protection zones are mapped.

Bruce Freeland agreed and said that this is a terribly important topic that the County does not have much information on.

Carl Walske said in Section 3, Page 5, the last paragraph, limited areas for adequate fire flow, should be re-written to make it clearer. On the top of page 6, beginning at fourth line: “... by steering most of our future growth to urban areas. Success in changing this pattern will strengthen both the urban and rural areas. This paper only addresses actions needed in the rural areas;
equal attention needs to be given to making the urban areas successful in attracting growth.” He asked what that meant?

Bruce Freeland said the policy states 2/3rds of the County’s growth should take place in the urban areas, but that is not what the County did, and he gave the formula the County used to figure this split. He said that the policy was either not implemented or not stated clearly. He explained that with all residential growth in the County, 54% is taking place outside of the cities or outside the UGAs.

John Ahl asked what the incorporated areas were doing to reverse this process?

Bruce Freeland said that Poulsbo is trying to expand its UGA and the biggest city, Bremerton, is not achieving the level of growth that the Comprehensive Plan was anticipating.

John Ahl said that the County should not be responsible for encouraging that growth.

Bruce Freeland agreed.

Nobi Kawasaki said that one of the problems with looking at rural development is that so much of the urban growth affects the rural usage.

Bruce Freeland said the County can play a role in helping the cities and gave some examples for the members.

Linda Rowe asked if the cities were charging impact fees?

Bruce Freeland said that Port Orchard and Bremerton do not charge impact fees.

Carl Walske said in Section 5, Page 6, the first bullet; in the long run the County has the provision to allow development subdivisions in rural areas with a 5-acre limit, if the demand is there it may happen. He felt there should be some wordsmithing done to that section.

Bruce Freeland said that the term “capacity” implies the subdivision in the rural areas.

ISSUES:

John Ahl said the County needs to map the Critical Recharge Areas.

Deborah Flynn asked whether there are policies to protect those areas once they are mapped?
Bruce Freeland said that certain listed uses are covered and those should be included as well.

Nobi Kawasaki said that once the Critical Recharge Areas are mapped this issue would become clearer.

Bruce Freeland said that the information came from the Public Utility District and they have more detailed information on the Recharge Areas that the County needs to obtain.

Deborah Flynn said the County needs to protect the quality and quantity of the groundwater.

Carl Walske said in the shorelines, water dependent uses are preferred.

Bruce Freeland said that within the Shoreline Master Plan water uses are listed and water dependent uses required.

Carl Walske said that the shorelines are being used for living. He asked about the statement to minimize view blockage and questioned whose views should be maintained?

Bruce Freeland said that there is a View Blockage Ordinance in the County that is already in effect.

Carl Walske said to minimize impervious surfaces; the best way to accomplish that is not to develop.

Bruce Freeland said in the Shoreline Master Plan it means not to pave more area than you are using.

Carl Walske said on Page 8 at the bottom, what was meant by “Build safe transportation systems that preserve the rural character”?

Bruce Freeland said that he was paraphrasing what the Plan says by not paving the shoulders of the roads and so forth.

John Ahl felt that the preservation of pervious surfaces should be an underlined fundamental issue. He said it appears that the County does not know if it should support development or thwart it by regulations. He said in his opinion, we have undeveloped lots and the tenor of the policy should be to support appropriate growth in the rural areas, that does not preclude consolidation of lots that are non-conforming and in this way we guide and support development in the rural areas.

William Matchett said that we need to encourage lot aggregation.
Bruce Freeland said that a controversial issue that came up in the salmon discussions was the lot aggregation.

Nobi Kawasaki said on Page 11, “Too much of the County’s development is occurring in rural area”, makes it more of a negative thing and this County should take a more proactive approach.

Bruce Freeland said in part, he is anticipating an obligation for a monitoring buildable lands report, which is definitely due, and if our land pattern does not reflect the County policies, those must be changed to be compliant with the GMA.

Carl Walske said on the top of Page 10, the suggestions for work groups, in the lead paragraph, the present status of these suggestions appears as though they have been made into policy.

Bruce Freeland said for the most part, this is brainstorming. He said he does not know what the ecosystem report implies, but because of the salmon work the challenge for the County is how much growth can take place and still have an intact environment. He said of all of the people who said one size should not fit all, that implies a regulated system that requires a lot of information. He said he is attracted by the physiological point of view, but how does that take place? He said that until the County knows more, it is best not to make too many changes.

Nobi Kawasaki felt that the County would be forced to go in that direction and identify the critical areas first, before making policy.

John Ahl said that keeping a holistic view involves more close participation between the cities, the County and the “Feds”.

Carl Walske suggested that the Rural Paper include some proposed policy direction and change to support our land use plans. Further, he said there should be examples for incentives to keep land in timber production.

Bruce Freeland felt that the incentives needed to be studied.

Deborah Flynn noted a typographical error on Page 13; change marking to marketing.

Carl Walske noted the portion on regulatory takings, which was part of the salmon meeting on January 29, 2000. He asked where the money was coming from for this process?

Bruce Freeland said, obviously the County should not regulate all use of land away. In the Critical Areas Ordinance, when push comes to shove there is an exception process, but there is no choice in salmon protection. He said that
the County might need a policy to buy the land in situations like this, which may become a factor in the process.

Carl Walske felt that the wording was a bit too strong and suggested that there be a “weasel” word in there to protect the County.

John Ahl said that the information included on Transfer of Development rights and so forth was very good.

Linda Rowe said that she was very skeptical of the Transfer of Development Rights issue.

Bruce Freeland said that this has been used very effectively in King County and gave some examples of this for the Planning Commission. He suggested long-term conservation easements on the timberlands to tie up that land and have it only developed on the edges like in the McCormick Woods project. He then explained that on Page 16 there are issues from the Comprehensive Plan or from the Rural Studies that are not included in the list that he gave to the members at the beginning of this meeting. He reported that there are no policy suggestions here, but work that needed to be attended to.

John Ahl asked, in the issues to be addressed, could these become part of setting design standards in an affirmative sense? He felt that these could be packaged to be policy for design guidelines.

Bruce Freeland felt that in a “cluster concept” this would work. He said some of this information came out of the Rural Design Study and these design standards would be tradeoffs for this.

Carl Walske suggested that these design standards be included under a “Cluster” label.

William Matchett felt that the idea of putting 2 houses together would be better even if the state will not recognize clustering.

Nobi Kawasaki said in the Suquamish and Manchester subarea plans there are problems to be dealt with regarding stormwater facilities. He said that the urban areas would have tremendous problems attracting development in the future.

Bruce Freeland said that the way that water rights are proportioned by the state and with the use of a common systems, there are limitations on how many homes can be on a community system, which will push more people to use individual water systems. He said from the point of salmon, the state is tripping over itself by its own practices. He said that a whole water system section should be added to this Rural Paper.
Carl Walske noted on Appendix E the last bullet, the Upper Hood Canal project has been approved. He then suggested that the Rural Paper include a section on monitoring where the County is going. He further suggested that this could contain questions on the future of the County.

Nobi Kawasaki said that when the Planning Commission reviewed each of the ordinances for inclusion into the Comprehensive Plan, the members did not look to see if each of the ordinances made sense as a whole.

Bruce Freeland said in 2002 there would be a comprehensive data process because of the Buildable Lands Program.

Deborah Flynn asked if Joseph Coppo was still working on a benchmarking and buildable lands program?

Bruce Freeland said that project is not being worked on at this time since Joseph is working in the Parks Department now. He said that benchmarking would have issues that are not in the scope of the buildable lands issue.

Bruce and Carl discussed the criterion used to develop shorelines whether it is by acreage or by front footage of the shoreline as well as including a provision of clustering the waterfront homesites.

Nobi Kawasaki said that clustering might be a problem for homes on the water because of the problems with septic systems. He noted that new sewer lines now run along Beach Drive in the South Kitsap, a rural area, because of septic problems.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

**DOCUMENTS DISCUSSED AT MEETING**

A. Planning Commission Agenda, February 1, 2000
B. Memorandum from Bruce Freeland to Planning Commission Members, dated January 26, 2000
C. Draft Rural Policy Issues Executive Summary (Rural Policy Paper) dated January 26, 2000
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