MINUTES
KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
September 26, 2000

The Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County Fairgrounds Conference Room, 1200 Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, Washington. Present were: John Ahl, William Matchett, Nobi Kawasaki, Deborah Flynn, Richard McConaughy and Val Torrens. Not Present: Gwendolyn Shepherd, Linda Rowe and Laura King. Staff Present: Jason Rice, Eric Baker and Karen Halbeck, Secretary.

9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order - Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

Minutes of July 25, 2000

Chair Nobi Kawasaki announced that a vote on the Minutes of July 25, 2000 would be postponed until the Planning Commission meeting of October 3, 2000.

9:10 A.M.

Study Session to formulate a recommendation to the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners regarding the proposed Design Standards for the Community of Kingston, dated May 2000 and an amendment to the County Zoning Ordinance. (Note: Generally, there will be no further oral testimony taken at this meeting.)

Val Torrens read a letter from Keith Beebe to the Planning Commission, noting that a copy was mailed to each of the members. “...enclosed is a copy of the map in question and the one parcel of property which is commercial and undesignated. If the designation for the property is actually Highway Tourist then it probably should be identified as Lindvog Commercial. If it is Neighborhood Commercial then Village Green probably should apply. From my own perspective, since the identified property does not access SR 104 I believe a Neighborhood Commercial zoning and Village Green designation makes more sense. The Lindvog Commercial District definition should read as follows: The area North of California Street to Lindvog Road, (including commercial property adjoining the West side of Lindvog Rd extension,) and then North to the end of the Kingston Terrace Development, East to a point in line with a Northern extension of First Ave and then South to SR 104. This changes the reference to “both
sides" of Lindvog, which creates confusion with the Village Green description and clearly identifies the inclusion of the omitted commercially zoned property adjacent to the West. If this change in definition is not acceptable please advise. Keith Beebe.”

Chair Kawasaki opened the floor to comment from the Kingston Design Standards Committee.

Robert Fellers of Kingston said that the map, on the third page of the Design Standards for the Community of Kingston, shows this parcel on the very northeast corner of the properties designated Village Green. He said that parcels on either side of Lindvog Road were included. He said that the committee intended this definition to include parcels on either side of the Lindvog extension.

Karen Ross said that Mr. Beebe's map meets the verbal description that was outlined in the Definitions portion of the Standards, on page iii.

Val Torrens felt that if these Design Standards address issues on both sides of Lindvog Road, then Mr. Beebe's verbiage needed to be included. However, she continued, if California Avenue is the southern boundary line, then how is Mr. Beebe's parcel to be included as Lindvog Commercial?

William Matchett said on the map included with his letter it is shown as one parcel.

(9:35 a.m. Jason Rice and Eric Baker arrived at the meeting.)

Jason Rice asked if the right-of-way has been purchased for the Lindvog Road extension?

Val Torrens asked if staff responded to Mr. Beebe after his letter was submitted?

Karen Halbeck Secretary, said that to her knowledge the letter was submitted into the record and copies mailed to the Planning Commission members, but she was did not feel that John Vodopich had responded to Mr. Beebe's letter.

Val Torrens said that the language is not as clear as it could be in the definitions of each of the three areas of downtown Kingston.

Karen Ross said that some of the County maps do not show NE California Avenue even though it is in existence.
Nobi Kawasaki said at the same time, staff needed to thoroughly review the map and descriptive language in the Standards. He felt that both needed to be clarified so there were no discrepancies in the final Plan.

Richard McConaughy felt that Planning Commission could vote on these standards at this meeting and then staff could clean up the language.

Val Torrens felt that the staff needed to work with the citizens to correct the verbiage.

Robert Fellers said in addition under definitions, change the wording from “...then extends north to West Kingston Road,...” to: “...then extends north to NE West Kingston Road”. Also, he continued, there was a question at the public hearing in August 2000, in the Introduction on page “i”, the third paragraph, if a residence is improved in the commercial area, but does not change to a commercial structure, does the owner have to follow these criteria? He said if there was an issue about that, the wording in the Introduction could be changed to: any existing commercial structure.

Nobi Kawasaki said he submitted a series of changes that were mostly wordsmithing, to the County staff. He said that there were words in the Standards that were used interchangeably. Also, he said, Section 355.050 should be changed to Section 355.090.

Jason Rice asked if the Standards were actually directed to commercial structures exclusively in these three districts?

Nobi Kawasaki said that was the determination from the Standards Committee.

Val Torrens said that it should be clarified whether the Standards pertain to commercial structures, and whether single-family residences were exempt from these requirements if they are located within these districts.

The Design Standards Committee and the Planning Commission discussed whether these Standards should apply to multi-family housing. It was mutually decided that a sentence should be added that: “Single-family residences are exempt from these Design Standards”, so the multi-family housing was covered under these Standards.

John Ahl said that these Design Standards appear to be very specific in describing what the community wants and does not want.
Val Torrens said that there might be a discrepancy in the County’s maps. She felt that staff should walk the property using the written descriptions, provided by the Standards Committee, make any necessary amendments to the written description and then draw the maps accordingly.

William Matchett said that the Planning Commission felt that the verbiage in the Standards accurately describes what should be done in Kingston. He felt that there could be more “shall”s in the document, but understood that this was a plan that the entire community could agree upon which may not be the case if it became too directive.

Karen Ross said that the committee wanted the zoning on both sides of the street to have the same designation not one zone on one side and another on the opposite side of the street, using the street as a divider.

Robert Fellers said that Kingston has been divided into 3 sections in order to regulate improvements/development in each of the areas.

Jason Rice said the area in the Village Green section is zoned medium density residential, and questioned whether the Design Committee wanted the Beebe property changed to commercial zoning?

Karen Ross said no, the Committee wanted Beebe’s property designated medium density residential as the Village Green properties.

Deborah Flynn said these designations are not rezones, but boundaries identifying each district as an overlay.

Val Torrens felt that staff needed to work with the Design Committee on these issues before the Planning Commission takes a vote.

William Matchett suggested that all the other areas of concern be addressed at this meeting.

Deborah Flynn said that there was some unclear wording on page 5, Relationship to Street Front. She questioned if this section was required?

Val Torrens said that a lot of the items in the Standards are suggestions; what the community is encouraged to do.
Robert Fellers reminded the staff and Planning Commission that the Design Committee went through the original document and removed many of the “shall”s and replaced them with “shoulds”.

Deborah Flynn asked on page 10, were dust and soil erosion identified in the County’s Stormwater Ordinance?

Eric Baker said yes, those issues are addressed in the Stormwater Ordinance.

Deborah Flynn said at the bottom of page 16 (c), she did not understand why the 5 categories were addressed, what was the relevance to this document?

Robert Fellers said that during the time these Design Standards were being developed, the Kingston Urban Growth Area (UGA) was also coming along and that section was put into the Standards to connect them to the UGA.

Deborah Flynn said that it did not state how one group differed from the other in that section.

Nobi Kawasaki said that the downtown road improvement plan was defined on the next page.

William Matchett said he had trouble understanding the first paragraph on page 23, Section 5. He felt that there was some wording that was missing. He felt the sentence should be reworded to: “The streetscape supports the visual and functional element of the roadway design which provides aesthetic interest and comfort to the pedestrian.”

Deborah Flynn said on page 29, Section 2, Recommended Building Heights, were these acceptable County standards?

Nobi Kawasaki asked if by definition the building height limitation in the Design Standards would alter the County’s Zoning Ordinance?

Robert Fellers said that he discussed the 45-foot height limitation with the fire marshal. He was assured that 45-foot building heights would be allowed with a variance procedure.

Richard M McConaughy asked if the Design Committee had a problem with removing the word “recommended” under the building height section?
The Committee said no, “recommended” could be removed.

The Planning Commission and Design Committee members discussed various height limitations.

Karen Ross said the Committee wanted the Village Green District to be high-density.

Following discussion, it was determined that the wording for the Lindvog Commercial should read: 35 feet, not to exceed 3 stories.

Deborah Flynn said on page 35, Section (e), the wording should be modified to read: “Select colors for all gutters, downspouts, flashing, electrical conduits, etc., to complement the adjacent surface...” She then asked on page 52, Section C, subsection 1. (b), what was the reasoning behind “Do not display vinyl banners or other temporary signs not advertising or related to a specific event or date?”

Val Torrens said those were the signs on businesses that say “Sale”, “Now Open”, etc.

Karen Ross said the Kingston community would like specific language for signage in the Standards that may not be stated in the County’s Sign Ordinance.

Nobi Kawasaki felt that the County needed consistency with their Sign Ordinance. He said that the town of Kingston was not defined in the Zoning Ordinance, which he felt should be added.

Jason Rice said that the definition could be: all of the commercial areas are located inside the Kingston Urban Growth Area (UGA). He said that if there are future property rezones in Kingston there could be a provision for that.

Deborah Flynn suggested that a reference in the Zoning Ordinance to the Kingston Design Standards would define this more clearly.

Jason Rice recounted that there was a specific area defined when the County approved the Suquamish Plan.

No further discussion being heard, Nobi Kawasaki announced that the decision on the Design Standards for the Community of Kingston would be continued until the Planning Commission meeting on October 3, 2000, beginning at 9:00 a.m., at the County Administration Building, Commissioners Chambers, in Port Orchard.
Update from County Staff regarding the Manchester Community Subarea Plan.

Eric Baker said that Michelle Pelvit has left Kitsap County and he has been assigned as the lead on this project. He reported that currently there are 42 members on the Manchester Committee. He said that the Subarea boundary of Manchester is still under discussion. To make this large committee more able to focus, he continued, they have split up the membership into several sub-committees, with specific topics for each group. He reported that the sub-committee process should be completed in about a month. He said that one committee was designing a commercial boundary within the Subarea boundary, adding that some of the members felt that the commercial area was too large. He said that the proposed Manchester commercial boundary was smaller than what was shown on the County's Comprehensive Plan map. He also explained that they asked some students from the University of Washington to review the proposed boundary and design a model of depicting how the Manchester commercial area would look in the future. He said the Committee has discussed lot sizes in the residential area for lot subdivision, so that it meets the requirements to provide the lots with sewer and public facilities. He said that the committee meets every two weeks so they have been able to cut through a large quantity of work in a relatively short period of time. He said another item of discussion has been a view blockage ordinance to protect the views from the lots that view Seattle. He said that this has become a very difficult process, mainly because there are many definitions of what constitutes a view.

John Ahl asked if the Manchester committee did not have some sort of plan to begin with?

Eric Baker said no, this committee is starting from scratch as a rural village/community plan. He said that the work is going quite well and felt that he may be able to bring this Plan to the Planning Commission in early January 2001.

Jason Rice said that copies of the Kingston and Suquamish Subarea plans have been given to the Manchester committee to help them with the process.

Nobi Kawasaki said that having gone through these other Subarea plans has increased everyone's understanding of these projects.

John Ahl felt that this public group process was a very necessary planning element.

Val Torrens said that the community receives these plans more favorably than they have in the past; recounting problems with the Silverdale Subarea plan, and how
much time and effort went into that plan which was then ignored by the previous county
administration.

Nobi Kawasaki felt that the University of Washington students' presentation was very effective
in this process.

Deborah Flynn felt this has become a good policy that a member of the Planning Commission be
involved with these community meetings and report back to the Commission on the progress.

- Update from County staff regarding the Critical Areas Ordinance, following recent
  workshops regarding the Kitsap County shorelines.

Nobi Kawasaki explained that Renee Beam and Rick Kimball were planning to give a
presentation to the Planning Commission, but that has been postponed until the meeting on

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

DOCUMENTS DISCUSSED AT MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Letter from Keith A. Beebe, Attorney at Law to John Vodopich, Kitsap County Dept. of Community Development, dated Sept 1, 2000, received September 5, 2000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES approve this ________ day of __________, 2000.

__________________________
Nobi Kawasaki, Chair

__________________________
Karen Halbeck, Secretary