MINUTES
KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
October 3, 2000

The Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Commissioners Chambers, County Administration Building, 614 Division Street, Port Orchard, Members present: Nobi Kawasaki, John Ahl, Linda Rowe, Laura King, William Matchett, Val Torrens, Richard McConaughy. Not Present: Gwendolyn Shepherd and Deborah Flynn. Staff Present: Robin Tyner, Eric Baker, Jason Rice, Renee Beam and Karen Halbeck, Secretary.

9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

A Motion was made by William Matchett and seconded by Richard McConaughy that the Planning Commission approves the Minutes of July 25, 2000. Vote: Aye: 6; Nay: 0; Abstain: 1 (Matchett not present at meeting.)

A Motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Val Torrens that the Planning Commission approves the Minutes of August 29, 2000. Vote: Aye: 4 Nay: 0; Abstain: 2 (Rowe and King not present at meeting.)

9:10 A.M.

Continuation of the meeting of September 26, 2000, to formulate a decision regarding the proposed Design Standards for the Community of Kingston, and an amendments to the County’s Zoning Ordinance.

Eric Baker handed out a revised version of the Design Standards to the Planning Commission explaining that the photos and drawings were not included in this draft, but would be shown in the final Design Standards. He said on Page ii, the staff added a colored map of the 3 districts addressed in the Standards. He recounted that at the previous meeting there were concerns expressed about which design standards applied to the western boundary of Lindvog Road. He reported that the Standards Committee felt that the guidelines would pertain to both sides of Lindvog Road, adding that there was a letter received from Keith Beebe who requested that his property be included in the Lindvog Commercial designation.
William Matchett asked if Beebe’s property was supposed to be in the Lindvog Commercial or the Village Greens district?

Eric Baker said it was supposed to be in the Lindvog Commercial and not in the Village Greens district. He said that the parcel could be cut making the northern portion in Lindvog Commercial and the southern portion Village Greens, but that could create future zoning problems. He reported that staff has revised the definitions of each district to be more generalized.

Val Torrens felt it should be noted in the Standards that this was a description of the areas, not a legal description, and should someone wish to ascertain whether a specific property was included in a district, they should review the map; similar to adding a disclaimer.

Eric Baker said there was a lack of consistency in referring to certain documents in the Standards, which has been corrected. Further, he explained, on page 51 and 52 Personal, Political and Event Signs, the double negative has been removed in Section b, so that it is easier to understand; on page 35, subsection e, the wording has been changed to read: “Select all vents, gutters, downspouts, flashing, electrical conduits, etc., to match or compliment the color of the adjacent surface unless they are being used expressly as a trim or accent element.”

Robert Fellers said that the Standards Committee generally approves of the latest revisions to the document. He said that when the Committee worked on this document the maps that they used were not as clear as they should have been. He said he really like the colored maps depicting the individual areas.

Eric Baker distributed copies of Section 355 Commercial Zones, to the Planning Commission members. He said the Commercial Zones will contain footnotes on each page pertaining to the individual development plans, consistent with the way staff handled the Bethel Corridor Plan. He noted the footnote on each page shows the zoning titles that would be changed.

Nobi Kawasaki asked if Section 355 of Zoning Ordinance would stand as it is and the Kingston Design Standards will be subject to a footnoted item?

Eric Baker said yes, it would be noted that the Kingston Design Standards does exist.

Nobi Kawasaki said as a side note, down the road, there will probably be a better system than footnoting.
Val Torrens suggested that staff create an appendix with all of the various footnotes.

Eric Baker agreed and reported that a revision of the County’s Zoning Ordinance is on the horizon.

No further discussion being heard, a Motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by William Matchett that the Planning Commission approves the Design Standards for the Community of Kingston, as amended on October 3, 2000. Vote: Aye: 5; Nay: 0; Abstain: 2 (Rowe and King not present at hearing.) Motion carried.

Public Hearing to consider oral and written testimony and possibly render a decision on the KITSAP COUNTY BICYCLE FACILITIES PLAN and any affected County Ordinances.

Bill Zupancic of the Public Works Department asked if all members received a copy of the draft plan? He recounted that during the Greenways Planning Process, the Transportation Non-motorized Element was included in that Plan. He reported that with the approval of the County’s Comprehensive Plan, it has allowed the Non-motorized Element to move forward. He made it clear that the Bicycle Facilities Plan was a stand-alone plan. He said that the consultant of McCloud –Reckord has been hired by the County to work on, revise and update this plan to the draft form it is in today.

Nobi Kawasaki understood that there was a separate Open Space Plan, which was side by side with the Non-motorized Plan; and the Bicycle Plan was an element of the Non-motorized Plan.

Bill Zupancic agreed and said that the Non-motorized Plan covered pedestrian and bicycle facilities, where the policies in the Transportation Element covered a wide range of subjects. He explained that when the Transportation Element is approved during the next year, it would be included in this Plan.

Nobi Kawasaki asked what has become of the Greenways Plan?

Bill Zupancic said while the Greenways Plan was being assembled, the public did not want to see a separation of a lot of these issues. However, he continued, there has now become 4 stand alone plans that were formerly part of that Greenways Plan, which he outlined for the members. He said that half of the Greenways Plan has now become the Open Space Plan; the visual portion of that Plan has yet to be worked on. Further, he explained, as staff moved through the process they segregated the 4 plans.
Val Torrens said she was concerned that the public wanted all of these Plans kept together and yet the County has pulled the Greenways Plan apart and created various segments. She asked where this will fit into the County’s Comprehensive Plan?

Bill Zupancic said that the Bicycle Facilities Plan would become part of the Non-motorized Element of the Transportation Plan within the Comprehensive Plan. He said there would also be pedestrian, transit and other issues included in that Transportation Plan.

Val Torrens suggested that a table of contents be included so the reader will know how this Plan will fit with the County’s Comprehensive Plan.

Bill Zupancic felt that would be a good idea.

Nobi Kawasaki said that at some time, all of these elements needed to be explained to the public.

Bill Zupancic said that was a good point, adding that it has created some confusion. He said that the Greenways Plan remained intact throughout the Comprehensive Plan process and only now has it been segmented.

William Matchett asked what was contained in the visual element?

Bill Zupancic said that the scenic resources were within the visual element.

John Ahl suggested that this meeting continue, adding that there has been a large discussion on form instead of substance to this point.

Terry Reckord of McCloud and Reckord explained that his firm wrote the Greenways Plan as well as this Bicycle Plan. He said that it was designed so that it could be taken apart instead of being together in one plan. He said that there was a lot of detail within the Plan that the Planning Commission should review. He said that there was a map of physical improvements to roadways in the County that could be modified to include bicycle lanes. He said that their firm was doing the “Mosquito Trail” from Kingston to Southworth as well, which is a totally separate project from the Bicycle Plan. From public comments that they have received while creating the Mosquito Trail, he continued, it appears that Kitsap County is very short on areas to walk and bicycle within the County. He said that the first draft was only for County staff to review and comment; the second draft was what the Planning Commission was given for this hearing and then the third draft will be prepared after the Planning Commission has reviewed this draft and added their changes. He reported that one of things they have done was to create some design
standards for the proposed facilities, including goals and policies which support the
creation of this project. He said that they would create a map of suggested routes and
prioritize the projects for 6-year and 20-year plans. He said that in this plan there was
a discussion of the various routes and how they were selected, i.e. by major modes of
transportation, areas of population and connections to schools and grocery stores, etc.
He said that they have also prepared a list of additional projects where bicycle paths
could be added, when a road is widened and so forth, because there is funding allotted
to a project. Generally speaking, he said, the elimination of obstacles should make the
roads easier to use for bicycles and pedestrians.

Val Torrens said that the road by her home was recently paved, but the shoulders on
one side were not paved so that pedestrians and bicyclists could use it, especially
since this road goes right by a grade school.

Laura King asked if there were cost figures for creating these bicycle paths?

Terry Reckord said that cost figures would be added when the final draft was
completed. He said this is a master plan and there are still some unknowns. He said
that such things as right-of-way surveys would be unavailable until the road
construction is actually beginning to take place. Further, he said, in the Design
Standards there is a hierarchy of improvements, which he displayed on a chart. He
said that all 6 possibilities were discussed in the Plan, which were specifically: shared
roadway; paved shoulders; bicycle lanes; shared sidewalks; separate paths road;
separate path off road. He said there were always cyclists who would rather ride with
traffic than with pedestrians, because vehicular traffic was more predictable. He said
that even though there will be a Bicycle Plan they will not be banning bicycles from
undesignated County roadways. He then explained each of the sections to the
Planning Commission, which were in increasing order of magnitude. He said that the
majority of the bicycle lanes would consist of paving the shoulders. He reported that,
by state standards, a designated bicycle lane must be 4 feet wide. He said that the
map was color-coded with the descriptions.

Richard McConaughy said that this Plan does not focus on mountain bikes.

Terry Reckord agreed, adding that in this Plan there is no distinction between a
mountain bike and a touring bike. He then referred the members to parts of the 6-year
Road Improvement Plan in the Bicycle Plan which included the: Clear Creek Trail, Port
Orchard City Limits, E. Ahlstrom Road, E., Hillcrest Drive, Watauga Beach Drive, Miller
Bay Road, Bucklin Hill Road, SR 3, Lighthouse Drive, Hilldale Road, SR 104 and
Seabeck Highway. He said that some of the projects listed might also be part of the
planning process for the Mosquito Fleet.
William Matchett and Bill Zupancic discussed the usage of the Clear Creek Trail and how it might be adapted for use with bicycles.

Terry Reckord said there were also latent opportunities listed such as: paved shoulders that have no signage at this time for bicycles, which would be quick to do.

Laura King asked about the cost of the various bicycle lanes?

Terry Reckord said that some of these bicycle improvements included matching grant monies. He said that all of the changes listed would cost about 7 million dollars over the next 20 years, adding that the Plan was intended to be flexible over that time frame.

John Ahl said this Plan contained a lot of good work and questioned whether this was actually a public hearing, since there was no one present to address their concerns to the Planning Commission. He asked the staff if there were no members of the community that were interested in commenting on this Plan?

Bill Zupancic said that there would be further public meetings on this Plan. He said that they have been holding public meetings to discuss the Bicycle Plan since 1991. He reported that there would be an open house on this Plan later this month (October), with numerous press releases forthcoming. He said at this point, they are working to formalize this Plan.

Val Torrens said that it appeared that the public is now concerned about how these facilities will be paid for, which possibly was not a concern before.

Bill Zupancic reported that staff received a mailing from the West Sound Cycling Club, expressing that they were on board with this Plan and wanted it to come forward for a decision. He said that they have a huge mailing list to notify interested parties of these meetings.

John Ahl felt that the cost element was an essential piece of this Plan and should be included in the next draft, so that the public will understand the expenses involved in implementing a Bicycle Plan in this County.

Val Torrens said on Page 16, top of the 2nd column, there are no passenger only ferries running between Bainbridge Island and Seattle. She then asked, on the bottom of Page 17, Open Space Plan, what will be added later?

Terry Reckord said that they will cross reference the Bicycle System with the Open Space Plan.
Val Torrens asked on Page 18, the 2nd paragraph, was there an additional summary forthcoming?

Terry Reckord said yes, that was a typo and that sentence will be reworded or completed.

Val Torrens noted Page 19, the 1st column, County Facilities.

Terry Reckord said that the Public Works Department will help determine what projects have been done to date, so it is reflected in this Plan. He said that section will be completed before another draft becomes available for the public.

Richard McConaughy asked if “primary” was based on traffic flow?

Terry Reckord said primary refers to regional transportation.

(Laura King left meeting at 10:30 a.m.)

Val Torrens asked where the criteria came from that was used in the Plan?

Terry Reckord said that this Plan was a localized version of the State Standards.

Val Torrens asked on Page 8, what was the term for the abbreviation FHWA?

Terry Reckord said that stood for the Federal Highways Administration. He also explained that the Goals and Policies will be expanded in the next draft.

Nobi Kawasaki said in the Goals and Policies on Page 22, if you look at other parts of the document there is a priority for recreational activities. He said that the Transportation Facilities, including the rural and urban areas, should be reflected in the goals. He also felt that recreation is discussed on Page 3, but it does not continue throughout the Plan.

Terry Reckord said that these goals and policies provide for transportation as well as recreation.

Val Torrens said that the recreation component seemed ancillary to the Plan.

Terry Reckord and the Planning Commission then discussed using the bicycle routes for getting around the County, compared to using them for and as tourist activities, which they felt should be higher on the list of importance because they also attract tourism.
Val Torrens felt that the promotion of tourism should be more important than just moving the people around the area.

Richard McConaughy said on page 27, there was a typo under Ancillary Facilities where that term is used twice. In that section also, he continued, looking a major traffic flow and tourism options, shouldn’t the schools also be considered a higher priority item so that students could use these paths?

Terry Reckord said they have not located the schools on this map in connection with the mapping of bicycle paths. He said that schools were mapped in the Greenways Plan. He said that the state provides money to the schools so that they can provide better roadways for students within a 1-mile radius of each school, to allow them to safely commute to school without using the bus. He suggested that these routes could connect with this Bicycle Plan.

Richard McConaughy asked, in looking at the bicycle route on the map, does the highway from Tacoma continue through Gorst, the Urban Growth Area and further on?

Terry Reckord said that some of the routes break because they go through the cities, adding that staff is working with the cities to make the connections with these bicycle paths.

Richard McConaughy asked what was the rationale was for the “stubs” on the map?

Terry Reckord said that some connect to a local system, that is not mapped, and others connect with the Mosquito Fleet.

In closing, Bill Zupancic thanked the Planning Commission for bringing several issues and concerns to staff that could be included in the next draft. He recounted that formerly the Greenways Plan created some problems with the regulatory language in that document, which made it nearly impossible to move through this process. He said that staff was hoping to move forward with this Bicycle Plan so that it can be implemented as soon as possible.

No further discussion being heard, a Motion was made by Val Torrens and seconded by William Matchett that the Planning Commission continues this hearing until the meeting of November 28, 2000. Vote: Aye: 6; Nay: 0. (King not present at this time.) Motion carried.

Work Plan Discussion, with County staff –
Critical Areas Ordinance, following recent workshops regarding the Kitsap County Shorelines.

Renee Beam passed out her staff report to the Planning Commission members, outlining that this was the final report that was presented to the Board of Commissioners. She said that this outlined some conceptual options for the County. She reported that she and other staff members hosted 26 shoreline workshops throughout the County, in which she spoke to about 2,000 citizens who live along the 190 miles of Kitsap's shorelines. She said that they discussed ESA issues, the shoreline inventory project, and the Department of Ecology guidelines, in order to get input and opinions on everything from changing the residential shoreline permit process to keeping in line with what the State and “Feds” wanted for the shoreline.

Generally, she reported, there was a clear message that the shoreline property owners were willing to do their part to help save the shorelines and the endangered species, but they should not have bear the whole responsibility to clear up the problems. She said that geoducks became a huge issue with the public as well as the salmon issue. She said that generally the public could not understand why the salmon could be considered endangered, since people are still allowed to fish for the Coho salmon. She reported that following her presentation before the Board of Commissioners, she asked that the Board come up with some simple understandable answers to these questions that were asked during the workshops. She further reported that during the workshops, two permit scenarios were presented: 1) Create a 100-foot buffer across the board on all waterfront development; or 2) Create a Habitat Management Plan by a marine scientist, to design the development of that particular property for a holistic approach. She said that the Board of Commissioners asked staff to put together various approaches, which she outlined, based on what was discussed during the workshops. She said that the Board of Commissioners want to make this process “user friendly” and work out the issues with the individual property owners.

She said that there were some huge issues that needed to be factored in such as: if the house burns down would they be able to rebuild it? She said they put some factors into this response. Also, she continued, the issue came up about the lack of science, which became such a big deal, so staff went to Jeff Davis to find out all they could about near shore habitat. She said they asked him to create a clear, concise report on the Properly Functioning Conditions of the Nearshore Environments of Kitsap County, which was included in the staff report. She then reviewed the processes for the members. She said that one type of buffer would not be suitable all over Kitsap County. She met with the Department of Natural Resources, the Tribes, the Department of Ecology and Jay Watson from the Hood Canal Coordinating Council, who is also reviewing this document. She said that staff will be making another presentation to the Board of Commissioners on October 10, 2000 to formulate these processes into a more narrowed approach. She reported that the Board of Commissioners would then hold some public meetings; it will come to the Planning Commission for a Public Hearing and decision and then back
to the Board of County Commissioners for a final public hearing and decision. She felt that overall these workshops were very successful, noting that the County wanted to put forth a huge effort to make sure the property owners, who would be directly impacted by these issues, would have a chance to give their opinion.

Nobi Kawasaki asked if there were state guidelines that would encourage or discourage these approaches that she had outlined?

Renee Beam said that the Department of Ecology addressed having a detailed inventory, 100-foot buffers, non-conforming uses, etc. She said if the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) wanted to go the easy route they would choose the 100-foot buffers throughout the County. She felt that this approach would not work in Kitsap County, because of the 190 miles of shorelines, 80% has been built out. In addition, she continued, there were many properties such as Driftwood Keys that could not build if there were 100-foot buffer restrictions. She said that the Board of Commissioners was also opposed to the 100-foot buffer requirement. She said she was not sure when this issue would be before the Planning Commission, possibly not this year, especially since the Commissioners do not want to rush a decision on this issue.

Nobi Kawasaki asked if the Board of Commissioners would be holding a series of public hearings?

Renee Beam thought there would be a set of 3 public meetings, then a public hearing before the Planning Commission with a decision/recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners for a final public hearing and decision by the Board.

Nobi Kawasaki suggested that the Planning Commission join the Board of Commissioners for a joint meeting.

Val Torrens thought that her impression was that the Board of County Commissioners wanted to go out to the public first to discuss these issues with them before the Planning Commission holds their public hearing. She felt that having the staff take these unresolved issues to the Board with recommendations from the public would be good for this interactive process.

John Ahl felt that this approach would put Kitsap County in a strong position to say what this County will do to work with NMFS and the Endangered Species Act.

Renee Bean said that the success of this project would depend on Kitsap County’s partnering with the citizens.
Draft Poulsbo Subarea Plan and proposed Urban Growth Area (UGA).

Jason Rice showed the members a map of the proposed Poulsbo Urban Growth Area. He said that staff felt that this meeting should be held with the Planning Commission, outside of the joint meetings, to see what questions our members had regarding this process. He gave an historical perspective using the 1994, 1996 and 1998 plan boundaries, which staff was currently working from. He said that staff used public input to come up with the March 2000 proposal prior to the refusia study. When the results of the refusia study came out, Commissioners Endresen and Botkin discussed them with the City of Poulsbo and suggested a joint planning process. Following that, he said, there was the next proposed Urban Growth Area based on what the City feels should be in their UGA. He reported that the Board of Commissioners has not made a decision on what the impacts of the latest UGA proposal will be. However, he continued, he did not feel that the public has officially seen the second UGA proposal by the City and there were additional concerns whether infrastructure could be provided to some of these areas. He noted that the area that the city removed from their proposed UGA has urban services available and was partially developed. The proposed size of the UGA is appropriate for the population allocation; however, the ability for the City to provide services beyond the Olhava development in a timely manner was in question. He then explained the map, which depicted the refugia study to the Planning Commission, noting that the dark line marked the current city limits and the dashed line depicted the proposed city limits of Poulsbo.

Val Torrens felt that more drainage comes into Dogfish Creek from the north than from the south.

Robin Tyner said that she heard the area to the southwest was hotly contested when it was proposed to be added into the UGA.

Jason Rice showed aerial maps of the Poulsbo area, noting that the creeks have not been mapped as to whether they are Type 3, 4 or 5. He said that the City preferred to extend the city limits out Finn Hill Road because it was away from the refugia area.

Robin Tyner felt that what the City proposed had logic, but it was going to be too much of a character change for the area and would compromise it.

Val Torrens noted with Poulsbo’s latest proposal, the city limits will come very close to Hood Canal, just shy of Clear Creek. She felt that this would allow the City to annex out further that what they were now proposing.
Linda Rowe noted that there were several large parcels in the proposed UGA area and asked if there were currently services in place?

Jason Rice said that the services end at Highway 3 and do not extend further west.

William Matchett felt that the County should not allow any development further west.

Nobi Kawasaki asked if the County really knew the rationale for the City’s decision to move in this direction?

John Ahl felt that the City’s decision was based on this refugia study.

Robin Tyner said that the County needed to define some policies for that proposal by the end of the year.

Val Torrens felt that the only residents who would be supportive of this change are those who live around the Olhava project.

John Ahl felt that throughout the joint meetings with the Poulsbo Planning Commission that they are setting out a UGA for Poulsbo. He said this would mean that some landowners would not be able to develop the way they want to, because Poulsbo will be creating city ordinances without providing some of the city’s services.

Robin Tyner said that the County’s biggest issue is annexation. She said if you are in the UGA, along with development should come annexation. She said for some reason the City is afraid to take that step. She made it clear that the County would like that position taken now and staff should be laying the groundwork for that annexation.

Val Torrens said in her experience when annexation is addressed the City of Poulsbo foresees controversy, which they want to avoid.

Robin Tyner said that the City is now looking at adding the Lemolo area to the city limits because there is a necessity to provide sewers to that area.

John Ahl said his concern, if he was a homeowner residing in the UGA area, was that he would have to deal with all of the restrictions, but would receive none of the benefits unless that area actually annexed into the City.

Robin Tyner said there are annexation agreements for the UGA areas around the cities, using Seattle as an example. She suggested that the joint Planning Commissions discuss this issue and their next meeting.
Jason Rice said that staff wanted to bring up these issues for discussion so that our Planning Commission could think about them before the next joint meeting.

Robin Tyner said at the last joint meeting what was most alarming to the County staff was that the City was ready to start scheduling public hearings, when the public is not even aware of what is being discussed between the Planning Commissions.

Val Torrens suggested that the City provide a couple of options for the public to discuss.

Robin Tyner said that the City does not want to go to the public with alternatives.

Val Torrens felt that this was a “railroaded scenario”; if there are public hearings then the public should be given some options to decide on.

Jason Rice said that there are some other transportation issues. He then gave a drawing of the same lot with city standards compared with county standards to the members. He said that comparing the drawing, development would be more effective by using the County standards.

Val Torrens suggested that the Planning Commission members meet with staff after the next joint planning commission meeting.

No further discussing being heard, the Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

**DOCUMENTS DISCUSSED AT HEARING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Planning Commission Agenda, October 3, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Design Standards for the Community of Kingston, dated October 3, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Kitsap County Zoning Ordinance, Section 355. Commercial Zones, undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Kitsap County Bicycle Facilities Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Memorandum from Renee Beam RE: Shoreline Workshop Project – Final Report; Conceptual Options for Residential Permitting, dated September 27, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Memorandum to Planning Commission RE: Poulsbo Subarea Plan, dated October 3, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Article from The Sun “Poulsbo ponders new sewage line”, dated September 7, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. Conceptual drawing comparing building in Kitsap County using the County’s requirement vs. the City of Poulsbo’s requirements, undated.
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