
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

➢ Study Session to discuss the subarea plan for the South Kitsap Urban Growth Area with staff.

Darryl Piercy reported that prior to this meeting he presented the recommendation of Kitsap County to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC), which prior to the County’s recommendation involved several joint planning discussions with the City of Port Orchard and the KRCC and then onto the Policy Board of the KRCC. He said at the Policy Board meeting the KRCC allocated an additional 10,000 population up to the year 2017 to the South Kitsap Planning Area, which was shown in “pink” on the Comprehensive Plan map, which are the Joint Planning Areas not the Urban Reserve Areas. What this population allocation will do, will be to continue forward with these Joint Planning Areas and prepare a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Port Orchard, which will identify certain populations within the City. He reported that through the Joint Planning Areas County and City staff could determine where the growth can occur.

Richard McConaughy asked if this process was like the joint Planning Commission discussions on the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area?

Darryl Piercy said yes, it would be very similar. The main difference, he continued, was that in South Kitsap, the population had not been allocated during the Comprehensive Plan process like it was in Poulsbo, so there is a different set of guidelines that the County and City of Port Orchard must follow. He reported that...
the Joint Planning Areas were identified in South Kitsap, but the allocation had not been determined. He explained that when an Urban Growth Area boundary is determined, County staff understands that it will be annexed in the future so the development standards and infrastructure must be considered as well as design standards for this area. He further explained that revenue sharing for these Joint Planning Areas was a point of discussion with the KRCC at this time, adding that the City will annex these areas so it needs to be determined what revenue should come back to the County to pay for the expenses that Kitsap County has put forth for the infrastructure.

John Ahl said that various cities were in agreement with revenue sharing.

Darryl Piercy said that revenue sharing works for the city’s benefit as well as the county’s, and he gave some examples for the members. He said design and development standards as well as infrastructure would “level the playing field” to make it just as attractive to live in the city as in the county. He recounted that in regard to the South Kitsap Urban Growth Area there have been ongoing discussions with the City, and the County has hired a consulting firm to help facilitate these discussions. Further, he said, by the end of June the Memorandum of Understanding should be in effect to recognize the efforts between the County and the City with these negotiations. He further explained that the designation of the area between the City and McCormick Woods, known as Anderson Hill/Berry Lake needed to be determined. He reported that this was an area where the residents were not thrilled with the possibility of joining the City of Port Orchard and the County was having difficulty because of the number of wetlands in that area. He said that the County has been working with the City and the residents with that regard. He also noted another 620 acres belonging to McCormick Woods Properties that was part of this Joint Planning Area, because it was included in the sewer area and has other urban services, which could be developed in the future. He said that the other area that was now gaining attention for inclusion into the Urban Growth Area is east of McCormick Woods. He said that Sidney and Sedgwick Roads access this property and then the road changes to Glenwood Road. He reported that staff would like to review this in the overall picture to determine how it will develop.

(9:16 a.m. Deborah Flynn arrived at the meeting).

Linda Rowe asked why that area could be in the Urban Growth Area if it was so rural?

Darryl Piercy said that it was mainly at the request of McCormick Properties who wanted an access to their site from the east and the Board of Commissioners felt that this was an area that could be studied.
Linda Rowe asked if McCormick Properties owned this area?

Darryl Piercy said no, it was owned by several owners. He reported that McCormick Properties was footing the bill for a consultant to help determine some of the expenses involved in this study area.

William Matchett asked if McCormick Properties hired this consultant and was paying the cost for services?

Darryl Piercy said no, the County chose the consultant who is paid by the County and McCormick Woods reimburses the County for the expenses.

John Ahl expressed that if all of the study areas and industrial areas were added together it appeared that Port Orchard would get to be the size of Bremerton.

Darryl Piercy said right now Port Orchard’s population is 7,400 with a growth rate of 5.5% and Bremerton’s population is about 35,000 with a growth rate at about 0%.

John Ahl asked how Port Orchard’s growth compared to Bainbridge Island?

Darryl Piercy said that Kingston and Bainbridge Island’s growth rate is at 2% and Poulsbo rate is about 4%. He said that since Port Orchard was not granted any population allocation with the approval of the Comprehensive Plan, Port Orchard’s holding capacity is definitely shrinking. He reported that during the next 12 months the County will be coming back to the Planning Commission with alternatives to these Urban Growth Areas and this process could also move forward through the Comprehensive Plan amendment process. However, he continued, he did not feel that this could happen during this amendment process. He said that the main difference here is that there is a real point of interest and common point of discussion with the City of Port Orchard, which is somewhat different than the discussions that have been held with the City of Poulsbo. He said that he was very optimistic about this process and the South Kitsap Commissioner is very interested in finishing up the South Kitsap Urban Growth Area as well.

Linda Rowe asked about the proposal move the County offices to Bremerton and how that would affect the negotiations on the South Kitsap Urban Growth Area?

Darryl Piercy said that should not be a problem; there isn’t any animosity between the County and the City with Commissioner Angel. He said that staff is still working on the South Kitsap Industrial areas and the conclusion on that process should be reached by the end of the year.
John Ahl felt that the problem with the South Kitsap Industrial areas seems to be a restriction that the industrial areas must be leased from the Port of Bremerton and asked why those properties actually needed to be leased instead of purchased?

Darryl Piercy said that the federal government originally owned that area and who turned it over to the County who in turn gave it to the Port of Bremerton to manage. He reported that the “Feds” and the FAA have seen this property as an area reserved for the military.

Darryl Piercy and the members then discussed ideas that could assist the Port of Bremerton to promote those properties to potential businesses.

- PowerPoint presentation from Zoltan Szigethy of the Economic Development Council, regarding Industrial land.

Zoltan Szigethy presented a brief biography on himself and then explained that the County needed more land for “primary” jobs in order to diversify the economy and create a physical and social infrastructure. He said that “physical” infrastructure was necessary for employers and provided systems for potable water, wastewater, stormwater, roads, ferries, bridges, energy and telecommunications, where “social” infrastructure was needed by the employees to provide schools, colleges, job training, medical services and insurance and housing choices. He said that when the Economic Development Council (EDC) prepared a survey in 1973 there were 10+ acres zoned, vacant and ready for this type of development and Kitsap County had only 2.9% non-military related manufacturing jobs compared to 14% throughout Washington state. He reported that the EDC is working to decrease Kitsap’s dependence on the military and determine how much industrial and commercial zoned land that the County will need for jobs by the year 2017. He said that the first assumption in Kitsap County was that “industrial” jobs were primary jobs. However, he continued, most of those companies located in the County sell their goods and services outside Kitsap. He then explained the methodology for determining the amount of land and building size that would be necessary to employ a “primary” business, taking in considerations for the amount of employees, restrictions for lot coverage and so forth. He said that the housing/building market was not a perfect science; some land will remain unavailable for purchase and it would be impossible to shoehorn a precise number of jobs into a certain amount of land. He said that the result of the study by the EDC surmised that between 1997 and 2017 the County will need 33,635 new jobs; 11,998 of those will need to be primary jobs and the remainder could be secondary jobs. With that goal in mind, he continued, there will need to be approximately 2,603 gross acres in the unincorporated County and 322 gross acres in the municipalities, where in comparison the 1998 County Comprehensive Plan identified 2,780 gross vacant acres which were zoned business park or industrial and 1,904 gross vacant acres.
zoned Urban Reserve, for future employment needs. In conclusion, he reported that
the EDC has located 1,579 gross acres of mainly vacant industrial land of which
1,254 acres are currently available and of that amount only 774 acres are available
for sale and 188 acres are ready for development (located in the Northwest
Corporate Campus).

(11:00 Val Torrens arrived at meeting.)

➢ Work Plan Discussion.

• City of Poulsbo Discussions

Darryl Piercy reported to the members that the Poulsbo City staff has put a proposal
out to the public, with public comment to be taken during their next meeting. He
said that the County will be commenting at that hearing and County staff will mail
the Planning Commission this proposal. In the draft created last August, he
continued, the City recognized approved and vested Plats and Planned Unit
Developments (PUDs) in their population and holding capacity and the City has
now removed those from their calculations. He made it clear that the County feels
that those approved Plats and PUDs should be included. He felt that if the County
and City could get over this hurdle, the other details could be worked out.

John Ahl noted that another issue was Poulsbo’s position that they could not use
property in the refugia area and asked if there any change in that obstacle?

Darryl Piercy said that it did not matter whether the refugia study area was included
or not and the County’s consultant confirms that. He said that the holding capacity
of the refugia area could be used as a portion of the holding area. He said that the
Poulsbo Urban Growth Area (UGA) could accommodate the assigned population
without increasing the size of the UGA. He made it clear that the County was
comfortable that they could defend their position on this matter. He reiterated that
the County would be making a formal presentation at this hearing before the City.
He said eventually, this issue would be coming to the County for a hearing and
decision.

Linda Rowe asked what if the County and City do not come to an agreement on this
Plan?

Darryl Piercy said under the Growth Management Act, the County would have the
final authority of determining the population allocation and the Urban Growth
Boundary; then the City of Poulsbo would be able to appeal to the Growth
Management Hearings Board if they chose to do so. He said that the County would
not like negotiations to come to this; they would like to work all of this out
beforehand. He said there is still the ability under the Memorandum of Agreement for further negotiations; that idea has not expired.

- Accessory Dwelling Units

Deborah Flynn asked about Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and what changes were happening with those? She said that the members had discussed this issue with Robin Tyner and said that she would get this information to the Planning Commission.

Darryl Piercy said that ADUs were allowed subject to a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), the development of the site and the appearance.

John Ahl said that there seemed to be a problem where the property owner would live in a small house, build a larger home and then use the small house as an Accessory Dwelling Unit. He felt this was contrary to the process.

Darryl Piercy said that there was a question whether this created an increase in the density in the rural areas. He said that the County felt that this process did increase the density and the impervious surfaces. He said that one restriction for these was that the ADU had to be within 100 feet of the primary structure.

Deborah Flynn asked if there had been applications for ADUs on Non-Conforming Lots?

Darryl Piercy said that ADUs have been placed on non-conforming lots as well as churches, which is allowed in the County’s Zoning Ordinance. He reported that the Zoning Ordinance would need to be amended for these changes to take place; it would not be a simple change, there could be design standards and another design for protection in accordance with the Endangered Species Act. He said that there has been a tremendous concern for developing churches and schools in the rural areas because of the stormwater issues. He reported that schools were being driven out of the urban areas because of the size requirements set by the State, in addition to meshing the goals of the GMA and the process for funding of the schools, so that they work together.

William Matchett felt that the original purpose of the ADU was to allow a smaller home on the same site to take care of a family member, but now they are being used to increase the rural densities.
Darryl Piercy said this provision was also to help with the supply of affordable housing and to have an elderly parent nearby to be a caregiver for them. He reported that only a handful, less than 5 applicants, have purchased land with a smaller home and then built the larger one on the same site.

No further discussion being heard, the Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.
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<td>Land for Primary Jobs, dated March 21, 2001, presented by Zoltan Szigethy.</td>
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