Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

A Motion was made by William Matchett and seconded by Michael Gustavson that the Planning Commission approves the Minutes of January 8, 2002. Vote: Aye: 6; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

9:10 A.M.

Study Session to consider the Findings of Fact and Recommendation of the Planning Commission to the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners regarding the 2001 Docket for Comprehensive Plan Amendments, which includes proposals for textual revisions to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, dated May 7, 1998; Site-specific amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Zoning Maps; and Map Corrections to the Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps. (This item was postponed from the Planning Commission Study Session of February 5, 2002.)

William Matchett said, with the exception of the single tie vote where there was no action, he would like the Commissioners to know the votes for and against each of the applications.

Laura Ditmer said that staff created a table, which would show the vote for each application.

Richard McConaughy said that he preferred that the vote be in text form instead of in the table.
Laura Ditmer said that the County Commissioners would receive the Minutes of the meetings, which show how each application was voted on.

Michael Gustavson understood that the County must review their Comprehensive Plan every 5 years to be sure to be in compliance with Growth Management Act (GMA). He suggested that in addition, the County review the GMA; to determine if the requirements that were established were actually achieving what was originally intended.

William Matchett said that even though he may agree with that, it was still not what the GMA laws required.

Lary Coppola said that the voters did not approve the GMA.

Michael Gustavson understood that the legislature approved the GMA, but he felt that when the GMA became law there may have been issues that were intended to be clarified and it would be good to know if the law was actually doing what it was designed to do.

Laura Ditmer felt that this could be reviewed with the Planning Commission so that when the next 5-year review process comes up, which is next year, it could then be determined if the Act was working.

Darryl Piercy said that there was a definite balancing act going on with the GMA, weighing the compliance issues with the actual purpose of the law.

Lary Coppola felt that with the GMA there needed to be a lot more compromise between the State and the counties than there has been in the past.

A Motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by William Matchett that the Planning Commission approves the 2001 Docket for Comprehensive Plan Amendments, Draft Findings of Fact and Recommendation dated February 19, 2002, to the Board of County Commissioners with the amendments as outlined above. Vote: Aye: 6; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

- Continuation of the 2002 Work Plan for the Kitsap County Planning Commission.

Laura Ditmer said that there are some issues that the Planning Commission felt were important for discussion this year together with the items staff felt were essential. She said that during this discussion, staff would combine these issues into a comprehensive work plan.
Darryl Piercy said the first issue that the Planning Commission will need to deal with will be ULID #6, which the Board of Commissioners was holding a public hearing on tonight. He said that depending on the outcome of the Board of Commissioners’ decision, this project might come back to the Planning Commission.

Lary Coppola said that he has heard from several people that there was an additional population allocated to South Kitsap that the Planning Commission did not consider in making its decision on this project.

Darryl Piercy said that he has heard that report as well, but he did not feel that information was accurate. He then outlined the formula used for the population allocation and why some people felt that there should be an additional 10,000 people expected to locate in Port Orchard. He said that the City of Port Orchard could come back to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) and ask for an additional population for the City.

Lary Coppola asked if the population numbers for the City of Port Orchard would be presented at the hearing tonight on ULID #6?

Darryl Piercy felt that the population allocation numbers would be discussed at the hearing. However, he continued, the Planning Commission’s decision was not based strictly on the population that would be coming to the City, but on more complex issues pertaining to the way the process was undertaken, which was a physical planning process. He expressed that the Planning Commission was also concerned about the “leap-frogging” effect that the three alternatives proposed.

Laura Ditmer announced that Linda Rowe would be representing the Planning Commission at the meeting tonight and all of the Planning Commission’s Minutes and written correspondence have been passed on to the Board to review following this hearing.

Darryl Piercy reported that in follow-up discussions with those who spoke at the hearings, they said they were concerned with the population allocation issue.

Linda Rowe felt that the projection of population allocation was not a very scientific study. She said it seemed like whoever asks gets some additional population.

Darryl Piercy said that there was actually a study done on this area, so it was not just “a shot in the dark”; when a decision is made, this population allocation will be the best estimate based on the information provided.

Michael Gustavson said he was troubled that people tend to vote with their wallets and they will locate in areas that are most attractive to them. He expressed that a
10,000 population margin, over the next 5 years, is not a large enough number to scatter around the County.

Darryl Piercy reported that one of the issues regarding the population numbers to the year 2022 is the real hard decision that will need to be made to determine where this population should go. He recounted said when the Comprehensive Plan was developed each of the cities wanted all of the population that could be allotted to them and now they do not want more population and have stated that they can’t manage any more than what they have. He said that it was clear that there would be more population numbers on the table than what most of the cities want. However, he continued, Port Orchard seems to be the city that is most willing to take on this population and they have the infrastructure to accommodate that growth. He said that at the KRCC level, the Community Council wants the policies established first before they address the population allocations. He felt that the whole process has been turned around since the Comprehensive Plan was developed and that this approach would be a lot more credible.

Laura Ditmer said that from the memo that she distributed to the members, there are issues that the Planning Commission wanted to discuss and she would like to understand how those issues related to the upcoming projects that staff could foresee during this year.

Mark Flynn said one issue that connects with Smart Growth and Affordable Housing was job development and attracting companies to locate here, and the housing in Kitsap is not affordable to those who are paid at minimum wage.

Lary Coppola agreed and reported that the 6th largest employer in Kitsap County is McDonalds.

Laura Ditmer suggested that items 2 (Smart Growth) and 6 (Affordable Housing) be linked together.

Mark Flynn said that affordable housing was an essential component to attracting businesses to the County, which would be a conceptual approach.

William Matchett said that it would be appropriate to connect items 2 and 6. He reported that on Monday February 25th, the Board of Commissioners adopted the Smart Growth concept, which was very important. Further, he said, Commissioner Angel voted against it, because she said that Smart Growth does not promote affordable housing, where he felt that the two should be interchangeable.
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Lary Coppola said he got a copy of a survey that reported that the laws associated with the GMA have increased the cost of housing by 26% in Washington and Oregon. He felt that this problem needed to be recognized and dealt with.

Linda Rowe reported that 3 years ago Bruce Freeland came to the Planning Commission with the Work Plan for that year and then the Planning Commission fit their items of importance into what the County had planned, so this process, as staff has presented it, seemed backwards.

Laura Ditmer said that if staff presented the Planning Commission a comprehensive work plan for 2002, there may not be room for issues the members wanted to discuss, so this year staff was combining their work items with those that the Planning Commission wished to resolve.

William Matchett said that he was pleased that the Sidney/Sedgwick review was the first priority on the Planning Commission’s list.

Darryl Piercy said that in the past, there have been some conflicts between the energy of the Planning Commission and what they wanted to accomplish and the level of work that could be done for them by County staff.

Lary Coppola said that item 6 ties in with economic development; infrastructure must be in place county-wide to bring in new businesses; this needs to be a mindset and at the top of the list of what needs to be done for future economic development. In addition, he said, having the high-speed telecommunication lines installed allows people to work from home, which could be very advantageous.

Mark Flynn said that he was in favor of having the commercial infrastructure in place, because it was a major cost to the developer and felt that it should be provided throughout the County.

Darryl Piercy said that this ties in with the Smart Goals Program and gave examples of how this is handled in Maryland. He said that whenever the street is opened for utilities then a PVC pipe must be located in the ground, so it is more economical to add additional infrastructure when necessary. He said that the placement of the infrastructure makes it the driving force for future development. He suggested that where this concept can come into effect would be on the subarea discussions that will be coming forward to the Planning Commission during this year.

Lary Coppola said that the placement of cell towers also needed to be included with the whole issue regarding infrastructure.
Laura Ditmer listed the issues that staff would be working with during 2002:

1. Silverdale Subarea Plan;
2. South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) with completion of the subarea plan in April or May and bringing it to the Planning Commission shortly after that;
3. Kingston, the Final Environmental Impact Statement will be before the Planning Commission in June or July;
4. GMA Compliance, beginning the first part of September or in the fall with regular updates.

Darryl Piercy said that this Comprehensive Plan review would not be as extensive as last year since there were only a few issues that were out of compliance, mostly the Development Regulations. He reported that the Department requested additional funding in this years’ budget to combine the County Codes so that they would be more useful to the citizens. He said that request was denied for this years budget, so staff will make the request again for the 2003 budget.

William Matchett explained that when the Planning Commission put the Zoning Ordinance on the list of projects that they wanted to do this year it was primarily to review that code and clean it up.

Richard McConaughy felt that issue should not just die because the total funding was not available.

Darryl Piercy explained that staff must still review the Zoning Code and make sure it was in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Laura Ditmer said that several of the subarea plans will address some of the concerns that the Planning Commission outlined in the Work Plan, and Silverdale will likely develop the prioritized list.

Michael Gustavson asked how far out of line the 1983 Zoning Code was with the requirements of the GMA?

Darryl Piercy said that some of the elements would need to be changed to make it up to date. He liked the 1983 Code because it was more “user friendly” and the current Zoning Code contains some contradictions that make it difficult for many people to understand. He reported that nearly all of the items on the Planning Commission’s list will be included in the Silverdale Subarea Plan, which will become the milestone when used for the creation of the rest of the subarea plans.

Laura Ditmer said that only the comprehensive review of the South Kitsap area and the Interim Rural Forestry were not included in the preparation work that will be
done on the Silverdale Subarea Plan. She said that during the development of SKIA, the Planning Commission members would review the economic development component.

Darryl Piercy reported that one of the things that staff has been struggling with are the goals of the South Kitsap Industrial area and defining what they should be.

Lary Coppola suggested that to determine those goals, first decide what you do not want developed in an industrial park and then welcome everything else.

Michael Gustavson said that the goal should be what the Plan wanted to achieve.

Darryl Piercy said that this would be a premium industrial park when it is completed and it would give the ability to maximize the value to the developer who was putting in the infrastructure.

Michael Gustavson felt that net rental return should drive the job site as well; the larger the project the greater the return, and a large project would also employ more people.

Darryl Piercy said that theory does not always pencil-out with industrial sites since one of the largest pieces of property zoned industrial in Kitsap County belonged to the Navy, but there were no employees there. He then explained that this year, the staff was putting together meetings with the KLOC property group who has had some very intensive discussions on formulating ideas on what should be done with Interim Rural Forestry. He said that providing for the maximum housing densities and open space are the chief concerns. He reported that there is a process for clustering in the rural areas in the County Code but there are no incentives built into this process for the developer. He felt that could be explored during the review process.

Michael Gustavson asked how the County could minimize transportation distances and develop those areas around the ferry docks, which have 5-acre parcels waiting to be developed?

Darryl Piercy felt that the major transportation corridors should be analyzed first and then design future development to occur nearest those transportation links.

Laura Ditmer said that in the fall the County would begin the Sidney-Sedgwick comprehensive review. She said the Buildable Lands Survey would also come forward in the fall.
Michael Gustavson asked if the statistical data would be coming forth with the Buildable Lands Survey?

Darryl Piercy said yes, Buildable Lands would show if the County was in compliance with the state requirements; secondly, it would give a good picture of how Kitsap was doing to achieve the goals of the GMA.

Laura Ditmer said that the data in the Buildable Lands Survey would be for the year 2000.

Darryl Piercy said a draft copy of the Buildable Lands Survey should be available next month. He recounted that there was a generous grant for this Buildable Lands Survey, which was one of the few fully-funded mandates. He said that this Survey would also be a snapshot for the future to depict what areas needed to be addressed and what County policies would need to be changed. He said that Kitsap, unlike most other counties, has the data for 2001 as well, so they will also be doing the yearly update. He felt that this Survey would be a great tool for determining the population allocation and development. He then reported that the Brownfields Study would be completed this year, noting that there was a grant for this as well. He explained to the members that there was a committee that were identifying Brownfield sites (those properties in Kitsap County, which were formerly used for industrial and commercial uses and then abandoned); there have been about 500 sites, not including the Navy sites, identified in this County. He reported that the committee was narrowing those sites down to 3 or 4 for the study and then 1 site will be reclaimed. He reported that Gorst, Berg’s Auto Wrecking and the Charleston area has been under review as single sites with multiple owners, which allows an opportunity to redevelop that area as the gateway into Bremerton. He said there are sites on Bainbridge Island and a few sites in North Kitsap as well.

Lary Coppola asked if the Brownfield sites included the “meth” labs and what happens to those sites?

Darryl Piercy said that those 500 sites did not include the meth labs; there was another government program that has some specific requirements for that clean up. He reported that staff would outline how each of the items of interest for the Planning Commission fit together with the staff’s projects. He felt that Interim Rural Forestry would probably be coming forward in the fall, noting that Bruce Freeland will be leading that issue.

Michael Gustavson expressed that the property owners should be included in these initial meetings on Forestry.
Darryl Piercy said that there was an active workgroup from the forestry community that will be working with this.

Richard McConaughy asked if those in the audience had questions they wanted to ask of the staff or the Planning Commission.

Gene Angst timber owner asked what other plans that the staff had for forestry besides clustering and bonus densities? He said he would like to keep active forestry going in the County and would contribute to the support of bonus densities.

Darryl Piercy said that was the main issues that he had regarding rural forestry and that staff would like to discuss this with all of the timber owners and come up with some ideas.

Gene Angst then outlined some of the problems the foresters were having with conservation easements and the forest industry in this County.

Gordon Shaw said he lived in King County and owned property in Kitsap. He said that he understood the process that the Planning Commission was going through and the problems with committees wasting time instead of solving the problems. He suggested that when the staff begins work with the committee on the South Kitsap Industrial area that instead of breaking this area down geographically, break it down into a task force and cross the neighborhood boundaries; then break it into a focus group and in the process put a time limit on these issues to make deadlines; which is not a perfect solution and will not resolve a lot of people’s issues, but it will get a plan in place. He felt that this could create cross-community participation.

Harriet Norwood suggested that the committee put together a survey where you go door to door with a series of 90 questions put together by the University of Washington. She said that even though this process takes a lot of time it is very successful. She reported that she was on a committee several years ago and they worked with Mr. Seabeck at the University. She said that this same effort was used to develop Leavenworth.

Michael Gustavson said that one of the comments he has heard from the community is that affordable housing is shunned from a development standpoint; it’s hard to get a mobile home development approved by the County. He feels that affordable housing serves a part of the community Kitsap County cannot afford to ignore.

Laura Ditmer said that multi-use developments could be developed in such a way as to bring together the first-time homebuyers as well as the seniors in the same development.
Michael Gustavson felt that these communities tend to be government subsidized, where the homeowner is not as proud of that achievement as full homeownership.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.
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