KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 25, 2002


9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions

9:05 A.M.

- Adopt Minutes of April 30, 2002. Acting Chair Linda Rowe announced that since there was not a quorum at this meeting, adoption of the Minutes would be postponed until the meeting of August 6, 2002.

9:10 A.M.

- Study Session with County staff to discuss the Draft South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) Plan.

Darryl Piercy said that staff distributed a draft-working document to the members a few weeks ago, which did not reflect comments from the open houses. He noted that they had a wonderful turnout at the open houses. He referred to the South Kitsap Industrial Land Owners (SKILO) and gave some background information on the SKIA area. He said staff was in the process of compiling comments from SKILO and will incorporate those into the Plan and noted that the final draft will be compiled from the Planning Commission’s comments; it will then go to Board of County Commissioners for adoption. He reminded the members that the document is a working draft and they do expect comments and noted that certain modifications will be necessary as a result of the comments received.

(Lary Coppola arrived at the meeting at 9:10 a.m.)
Laura Ditmer referred to the SKIA Comprehensive Plan Map. She pointed out that the area in the blue was designated Industrially zoned land that is owned by the Port of Bremerton with approximately 1,700 acres in the Urban Growth Area, which will be added to the Industrial area. She said they are working on a Master Plan Overlay Ordinance to go with this Plan that, upon completion of the construction in the SKIA area, will provide 9,300 jobs. She said they addressed all the issues that came forward several years ago some of which included management considerations for the wastewater, water issues, transportation, etc.

Darryl Piercy added there was some discussion within the Plan about taking land from the southeast portion and adding it to the northeast area as a natural break and noted that it would not change the amount of industrially zoned land. He said there was some private ownership included in this Plan and pointed out those areas on the map.

Lary Coppola asked about each parcel being developed in a 7-acre piece and questioned why they cannot develop smaller parcels?

Darryl Piercy said they are looking at this question and trying to determine where it makes sense to include these master plans for subbasins. He gave the example of individual parcels that are located along State Route 3 the area to the north, and noted it is very unlikely these parcels could be developed in a concept of master planning in association with all of the other adjacent parcels within that sub basin, simply because of their size and unique characteristics in relationship to one another. He said they are looking at language that would exempt certain properties from that requirement and noted the requirement does not specifically say that they need to have a minimum lot size for development, but the Master Plan does require you to look at the relationship of your development to others within your sub basin.

Deb Flynn felt it was good to have the minimum 7-acre parcels for some properties because that would allow development to become more of a planned approach, which in turn would protect the environment.

Alice Strand reported that many of the current zoning standards have a minimum or maximum impervious surface ratio. She said they did not want to specify a minimum size because, in many ways, the minimum then becomes the maximum. The intent of this Plan is to provide a location for economic development along with the protection of natural resources, so in order to do that, they are attempting to minimize the impervious surfaces as are seen with a number of Stormwater Policies.
Darryl Piercy said if you look at the elements of the Stormwater Requirements and also at the elements of the Master Plan Overlay Requirements, without setting specific standards for impervious surfaces, the very nature of those elements are going to begin to limit the available impervious surfaces within a given area simply because of the requirements of identifying properly functioning conditions in terms of current conditions versus post-development conditions and the requirement that you ensure properly functioning conditions as a result of development.

William Matchett asked Darryl Piercy to identify which lands are in private ownership?

Darryl Piercy said McCormick Woods Properties owns property to the south and primarily Alpine Evergreen owns property to the north. He said along Highway 3 there are number of individual owners and that is why they are looking at potentially providing exemptions or revising the Master Plan requirements for those sites. He noted that there is a transportation issue with those properties in that Highway 3 is a limited access highway and there is a need to think in terms of creating a frontage road with single access points and interconnectivity.

Lary Coppola asked if impervious surfaces are calculated on the entire area or just the developable area?

Darryl Piercy said since they do not have a specific design standard for maximum impervious surface, it could be calculated on the entire area or the developable area. He said it should be consistent with the Master Plan requirement of the Subarea Plan. He noted that the persons putting together the Master Plan would be responsible for allocating the impervious surface ratio of each site.

Linda Rowe felt that if the standards are made too flexible, it could create ambiguity and confusion.

Deborah Flynn noted that the importance of impervious surfaces is how they impact natural resources on a watershed level.

Darryl Piercy said that is the intent of this approach and reported that there are 23 identifiable sub-basins within the SKIA area.

Mike Gustavson said he felt the County has an obligation to develop a well-defined Plan, and thought this current draft Plan was too fuzzy.
Darryl Piercy pointed out that this is a 2-phased process; with this Plan being the first phase. He said in the second phase the property owners will work with the County to develop the Master Plan, because the County does not have the money to do this. He said that phase I of the Plan needed to be flexible because they don’t know what the specific site requirements of each developing parcel would be. He noted that Phase I is more of a planning document.

Mike Gustavson said they have done a lot of study to show overlays for Buildable-Lands in the County and felt the Buildable Lands and this Plan should work together.

Darryl Piercy said they do not have the detail to identify the wetland boundaries on any given parcel because the maps are not specific.

Rod Reid of Alpine Evergreen said he was part of the South Kitsap Industrial Land Owners (SKILO) group. He said they wanted to convert the land use designation on their property from “purple” to “blue” on the map, but were told they needed a valid Comprehensive Plan in order to make those changes and they could not do anything with their land until the Comprehensive Plan was completed. He gave background information on SKILO.

Linda Rowe asked Rod Reid if the SKILO members were comfortable with the flexibility approach the County has taken in regard to impervious surfaces?

Rod Reid felt the flexibility in a Plan like this was very beneficial to the property owner.

Mike Gustavson asked how the Planning Commission could help the process go more smoothly?

Rod Reid said it would be helpful to have the Subarea Plan approved so they could move on towards developing these properties if they chose to do so. He said they are very comfortable with what they see.

Fred Depee asked about the number of potential jobs that are expected to be created once this Plan was completed?

Darryl Piercy said the economic forecast and goals for job creation in Kitsap County, for this type of family wage job, was identified within the Comprehensive Plan; they went through an analysis and found that within the SKIA area there was the potential to create a little over 9,000 jobs. He said if the requirements of this Plan were applied, taking into consideration
the land that would come out of the available land supply for development, they would come very close to 9,000 potential jobs being created within the SKIA Plan, as it exists today in the working draft. He said when staff began developing this Plan, they had not done the analysis and were concerned that it would be very difficult to meet the employment goal based on some of the requirements for development that are identified within the Plan. He reported that they actually did an analysis, applying what they knew in terms of the land itself and also the requirements contained within the Plan and identified the ability to create those 9,000 jobs. He felt they are right on target with the employment needs of the County in relationship to the forecast of these 9,000 family-wage jobs that could be created within the SKIA site.

Mike Gustavson asked Darryl Piercy to define the number of jobs created per developable acre?

Darryl Piercy said that staff used formulas out of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mike Gustavson asked about residential uses at the SKIA area?

Darryl Piercy clarified that the SKIA area is not a Smart Growth area it is an industrial site. He said staff did not allow for residential uses within this site for 2 reasons, specifically: 1) No other industrial area in the County includes an airport; and 2) The SKIA Plan would create an industrial area that may have the potential for uses that would not be conducive to nearby residential development.

Alice Strand pointed out that they have allowed accessory dwelling space for a caretaker or owner/operator within the Plan, which could be considered somewhat of a residential use.

Laura Ditmer said with regard to compatibility of residential and industrial uses, there is always the noise factor within an airport as well as that caused by large trucks traversing through those areas.

Darryl Piercy said within the Plan there are very specific considerations for the Bremerton Airport. He said the Port of Bremerton was not only feeling a need locally to preserve the future integrity of the airport as well as the possibility of airport expansion into uses that may not even be anticipated today. Further, he said, there are also requirements under the State Growth Management Act to preserve the operational conditions of the airport. He said the primary concern was not to get into a situation in the future where the airport expands and the County must buy out the adjacent residents
because of that expansion. He made it clear they do not want to create another Sea-Tac. He noted that even in the industrial elements, there are areas that are clearly defined and relate back to the Port of Bremerton’s Master Plan and yet the FAA requirements place restrictions on development near the airport, in terms of things like structure height and even uses that might emit fumes. He said uses are reduced and minimized, as you get closer to the airport.

Lary Coppola asked what the time line was to begin development?

Darryl Piercy said if the Plan was adopted in October of this year, the property owners could market their property by the summer of 2003.

Mike Gustavson asked about the map change from purple to light blue.

Darryl Piercy said there is going to be a difference between the existing Industrial Zone in terms of color on the map and the Business Center Zone, which will be just enough of a shade difference that will show, but it is going stay with the blue theme because it is intended for job creation and industrial development.

Laura Ditmer said staff would get together with the Planning Commission at the end of July and if the members were comfortable going forward with the Public Hearing and did not feel that another work-study is needed, then staff could prepare a review following the public hearing.

William Matchett asked if there would be a new draft available before the public hearing?

Laura Ditmer said yes.

William Matchett reported that he and Shannon Bauman spent a number of hours working on getting the goals, policies and performance standards parallel throughout the document.

Laura Ditmer said they expected to have a new draft within a week and a half.

Darryl Piercy thanked William Matchett for his assistance in preparing this current draft Plan. He also noted that there would be a joint meeting between the Board of County Commissioners and the Port of Bremerton, which was scheduled for July 9, 2002.

Linda Rowe said they would like to move forward to the public hearing stage.
Laura Ditmer said they would clean up the draft and distribute it to the members. She said the public hearing would be scheduled for the end of July followed by the Work Study during first week in August.

Deborah Flynn referred to the Economic Development Section, page 21, regarding fiber optics; she questioned if the language was strong enough.

Darryl Piercy referred to a conduit ordinance that has not been finalized yet. The members then discussed the wording in the Economic Development Section and agreed the language should be stronger.

Deborah Flynn also referred to page 58 of the draft, Policy 6.3.2, Policies for Storm Water Management; she asked what policies new development would follow?

Darryl Piercy said it was possible that some development could occur before the completion of that Plan. He said the Plan is not being conducted in a vacuum, the Port is acting as the lead agency, Kitsap County is also involved, and he is convinced as programs are coming forward, if someone is conducting a Master Plan that they would be checking in with that plans basic elements. He said their stormwater review team uses the information that is available today as a guide for development.

Deborah Flynn referred to page 65, Item B, under Goals, and questioned the wording regarding no new on-site septic systems being permitted and interim on-site disposal technologies seemed inconsistent.

Darryl Piercy said the word “permanent” on-site system was missing.

Deborah Flynn referred to page 72, Transportation Policy, and questioned how the policy supports the goal. She also referred to pages 80 – 81, where one of the bullets on page 80 states that State Route 3 remains 2 lanes and on page 81 under “A Strategy” it states “State Route 3, from 2 to 4 lanes.”

Alice Strand said she would research this issue to bring clarification.

Mike Gustavson said he would like to see herbicides banned in this area.

Darryl Piercy said they have not prohibited the use of all herbicides, but have limited their use to be applied only by licensed applicators under provisions consistent with state law. He noted that the Port might have some need to use herbicides on hard surfaces at the airport, as well as the State whose roads are located within the SKIA boundaries.
Lary Coppola referred to page 18 Economic Diversity, and asked for the definition of “living wage”.

Alice Strand said the average annual covered wage is put out as a statistic every year in a report by the state and noted it was wages that are covered by unemployment insurance.

Laura Ditmer noted that a living wage is not defined in the Comprehensive Plan.

Work Plan Discussion

Laura Ditmer said they should discuss having other future presentations. She noted that Jon Rose of Olympic Resource Management would like to come back before the Planning Commission to update the members on what they have done with their open space. She then asked the members if they had other presentations they were interested in.

Mike Gustavson suggested they invite representatives from Mason & Pierce Counties.

Deborah Flynn asked if the Planning Commission would hold a hearing on the Nuisance Ordinance?

Laura Ditmer said she had not received an update regarding the Ordinance and would get back to them.

No further discussion being heard, the Meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.
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