
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

• A Motion was made by William Matchett and seconded by Linda Rowe that the Planning Commission approves the Minutes of June 4, 2002. Vote: Aye: 8; Nay: 0; Motion carried. (Coppola not present at this time.)

• A Motion was made by William Matchett and seconded by Linda Rowe by that the Planning Commission approves the Minutes of June 25, 2002. Vote: Aye: 4; Nay: 0; Abstain: 4. (Gustavson, McConaughy, Nevins and Ahl not present at this meeting.) Motion carried. (Coppola not present at this time.)

John Ahl expressed discomfort with having to approve Minutes that are 3-months old and said he would like to see an effort made to get the Minutes more up to date.

➤ Continuation of a Public Hearing to consider additional oral and written comments regarding the Draft South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) Plan.

Darryl Piercy recounted that the topic of the SKIA Subarea Plan had been before the Planning Commission members a number of times and there were comments received during the public testimony that caused staff to pause and reflect about some of the issues that were being raised, especially the comments relating to the Port of Bremerton’s existing Industrial Zoning and their relationship of that overall Industrial Zoning to the Subarea Plan. He said that since the last Public Hearing,
staff has had discussions with representatives of the Port of Bremerton. He said they have worked through those concerns expressed by the Port regarding specific elements of the draft Subarea Plan as it was presented at that time. He said the approach that staff has taken does a number of things: 1) It provides a clearer distinction between the existing Industrial Zoning, currently within the SKIA proper, and the new area that is being added as a Business Center Zone. He noted that this distinction is important because it continues to allow the Port of Bremerton to operate under a number of events; one is the existing Master Plans that are in place for the Port of Bremerton and the process they currently enjoy for the review and development within those master planned areas, and 2) It continues to reinforce the idea of Master Planning within the SKIA Subarea, but addresses those areas that are new or additions to the overall Subarea and identified as Business Center Zones. He said within those Business Center Zones, the wording in the proposed ordinance would require Master Planning to take place; with a few exceptions to the Business Center Zones at the north end of the SKIA boundary that front State Highway 3. He explained that one of the main components of the Subarea Plan, from staff’s view, is that there has been a requirement for integrated development between existing Industrial and new Business Center Zoning. He said they have reconvened the working group that had initially brought the Draft forward and discussed the modifications with the working group and representatives of the Economic Development Council.

(Lary Coppola arrived at the meeting at 9:10 a.m.)

John Ahl said they received the proposed ordinance and new zoning in the mail and asked if both of these items were on the table today?

Darryl Piercy said all the elements that the members received were open for discussion as the intent is to move those forward as a package for the Board of County Commissioners’ consideration.

Richard McConaughy opened the floor for public testimony.

Linda Niebanck, of McCormick Land Company, said that many of the concerns expressed by the working group have been addressed in the Final Draft. She noted a particular item of concern, was the use of interim on-site septic systems under strict regulations, which contributes to the financially feasible development of these properties. She said there are a number of concerns that she has pertaining to the Business Center Zone and sees it as being extraordinarily restrictive. She felt the maximum height limit of 35-feet is something that needed to be looked at as well as the list of uses, comparing the old Industrial Zone to the new Business Center Zone, which seemed to be extraordinarily restricted. She commented on the omission of the Master Planning requirement for those properties that front on Highway 3; she
felt it should be considered as a visible entrance. She said in regard to the ordinance, she hoped that there would be an opportunity for interim uses, possibly odd uses that require a Site Plan Review or Conditional Use Permit.

William Matchett asked for examples.

Linda Niebanck gave the example of the runway behind the airport being used as a racetrack.

Ken Atteberry from the Port of Bremerton expressed his appreciation to the Planning Commission and staff. He said the Port was interested in the 1998 Urban Growth Area (UGA) lands being recognized as having some preexisting status; that concern has been accommodated and the Port was satisfied. He said the Master Plan Ordinance focused on the development process of creating of jobs. He said the Plan does provide some opportunity for a level of discretion related to the specific site. He recommended they pass the draft onto the County Commissioners.

Tim Arnold from the Kitsap Regional Economic Development Council (EDC) commended staff and the property owners for their work on this Plan. He said there were a lot of bridges to cross and discussions and agreements to be put in place before Kitsap County can come forth with something in a major way that had a really true important definition for job creation and placement within this County. He said from the EDC’s point of view, this draft Plan was a vital piece, to propel Kitsap County forward to being competitive and have job opportunity placement in this area. He said this is the beginning stage, it has taken a long time to get it to this point and Kitsap will go through a lot more. He said that the EDC was glad to be involved to make this draft Plan a reality. He urged the Commission to unanimously approve this Plan and pass it forward to the Board of County Commissioners.

Chair Richard McConaughy opened the floor for additional written and oral testimony.

Linda Niebanck read a letter from the Port Blakely community in support of SKIA and submitted it to staff.

No further discussion being heard, Chair McConaughy closed the public hearing at 9:27 a.m., and opened a study session for the Planning Commission to discuss the draft SKIA Plan with County staff.

Darryl Piercy reported that the Business Center Zone was an attempt to create as many permitted uses as possible once the Master Plan was developed; the attempt was to minimize any additional review beyond the Master Plan than would be
necessary and encourage and expedite the process. He said one of the things the
members should note within the Business Center Zone, compared to other zones, is
that almost all the uses that are identified as allowable are permitted. He said that
staff would have no objection to adding a use table that would point out other uses,
that were not specifically identified as not permitted, and then have those go
through some other review process. He said the next goal of the work group is to get
together with property owners and develop design standards that are appropriate to
this area.

Deb Flynn said she had a number of questions about the Plan when she reviewed it.
She referred to page 39, item 6, and asked for clarification.

Darryl Piercy explained there is no specific timeframe for the Bremerton Airport and
Olympic View Industrial Park to update these master plans. He said it is action by
the Port that would identify when that would happen; if the Port undertakes a major
review resulting in significant changes and chooses not to update the Master Plan,
they would need to request a Site Plan Review of each site or if the Port submits
development applications that are expansion or inconsistent with their existing
plans, then they would have to do that under a Site Plan Review.

Deb Flynn agreed with Linda Niebanck’s comment about properties fronting
Highway 3 as serving as the entrance and she felt that those buildings should be
attractive and coordinated.

Darryl Piercy said the proposed plan allows that as an option, it does not preclude
those property owners from Master Planning. He recounted that staff’s concern was
avoiding a regulation that required a Master Plan for smaller properties that would
most likely be developed as individual properties along the highway for a variety of
smaller uses. He said potentially, it would be very difficult to develop those
properties if they have the requirement of a Master Plan as the only option; their
intent was to leave the utmost flexibility for those property owners to develop
individually if they chose to.

Deb Flynn referred to page 70 regarding on-site septic systems, and pointed out that
Policies 1 and 2 may be inconsistent.

Darryl Piercy said yes, staff would correct those inconsistencies.

Tom Nevins referred to page 24, the first sentence of paragraph 3. He said they are
planning the need for industrial land to 2017. He expressed concern that the
demand is predicated on an increase of industrial jobs from 3 to 9 percent, from 500
jobs to over 9,000 jobs. He felt that the growth expectation was phenomenal and
was unsure if Kitsap County could back the infrastructure growth.
Darryl Piercy said this is working through a planning period out to 2017; in the not too distant future they will extend that vision out of 2022 or even to 2025. Once they have a population allocation out to that period, then a reevaluation would be necessary in Kitsap County for that next 20-year period. He said that might indicate a need to revisit the Industrial Lands and Urban Growth Areas; they will reanalysis this every five years.

William Matchett suggested they replace the wording to state: “may be met”.

Tom Nevins asked if the recommendations cited on page 23 were an increase over a 20-year period?

Darryl Piercy said this is the planning period out to 2017.

John Ahl referred to the business center zones 35-foot height limitation. He also felt it would be better to move to criteria rather than lists. He questioned if Industrial land is so scarce, why is Agriculture and Forestry permissible in Industrially-zoned areas?

William Matchett wondered why not make a list what we do not allow instead of what we do allow.

Darryl Piercy suggested he bring this issue up at the next discussion when they talk about code modifications.

Lary Coppola referred to page 1, Site Requirements, and questioned why a 2 ½ acre minimum site requirement was chosen?

Alice Strand said the idea behind the 2-½ acre site requirement was to have the potential for larger uses.

Lary Coppola felt that a larger lot may not be feasible for many businesses and suggested they look at other industrial parks.

Alice Strand said she would look into it.

Mike Gustavson said they might want to look at a variety of lots sizes within the region.

Darryl Piercy said maybe a way to approach that would be to require that the Master Plan identify the minimum lot size provided for in each Master Plan.
Deb Flynn asked the size of the “Business Center” lots that front Highway 3, which are exempt from the Master Plan?

Darryl Piercy said they range from ½-acre up to 7-acres.

Linda Rowe referred to the first Public Hearing and questioned why Arthur Blaine’s property was excluded from the Study?

Darryl Piercy said it was not included within the Study Area because as staff looked into it further, it was obvious that it was encumbered by a large wetland system that runs through that property; the developable portion of that property was so small that it would not lend itself to a normal development.

Linda Rowe asked how the 35-foot height projection came about?

Darryl Piercy said it is a restriction currently in the Zoning code; they could require that any building over 35-feet be approved by the fire marshal.

Mike Gustavson reported that there is a consistent increase in population of 2% yearly. He said that the airport has a 6,000-foot runway, which accommodates Category 3 aircraft. He felt it would be wise to consider putting an airfield reserve extension of 4,000-feet to the south.

Laura Overton-Johannes of Overton and Associates she said the airport has not shown any interest to expand.

Linda Rowe asked if the railroad is open for private parties?

Ken Atteberry said there are private users on that line and it is used more frequently now that the Waste Management Facility is located along the tracking.

Deb Flynn referred to page 46; the last sentence before section 5.1.1.2 and said the statement did not make sense to her.

Alice Strand said she would get additional clarification for this sentence.

Deb Flynn referred to page 48, Section 5.2.2 and said it seemed that Policy 1 was redundant of Policy 2, and that Policy 2 seems to contain 2 policies.

Darryl Piercy said those two policies are slightly different than Policy 1.

Linda Niebanck felt the Master Plan Ordinance has serious issues that need to be resolved.
No further discussion being heard, a Motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission approves the South Kitsap Industrial Area Plan, Working Draft Revision 2, dated September 24, 2002. Vote: Aye; 8; Nay: 1; Abstain: 0. Motion carried.

- Study Session with County staff to discuss The Buildable Lands Study.

Darryl Piercy said the intent today was to present the Planning Commission with a copy of the study that was sent to the State; its purpose was to meet state law. He noted that it is not a market analysis, so it does not answer local questions; they are working with the Home Builders Association to answer local questions. He said it is important to remember that Kitsap County has only operated under a valid Comprehensive Plan for 2 years. He said if they would like to have a Work Study Session, he would be happy to facilitate a meeting.

Lary Coppola asked why was this update is 3 years behind.

Darryl Piercy said they did not have a common database at the time of this report, but they now have one.

Mike Gustavson asked if there is a disparity between buildable lands and actual buildable properties and to what do you contribute the disparity?

Darryl Piercy said it does not take into account market factors.

John Ahl was concerned that they have established a dependency on a study that does not meet the local needs.

Darryl Piercy said it has a lot of valuable information; it will be a very useful tool. He noted that there are local questions that were not addressed by the state legislature.

Lary Coppola felt that Kitsap County has postponed making land use decisions waiting for a document to be issued that is already out of date.

Zoltan Szigethy commented that there must be a starting point and that is what this study offers, outdated though it may be.

- Study Session with County Staff to discuss the 2002 Amendments to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan (to make a recommendation to the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners regarding items in the Plan that should be considered by the Board for review and possible amendment during this year’s process.)
Darryl Piercy reported that on September 23rd, staff held a meeting at the Water/Fire District Facility in Silverdale that kicked off the public process of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment cycle 2003. He said a major category they continually heard was the need for affordable housing and felt that they needed to look at the Comprehensive Plan and make sure there are good policies that direct people toward viable affordable housing in that Plan. He reported another issue that was brought up was whether there were policies within the Comprehensive Plan that discouraged the development of single-family lots; the cost of the application process as well as the time it takes for the process. He noted that a long-term concern were transportation issues in Kitsap County and many people felt they should look at elements of the Comprehensive Plan relating to transportation, to ensure that they are putting themselves in a position of being proactive rather than reactive.

Robert Alire said that at the meeting last night staff was hoping to pick up ideas from the public to suggest to the Board of County Commissioners and asked the Planning Commission members for their input as well. He said this kind of effort requires a lot of housekeeping, which included improving the document by updating information, and making corrections. He said they have already started to put together a list of textual amendments for the 2003 process. He asked if there were any items the members wanted the Board to consider? He said Kelly Robinson has a number of items that he is going to propose be corrected, improved on, and clarified to make the Zoning Code easier to use, and to compare how the policies in the Comprehensive Plan are interpreted in the actual rules and regulations. He said that prior to October, he would have a draft of the items the staff will present to the Board. He reminded the members that this was just the initial docket; the final docket is the main purpose of this process for residents, and property owners to have an ability to ask the County to review issues related to the Comprehensive Plan on their behalf.

Kelly Robinson said historically, there have been 2 different processes for making changes to development regulations: the Comprehensive Plan and the Development (Zoning) Code. The primary separation is the one that is mandated by the State that says under the Growth Management Act (GMA) you can only change your Comprehensive Plan on the periodic cycle. He said for the Development Code, the implementing code, the rules state it can be changed at any time. Historically, he continued, we have changed the Zoning Code as the need arose; at any time in the County, there are 2 or 3 code-change initiatives going on. He noted that one of the problems with this historical approach has been the relationship between the implementing codes and the Policies in the Comprehensive Plan that are supposed to be driving them; the goals and policies are often not matched up. They find they are regulating things that they cannot find any guiding policies for in the adopted Plan; on the other hand there are Policies in the Plan that they felt strongly about, but there is no mention about them in the implementing ordinances.
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He reviewed the different codes and noted that they were developed under state mandate. He said so much of what is difficult and troubling about the County’s Development Codes is that they are contradictory and have holes in them. He said the Board of County Commissioners asked Bruce Freeland to develop a process where they could have an annual cycle to do code amendments to the Development Codes so that they can be coordinated and on a single docket in order to see their relationship with one another. He suggested that they would also make changes in the Implementing Code just for their own sake because they need to be changed, not necessarily driven by a policy or goal change in the Plan. He said if they agreed to this concept, then he was prepared to share with them today a candidate list of 34, mostly housekeeping code amendments, that need to be changed. He submitted a document to the members entitled Candidate Development Code Amendments. The document included the following headings: Procedural Changes, New Definitions, Simple Substantive Changes, More Complex Substantive Changes, Non-Housekeeping, and Map Corrections. He asked for their comments.

Mike Gustavson said he found a number of the definitions in Title 17 that are sadly lacking.

Darryl Piercy requested the members provide a list of specific issues and then they can determine how to address them.

John Ahl felt that changing from lists of things to criteria of things would be beneficial.

Darryl Piercy said next year they hope to have Kelly Robinson’s time devoted to a broader review of this whole issue, to go through and look at the codes very specifically and do a major overhaul.

Kelly Robinson said some of them believe there should be a Unified Development Code that defined items only once for the Critical Areas Ordinance, Subdivision, etc.

Lary Coppola questioned the necessity of having a complex Comprehensive Plan.

Darryl Piercy said they took out huge sections of the Comprehensive Plan at the last review.

➢ Work Plan Discussion

It was reported that the next meeting is scheduled for October 1, 2002 at the Thunderbird Room at the Fairgrounds in Bremerton, with the following meeting scheduled for October 29, 2002 at 7 p.m. at the Kingston Junior High Commons.
No further discussion being heard, the Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.
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