
6:00 P.M.

- Open House for discussion with County staff regarding the Kingston Subarea Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).

7:00 P.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

7:05 P.M.

Approve the Minutes of July 30 and August 6, 2002.

Chair Richard McConaughy announced that the approval of the Minutes would be continued until the meeting of November 5, 2002.

7:10 P.M.


Shannon Bauman said that this meeting was established to receive public comment on the Draft Kingston Subarea Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement from the residents. She said this draft was a culmination of many years of work that began approximately ten years ago with the Kingston Community Design Study. She said that when the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan was validated in 1998, the planning process was resumed with the goal of completing a
Subarea Plan for Kingston. She added that the County developed a planning process that would build on the Kingston Community Design Study to include a review of the current circumstances, since many things had changed since that initial study was done as well as consider revisions to the vision and determine an appropriate boundary for the Kingston UGA. She said as part of that process the Steering Committee, comprised of 15 citizens, was appointed by the Board of County Commissioners in February of 2000 to begin the process. She reported that the County also determined that an integrated Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process would be used to analyze and evaluate the alternatives that resulted from the Steering Committee’s work, and, in doing so, the County hired Madrona Planning to work with the Steering Committee to develop the plan and the integrated Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). She introduced Rick Sepler of Madrona Planning to the Planning Commission and the audience.

Rick Sepler of Madrona Planning said in February of 2000, the Steering Committee was appointed by the County Commissioners to look at things that might have changed since the Kingston Design Study was prepared and the Committee diligently worked to develop a plan that best served Kingston. He said that although consensus was achieved by the Steering Committee on a variety of issues, they were divided on what the most appropriate boundary would be for the Urban Growth Area; that issue took a great deal of discussion and resulted in the alternatives that are submitted at this hearing. He said the Committee felt that several alternative proposals should be developed, which represented those plausible courses of action that could give a full range of choice, both to the community and the Planning Commission, as a starting point for this Plan. He said the Alternatives are as follows: A) The existing Urban Growth Area (UGA); B) An expansion of the current UGA to incorporate many of the schools that are located in the area; C) Incorporating a vested, but not approved, proposal called “Arborwood”; and D) Expand land to the north of Kingston. He said in preparing these alternatives, it was clear that the community was evenly divided between Alternatives B and C. He said it was important to note that virtually everyone on the committee agreed that Alternative B was a reasonable course to take. He noted that the Planning Commission has not received a recommendation on a specific alternative, so no decision will be made at this hearing. He said they would consider the Environmental Review and allow public comment on the Environmental Analysis and on the various alternatives. He said written comments would be accepted until November 12, 2002.

Chair Richard McConaughy opened the public hearing and invited the first speaker to come forward.
Walt Elliott thanked staff and the committee for all the hard work they put into this Draft Plan. He said he hoped that the comments that are heard at this hearing were not considered as criticism, but rather expresses the community’s interest in participating in this process. He submitted a letter to the Board outlining the following suggested changes: 1) Allow additional time for public review and comment on the Plan by the residents inside the UGA; 2) Include elements that are desired by the community in the Plan as documented by the Kingston Design Study; 3) Include specific policies for preserving neighborhoods by planning for increased density through infill; 4) Include intersections in the Transportation Level of Standards (LOS) analysis; 5) Ensure that public meetings continue to be held to keep the residents informed; and 6) Provide for public participation in Plan implementation and monitoring.

Bobbie Moore said she believed the community’s priorities and preferences for recreational spaces should be included in this Plan. She noted that thanks to the sponsorship of Commissioner Endresen they have conducted a Community Parks, Trails and Open Space Survey, which is currently being summarized. She said the level of response now ensures them of at least a 93 percent confidence that the responses are representative of the community’s wishes. She said incorporating the community’s goals and desires, as reflected by the survey, in the Subarea Plan is essential to future planning for Kingston. She gave an example of how the survey responses are showing a strong interest in safe routes for walking from place to place throughout Kingston; there is also an overwhelming amount of support for a downtown community center and a replacement library. She made it clear that by including the detailed priorities as reflected in the Parks, Trails and Open Space Survey into the Subarea Plan would be consistent with other community plans in Kitsap County. In summary, she noted that they would appreciate working with the Department of Community Development, County Parks and Recreation, and the Planning Commission to achieve these goals.

David De Bruyn felt that the public process had been flawed and is open to procedural challenge by inclusion of Alternative D. He said that the Dames and Moore Study should be included and if Alternative D is chosen; sewer and stormwater requirements also needed to be included.

Betsy Cooper wanted to highlight the significant aspects of the SEIS that she believed needed modification or correction, so that it can accurately reflect the input from the Steering Committee, together with the potential impacts and the analysis that underline the impact conclusions. She felt that it was unclear in the SEIS whether an analysis had been done to determine the
impacts of the continuing development of all undeveloped lots outside the Study Area. She also noted that the Water Supply Impacts on all Alternatives are not fully presented. She felt that the Conclusions of the Total Impervious Area Analysis have been improperly presented in the EIS and the Forest Cover Analysis is also somewhat misleading, Alternative C needing to be clarified. She stressed that it is very important that the EIS include the impact analysis of intersections in the Transportation Analysis, in order to show differences between the alternatives. She noted that the general population analysis is based on older data and reported that the 2000 data is now available. She felt that the public needs more opportunities to express their views and urged the Planning Commission not rush its decision.

Linda Cazin said she is in favor of Alternatives A or B. She felt that Alternative C is not substantiated by the population growth and noted that the population must be allocated where it is needed. She said that one thing about Alternatives A and B is that Urban Restricted zoning should be liberally used.

Cassy Peterson expressed concern about Alternative D. She said as the Steering Committee worked through the issues, they looked at the northern expansion option and using all the materials that were provided to them, they determined that that area really did not support an additional growth option. She noted that it had many environmental and geological issues that cause it not to be a good alternative. She felt that Alternatives A & B have a great deal of viability and deserve extra consideration.

Nancy Tietje asked the Planning Commission not to consider Alternative C, because she thought it was in an area that needed to stay at the same way it is currently. She said she is concerned about South Kingston Road being used as a freeway and the lack of sidewalks and expressed concern for the safety of pedestrians.

Jon Rose of Olympic Resource Management gave some background information about his company working with the community and different community groups prior to 1990, in planning growth in the Kingston area and how their properties would fit in with this draft Plan. He said their company submitted a land use application for a project called Arborwood in 1991, noting that the project has been in limbo as they have watched different Growth Management laws come and go. He hoped this discussion was based on more than where people would live, but they would look to master planning the whole community. He presented Arborwood as a viable 5th alternative.
Nick Jewett said the roots of this process are not with the Kingston Design Study, but with a subarea plan that was completed in 1991; that work is sitting on a shelf somewhere. He said in preparing for that work they established a roundtable discussion group, which included David Cunningham from Pope Resources and Mary McCumber, who later became the Director of the Puget Sound Regional Council. He noted that they came to give their insights into how to go about the subarea planning process. He said that David Cunningham made it clear that growth was not going to take place where it was told to take place; regional and global pressures were going to determine who wanted to live in your community. He reviewed each alternative with that original meeting in mind. He felt that master planning needed to be done to develop this community.

Annie Humiston said Alternative A was deemed adequate by the Growth Management Hearings Board through 2017; Alternative B was crafted as a compromise of Alternative A; Alternative C, if bringing Arborwood into the UGA, could open up wholesale development of 5 to 9 dwelling units per acre. She reported that she has all the comments that were collected during their planning process for Alternative D and will make them available to the Planning Commission.

Tom Wagoner gave some historical information on the Kingston area. He said the 1992 Kingston Community Design Study cost $100,000.00 and took about 2 years to compile; he offered to print it and supply it to the Planning Commission if it was not available through the County. He said the boundaries that are chosen would affect business in downtown. He made it clear that the business in Kingston and the downtown business core is not healthy and expressed concern that the Planning Commission take their time in coming to a decision on this proposed plan.

Darryl Piercy said that one of the comments that he heard repeatedly on number of occasions was the comment that there is a tremendous amount of information to be considered as they go through their deliberations on this topic. Therefore, he encouraged the members not to set a schedule that would be unrealistic in terms of the amount of information they will be looking at. He said while staff has provided the Planning Commission with a schedule that is pretty ambitious; please feel free to ignore it. He asked them to consider the issues and deliberate very thoroughly on this topic, rather than meet any predetermined schedule. He said it is very appropriate for the Planning Commission to consider the public comment that was received tonight and will also be receiving in writing prior to November 12, 2002. He encouraged the Planning Commission to determine the number of public
meetings and additional opportunities for participation that they feel is appropriate.

Deb Flynn asked if it would be appropriate to extend the comment deadline past November 12, 2002?

John Ahl said that one of the comments was that the study is not as accessible to some as they would like it to be. He asked if the County could make more hard copies of the EIS available at the library?

Rick Kimball said yes. He also noted that the State SEPA Act provides the typical review period for a draft EIS is 30-days, however, there is a provision to extend that by 15 to 45 days, at the discretion of the lead agency.

A Motion was made by Richard McConaughy and seconded by Michael Gustavson that the Planning Commission extends the comment period of the Kingston Subarea Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to November 26, 2002. Vote: Aye: 8; Nay: 0; Abstain: 0. Motion carried.

Rick Kimball reported that he would send notification to all the recipients of the EIS and post a notice in the local newspaper.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.
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