The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Silverdale Community Center, Poplar Room, 9729 Silverdale Way NW, Silverdale, Washington. Members Present: Monty Mahan, Mike Gustavson, Mark Flynn, William Matchett, Tom Nevins, John Ahl, Richard McConaughy, Deborah Flynn. Staff Present: Kelly Robinson, Jim Barnard, Laura Ditmer, Eric Toews, Shannon Bauman, Mike Koepke from Kitsap PUD #1, Karen Halbeck, Dana Hill.

9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions and Agenda Review.

9:05 AM

Tom Nevins, Vice Chair called the meeting to order, noting that the agenda was being revised with the Study Session for possible decision on amended Kitsap County Short Plat Ordinance to be the first item addressed.

➢ Study Session with possible decision on Kitsap County Short Plat Ordinance

Kelly Robinson noted that this item was in follow up to the previous meeting which included a Public Hearing on the concept of changing the Subdivision Ordinance to take advantage of new State legislation allowing Short Subdivisions as an administrative process, thereby not requiring Public Hearings, inside the Urban Growth Area. The maximum for these Subdivisions was being increased to nine. After reviewing the information presented that the last Public Hearing, a draft Ordinance was provided to the Planning Commission on Thursday, January 30, 2003. Kelly Robinson asked the Planning Commission to act on this matter, thereby allowing the County to stay on a schedule set by the Board of County Commissioners. This schedule anticipated the Board of County Commissioners having a Public Hearing and adopting the Ordinance in late March 2003. Kelly Robinson stressed, however, that despite that schedule, the Planning Commission should not feel compelled to rush matters if they were uncomfortable with the recommendations being made. To begin the process at this meeting, Kelly Robinson noted he would go through the main points and how Staff had responded to issues raised at the last hearing, after which they could proceed with further discussion and questions.

The approach taken was to use the existing Short Plat language from 60-58 in the Code which had originally been modeled after the State’s Short Platting requirements. The name was revised from Short Plat or Short Subdivisions to Rural Short Subdivisions,
anticipating the need for continued review and approval of Short Subdivisions outside
the Urban Growth Area, regardless of changes in the rules within the Urban Growth
Area. The Rural Short Subdivision portion would remain for outside areas. All changes
in that section were just housekeeping changes, essentially to accommodate the new
title.

There are some other housekeeping issues also addressed along with the process. The
reorganization of the County, moving the Development Engineers from Public Works
and to Community Development moved storm water responsibilities to the Department
of Community Development, as well. Language referring the County Engineers and
Public Works dealing with storm water have been revised accordingly. There are no
substantive changes, and the same rules would apply outside the Urban Growth Area
that apply now.

Inside the Urban Growth Area, Staff created a new section that is being referred to as
Urban Short Subdivisions that includes some substantive changes. The most important
relate to the specific applicability: what is necessary inside the Urban Growth Area to
submit an eligible application. A table is provided that summarizes the three critical
eligibility requirements on the right hand side on the first page.

1. The property must be inside the Urban Growth Area. This was discussed at the
previous meeting, noting that there are Urban Growth Areas which are stand-alone and
don’t surround existing incorporated cities. The County is likely to maintain sole
responsibility for Short Platting inside those areas into the foreseeable future. There is
also one Urban Growth Area, surrounding the City of Poulsbo, where the County has
entered into an Interlocal Agreement where the County will process applications for
development, including Short Subdivisions, under the rules adopted by the City. The
Interlocal Agreement is something that the Planning Commission needs to be aware of
and it is a distinction that is specifically drawn out in the Ordinance.

2. The land must be Zoned Urban Low Residential, indicated as yellow Zoning on
the Urban Growth Area map. This indicates where the County expects new Subdivision
activity for single family homes to be focused. It’s where people who want Short Plat
land are looking at property. The density range is from a minimum of 5 and a
maximum of 9 dwelling units per acre. The minimum density in that Zone under
Growth Management Act was stressed. The minimum density is calculated differently
from the maximum density. The maximum density is based on the gross area. If you
have two acres of land the formula would simply multiply the two acres times the
maximum density of 9, indicating a potential of 18 lots. For the minimum density, the
net developable area must first be determined. This is currently defined under the
density definitions in the Code. It will become more important should this amendment
go forward because an undevelopable area takes out area for roads; critical areas like
wetlands or steep slopes, including their buffers to protect them; and for any storm
water issues if they apply. What’s left over, which is likely less than the original two
acres, is then multiplied by five and that’s the minimum number of lots that will be
required in Urban Low Zones. This minimum requirement creates small lots which
obviously require urban services, critical among them being sewer service. As
previously discussed, there are large areas inside the Urban Growth Boundaries where
the Growth Management Act promises urban services, but sewer is not yet available. The Code currently defines availability as within 200 feet of a sewer line, although there are other considerations, as well. In many cases a sewer line might be undersized or connect to a pump station that doesn’t have capacity to serve its theoretical service area. Downstream it might even go through a gravity line that doesn’t have capacity. There are multiple areas where there could be a combined sewer overflow that doesn’t meet State standards. It may even be that the existing sewer plant does not have the facilities for the increase in volumes. All of these issues have to be taken into account when determining availability of sewer. Sewer availability will, therefore be left up to the Purveyor with the County providing a specific rule triggering the need for the Purveyor to make a determination regarding the 200 feet.

In the event sewer is unavailable and you have two acres, under the current rules the minimum dwelling unit requirements would not fully apply. The net developable land would still need to be determined as indicated. If after that there is enough net developable land remaining, it can be developed at less than minimum density with specific stipulations. It was stressed that this only applies if sewer is not available. In that event, if it is being developed below the minimum established density, a Preplan would be required indicating streets, improvements and buildings, showing that at some future time when sewer does become available, the minimum number of dwelling units could be reached without dramatically disturbing the initial investment. That will become even more important when the minimum dwelling units per lot is increased to nine units per lot.

3. This Short Plat Ordinance is limited to parcels with no more than 1.8 acres of net developable acreage. The maximum acreage was determined after public testimony about potential problems within the Urban Growth Boundary if people wanted to take advantage of the preplanning requirements where sewer isn’t available on larger lots. Darryl Piercy had indicated the aim of this, and the only way for it to work sensibly while complying with the Growth Management Act, is to target those smaller 1-2 acre parcels where they can take advantage of the nine lots; providing urban densities on smaller parcels for infill. An example as to why the acreage size was being limited would be a five acre piece where the owner wanted to develop to the maximum of 9 lots per acre using a Short Plat. This would result in a density of 45 homes; even at the minimum it would result in 25 homes. We would now be talking about a conventional Subdivision with regular dedicated streets, full County standards, etc.

If somebody wanted to create some urban-density lots, putting nine lots on their five acres providing the desirable suburban density lots which are less available outside the Urban Growth Area, they could do that with a preplanning requirement, but it is a difficult process. It would also create the expectation of the owners that their suburban density development would be protected under the Growth Management Act neighborhood protection objective. Once sewer became available, this might not be the case and could lead to development of duplexes in the back yards where homes had been developed at suburban densities.

As a policy issue, it will likely come back to the Planning Commission that there is a need for a Code amendment to protect some of the half acre and 3/4 acre existing
lots; maybe even one acre lot Subdivisions of standing which have created little
neighborhoods. Concern has already been expressed about the minimum density
requirement potentially pressuring a neighborhood into selling and the property being
developed into 5-6 homes next to their suburban lot. There has been some really
compelling testimony on this matter. For that reason, the County has decided that the
best course at this time is to limit application to lots no larger than 1.8 net developable
acres.

Buffer requirements have had some revisions relating to perimeter buffers that may
require further discussion. In the existing Short Subdivision Ordinance, both for Short
Subdivisions and Large Lot Subdivisions, there is a substantial perimeter buffer
requirement or at least 25 feet and possibly more; 75% of the perimeter of the
Subdivision. Staff thinks that’s appropriate in rural areas where the existing Short Plat
Ordinances were intended to preserve the rural character. Inside the Urban Growth
Area, however, they are recommending removing some of those buffer requirements.
Developers have encountered problems with building in Subdivisions due to the
constraints imposed by these buffers inside the Urban Growth Boundary. The purpose
of the buffers has come into question inside the Urban Growth Area. They’re not to
preserve rural character and they interfere with the intent is to increase densities. Staff
had been attempting to maintain the compact between the County and property owners
from when the original plat was done and has been reluctant to change the previous,
explicitly stated, buffer requirements. In order to meet the density objectives, however,
Staff has decided that the buffer requirements should be removed in the new nine lot
Short Plat.

Road Standards have also been addressed due to the County adopting new local street
standards for Rural local streets. The County, however, remains reluctant to compel
Short Subdivisions to build streets to County standards and dedicate them to the
County for maintenance. If the property owner wants to do that and the streets are
built to County standards with the appropriate dedicated rights-of-way, the County will
take them over. The County does not, however, want to make them a requirement. In
many cases, not having this requirement will enable property owners to develop private
roads less expensively. In the case of private roads, the County will continue to require
that a Road Agreement be in place before the plat can be recorded. That rule will apply
even into the nine lot Short Plat. There may be concern that the road requirements for
nine lots are different from those of four lots. This issue is addressed through existing
standards in the Fire Code for local access streets with regard to the access of structures
to fire equipment apparatus. It’s a five-part standard and is in the footnote of the
documentation.

1. There is a 20-foot minimum road width, which incidentally is the one standard
that we still do maintain in the Short Plat and in the Public Works review process.
2. The road can’t have grades greater than 12%.
3. The curve of the road cannot have inside radii less than 25-feet.
4. There must be some place to turn around at the end, either a hammerhead or cul-de-sac. Detailed drawings are provided that show how that can be accomplished.

5. The road has got to be able to support a 60,000 pound vehicle; which means you can’t have any culverts or bridges that don’t’ meet structural standards.

The County is saying they are not going to change the Public Works rules regarding street requirements, but they are going to require the new nine lot Subdivisions to meet the minimum Fire Apparatus Standards within the Urban Growth Area.

Compliance with Fire Flow Requirement is also being required by the County. For residential development the minimum standard is 500 gallons a minute for a half hour. Short Subdivisions had previously been exempted from the Fire Flow requirement. Outside the Urban Growth Boundary Short Subdivisions will continue to be exempt. This exemption is not an ideal standard for the County, but it is maintainable outside the Urban Growth Boundary. Nine lots, however, are too many to be allowed without some kind of Fire Flow Requirement. It was discussed at the last meeting that the Fire Marshall has options available if the requirements can’t be met, such as residential sprinkling. This is not a hard and fast rule but the discussion will begin by stating the applicant must meet the minimum vehicle access standards for the fire equipment and meet the fire flow requirements. These requirements are significant revisions to the proposed draft Ordinance.

Mike Gustavson asked for clarification as to how a 6-8 lot Short Plat would be implemented if it’s nine lots based on gross developable area but five lots based on net developable area. Kelly Robinson noted it could be done with either lot standard. Five would be the minimum density with the maximum usually constrained by other considerations such as placement on the lot, access issue, etc. Essentially, anywhere between five and nine is acceptable. The applicant begins by addressing the minimum density calculations, then calculating the maximum and showing the County somewhere between those numbers how they plan to develop the property.

Mike Gustavson asked if a 6 lot Subdivision was proposed to the County, would the County waive the requirement for deducting roads, wetlands, slopes, etc. from the developable area. Kelly Robinson stated that the applicable deductions from the developable area would not be waived. This standard would apply to any Short Subdivision inside the Urban Growth Area. Even if the intention were to only put two lots in where there was no sewer and the minimum density requirement did not apply, the County would still require all the Urban Growth Area standards be met if the property is within those boundaries. There is not a threshold after four dwelling units. If it’s within the Urban Growth Area and designated Urban Low Density, these rules apply.

Mike Gustavson stated he understood that but wanted more clarification on the matter with regard to the difference between the five and nine density requirements. In one case it appeared the owner must discount for roads and critical areas - the five lot Subdivision. There are lots of cases where the flat portion of a piece of property or a
dry portion could be two acres. If a nine lot Subdivision were applied for, would the applicant have to deduct for all the other issues.

Kelly Robinson stated that the confusion appeared to relate to two different types of nine lot subdivisions. In one case, the maximum number of lots allowed for a Short Plat Subdivision. This number can be exceeded if applying for a Long Subdivision. If, however, the applicant wants to keep it as an administrative process and do a Short Subdivision, the maximum is nine lots. The other “nine” refers to the maximum density per acre that can be developed under the Short Subdivision rules and applies to the whole Zone, the Urban Low Zone itself. Kelly Robinson offered to walk through the equation if the Planning Commission wanted to provide an example. In either case, all the rules apply if the owner wants to do a Short Subdivision inside the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Low Zone.

The Planning Commission asked if the density was clearly specified in the documentation. Kelly Robinson noted it was not but that the formula was included, multiplying the number of units by the amount of developable acreage. It could be done if it exceeded the acreage requirements, but could not occur as a Short Subdivision.

Mike Gustavson requested further clarification as to whether they were looking at five units per acre or nine units per acre. Kelly Robinson noted that five was the minimum per acre and 9 was the maximum; regardless of whether the owner was doing a Short Plat or large lot, it made no difference. If doing a Short Plat or a Short Subdivision, there can’t be more than 1.8 acres of net developable land. At the request of the Planning Commission, Kelly Robinson verified that it could potentially be done on one acre. The minimum of five units and maximum of nine would have to be addressed, taking roads and storm drainage into consideration.

Mike Gustavson still noted the developer was likely to be confused based on the current wording. Kelly Robinson noted if it was confusing to the Planning Commission, it should be addressed by Staff for better clarification. It was noted that the defining information was located at the bottom and that the rules for minimum and maximum developments were laid out in the Zoning Ordinance, just not in the proposed documentation. Kelly Robinson noted that the confusion might be related to how portions of the information were located in different areas. He noted that the Zoning Code contained the definition of net developable acreage, although it was not under “N” for Net; it is found under “D” for Density. The County could add another definition called Net Developable Density for reference. The same applies to fire code requirements. Fire Flow Requirement exemptions are located in Title 14.

Mike Gustavson asked if these requirements could be applied to Subdivisions that were currently in the application process, as there were some that appeared to be applicable to the County’s intentions. Kelly Robinson verified that Mike Gustavson was suggesting that a developer be required to change current plans based on the new requirements. He noted there had been a problem with the County being pretty liberal in allowing people with adjacent properties to do combined Short Plats, creating eight lot situations that had previously been mentioned. There are a lot of advantages to the
public and the property owners to allow that in some situations because of shared roads, storm drains and such, but it doesn’t comply with existing code. The Planning Commission may have seen some language prohibiting contiguous parcels to be joined for this purpose. It’s something that could be abused with the example of 40 acres being divided into five acre parcels that are sold to family members and each of those short platted, creating a huge Subdivision. The language was written by the State to prohibit that type of abuse between contiguous properties. The County has allowed exceptions in the past where there was deemed to be a real benefit to the public, but the County has to be careful about that issue. With the new requirements, that would no longer be an issue. The lots could be combined and developed appropriately under the new rules.

Mike Gustavson asked for clarification of Page 2, (i) and (ii) stating that it was confusing, even though it might be standard language. “A general buffer area shall be equal to the lesser of…” with two choices provided. It was requested that the County try to word it in a clearer manner. Kelly Robinson stated it could possibly be simplified, with two potential problems.

1. All of the rules should not be included as part of the definitions. They should be placed within the rules themselves.

2. If the rules were moved into the definitions as part of a housekeeping cleanup, there was potential to clean up the language.

Mike Gustavson was concerned with the amount of property loss when a 25-foot buffer is required around 75% of the parcel. He also questioned who benefits from this restriction. He stressed that the wording still needed to be cleaned up for clarification.

Kelly Robinson noted that with regard to the second item (ii) 15% of the net Short Subdivision area would be required to protected, such as environmentally sensitive areas, slopes of 30% or greater, etc. This portion was designed to accommodate a property that already set aside a substantial amount of property for wetlands, slopes and such, where the first requirement of 75% would be excessive if added to the already excluded portions. Jim Barnard verified that the 15% buffer excluded areas otherwise required. Therefore, critical areas would be removed from the usable property, then a buffer of 15% of the remaining net are would be established.

The Planning Commission asked that the wording be clarified so that it was more in line with the definitions provided by Kelly Robinson and he agreed to do so.

Mike Gustavson noted that in the Review Section, 16.48.090 on Page 6, there are 240 days allowed for approval of an application. He noted there was nothing specified to keep the County moving forward except that they were required to notify the applicant if they can’t meet the deadline. Mike Gustavson proposed that there be an approval by default if the County did not process the application within the 240 days allotted. He noted this would get the issue of property development on the side of the developer.
Additionally, the first time that happened it would draw a lot of attention to whoever was holding up the process and it was unlikely it would occur twice.

Kelly Robinson noted he wasn’t familiar with the total time allotments but that a lot of the times periods run concurrently within the County.

Mike Gustavson acknowledged that but still stressed there should still be a default mechanism. Kelly Robinson noted that he would have Jim Barnard expand on the process, but in the County’s experience any delays were more often due to some sort of mutual impasse rather than inefficiency or related delays on behalf of Staff.

Mike Gustavson stressed the wording should be changed to note that the developer should be provided the option to extend the application process time or step aside and come back later with their solution.

It was noted that the intention was that there be an emphasis on the need to expedite the process; that it not be a labored process involving Public Hearings and that sort of thing. If options are put in there allowing for extensions, it is not necessarily an expedited Subdivision process as was the original intent. Mike Gustavson noted that was his issue, the time limit and option to extend it.

Jim Barnard noted that the timeframe was actually only 90 days and that the 75 days Mike Gustavson had added to that was actually one of the concurrent processes that fell within the 90 day preliminary approval period.

Kelly Robinson noted that further clarification was provided in Section 5 at the bottom of the page. It states the Director has 90 calendar days to review a complete application. If no action can be taken to approve or disapprove, it is the Director’s responsibility to notify the applicant and explain the reasons for the delay. Additionally, if at any time during the application process it appears the 90 day review cannot be met, the Director is responsible for advising the applicant and indicating the reason for the delay.

Kelly Robinson acknowledged that often delays occur due to engineering, surveying or technical problems, or sometimes the developer decides to sell the land to somebody else and they want to change the development plans. Mike Barnett concurred and noted that there are also “clock stops” in the process. When a review is started and reaches the 30 day point, a letter is sent to the applicant requesting any additional information that is needed. The clock is stopped until the applicant responds to the request because the ball is back in the applicant’s court. A lot of times they are working with a surveyor or engineer who have heavy workload schedules, so there may be a delay in the applicant’s response while it is worked into the applicable schedules. That delays the process but is considered to be outside the 90 day timeframe. With that process while the applicant responds, the process looks like it is an extended process but actually meets all applicable timeframes.

Another Planning Commission member noted that Page 6 refers to rural, as did Page 18, when it should be referring to Urban. The language in many areas still says Rural
Mike Gustavson noted that on Page 16, Item 2, near the top he had made a note that it was redundant. It was clarified that it might be redundant because it provided mileage definitions as they relate to acreage. Mike Gustavson questioned why it was even there. Kelly noted that the problem was if the County gives special status to a sort of proportional Subdivision of land. It was recognizing that not all land sections are full square miles, often not even square, and need to be portioned out. The provision is written that way with regard to an aliquot Subdivision because with the map it’s very easy to know whether it is a proportional 10 acres or 5 acres, etc. based on how it was divided. Then you ignore the fact that it’s really 4.6 acres or some other variance and it’s given the applicable status. This is recognizing that anybody can go down and divide the property into these aliquot Subdivisions down to the five acre level without subdividing, just segmenting your land.

Mike Gustavson expressed concern that if they were at the maximum parcel size at 1.8 acres gross, why was platting a piece even being addressed. Kelly Robinson stated what was being expressed was a specific exemption from the requirements of the Code and agreed that Mike Gustavson was right. By the wording, Mike Gustavson noted that if it was over 1.5 acres would be considered 5 acres. Kelly Robinson agreed but noted that a lot of the beginning language is included in the different sections of the Code in an attempt to create standalone documents. If somebody wants to take advantage of a Rural Short Plat, they will review that section with the same recitals of exemptions. Kelly Robinson agreed that if the whole Ordinance could be rewritten; they could probably just put the exemptions to certain uses up front and note it applies to everything within the Subdivision code.

Mike Gustavson asked why that couldn’t occur now, while the County is in the process of rewriting the process. Kelly Robinson noted that they are rewriting, but doing it as surgically as possible because every time one string gets pulled it leads to even more places.

Mike Gustavson noted that Page 17, in the middle, refers to scales on drawings. It was his experience that the County mandated a particular scale, without any option and that it should be specified in this requirement to avoid further confusion.

Jim Barnard, as a licensed land surveyor, noted that Page 17 is about preliminaries and states it can go no less than 1:200. When you start talking about scales and are looking at 1:200 versus a 1:50 scale, the 1:50 is the larger scale. It is specified that you can’t go smaller than 1:200, such as to 1:400.

Mike Gustavson stated that he had previously submitted a 1:171 scale but that it had been turned down due to scale. Jim Barnard confirmed with Mike that this had occurred at the Health Department. Mike Gustavson, however, stressed that in the public’s view it was all “The County.” Jim Barnard noted that perhaps the reason for the refusal by the Health Department was due to a specific situation, perhaps involving
the type of septic. Mike Gustavson agreed that may have been part of the problem, but that it was still part of the County.

Jim Barnard noted the Health Department may have conditions and variables that he wasn’t familiar with. Mike Gustavson again stressed that it was still “The County” and should be clearer to understand. The public doesn’t perceive the departments as little offices within the County and he requested that all criteria be consistent and requirements brought together.

Jim Barnard noted that the matter being addressed related to plat maps. Mike Gustavson understood that but still stressed that the County and all its departments needed to make sure they were consistent in their rules and guidelines.

Mike Gustavson noted he had a final comment with regard to road standards. He stressed any standards should be compatible with the one city that would be affected, which was Bremerton. It was noted that Bremerton currently had no road standards. With regard to Page 22, Paragraph C, Bremerton and the County need to get together to ensure the same standards. All this property, unless Silverdale becomes a city, would likely be annexed to the City of Bremerton. The County and Bremerton needed to ensure that ultimately Bremerton didn’t have property unloaded on it that they might object to due to County-established standards.

It was noted that the process might lead to an extensive delay of potentially six months in the overall process. It is probably something to look at, but not necessarily at this time.

Kelly Robinson noted the reason they had settled on this standard is that the Fire Marshall can enforce this Countywide, across jurisdictions. It is an enforceable minimum standard. Although there needed to be more discussion between the County and cities. It had already been acknowledge by the County that if those discussions led to formal agreements, they would probably supersede the County’s rules anyway, similar to the Poulsbo Interlocal Agreement.

Mike Gustavson requested the City of Bremerton be provided with a copy so they would have advance notice on how the County was proceeding, allowing Bremerton to potentially adopt the County’s standards.

The Chair verified there were no further questions. It was noted that the Public Testimony portion was closed last week and this was a study session. The next opportunity for the public to have input would be when the Board of County Commissioners considered the issue. He noted that it was therefore appropriate for someone to move for approval of the amended Short Plat Ordinance. Before proceeding, Jim Barnard asked that he be allowed to discuss the matter in further detail.

Jim Barnard, Development Engineering Section of Department of Community Development, noted that he had been reviewing these projects at the County for nine years. He created them for eleven years in the private sector. He was on the
Committee that adopted the present Short Subdivision Ordinance and he was on the Committee that adopted the present Large Lot Subdivision Ordinance. This was provided in order to make note of his extensive experience in this area.

Jim Barnard commended Kelly Robinson and his Staff for putting together this document in a such a short period of time, noting that it did a great job at addressing the issues. Once the document is adopted, however, he noted that he and the people he works with would have to handle these issues when people come to the counter to submit applications. They will have to review them, condition them, etc. He noted that he had reviewed the material very carefully and, knowing the problems he had encountered in the private sector and those he now sees as part of his job as projects come in, he would like to make some comments on the document.

Page 1 regarding Code 1608 involved platting, what people refer to as a Long Plat or Formal Subdivision. Jim Barnard noted that he did not feel it was appropriate to change this definition at this time. The definition in the RCW provides the definition of a Subdivision. He believes the County can go into each individual Ordinance to describe the Urban Short Subdivision and the Rural Short Subdivision.

Jim Barnard further stressed that if somebody wanted to come in to do a six lot plat, they should be allowed to. They would spend more money and maybe want to provide a better product for their client. If the definition were left like it was, that type of opportunity would be removed and he felt it should be left as an option with the wording unchanged.

The Planning Commission clarified that his objection was on the underlined items.

Jim Barnard stated that it was his opinion that the entire section should remain unchanged in the definitions.

The Planning Commission asked which particular language he was referring to and Jim Barnard noted that he was specifically referring to Code 16.08.170. The Planning Commission further verified that he was stating it should be left out, struck from the Ordinance, which Jim Barnard confirmed.

The Planning Commission expressed confusion regarding what the County as a whole was recommending. Two staff members from the County were expressing two different things on the same document. The Planning Commission noted that those issues should have been worked out by Staff before it was presented to the Planning Commission.

The option was offered that the entire document be deferred until the County could come forward with an agreed upon, recommended document. The Planning Commission members all concurred with this recommendation. It was noted that if Staff were able to provide an immediate resolution to their apparent conflicting opinions, the Planning Commission would be willing to rule on it, but only if there were a unified position.
Both Staff and the Planning Commission noted that throughout the process, the apparent rush was causing some obvious problems. It was recommended that it would be better to slow down and take the necessary time to prepare a document that could be agreed upon and approved of by all applicable parties.

The motion was made that a decision be postponed on the Short Plat Ordinance until further revisions could be made to the final document providing Staff concurrence and with clarified wording. The motion was seconded.

Vote: Aye: 8; Nay: 0. Motion carried.

Laura Ditmer began the discussion by noting that, after reviewing ULID #6, they needed to go through the different sections submitted to the Planning Commission to clarify items that had been brought up, working through the issues. This would be a dialog of working through the existing materials with the intention of Staff bringing the revised materials, to include items addressed at this meeting, to the next meeting for further review.

Laura Ditmer noted that, based on Kelly Robinson’s presentation, Page 1 of the ULID #6 documentation addressed the County Subdivision Ordinance. Staff would like to postpone review of that page and work with Kelly Robinson to ensure consistency. Therefore the Planning Commission was asked to put the first portion aside, Chapter 16.3, and the Section beginning with Page 1.

Laura Ditmer proposed covering the material section by section, with the Planning Commission commenting or providing questions as they deemed necessary on each section.

Regarding Page 5, Urban Low Densities, a spokesman for Cascadia Community Planning Services provide clarification. He noted the original language that had been distributed to the Planning Commission at the beginning of the year had since developed into a different process. It had started as a Comprehensive Development Plan but had evolved into a Master Plan Overlay Process that was recommended by the Planning Commission. Based on that, there were a number of provisions included in each of the Zone districts. These would allow greater flexibility in terms of the bulk standards, dimensional standards; setbacks and height regulations. With the Master Plan Overlay approach, there are specific provisions allowing deviation from the bulk and dimensional standards in particular; as well as a number of other standards. The provisions that had been carried over from the original draft weren’t really necessary, simply because the Master Plan process would allow for deviation from the bulk and dimensional standards of the underlying Zone. Throughout the draft before the Planning Commission now, height requirements and areas governed by Sub-Area Plans, as well as some corollary provisions relating to setbacks and minimum lot depth...
and width requirements, could now be removed in favor of the Master Plan overlay provisions.

The Planning Commission asked whether, in a situation like this, there would be a cross reference to exceptions, providing direction to the Master Plan.

Eric Toews noted that a cross reference was included, referring Page 7, Section 330-090, Other Provisions. Throughout the document the same language referred the reader to the Master Planning Requirements applicable to the South Kitsap Urban Growth Area. Although it is referenced in that form, it is not specifically included in the bulk conditional standards.

Mike Gustavson asked if they were getting toward a Master Plan concept for all developments in Urban Growth Areas throughout the County, or was this just relating to McCormick Woods. If specific only to McCormick Woods, why would it be included in ULID #6.

Laura Ditmer noted as background that there is a large area that is completely undeveloped. Direction for the Ordinance stated there should be more specific and required planning involved for those large, undeveloped areas. Master Planning would not apply to Silverdale, for example, because it’s largely built out and infill is what would be needed.

Mike Gustavson asked for verification that it was a category for potential developments, such as Arborwood. He wanted to know if Arborwood would fall into the same category. Laura Ditmer stated that it could, possibly. That could not be specified at this time, but it was what would be considered for those large areas.

Mike Gustavson asked if the nine lots on one acre would apply, with Laura Ditmer requesting clarification as to which area he was referring to. Mike Gustavson stated he was referring to the Short Plat phase. How far does the County go if there are no rules.

Eric Toews noted that a lot of the language before the Planning Commission in the NPO section is based on draft language that Staff is currently working on for the South Kitsap Industrial Area. Those provisions, while mandatory within that Sub-Area, that chapter that has been crafted, would also be permissible Countywide. If an applicant wanted to go through the Master Plan process as opposed to applying through the underlying Sub Plat requirements, it was available but not mandatory. The way it appears to be unfolding is that there are some discrete Sub-Areas where it is a policy judgment whether or not to require mandatory Master Planning. Thus far it appears that decision is being recommended for South Kitsap and for the South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, as well as for the South Kitsap Industrial Area. It is possible that a similar mandatory approach could be recommended in the future for other areas, but it is not required at this time.

Laura Ditmer noted there is a distinction between South Kitsap Industrial Area and this Master Planning Process that will come forward at the next work study. South Kitsap
Industrial Area is by sub basin, the Master Plan is by Zone, so there is a very distinct difference in the approach.

Mike Gustavson noted that Page 1 exempts all parcels five acres or larger from the requirements of the Sub-Area Ordinance. The Urban Village is pending and he knows this applies to that.

Laura Ditmer noted that Staff would like to shelve this matter so that they can meet with Kelly Robinson and work out the issues. She asked that the Planning Commission not provide too much analysis of that section at this time.

Mike Gustavson noted he was not challenging that request, only stating that when it is reviewed, she should look at that issue. Taking 5 acre pieces out of this might not be appropriate.

Eric Toews noted that the intent was to remove the exemption within unincorporated Urban Growth Areas, even if subject to mandatory Master Plan requirements. The parcel could be segmented. That would not constitute development that would trigger the requirement to do the Master Planning. It could thereby undermine the potential to do effective Master Planning if it were parcelized in such a manner. The intent behind these provisions, which still need to be worked out with current planning staff, was to remove that exemption so that compliance with Short and Long Plat requirements of Title 16 would be mandatory.

Laura Ditmer noted that Page 39, Common Open Space had been brought up previously. She noted they would be going back to the other sections, but wanted to clarify those sections that were specifically addressed last week, indicating corrections that had been made. Page 39, 6-A-2, regarding Common Open Space, the word “preservation” had been removed and reference was being made to the critical areas Ordinance.

Monty Mahan noted the actual suggestion was that the wording be something more along the lines of “common open space containing critical areas designated and protected under Kitsap County Code Title 19 shall be left undisturbed.”

It was also noted that on the same page, just below Item 3, there was the word “practicable.” Who determines what was practicable and how could that language be worked around. The Planning Commission expressed concern that the term was too vague and allowed too much room for disagreement as to that type of standard. Laura Ditmer noted they would work on clarifying that.

Deborah Flynn noted that she brought up the same points at the last work study session and was surprised to see that the language was still the same. Additionally, regarding Item VI at the bottom of Page 39, the requirement that pedestrian and bicycle trails and facilities be accessible to people with disabilities “as much as the natural characteristics of the area will allow.” She requested that the wording be added “while not increasing impervious surfaces in these areas” with examples of innovative methods like grasscrete or boardwalks, etc., rather than potentially indicating paved areas or sidewalks.
That might potentially be acceptable, but the next item, directly after it, says to the extent “practicable” pedestrian and bicycle trails and facilities shall be located in areas that are important to preserve as open space corridors, wooded areas, wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas. It would appear that those two items conflict without further clarification. Additionally she was wondering when she read this, what the intent really was. If it was to provide access to those areas so people can get in there and enjoy them, perhaps there is another way to address it besides the existing language that suggests bike trails be put in these areas.

Monty Mahan proposed “adjacent to” or “in proximity of” or something along that line. Deborah Flynn stressed she questioned the reason the language was even there and that a possible solution might be to delete the entire section.

Eric Toews noted that the intent was to try to integrate the trail network so the open space corridors could be used as an amenity; not that the trails would diminish the functions and values of the areas intended to be protected. The notion was that the trails in most instances would be located at the edge of required buffers. Laura Ditmer concurred.

Deborah Flynn noted that was a good goal to bring people in to enjoy these areas, but it seems like the language isn’t really offering that at this point. Laura Ditmer agreed to work on that for further clarification.

Mike Gustavson noted that this was a really good point. Surfaces certainly are available with the technology today that are impact impervious, where the water runs right through them: non-mortar joints, grass crete, all that is out there and usable by people with disabilities. With proper wording it would be very appropriate. He also liked the idea of trails going through the woods, as opposed to the shoulder of a road with a white line. Deborah Flynn noted she didn’t object to the concept, only that the language needed to be clarified to ensure there was not unintentional conflict.

Laura Ditmer again stated that they would work on clarifying that. She stated they intended to take discussions out of last week and this meeting. When working through the design guidelines they would be bringing all of that forward, putting it together with those changes in a final draft package for the Planning Commission.

Active Recreational Open Space, the next item, was also noted by the Planning Commission. It states that at least 5% of common open space should be developed as Recreational Open Space. That was a minimum and it would probably be more acceptable if there were also a maximum stated. In other words if it’s 100% of the open space set aside as recreational, it would not meet the intent of the Board of County Commissioners or Planning Commission. Mike Hartase noted the way it was currently worded was that the agreed requirement is 15% and then one-third of that must be active.

Mike Gustavson indicated that he had not interpreted it that way. William Matchett noted that one-third must be active, but the wording left it unclear as to whether the
entire amount could be active. Staff concurred this could be the case if there were no
critical areas. William Matchett stated that would be a reason for including a
maximum. Mike Hartase noted that a maximum could be included and would be a
policy call for the Planning Commission.

Laura Ditmer noted that there was one more change, which was Page 13, 080-A, where
it addresses densities. Wording had been revised to “gross.”

Having covered previous revision issues, Laura Ditmer recommended that they work
through the Urban Low and the meaning of the different designations: Urban Cluster,
Urban Medium, Village Center and look at the Master Planning.

The Planning Commission asked if at some point would they be able to look at Page 6,
with Laura noting that was what they were getting ready to address. Reference was
made to the creation of a permit tracking system, which Laura Ditmer clarified was
already in existence within Department of Community Development, countywide, and
was referred to as the LIS System. At the time the document was prepared, the system
was not up and running, but Staff would clarify the language. The Planning
Commission noted that, if the system was in place, the wording might not be needed at
all.

Deborah Flynn stated that language referring to the tracking system appeared
throughout the document, generally at the end of each section. Eric Toews noted that
placing the language in each of the Zones within the Sub-Area was intended to ensure
that potential developers would be aware of the density limit and that it was being
tracked within the Sub-Area. The Planning Commission noted that the density limit
was fine, but if there was already a tracking system, it did not necessarily need to be
noted. It was confirmed by Staff that reference to the Tracking System was the only
concern; the limit portion was fine.

Laura Ditmer noted that referencing the tracking system would protect the developers
coming in at a later date letting them know that it was monitored. It was compared to
laws prohibiting speeding with police to catch those who violate that law.

William Matchett stated that there are too many regulations with no way to follow
through on them. It would be nice for a change to have one where there is an ability to
follow through on them.

Laura Ditmer stated Staff would reword it to reflect applicable changes.

Eric Toews then began to address the individual sections. He noted the new sections
were obviously new Zoning distinctions that were being recommended: Urban
Clustered Residential and urban Village Center Designations. Urban Clustered
Residential would be applied to almost the entire McCormick West and McCormick
North developments outside the Urban Village Center and Business Park designations.
The Urban Village Center, a new mixed use designation, would apply to that parcel at
the northwest intersection of Campus Parkway and Old Clifton. What was done in
preparing the Use Table, was looking at what was elsewhere in the Code as a starting
point to ensure there was no radical difference in nomenclature. To a significant extent they used the categories or classifications of land use found within the Neighborhood Commercial Zone as a basis for the Urban Village Center uses, then augmented or expanded that considerably. They added definitions as well for the new terms being used in the table. The recommendations with regard to how to classify the uses as prohibited, conditional, subject to site plan review, or permitted outright, are inherently policy calls. There is significant flexibility that may allow for different conclusions that have been defined in coordination with Staff. Urban Village Center Zone in particular provides for nearly all uses, subject to site plan review. The notion is that site plan review would serve as the trigger for application of design criteria in the future. It was Staff’s intention that design criteria would be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their review in the very near future. It was verified that Section 410 was being referenced.

Eric Toews continued with regard to the Master Plan overlay provisions, noting there was a significant departure from the provisions relating to the comprehensive development plan. These provisions would create a mandatory Master Plan requirement applicable to each Zone within the Sub-Area. An applicant walking through the door to do a development within the Urban Village Center would need to submit a Master Plan for the entirety of that 10 acre Zone and any Subdivision applications concurrent with the Master Plan. The provisions, some building requirements, the decision criteria and the procedural process for the Master Plan, are drawn from the in-house draft of the South Kitsap Industrial Area Master Plan Ordinance currently in development. This was augmented with additional submittal requirements that were part of the comprehensive development plan language.

Laura Ditmer also noted that the uses came directly from the Steering Committee’s meetings where they discussed different uses they envisioned in the Urban Village Center. It was not a random process, rather it reflected the Steering Committee’s vision for an Urban Village Center.

Laura Ditmer recommended the Planning Commission be provided additional detail regarding the Urban Cluster Zone since it relates to the Urban Low and is a new zone. Unlike Urban Low, it specifically calls out for those neighborhood commercial centers where you have local, daily uses allowed on a very small scale to fit the neighborhood’s need. It could be along the line of a delicatessen, coffee shop, drycleaner; that type of thing. The intent with this new designation was to allow for more flexibility relative to the Urban Low.

Eric Toews noted that, in essence, the density requirements are identical for the Urban Low, but the configuration of density is permissive. In other words, if you had a heavily constrained parcel and wanted to locate all your density within one structure, such as a townhouse development, on the unconstrained portion of the property you would be able to do that through the Urban Cluster Residential Zone. Likewise, single family residential development and duplex development would be permitted, as is the case in the Urban Low. So it allows broader flexibility with configuration of residential use, while ensuring the overall density limits of the Zone are not exceeded. As Laura indicated, Page 12, under retail sales, general merchandise and services would be
allowed conditionally within an Urban Cluster Residential Zone. Footnote #8 relating to the table indicates that the commercial use areas were allowed only within a commercial center limited in size and scale; basically an intersection or corner style development. Without creating a standalone Neighborhood Commercial Zone with a fixed location on the map at this time, the Urban Cluster Residential Zone would permit some very limited retail development within the Urban Cluster Residential Zone.

John Ahl stated that he was trying to envision the Urban Cluster development described in 010 as a multiplicity of housing. When looking at the uses, it seems like there are some incongruities. Accessory dwelling units; to him that is always the extra house that is placed on a large lot. Living quarters; he can see that because it is within the existing house. Item H - Services and Amusement: things like golf courses, race tracks and gun clubs. Under Item L – Others: things like cemeteries or mausoleums, crematories, mortuaries. He is trying to picture this in the context of what is described in 010 as a compact residential area.

Eric Toews noted these are uses that are found as permitted uses with the Urban Low designation, as well, and are just reflecting the broad range of uses that is permitted in the lower density residential districts in Kitsap County already. But he raised a good point to the extent that they are trying to promote more compact urban development and that these uses may need to be reconsidered. The main difference of the Urban Cluster Residential Zone and the Urban Low is the configuration of density, rather than primarily being limited to single family residences in the Urban Cluster Residential Zone. Although the density is the same, those units may be placed in duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, townhouses, etc. without limitation provided that the densities of the Zone are not exceeded.

Laura Ditmer recognized John Ahl’s point. They had worked from the Urban Low as it existed in the current Code, trying to take Steering Committee input and other discussions. She noted they were still working through all this and attempting to combine the various areas of input, but acknowledged what he was saying.

John Ahl noted that it seemed they were dealing with minimum densities over a spread of land of 5-9 acres in Urban Low. Laura Ditmer stressed that McCormick West is because it is a constrained area. John Ahl stated that if you start adding golf courses, race tracks, cemeteries and mausoleums, it only creates more problems with meeting the minimum density requirements.

Eric Toews noted that with the allowable uses, they would be placed where they could find the land. He did not know if they would be apt to put them in the Urban Village Center in the first instance, but it might still make sense to remove them.

Laura Ditmer noted that when you are Master Planning by Zone for a particular area, that’s where uses are addressed with regard to density and the number of residential units that come in. You’ll look at that area as a comprehensive process. It’s obviously nothing to pencil out given that the area is so highly constrained. She recognizes what
Deborah Flynn noted that Items 4 and 5 of that section seemed to say the same thing, although one was conditional and one was prohibited. Laura Ditmer believes that was brought up at the last meeting and it does need clarification with regard to the difference.

Mike Gustavson asked if Laura Ditmer would bring some maps to the next meeting to explain some areas further. One area of concern was a lack of adequate parking. Based on density numbers, it would appear there would a parking need for about 10,000 cars. Additionally the documentation had referenced skinny streets, which eliminated the option for parking. If parking was not already addressed in the plan, it should be added.

Mike Gustavson asked, in relation primarily to the residential area, where to put the 10,000 cars. With regard to the commercial zone, that should already be covered by zoning.

Mike Gustavson further stated that the designated 4,000 housing units is the same number as currently in the entire City of Port Orchard and one-third the number of all of Bremerton. He expressed concern that placing that number of units in such a small area could invite potential crime rates and lower income housing due to the density. Those problems seem to be inherent in extremely dense housing. It has already been voted on and the Board of County Commissioners has already voted on it, but he stressed that he still has a problem with housing. The Board does not think it is workable economically and that it won’t sell.

It was noted that there were probably instances of high densities that didn’t have that same crime situation. Mike Gustavson stressed that in his experience it is a continual factor and relates to what is being presented.

Laura Ditmer suggested they come back to Mike Gustavson’s initial request for a map. Mike Gustavson stressed he would like to see how they can put the required number of units in a three story building in the space allowed. That will fall back on the developer when the Master Plan is presented. He wasn’t convinced it could be done, providing the number of units on the designated space, excluding the critical areas. He therefore requested that the County come back with a map addressing both parking and how the density goals would be accomplished.

Laura Ditmer asked for verification that he was asking for them to address the situation with parking. Mike Gustavson stated that parking was a problem, but he also questioned whether they could even do the development as they intended.

Eric Toews interjected that the population of 6,400 was recommended to be allocated through the Sub-Area Plan, fitting within the entire limit of the South Kitsap Urban Growth Area. Mike Gustavson stated that it related to ULID #6.
Laura Ditmer clarified that with the Code language for the Urban Cluster of the Urban Village, they were to be standalone without being specific to a particular area. It was noted that the Zoning regulations is a document that addresses everything intended, regardless of where it was located. It does not specifically address ULID #6, the South Kitsap Industrial Area, Port Orchard Urban Growth Area, Kingston, etc.

The Planning Commission stressed that they were starting to encumber a fairly straightforward building regulation with lots of additional requirements that might be inappropriate. It could be great, but it might be the wrong vehicle. Laura Ditmer agreed, stating that they’ve come a long way and they’re getting there.

Darryl Piercy, Department of Community Development, wanted to address the concerns that the Planning Commission had expressed. He noted that it is a concern Staff shares with the Planning Commission. There are separate development rates for Manchester, Suquamish, South Kitsap Industrial Area, and ULID #6, with Silverdale and Kingston coming up. One of the things they had attempted to do with ULID #6 was a change in direction for them at this point. It was their intent to set the tone for other developments that are going to occur throughout Kitsap County as they go through community and Sub-Area Plans.

What Staff are finding is that they really need to crawl before they walk and this is the crawling phase. The hope is to get this encompassed into a unified development code at some point, where if you could pick up the Code and know you are in this Zone, it will be clear what needs to be done. It was acknowledged that Staff needed coordinate their community plans to ensure that approach in code development. This was a starting point with nothing to build on prior to this. It was a foundation to be built on with other plans. Darryl Piercy asked the Planning Commission for their patience and faith that Staff will get there, which is their long term goal. For now Staff are trying to establish what the Zones are and what they should look at before they can do that. It’s a promise and a hope; that’s where they are headed and that’s where the Staff’s goal is, but they are not there yet.

Before taking a break, Mike Gustavson noted that he shares the concern about what high density housing zoning will look like. When this went for an advisory vote in Portland, it was voted down 80 to 20 by the people who were faced with this kind of stuff. He feels that the developers are going to rapidly run into the problem that they ran into in Portland where they can’t build it and sell it without a strong subsidy. He did not believe the County’s intent was to develop subsidized type housing? It is out of order because the Board of County Commissioners has already voted on it, but he really worries about this and feels it is the wrong way to go; it’s too dense.

10:00 – 10:10 A.M.

Break Was Called.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions on ULID #6.
The question was raised with regard to school district issues and if that was something that should be discussed; setting aside that land, or would that be coming up later. Laura Ditmer noted that Chair Coppola had discussed that and it was her understanding it was to be brought back at the Public Hearing.

- Study Session with County Staff to Consider **The Draft Kingston Sub-Area Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)**

Shannon Bauman noted that she did not have copies of the materials necessary for the Planning Commission’s review. There were a couple of items, though, that she wanted to specifically address.

First, she wanted to address issues from the last meeting. Water Supply had been questioned, and she invited Mike Koepke (?) from PUD #1 to address any questions the Planning Commission might have.

The Planning Commission asked that they be provided with a general review. Some of the questions raised at some of their hearings and discussions related to the use of water upon which this expansion depends. The tribes and others are disputing the availability, while the County is betting on being able to have enough water to supply this Urban Growth. Essentially, the question posed for Staff was whether there was enough water to support the intended growth.

Mike Koepke stated the current system in North Peninsula, which encompasses everything from Gamblewood North to Hansville and down to Jefferson Beach, has approximately 920 ERUs (connections) available. The PUD is currently in the process of working the Department of Ecology on approval for a well located behind Kingston Lumber off Lindvog, referred to as Well #7, which is currently outfitted. It is currently used as emergency backup, with a generator system. The PUD has been told by the Department of Ecology that by Summer there will be a decision on that well. That does not mean they will approve it; it just means they will provide a decision. There are additional wells the PUD currently holds water rights on that are what the PUD call an emergency standby. They are not used as part of the calculation in determining the number of connections that available in that system. Those wells could be brought back online and utilized to provide water, but there is a dollar expenditure to do that. At this point, the PUD, having invested the money in Well #7, prefers that option should it be approved by the Department of Ecology. If it should be denied by the Department of Ecology, they still have the option of going to the existing emergency standby wells that aren’t in the calculation; bring those systems back on line and utilize that water that they currently hold water rights on.

Deborah Flynn asked if the available connections included Well #7. They did not. If it were approved, Mike Koepke estimated that it would provide an additional 2000 connections, stressing that was just an estimate.

Mike Gustavson asked if the emergency wells were part of the 900 ERUs, and was advised that they are not. He then asked how much they would bring with Mike Koepke estimating an additional 700 or 750 connections.
The Planning Commission asked if the PUD considered Kingston to be water rich, water poor, or what the finite resources were perceived to be at this point. Mike Koepke stated that if that questions were posed to a group of Geologists, there would be a group of different answers. He did acknowledge, however, that there is not an endless supply of water, but there is a manageable resource out. The goal of the PUD was to manage that resource in providing water service.

The question was further posed that if the population were to double, how would that affect their ability to manage the water resources. Mike Koepke noted that they plan, as required by the State Department of Health, for a 20-year period. Within their 20-year planning period there will be an additional source brought online. That’s working with the Department of Ecology and there are alternatives to the existing sources that are out there. The PUD has water rights that are approved that would allow them to provide the necessary water anywhere that the PUD serves, which is countywide, other than incorporated areas. It becomes a dollar-and-cents issue regarding which resource will be utilized. How much will be spent to transport water from Central Kitsap to the north end of the County. The water is available, it’s only a matter of determining which source will be used. Again, with the outfitting of Well #7, the PUD considers that to be the cleanest option. It is not the only option and will depend on what the Department of Ecology’s final determination is.

John Ahl asked if the numbers that were just provided were based on the old criteria for consumption or are they related to the criteria that is evolving, which is less than the existing method. Mike Koepke stated that the numbers provided are based on the 2000 water system plan update that was recently approved by the State Department of Health. The numbers were developed from a three year average for use within the North Peninsula System.

Deborah Flynn asked how many gallons per family or per person was used per day. Mike Koepke estimated that it was about 174 gallons with a peaking factor of 3.2. Deborah Flynn stated that sounded like the new criteria. John Ahl verified that was the actual usage and that it was closer to the new criteria they had heard about. The criteria they had been hearing before was over 200 gallons per day per person. Mike Koepke reviewed his information in order to provide more than just estimates. He then specified that for the years 1999 through 2001 the average daily demand was 174 gallons per connection; not per person. It’s based on an ERU. The population calculation that was used for North Peninsula was 2.3 population per ERU. John Ahl indicated he was confused with regard to the terminology.

Mike Koepke clarified that a single family residential unit will have 1 liter connection; that one liter connection is considered and ERU. Each ERU in the North Peninsula system over that three year period of 1999 through 2001, is 174 gallons per day, per connection. There is a peaking factor that the State requires be calculated in. It takes peak day demand and develops a number that, in this case was 2.23 for the North Peninsula System. So if you take 174 gallons times 2.23 you get your peaking factor for each of those ERUs. The ERU numbers that were provided are based on peak factors. In other words, the State Department of Health requires the PUD to take worst case
scenario, what will in actuality probably never happen, but that is what they have to
plan on when looking at the demand and the number of ERUs that are available.

John Ahl noted that was sort of what he was getting at. It would seem they were
looking at some really conservative projections. Mike Koepke clarified that what they
were looking at when discussing ERUs was actual demand data, usage data that has
been calculated. The original numbers had been an estimate and weren’t based on
actual data. When the plan was updated this time, it used actual meter consumption
data and converted it into gallons per day and average peaking factor, to come up with
the peak demand per ERU.

John Ahl asked for verification that the 174 was peak demand. Mike Koepke stated that
174 is average demand with a peaking factor of 2.23.

Deborah Flynn noted that the water can go wherever the PUD serves within the County.
She then asked if there were any amount of hookups set aside within the Urban Growth
Area or was it first come, first serve. If it was reserved for the Urban Growth Area, it
wasn’t as much of an issue as it might be on a first come, first serve basis.

It was clarified that the Board of County Commissioners’ policy at this time is for a
utility service provider, anybody who comes to the PUD, in or outside of the Urban
Growth Area that requests service, will get service. They can only build to the density
that is set forth by the County, but as a utility provider, they provide it to those that
request it; first come, first serve. ERUs have not specifically been set aside for the
Urban Growth Area with the Board of County Commissioners policy indicating ERUs
could only be set aside once the connection is paid for. After payment, they are set
aside with the State deducting it from the available 900 connections, then they’re gone.

Deborah Flynn clarified that somebody has to buy them to “reserve” them. Mike
Koepke clarified that if they want those available at the time they build, that is correct.

Mike Gustavson stated that 900 is the number that is as yet unused, which was verified.
The 900 is the remainder; the system is approved for approximately 5700. They are
not all active connections right now; there was an LUD out at Jefferson Beach with
people who participated in the LUD with assessments assigned to their properties, who
are currently on their own private wells. However, because they did participate and
were charged for that, those ERUs have already been deducted and are “set aside and
paid for” for when the people who were participants decide they want to be on a public
supply, the connections are available for them.

Shannon Bauman returned the discussion back to William Matchett’s question as to
where they were with the Kingston process. At the last meeting, besides the water
issue, there was an issue about commercial land. There were a lot of comments during
the public comment period on goals and policies, and she promised a matrix from Staff
with their inputs and would like the Planning Commission to provide feedback on what
would be included or not included on the different policies.
The other issue that wasn’t discussed, but Staff would like to discuss with the Planning Commission, was Stillwater’s letter regarding designating additional Urban Restricted areas. Staff would also recommend that the Planning Commission consider designating some additional lands as Urban Restricted, which she will address, as well.

To answer some of the questions and bring up some of the other issue where they haven’t spent any time, it would seem that adoption of Alternative B would now allow them to focus on the goals and policies, as well as other issues related to the plan before going out with another Public Hearing. The goal of the next Public Hearing would be for the community to see what the Preferred Alternative is and the changes to the plan goals and policies or other adjustments made to the plan. At this point, Shannon Bauman asked that she be able to go through those issues and see where they could get in the remaining timeframe.

Shannon Bauman noted the Commercial Land issue was going to be readdressed with some of the Chamber of Commerce members in Kingston to get an idea of what’s going on in Kingston. Some of the comments she had heard were about the health of businesses that existed in Kingston now. There are some vacant buildings and she doesn’t have a good sense as to why that’s occurring and what the current business plan is. She has a meeting scheduled next week with selected members of the Chamber of Commerce, not the entire Chamber but a group from the Chamber. She sent forward some questions she would like them to think about and will address. What is the current business climate in Kingston? What do they think the County should be doing from a land use perspective to address those issues, the vacant properties? She knows there are some developers looking for sites in Kingston right now to develop certain things; are they finding those sites? Is it difficult? Are the design standards currently in place working? She also would like to discuss what the Planning Commission was referring to this morning regarding ULID #6 and the whole Urban Village Center concept.

From talking to people on the Steering Committee discussed some of these issues, but it wasn’t really the focus of their effort. She does not believe a huge amount of their time was spent talking about what a commercial, or the downtown area, of Kingston, would look like. Things like mixed use popped up but didn’t really get fleshed out. That’s what she would like to get a feel for from the Community. Kingston is already an Urban Village. She is confident in saying the community likes their Urban Village the way it is now in terms of the scale and the types of things that are there; but they also really want it to be healthy. They want to be able to draw people that live around here into the town itself. That’s her goal in meeting with the Chamber of Commerce. It may go beyond that to get a feel for what residents are looking for in terms of what would draw people to shop in Kingston rather than someplace else.

Shannon Bauman stressed that more information would be coming forward for the Planning Commission to look at once she has that conversation with the Chamber of Commerce. A memo had gone out noting the Chamber of Commerce meeting at the end of the month, sponsored by the Kingston Chamber of Commerce. That meeting was intended to address White Horse and other things that are going on, but she expects that some of this would come up during that meeting as well.
Shannon Bauman also expressed the need to determine the role the Kingston Citizen Advisory Committee plays now and how that may or may not change in terms of implementing and monitoring the plan. She anticipated further discussion with the Kitsap County Advisory Committee tomorrow night. Their role now relating to land use was mostly just informational. Information is presented on current projects in the Kingston area, but their role doesn’t extend beyond that as far as reviewing projects or anything like that. Occasionally developers will come and make presentations to the community when they’re trying to gain support for projects in the Kingston area. The broader question, however, is if we have this plan in place once it’s adopted, and there are some projects listed in here, who is going to be involved in those and how is that going to take place. So the discussion tomorrow night will focus on that, what the role of the Kingston Citizens Advisory Committee would be in that. Initially she thinks the subject will be their existing role and subcommittees. They currently have a transportation subcommittee that focuses on transportation issues for Kingston, so they keep track of what the County and State are doing. That subcommittee comes back each month and updates the Committee as to what’s going on. That might be the appropriate role for the Committee with land use issues. Staff could have a better connection with the Committee and have somebody on the Committee tracking what’s going on just as an informational kind of a role. The Committee does not currently have design review, although they did at one time. It was Shannon’s understanding that process became problematic and the Committee no longer has that role. They don’t get involved in that role and leave it primarily up to the County. She will be having that discussion with them tomorrow night and will report back to the Planning Commission with the Committee’s input about their future role and whether it should be expanded from what it is right now.

Shannon Bauman felt the next issue should be Urban Restricted Zoning and provided materials including an aerial map and a land capacity calculation of Alternative B. She noted that the aerial map would not be used until they started talking about properties that came up in the comment letter from Stillwaters relating to estuaries. The map does not have the estuary as clearly mapped as it should be and that is clearer in the aerial photos.

Mike Koepke noted that because he had thrown out the number or ERUs, he should note that, with regard to the White Horse Development, two-thirds of the anticipated ERUs had already been assigned and were not part of the 900 remaining connections. The 900 was what was remaining after White Horse was deducted. Arborwood, however, had not made a request for water yet.

Shannon Bauman noted that the reason for the capacity analysis was to show the change in population in two areas designated as Urban Restricted instead of Urban Low. The designation change would not have a large impact on the numbers for this area and the change to Urban Restricted was supported based on critical areas and steep areas, basically bluffs, already primarily developed with homes. The likelihood of them being developed at Urban Low Densities does not seem likely and probably shouldn’t be encouraged given the degree of slopes. The other area is also critical areas,
Mike Gustavson asked what the topography was like in that area with Shannon Bauman indicating it was slopes, there was an unnamed stream and some wetlands. She had not brought the critical areas map to provide more specifics, but those were the generally topographical issues. Deborah Flynn noted there seemed to be a ravine, as well. It was noted that this was already being developed, which was the reasoning for the capacity analysis; to see how designation changes impacted the overall numbers.

Changing the designation would put the population at a low end of 1,189 and a high of 4,330; still within the targeted range. Without the changed in designation, the previous low number was 2,384 and the high was 4,834.

In addition, there were a number of other items addressed in the Stillwater letter that she would like to review and discuss with the Planning Commission.

Shannon Bauman indicated an area on the map designated as industrial. The concern there was sensitive areas and the developability of the site, how developable it was. It was asked that the County consider a different designation such as Urban Restricted, like that used for residential land. There is not really a comparable designation given to industrial or commercial land, in part because those issues are addressed when the development application is submitted. In this particular case, with the property being along the highway, Staff feels there is still potential for some sort of development, although it would still have to meet all the critical area regulations. Staff doesn’t really have anything to change the designation to and therefore feels it does not need to be changed but that the issue could be addressed when it was brought in for development.

The other piece of property addressed by Stillwater was pointed out on the map as the square piece next to an already developed Subdivision. The concern in that area was accessibility. There are limited ways to access that piece of property that wouldn’t require crossing over a stream or involve slopes. The concern was that developing it at Urban Low densities would not be very desirable because of those issues. Again, it is Staff’s opinion in this particular case that it may be possible. It is not something that has been studied extensively, whether access may be available through another way that did not affect critical areas. At this point it did not seem appropriate to change it to Urban Restricted, with Staff being of the opinion that there were enough options available to address the concern regarding access and critical areas.

Mike Gustavson asked if it could be accessed from the South with Shannon noting the development to the South was already in existence and would require an easement through somebody’s property. She noted that she had not walked the property or done extensive research to determine all the issues and possible resolutions.

It was noted by the Planning Commission that when Subdivisions are platted in a standard method, it doesn’t seem to take into account potential access as part of the procedure and it would be nice if that could be addressed going forward. Shannon Bauman agreed. This situation, when there are a lot of critical areas, can be problematic in terms of access. She stressed, however, that changing the property’s
designations to Urban Restricted would not really address the issue, it would only reduce the density without solving the access problem.

The other properties mentioned by Stillwaters were noted on the map. It was noted that there was one area in green that should have been shown as County property.

Additionally, the parcels at issue were pointed out on the map and cross-referenced to the aerial photo. Shannon noted the map didn’t show very well how Kitsap County General property flows over into designated Urban Restricted. The thought behind including the properties bordering the County property as Urban Restricted was that they flowed down toward the estuary. Property adjacent to the estuary was already designated as Urban Restricted. By including the noted properties, some of those surface runoff issues could be addressed, as well as other issues related to development of property that is next to a clearly sensitive area.

Mike Gustavson asked if there was a school indicated in the back, and Shannon Bauman clarified that it was private property—a horse ranch. She also noted on the map where Kingston Terrace Development was located, a private property that was a horse farm that bordered the County’s property and then the additional properties being considered. It was stressed that Urban Restricted was really designed to try to address sensitive areas in Urban Growth Area that are most likely going to be developed in some fashion.

The Planning Commission noted that the argument regarding the possibly sensitive areas was drainage or runoff from the developments. Deborah Flynn asked for clarification as to which properties were being suggested as Urban Restricted. Shannon Bauman noted Staff was recommending Urban Restricted for those properties that border what is already designated as Urban Restricted and a piece that borders the county’s property as shown on the map.

Mike Gustavson noted that to the left of where she was indicating was a darker green portion that Shannon noted was the Old Nike Site and it was County Property. William Matchett confirmed that the other green area should also be dark green since she’d indicated it was also County owned.

Deborah Flynn asked what Staff was recommending. Shannon Bauman noted that Staff felt there was definitely some merit in the area related to the estuary. William Matchett asked if there was a piece of Stillwater on the shoreline, with Shannon asking if he was referring to the estuary shoreline or saltwater. It was left undecided.

Mike Gustavson noted in the Kitsap County General portion, north of the road, just to the left, there was a tiny piece of private property. He questioned whether those properties should be restricted and Shannon noted that they were already designated as Urban Restricted.

William Matchett suggested that perhaps the darker green should follow the County boundary rather than the way it is now. Mike Gustavson agreed. He suggested taking a notch out of the bottom left hand corner that was private property. Shannon Bauman
noted there was already a parcel line. Mike Gustavson noted that if it was privately owned and developable with Shannon clarifying the portion he was referring to had three parcels and the County has them listed as Urban Restricted. Mike Gustavson verified that they could build on it. Shannon verified that, indicating that Urban Restricted was 1:5. With Urban Restricted the County is looking at some kind of performance-based development. The County was encouraging clustering, saying you can build five dwelling units but they need to be clustered in a specific area to provide a buffer along whatever area is considered critical, etc. The Critical Areas Ordinance is still in effect and would be applied. Urban Restricted just means that you aren’t going to see nine units on one acre.

Deborah Flynn asked if Staff was requesting input from the Planning Commission and Shannon Bauman indicated that they were. Deborah Flynn stated she would support the preferred alternative B showing those areas adjacent to the estuary and next to the County owned property as being Urban Restricted. She wasn’t sure she supported the one that had the access issue as being Urban Restricted since the County’s goal was to put development within the Urban Growth Area. If there aren’t environmental restrictions she would not support that one. She would support the Urban Restricted in the other ones and asked what the other Planning Commission members thought.

Mike Gustavson noted that when looking at the picture of the piece they were talking about, which he presumed was right above (half cut off from the other area), if you look at the right upper right hand corner, there is a tiny sliver on that. Both he and Monty Mahan thought that may very well be an easement to that piece of property with questionable access. If that’s the case, then he didn’t think that property should receive the Urban Restricted designation as the access wasn’t an issue. Tom Nevins verified that Mike Gustavson and Monty Mahan were in agreement that the property relating to access issues should not receive Urban Restricted designation. Mike Gustavson asked Deborah Flynn to clarify that she was indicating it should be made developable, with Deborah concurring that was her intent and that it also not be Urban Restricted. Regardless, her intent was that it be developable, it was just a matter of designation relating to density.

Mike Gustavson asked if they were referring to the entire Alternative B or just this issue. It was clarified that they were referring just to these issues, in which case Mike Gustavson noted his agreement with what Deborah Flynn had stated.

Shannon Bauman noted that the next topic of discussion was the recommended additions and changes to the goals, policies and projects. The materials had been provided to the Planning Commission and she would like to address any questions or areas of concern they might have.

Page 1: The Planning Commission noted #1 looked like a Growth Management Act goal and wanted to know if it was necessary to restate that in the plans. There was no real issue, just a question of whether it was being redundant. Shannon Bauman noted that even though the County indicated it will not restate the goals from the Comprehensive Plan, sometimes it is deemed helpful just as a matter of clarification for the community,
based on their input. The Planning Commission noted there were no other comments regarding the first page.

Page 2: The Planning Commission had no questions or comments. Mike Gustavson specifically stated it all makes sense.

Page 3: The Planning Commission had no questions or comments.

Page 4: It was noted that the County Greenways plan was never adopted although it was referenced on this page. Shannon Bauman was asked if there was a schedule as to when that would be adopted. She noted that the County Greenways plan was part of several different plans with the bicycles facilities plan adopted. Bill Zupancic would be the person to answer the question about what is going to happen to the rest of the plan. Part of the issue became what County agency would be responsible for implementation, which led to the decision to adopt separate plans. Money will come through certain channels for various projects, such as bicycle paths. That would be different from money for things that are more open space than trails. The document became a little problematic as it was. What she didn’t know was what the long-term plans were for the parts of the plan that had not been adopted. She stressed that she would attempt to find out and let the Planning Commission know the status. William Matchett recalled that the plan was received but not adopted because they didn’t know how to make it work. Shannon agreed and said some of it was that when the Park Department took some elements out of the Open Space plan, because there were things that the Parks Department could implement and that would be funded through the Park’s Department. But there were still issues that were in between all of those and it was not really clear who would be responsible for making it happen. The Planning Commission verified that they would like to receive an update on that.

Mike Gustavson noted that he had concerns regarding Items .3 and .5. There appeared to be a sense that people don’t want competition with downtown, by development of George’s Corner or whatever. He is concerned that with the growth rate they have habitually or historically seen, there will be plenty of customers with a need to purchase things, but no place to do it. He expressed the thought that having a larger commercial area set aside for sales might be appropriate and should be addressed. Shannon Bauman noted that she would be considering that. She felt that part of the Steering Committee discussion included the big box retailer. The feeling was that was not what Kingston wanted to move toward. That type of retail development really didn’t fit Kingston. But it brings up the question, though, of what kinds of goods and services should the community contain. How do they want to see the area develop, redevelop and expand. Mike Gustavson noted that there is already a big block grocery store; it’s outside of town but it’s there and it draws a pretty big crowd. The way we shop in America is to go where things cost less, and they cost less at a big box store. Although it may not be desirable, it’s still where people shop. That’s tough on small businesses and he shares their concern. Just because you don’t have a big box in Kingston, doesn’t mean you won’t go to the big box to shop. In that case, the little business owner still isn’t selling the stuff. He’s not sure how to wrestle with that one, but it should be addressed.
It was noted that philosophically there are those who are willing to pay somewhat of a premium to walk to a smaller store where they know the owner, etc. Not everyone prefers going to Wal-Mart and that type of store with Front Street in Poulsbo used as an example. Although the prices might be slightly higher, there was a savings in gas and a preferable shopping environment. Mike Gustavson argued from that standpoint the area could still fail. People will still want to hang out in downtown Kingston, even if there is a big box store.

It was agreed that was true and that sometimes you might want to go to a big box, but it didn’t mean that at the same you’re not going to shop at the stores that are convenient to you. Sometimes you’re willing to pay a little bit more for the convenience. Mike Gustavson noted it had a big impact in south Kitsap. He favored little stores, used to like to go to them. The big boxes came in and the smaller stores couldn’t compete. William Matchett noted they haven’t all gone away and some of are still used by Planning Commission members. Mike Gustavson still argued that by mandating that the big box not be there, they may be spending more money on infrastructure, gas, pollution and the other things by causing people to go further for that service. Other Planning Commission members noted this was something the neighborhood wanted to mandate and that they should honor it.

Deborah Flynn noted that during the last Comprehensive Plan review they added commercial land outside of Kingston, out at George’s Corner, and it is not shown on the map. Shannon Bauman verified the area referred to and noted the map presented was over a year old. Deborah Flynn noted that it was across from the existing Albertsons and there was an empty storefront in downtown Kingston.

The Planning Commission had no other questions or concerns on this page.

Page 5: William Matchett noted that he needed clarification under Section 28, the second column over, where it added two additional projects. The second project indicated “undertake or coordination review.” Shannon Bauman noted that it should state “undertake a review” (not “or”). Under that same item it was questioned as to who was doing the Growth Management Act critical areas Ordinance compliance. Shannon Bauman noted that actually several Staff were involved; Rick Kimball was probably the primary person. Jason Rice is doing Growth Management Act compliance on long range planning, sort of heading it up.

The Planning Commission posed a question regarding low impact development and whether there was work going on in the Planning Department to incorporate some of these ideas on holding back development in the Code. Shannon Bauman noted there wasn’t currently. She stressed it was something that should be looked at Countywide, not just for Kingston, as to how it will be incorporated and encouraged. Mike Gustavson suggested there be a phrase added stating “pervious surface” to #30. That carries the water on through and can be done even on streets. William Matchett noted that was another thing that should be Countywide; not just in Kingston, with the Planning Commission agreeing.
Page 6: Mike Gustavson noted the limitation of building heights to 17 feet. It would appear to be related to view preservation, like previous setback requirements, which were later thrown out. In his terms, if you want the view, you buy it. If you limit the height to 17 feet, you don’t get skinny buildings, you get wide buildings. He’s not sure there is any gain on this point in this case.

Page 7: Item 38, with regard to paths, the Planning Commission asked if the document was going anywhere beyond the Planning Commission. Shannon Bauman noted that it was not at the moment. Mike Gustavson wanted to note that if they’re going to put in bike paths, get them off the roadside. The wording implies what has been done forever, put a white stripe on the road and you can bicycle outside. But you can’t take a kid out there. John Ahl noted it was a good idea and he noted that just 20 feet off the paved surface would work. The practical problem is who owns the property where they are putting the bike path or is it within the County right of way. There are lot of times where the white stripe solution is the only option. There are areas around the County where that happens. If the path can be away from the road it’s wonderful, but from a practical point of view it gets into easements and such. Mike Gustavson stressed his encouragement to look at that option. The need was expressed with the example of a sixth grader with his buddies coming home from school, pushing and playing, with someone winding up in the street.

Monty Mahan noted that in his previous work in the Kingston community, that was something that was highly desired. He wanted to know if West Kingston Road had been built with a separate bike lane. Shannon Bauman noted it did not have a physical separation like a higher surface or a curb, it was just widened. Monty Mahan verified then that it had not been separated. It was noted by the Planning Commission that there had been some negative comments because of that. Shannon Bauman noted it goes back to the whole issue of urban versus rural road standards. It’s problematic in the unincorporated urban areas. Monty Mahan noted there were a lot of wounds in Public Works over that road.

Page 8: There were no questions or comments by the Planning Commission.

Page 9: The Planning Commission made a short comment on the last staff comment where it states “to ensure that the community is informed and participates.” It was not sure that was possible entirely.

The Planning Commission made particular note that the presentation was well done and expressed their appreciation.

Mike Gustavson noted that when discussing Arborwood the last time, there was a vote on it. He had talked to Jon Rose on the side to see what his thoughts were as a property developer and his question was whether the County was to the point in the process where the 800 acres could be taken at 1 house per acre and sold. That is a tough one because of development in a different way, but it will go right back to the Hearing Examiner and probably take a couple of years to turn it around. Either way John felt he could chop it up and get it done with a great layout; one house per acre, roughly. The property they had discussed was all suburban, exactly what people are buying a lot of
right now. So Mike stated that if a developer wanted to go one house per acre, he
recommends that it be left alone and that’s the way it is. Either way he can sell it,
although he didn’t want to argue either way.

An update regarding the Kingston Advisory Committee was requested, with Shannon
Bauman stating she was meeting with them the following night and would have more
complete information after that. Although they had discussed their future role, it had
not really been fleshed out and would be addressed further at the next meeting.

Shannon Bauman then presented the question as to whether the Planning Commission
would like to have a Public Hearing scheduled for their first session in March. She
asked if the Planning Commission felt the issues had been reviewed enough or did they
think there was more to address as a work study first.

Deborah Flynn noted that it seemed like the materials should be taken back to the
Steering Committee. Shannon Bauman had discussed that option with some of the
members, with the general feeling that it would be extremely difficult to try to
reconvene the whole Steering Committee. If they did readdress anything with the
Steering Committee, it was essential that a majority of the members be in attendance.
Shannon Bauman felt that issues that would be looked at were the goals and policies, as
well as some of the issues that spun out of them. At this point the commercial land
issue was really one of the big issues and maybe it would need more input, but Shannon
noted that might not require review by the entire Steering Committee, as much as it
might need to go out to a public open house. The other issues, like the view protection
issues and those types of things, she lumped together and things that the Community
would want to look at on adoption of the plan. That would prevent starting another
process, a design process, in the middle of this but perhaps the first project that comes
out of this should be to look at those residential issues, buffering, views and those types
of things.

The Planning Commission clarified what they would be hearing about if they proceeded
with a Public Hearing. Shannon Bauman noted that the Public Hearing would be on
the preferred alternative, which would include the map they had been reviewing with
the addition of Urban Restricted designations. It would also include the recommended
changes to the goals and policies on the plan. She would also like to get something
tangible out of the commercial land discussion. It was her opinion that it would need to
be the community’s decision as to whether they should designate more land or if they
are going to look at an Urban Village Center concept with mixed use. That would need
to be put out before the next Public Hearing to see if there are going to be any changes.
Shannon Bauman asked the Planning Commission if they wanted to move ahead with a
Public Hearing or if they would prefer to have another work study.

The Planning Commission noted it would be useful to have another work study
beforehand to make sure there were no dramatic changes.

Deborah Flynn asked whether Shannon Bauman would be meeting with the Chamber
of Commerce regarding the commercial situation. Shannon noted that she was meeting
with the Chamber, but it was more to get a feel for what was going on now in Kingston;
why there are empty buildings and that kind of thing. She would be meeting them the
following Monday at noon. The meeting scheduled on the 19th was not a County-
sponsored meeting – it was coming out of the Chamber and her sense was that they
want to get an update on the White Horse Development that is underway, and the
status of Arborwood. She also suspected there might be some discussion on the Sub-
Area Plan and what the County and Planning Commission are proposing in the Sub-
Area Plan.

Mike Gustavson asked where the White Horse Development was, with Shannon
pointing it out on the map in relation to where Arborwood was located. Mike
Gustavson asked what the density was for the White Horse Development. Another
member indicated it was somewhere around 200 acres with 2 acre lots and a golf
course.

The Planning Commission asked whether the additional dialog with the Chamber of
Commerce and others might lead to an increase in the proposed commercial areas.
Shannon Bauman stated that was one of the questions she proposed be put forth,
having neighborhood commercial or neighborhood commercial centers in Kingston.
The Planning Commission received verification that it could evolve into a neighborhood
commercial which was spread around in various places.

Deborah Flynn asked how this related to the Steering Committee’s work. The Steering
Committee had looked at this in pretty good detail. There were members of the
Chamber of Commerce who were also on that Steering Committee. She wanted to
know why the County was now going to the Chamber of Commerce separately?
Shannon Bauman noted her goal with regard to the Chamber of Commerce was to find
out why things were the way they are now in Kingston; why are there empty buildings?
Certain individuals have expressed concern that the business climate is not very good in
Kingston. William Matchett noted this should have come out in discussions before this
point and Shannon commented that the Steering Committee had talked about
commercial land, it just wasn’t the focus of those meetings and was only touched on.

Deborah Flynn stated to her recollection it had been discussed in pretty good detail and
she would be hesitant to make changes to the plan designations by adding more
commercial or other changes separate from the Committee after they had spent so
much time on the plan itself. She stressed it would be worthwhile to go to the Chamber
of Commerce and have a round table discussion as to why there are empty buildings
and such, but not with the intention of it resulting in changes to the designations on the
plan. That seemed a little bit disingenuous toward the Steering Committee. Shannon
Bauman noted that information she had received and input from the Chamber of
Commerce would help her determine if there was anything wrong with what they have
right now. If so, maybe there would be more work to do with matters potentially
reedressed with the Steering Committee.

It was noted by the Planning Commission that they should probably move ahead with a
Public Hearing. It could always be postponed if there were any substantial
developments. There was one scheduled already for March 4. The Planning
Commission agreed that there was no reason not to proceed with the scheduled Public Hearing.

The Planning Commission asked if that could be done in Kingston since that was the area being addressed. Shannon Bauman noted that her concern at this point was finding a location in Kingston that would not require County funds. The Fire Hall was recommended, but there was concern about parking. Parking at the church next door was an option, but would need to be verified with the church in advance, advising them of a public meeting and the need to use their parking.

Tentative time for the meeting was set at 7:00 p.m. with Shannon Bauman to advise the Planning Commission of the final meeting location. It was confirmed that the meeting would also include ULID #6 and South Kitsap Industrial Area. There was the possibility that those would both be addressed at the same time on the South end, but it was unsure that it had been scheduled.

The Planning Commission expressed their appreciation to Kingston for continuing to monitor and assist with the process.

The next study session was scheduled for 2/25/03 and was to be just a work study. The Planning Commission asked if there were any other items to discuss. William Matchett noted, before adjourning, that it was Karen Halbeck’s last session with them. He asked that it be put in the minutes that they congratulate her on her retirement, express their sorrow for her leaving and thank her for all her good work.

Karen introduced Dana Hill and noted that she had attended the meeting to become familiar with the process. It appeared that she was going to apply for the position and Karen anticipated training her in the process before her retirement.

12:30 P.M.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.
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