
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

Lary Coppola asked if all members had reviewed the minutes of December 3, 2002 and January 7, 2003. The Planning Commission had submitted all their requested changes; however, the final versions had not been distributed at the time of this meeting and would therefore be reviewed and adopted at a later date.

9:15 A.M.

Work Study on proposed amendments to the Kitsap County Zoning Code.

Lary Coppola, Chair, stated that Item 3 on the agenda would be addressed first as there were some people in attendance for the sole purpose of providing testimony and he did not want to make them have to sit through unrelated items.

Kelly Robinson started the discussion indicating it was a follow-up from a series of meetings. It was discussed at a Public Hearing in January 2003 and was now being presented with revisions based on suggestions made at that meeting and internal discussions with the development engineers on the ordinance.

All Planning Commission members were provided with the most current version of the ordinance prior to the meeting, with the Planning Commission stating that they had reviewed the material. There were quite a few changes, but only a few that were substantive:

1. Page 23. In the earlier version of the ordinance, changing the filing deadline was proposed, that is the time between preliminary and final approval. This had been changed from the current ordinance timeframe of three years to five years to make it consistent with the general subdivision ordinances and State law. Subsequently Staff reviewed the effects of that change and determined that it should remain at the previous three-year timeframe. State law allows the County, with regard to short subdivisions, to write rules differing from the State’s rules. The consensus among the
development engineers was that three years is a reasonable time period and that a person could reasonably be expected to make improvements for a short subdivision within a three-year period. So, essentially, that would negate a change that had previously been made.

2. Page 27. Pertains to further subdivision declaration. It was thought that the initial language was complicated and an attempt to mirror State Law which stated that there be a five year moratorium on changes to any more than four lots. The Prosecuting Attorney, however, has opined that the County can interpret this matter in a more sensible manner and should apply the same standards to urban nine-lot short plats as it previously allowed for four lots. The wording has been clarified to indicate that if you short-plat a property into less than the maximum number of pieces (4 in rural areas, 9 in urban areas) you can apply at any time to meet the maximum amount. Once a property had been divided into the maximum number allowed, there would be a five-year moratorium before an additional subdivision would be allowed. At the Planning Commission’s request, it was clarified that the five year freeze on further subdividing of the property would only apply once the maximum allowable amount had been met and that the subdivision could be done in stages until it reached that amount.

Kelly was also asked to define the difference between further subdividing and adding more lots. He stated that it depended on whether the lots you were adding were more than what could have been done in the original short plat. State Law indicates that if you divide property into four lots and record it, you must wait five years before further subdividing a lot. The caveat is that if you only divide it into three lots initially, you still have an option of dividing it into one more lot. The purpose of the waiting period was to prevent people from coming in and dividing their land according to the maximum allowed, then a week later dividing it again, repeating the process and thereby bypassing the intention of the subdivision limitation. The moratorium therefore ensures that the land will be gradually subdivided and not cause excessive increases in densities in limited areas. When the State wrote the new enabling laws for nine lots, they did not include a section that limited dividing a short plat into more than four lots.

Staff tried to simplify the language from the first meeting, with input from the Prosecutor’s Office; applying the same process to nine-lot subdivisions as those that are applied to the four-lot process.

3. Page 26. Road standard. The previous draft requested that urban short plats meet Fire Access Requirements. Since that time, Development Engineers and Public Works have determined that this should be increased some to have a minimum width or right of way for the access road of 30 feet vs. 20 feet. This is based on previous experience regarding the amount of space needed for a normal two lane road, ditches, utilities, drains, etc. It is therefore recommended that 30 feet be the minimum standard from the Fire Access standpoint. With regard to the new nine-lot subdivisions, there is a two-stage standard being requested. This would state that if there are only four lots, the standard would remain at 30 feet. Anything over four lots would be increased to 40 feet, adding an additional 10 feet for Fire Access.

4. An additional road standard being requested is separate pedestrian access. This is not the sidewalk standard, which some had preferred. It could be a path, gravel way
or other type of pedestrian access. It would, however, require that every lot in the urban short plat have pedestrian access connecting back to the county road.

The Planning Commission brought up multiple items regarding this issue. It was confirmed that the pedestrian access was separate from any existing driveway. The pedestrian access would not have to go up to the house, only that every lot be provided with some sort of pedestrian access to the county road. A sidewalk is not being required because it is not necessarily appropriate in every case. There are lots currently, and anticipated in the future, where there is a dedicated common space between the lots.

Mike Gustavson liked the idea of trails but he wasn’t sure he agreed with mandating trails through subdivisions was the best idea. Trails in an urban short plat could be very contentious and it was unclear to him whether it would be part of the street or driving easement. If it was a separate walking trail directly from each lot to the public street it could become very problematic. He indicated that if the wording were revised to an option or recommendation and if the wording had the term “separate” removed; or if it were made part of the street right of way it would be more agreeable. He also stated that he felt a right of way would probably be the best place to walk. It was also noted that a driveway already provided pedestrian access though not necessarily to the county road.

Mike Gustavson again stressed that there could be problems with trails in that they could run past someone’s house, imposing on their privacy. The Planning Commission in general agreed that this requirement could disrupt the privacy of individual property owners. Kelly Robinson suggested that the wording be revised to “pedestrian access, which may be separate, shall be provided from all lots...” with the presumption that it would be the street, although it could be separate.

The Planning Commission in general agreed with that wording. It was further clarified that the intention was that it would be separated from the pavement, not abutting the pavement. The type of pathway should be the choice of the developers or owners, possibly putting it within the road track, within the easement, thereby keeping it out of private property. Once it is put on private property it becomes a liability issue. The County was looking at a separated trail, rather than abutting the pavement and it might just need some minor verbiage revisions such as stating that it had to be separated from the pavement/road.

There is an additional item that has been brought up over the past couple of days that is not yet incorporated into the documentation. It would be an easy change to make if the Planning Commission should agree on it. It has been suggested that the urban short plat should be paved. There is nothing in the Fire Access Standards requiring paving; only that the road must support 60,000 pounds which could be accomplished with a gravel road, oiled road or one with a good foundation base. It is being recommended by the Engineers and the Planners, however, that while planning the Urban Growth Area, paved roads should be a requirement. They have requested that this be an explicit standard. At this point the Planning Commission does not need to be concerned with where this would be incorporated into the ordinances; only to determine if it should be included.
Kelly stated that the remainder of the revisions were just housekeeping issues relating to relocating buffer requirements from definitions and putting them in the standards, and things along that line. The previously mentioned items were the policy level, substantive changes from the draft that had previously been provided. What Staff was requesting was for the Planning Commission to reach a level of comfort with these revisions so they could be recommended to the Board of Commissioners.

Additional clarification was provided to the Planning Commission on some of the changes that had not been specifically addressed.

Page 18, Item 1 states “Board” means the legislative authority in Kitsap County. It was confirmed that this referred to the Board of County of Commissioners and language would be amended for clarification. Additionally, Item 8 states “Engineer” means the County’s Engineer. It was confirmed that the County Engineer is an office that is defined legally in the Public Works Department, actually holding two offices - Public Works Director and County Engineer. It was felt that this did not require further clarification as it was consistent with verbiage throughout Code and State Law.

Page 19. Footnote 14 was clarified to indicate that this related to developable area and was now included in Density Definitions of Title 17 zoning code. The footnote was provided in an attempt to further clarify the matter. If a portion of land is being considered for subdivision, eligibility would be determined/calculated under this code. That would include determining applicability of critical areas, buffers, roads, storm water improvements and what remaining part could actually be built on. It does not exclude the drain field from buildable areas as there are options available in that area. The remaining developable area is critical to this ordinance when determining if a site can be subdivided and which ordinance applies. This item came about after Public Testimony about the potential abuses of this inside the Urban Growth Boundary where the County would be forced to preplan property and the minimum density requirement in the zone could create problems, creating expectations which could lead to further complications at a later date. This is intended primarily for the smaller sites to ensure developable area meets density requirements. It was also clarified that net developable area excluded access roads. Ditches would presumably be in an easement for the road and would not be factored into the net developable area.

An additional issue that was addressed was that many of the plat maps in urban areas appear to create cul-de-sac situations where there was only one way to access the properties. The opinion was presented that it might be preferable to have more than one way in and out of a property; preventing isolated communities with no reasonable access to the other side. It was agreed that having a connecting road as opposed to a cul-de-sac would not be applicable if the property was bordered by open space. There was concern expressed that without some sort of requirement, the standard would be for cul-de-sacs to run off main roads and that could potentially occur throughout the Urban Growth Area.

Dick McConnahey indicated that, in California and other areas, cul-de-sacs were part of the plans as it was an advantage from the property owner's perspective, limiting traffic.
and providing safer environments for children to play. The disadvantage that was brought up was that those living in the cul-de-sacs may benefit, but that the main access roads would wind up with the increased traffic. This situation was, however, something that would be known by individuals purchasing the property and that there would certainly be a differential in value. It was still stressed that a cul-de-sac environment would not allow for easy access from one area to another.

Monty Mahan stated that based on his past experience, as well as that of the County, it was not realistic to address traffic circulation in the same venue as short plats. It would be nice from the traffic-planning aspect, but it was not realistic as part of short plat requirements due to getting neighborhoods to agree to the access, getting a road extended through, people becoming accustomed to the limited traffic and then having a road going through and increasing traffic levels. It just didn’t seem to be applicable to the issue of short plats.

Kelly Robinson agreed with everything that had been said. He stressed that the preplanning process was critical and had multiple issues to address. One of those was ensuring that if property were subdivided it did not result in a landlocked property. If that should inadvertently occur, the County had the responsibility of ensuring there was an applicable ordinance to address the situation. As previously stated by Monty Mahan, there is a level of planning beyond what would be required in a city where they know how they are going to get to every piece of property and where they need to make connections.

Additionally, Jim Barnard has extensive experience both for private and public entities. It is his experience that cul-de-sacs are the preferred design and rarely is there a more logical alternative. The key area for consideration is at the subdivision level, ensuring that they don’t have a negative impact on bordering areas and that access to those subdivisions does not negatively impact other properties.

Members of the Planning Commission agreed that these items had been satisfactorily explained and had no further questions in these areas.

With regard to the Urban Growth Area, however, there were questions raised with regard to potential water and sewer addition. It was recommended that when a subdivision occurred, the requirement be added that piping for sewer and water be put in place to allow for hookup in the future when the sewer services became available, rather than having potentially to deal with that aspect after roads have been paved, etc.

Kelly Robinson stated some areas have preplanning requirements referred to as “dry sewering” in which sewer lines have to be put in place even if they don’t have anything to connect to at the time of development. This eliminates disruption of the property at a later date and enables the property layout to maximize gravity for the sewer rather than requiring unnecessary pump stations. Should the Planning Commission request it, Staff could add another standard, simply stating that the preliminary and plat approval must include sewer line placement and that those lines must be included in the site-development permit following preliminary subdivisions, preliminary plat approval and before it could be recorded.
The general consensus was that this could be done at a reasonable cost when a short plat is being put together and that it might be the best time to do it.

Jim Barnard, Development Engineer, understood the thought process and concerns but made note of some concerns. Primarily, if a dry sewer system is put in and the Sewer District doesn’t have a master plan, there is no way to know where the lines should go and may result in unusable piping. The alternative would be that if dry lines were put in and did not extend to the mains, they would result in the need for a pump station. He stressed that these issues needed to be addressed in advance since, without a master plan from the Sewer District, there was no reliable way to anticipate where to place the dry sewers.

Due to the need for expertise in this area, the Planning Commission stated an intention to get input from sewer experts, sewer districts and county sewer people in order to get some clarification to assist in the decision process. In the interim, it was acknowledged that this was a reasonable consideration provided the aforementioned issues could be resolved. In the event that sewer lines were placed after development, there was the additional consideration of how adding sewers would impact other utilities. Sewer lines are always the deepest utility, so after-the-fact sewer additions would require that all other utilities be pulled up so they didn’t fall into the hole and construction would be escalated substantially.

Property owners would be required to connect to a sewer line should it be within 200 feet of their property. It was stressed that when property had been divided into multiple lots, if a sewer line was within 200 feet or closer to any of the lots, all of the lots would be required to connect regardless of individual distances, based on Department of Engineering requirements.

In the event a dry sewer line was placed in a less accessible location to the trunk line, pump stations would be required. There are, however, some instances where the lay of the land all but ensures where the lines will run. Additionally, in the event the sewer lines were not in convenient locations to the trunk line and a pump station were required, all of the lines could be interconnected so that only one pump station would be necessary. When looking at the costs of dry sewer systems and potential pump stations versus putting the sewer lines in after development and other utilities are in place, the former would seem to be the most efficient method. Mike Gustavson pointed out that, even if the dry sewer line had to be abandoned to due extremely poor positioning, the cost would be minimal when compared to the potential savings in the majority of cases. In general it was agreed that the dry-sewer requirement would ultimately save the property owners a substantial amount of money.

Jim Barnard stated he just wanted to make sure they were aware of both sides of the situation.

The Planning Commission also noted that the County Commissioners had also committed to expanding broadband throughout the County and that perhaps this could be accomplished whenever development is occurring and ditching is available for
broadband installation with a minimal cost. This should be considered as a potential requirement, in addition to the dry sewer.

Kelly Robinson then addressed some additional revisions as follows:

Page 9. States that the Health Department has 75 calendar days to give preliminary approval, despite the fact that they already had soil logs at the beginning of that process. It was recommended that this was an excessive amount of time and that it be amended to 30 days. The 75 days had been an old standard developed when the Health Department had different capabilities, while the Health Department continued to be a critical link in the process. The majority of delays in short-plat approvals related to the Health Department approval process. The application requires that multiple reviews occur concurrently. It is reviewed by the Engineer, Health District, Planners, etc. and they are all working together. Kelly Robinson expressed no objection to the reduction in timeframe requirements, but would like to consult with the Health Department before imposing that burden on them. The general consensus of the Planning Commission was that decreasing the timeframe would force the Health Department to operate in a more timely and efficient manner. The two items that are required by the Health Department are soil logs (with soil provided at the beginning of the process) and confirming that, conceptually, the lots can be built on based on their size. The Planning Commission used the Building Inspectors as a good example of processing high volumes in a timely manner and felt that the Health Department should be encouraged to improve their processes accordingly.

Jim Barnard pointed out that the Health Department timeframe also tied in with the Director’s approval timeframe of 90 days; longer even than what the Health Department currently had. It was noted, however, that the Director’s approval generally was well under the allotted timeframe and that it generally applied to exceptional circumstances.

The general opinion within the Planning Commission was that the Department of Community Development operated in a timely, responsive manner. The Health Department, however, was deemed to be a major problem where they weren’t necessarily proceeding in as timely a manner as would be possible. It was felt that, with more pressure on them, they would find ways to expedite the process. With regard to the 90-day timeframe for the Director, it appears that two weeks was the normal timeframe and there was no need for revision in that area.

On possibility mentioned that could expedite the Health District’s process was increased access to information over the computer. Apparently, at this time, the Health District has limited access to all information and has not integrated that information fully into their process. The timeframe decrease was deemed another way to encourage the Health Department to take more advantage of the technology available to them.

Kelly Robinson did point out that there were other obstacles. He stressed that the Health Department already had a representative in Department of Community Development on a daily basis to improve communication and understanding of each group’s responsibilities, which had helped immensely.
The Planning Commission asked that Kelly Robinson consider options for streamlining the process and get back to them with suggestions. He indicated agreement and said he would also discuss the situation with the Health Department and get their input on the change in timeframes. The Planning Commission did not feel the Health Department should be consulted on the change as the presumption was that they would not voluntarily be put in a situation where they had to operate in a faster, more efficient manner.

A motion was made that Subparagraph 3 on Page 9-32 be changed to 30 calendar days for the Health District’s approval. There was no second. Chair Coppola asked for discussion.

The question was raised as to whether the Planning Commission had the authority to direct the timeframe change and it was clarified that this would only be a recommendation pending further approvals. If it was a recommendation, it was noted that the Health District could very well disregard it. Voting on a recommendation would not necessarily be more strongly received than a recommendation made by Department of Community Development. At this point Kelly Robinson noted that there would be other opportunities to discuss the situation once more information was available to the Planning Commission.

The next issue addressed was whether or not the aforementioned revisions would require another public hearing. Kelly Robinson stated they are not compelled to have one, as they had already had a public hearing and received testimony with further due process being met when the recommendations go to the Board of Commissioners. Due to all the revisions that were noted in the documentation, there should probably be another public hearing. It was stressed that if there were substantive changes to the document a public hearing should be required.

Kelly Robinson stated that if the language was going to be changed and there was going to be another public hearing, he would ensure that the Health District had a representative at the meeting to explain their reasoning. The Planning Commission would be given the opportunity at that point to make any other revisions after hearing from the Health District and the public which may lead to further revisions to the draft.

It was noted that the Board of the Homebuilders Association had the Health District provide reports at every board meeting. Essentially they didn’t provide any substantial information and seemed to avoid the point. Having them appear at the a Public Hearing might be beneficial in resolving many of the issues relating to their procedures.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion.

Vote: Aye: 3; Nay: 0; Abstained: 5; Motion carried.

Regarding Page 11, Kelly Robinson noted that there was a minor change. Near the top of Paragraph 1 it states “per sample below.” There is not currently a sample, but there
will be one provided as an attachment to the ordinance. Subparagraph 2, clarified standard scales relating to accurate measurements.

Page 13 clarifies that where there is a vegetation buffer of 25 feet and there were critical area setbacks/damp areas, there would not be an additional setback requirement in addition to the vegetation buffer. If the critical area is part of the buffer it is noted as part of the buffer and is not included in 15% critical area requirements.

Staff advised that Page 14, Subparagraph 2 was legally recommended to be included and, therefore, it was agreed that it would remain unchanged.

Clarification was requested as to what the road requirements were with regard to paved or unpaved. Storm water was noted as a potential consideration, but it was clarified that a gravel road surface is treated the same as asphalt for the purpose of storm water. General consensus was that road surfacing should be left up to the developer. With some discussion it was agreed that the wording should remain as it was; not making any specifications regarding road surfacing.

Whether or not the access road would be county or private was addressed. Kelly Robinson stated that the developers would need to state their intentions at the beginning of the process and receive approval if it were to be a county road. Additionally, it would have to be paved to meet the county road requirement. If it remained a private road, the only action on behalf of the county was to ensure that there was some sort of road maintenance agreement in place before a short plat could be recorded.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any further comments or questions. There were none.

At this point Staff were advised to schedule another Public Hearing. Laura Ditmer indicated she would work with Kelly Robinson with regard to scheduling and get back to the Planning Commission with a schedule at the next meeting.

Before the Planning Commission had the next public hearing, it was stressed that the matter of dry sewers and broadband be addressed so that it could be incorporated by Kelly Robinson into the language for review. Kelly Robinson stated that they were talking, basically, about putting two-inch pipe in the ground for each site.

With regard to scheduling of meetings, Laura Ditmer anticipated a public hearing would either be the end of April or the second week of May, with that being a tentative timeframe that would need to be worked out by Staff.

Additionally, the Planning Commission schedule was addressed. Staff proposed that there be a set schedule, possibly on the first and third Tuesday of each month or the second and fourth Tuesday. That would enable Staff to provide a timelier turnaround on revisions and other documentation between meetings. Any accepted schedule, however, would be affected by Spring Break in April when several key individuals
Based on some noted preferences, Laura Ditmer asked if the second and the last Tuesday of the month would work for the Planning Commission. That would still give Staff some time for processing necessary documentation. The first worked better for some, although the last would be difficult as it would only allow one week to process items before the next meeting.

Individual input from Planning Commission members was received with everyone being in agreement with changing the schedule. There was one vote for the first and third with the remainder not caring, so the meetings would be scheduled going forward for the first and third Tuesday with the exception of the first week of April, as previously noted due to Spring Break.

Next the upcoming schedule was addressed. There had initially been a public hearing scheduled in March but it was postponed to allow for more preparation. It has now been scheduled for April 8, the second Tuesday, at the Kingston Fire Hall. The Planning Commission would be provided with a revised schedule and meeting locations. There was also a work-study session scheduled for March 4 which would remain unchanged, occurring in Kingston in the morning.

With regard to meeting locations, Laura Ditmer stated that they were going to check on reserving a meeting room for the first and third Tuesday of each month and let the Planning Commission know the final outcome.

The Planning Commission confirmed that the second meeting in March would be on March 18. There was also a public hearing on ULID #6 which was scheduled for March 25 and could not be changed because there were some other meetings scheduled prior to that. The revised schedule implementation was anticipated after April 8.

A motion was made for approval of the minutes of December 3, 2002, which was seconded. There were no questions or comments.

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

A motion was made for approval of the minutes of January 7, 2003, which was approved. The motion was seconded. There were no questions or comments.

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

John Taylor of Tracyton Boulevard expressed his appreciation as he listened to the conversations and concerns of the Planning Commission. He also provided Lary Coppola, Chair, with a copy of his short plat showing that he had put in his own sewer line at his own expense over 600 feet. He also put in two 2-inch empty, high tech, broadband pipes in the ground and brought in his own gas line from Bucklin Hill Road down to Tracyton, over 600 feet. He put in curved roads with curved sidewalks all on public easements. Based on his personal experience, he felt that the sewer and
broadband requirements being recommended were reasonable and he supported their implementation.

The Planning Commission acknowledged and expressed appreciation for his efforts.

9:00 A.M.

BREAK CALLED.

- Study Session to consider The South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) development regulations

Lary Coppola, Chair, stated that the first order of business was a Study Session relating to the SKIA plan and asked who would like to begin the testimony.

Alice Strand for Department of Community Development stated that there had been problems with some of the mailings sent out to the Planning Commission members. She, therefore, provided a brief overview with further discussion to be postponed until the next meeting after the Planning Commission had the opportunity to review the materials in detail.

In September 2002 a business center ordinance was presented to the Planning Commission establishing a business center zoning category. There was also a master plan ordinance addressing all the master plan components approved in the South Kitsap Industrial Area plan. Those two ordinances were now combined in one document along with any other incidental ordinance revisions for the County. The referenced document included all of the ordinance revisions related SKIA. Since all the documentation was not available at this point for the Planning Commission’s review, the best point of reference would be the Table of Contents which covers all sections of the documents. The sections lay out the process for doing a master plan in South Kitsap Industrial Area, both for the applicant and Staff, and are the result of multiple meetings including Dave Tucker, Kelly Robinson, Rick Kimball and others.

Section 1 Master Plan is defined in this section using wording from other counties because the Kitsap County did not have a specific definition. Master Plan is defined as meaning “the comprehensive plan to guide the long term physical development of a particular area which has been prepared and approved pursuant to Chapter 17.415 of this Title.” William Matchett noted that, as written, the “which” mistakenly applies to the area, not the plan.

Section 2 Business Center classification is added to the approved list of zones for Kitsap County and is primarily a housekeeping issue. It was confirmed that it does not exclusively refer to SKIA; it relates to the master plan element. Although the document is called the South Kitsap Industrial Area Plan Implementation Ordinance, the Master Plan and Business Center zone could be applied throughout the County. That should be taken into consideration while being reviewed by the Planning Commission.
Section 3  Page 11 is the master planning chapter of the code and is very similar to
the one presented in September 2002. The most substantive changes are sections added
at the end:

Environmental Review.

Subdivision Areas: How the laws apply to those areas, when they can be
subdivided and how that works.

Duration of Approval for the Master Plans. Will there be a defined period
of time and how should that be addressed/amended?

New Business Center Zone, which is virtually identical to the version from
September 2002, establishing the Business Center Zone.

Table of Uses. In current zoning it is the Business Park and Industrial Use
Table. This addition includes a new column next to Business Center for
what uses are permitted outright, prohibited, etc. Underlined items
within the table indicate changes or additions from the previous table.
Footnotes within the table do not have the numeric portions superscripted
which leads to some confusion and Staff stated this would be corrected
along with any other revisions.

Section 6  The Master Plan is optional for industrial portions of the South Kitsap
Industrial Area under the South Kitsap Industrial Area plan unless that particular sub
basin crosses over the line into the Business Center.

Height regulations were also addressed as a housekeeping item. There are height
regulations related to industrial areas and the airport. There is an exception that allows
the height to exceed 35 feet with approval of the Fire Marshall. After meeting with the
Fire Marshall’s office, they requested that the wording be revised so that it was in line
with how it was actually implemented.

The fee ordinance is amended to add fees for the two types of applications that are
required with the master plan.

The last item is just adding those two types of permits onto the County permit list.

The Planning Commission requested that the wording at the top of Page 3 be revised
for clarification. It was suggested that it be broken into two paragraphs: sections that
require master planning and those that do not require master planning. Staff agreed to
revise this into two subparagraphs.

It was recommended that the fee schedule indicate a total and that it be compared with
other related tables to ensure consistency. Anyone planning a Type I Development
should be able to determine easily what the bottom line cost would be. The County was
asked to somehow incorporate a total into the table or related documentation.
Relating to fees, it was also noted that some of the fees were for third party review of the application. Someone paying a third party to review the application, should not be required to pay the county an additional fee based on the review for which he or she has already paid.

Alice Strand stated they could work with the current Planners and get more information regarding the process and reasoning on those fees. Additionally, these fees were based on an ordinance approved just a few months ago which was used when working with the Current Planners, Dave Tucker and Kelly Robinson, to develop the fee table.

The Planning Commission questioned the reasoning and definition of the $20 fee for “non disturbing activities.” Alice Strand believed that related to not disturbing the soil, but she would have it clarified by the Current Planning group.

Before proceeding to the next agenda item, John Ahl wanted to determine if the all-encompassing regulations/sub regulation Master Plan documentation related to the proposed final ULID #6 sub-area plan.

Alice Strand stated that they did. The master plan approval and process requirements will mesh together and be outlined and separated for ULID #6. Documentation to this extent had not been completed but, conceptually, the specifics for the master plan for South Kitsap Industrial Area and related ordinances would be applicable to ULID #6. The process will be the same, so they do intermingle, although there are some discrepancies that have not been worked out. The ultimate plan is for these two items to merge into one master planning document. Parts of that master planning document would be specific to ULID #6, or perhaps some other business center zoning. Those details had yet to be worked out.

It was confirmed that the intent of the Master Plan was for a developer to analyze the intended property to determine its greatest economic advantage and, within the County’s constraints, produce a proposal of how that would best work economically.

The Planning Commission requested clarification related to design guidelines and how detailed they would be. Laura Ditmer stated that the Sub-area Plans do dictate that design guidelines be worked out. In the case of SKIA, she believed that had to be accomplished within six months of adoption. The County is still working with SKIA and presumably the final details would be completed by the end of the year.

The Planning Commission asked if the pictures in the handout represented the level of detail that would be established. Laura Ditmer clarified that the handout was just providing a broad overview. Once the Planning Commission had reviewed it, they could begin working on what they realistically wanted in an Urban Village for design guidelines, as well as for urban medium and multi-family zoning. SKIA would come back with their own set of guidelines that are pertinent to the business center and industrial zones.
Alice Strand stated that normally in an urban plan there would be a higher density area like Residential or Mixed Use Urban Village type area, which would have more detailed design standards than those seen in a business park or business center.

The Planning Commission stressed that the developers should have some say because they are the ones who have to make it work. Alice Strand stated that was what was to occur in both cases.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none and the item was tabled until the next meeting when the Planning Commission would have received and reviewed corrected documentation.

- Study Session to consider updates to the proposed South Kitsap Urban Growth Area ULID #6 Sub-area Plan.

The background on the ULID #6 is that the Planning Commission had received the amendments to the Sub-area Plan with the amendments to the Code. Up to this point, at least until the last meeting, discussion had been about amending the code except for the design guidelines that are pertinent to that. Staff was now asking that the Planning Commission address the design guidelines at this meeting for further review. This will enable Staff to come back with an overall Sub-area Plan and documents for the whole package.

Clarification was requested regarding a newspaper report from the last Board of Commissioners meeting where it appeared that, rather than just addressing the Urban Village Center issue, the Board of Commissioners was addressing all of South Kitsap.

Laura Ditmer made a presentation at that Board of Commissioners meeting and was able to clarify the matter. Discussion related to how to move forward under the current Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Port Orchard and the County. The discussion set forth a three-phase process. Phase I is ULID #6. How to move forward from Phase 1 is what was agreed upon: to look at the remainder of those areas outlined in Phase 2 and 3 for the rest of South Kitsap. ULID #6 is still moving ahead and needs to be completed. The rest of South Kitsap as outlined in the MoA is what would be looked at next. There was no intention indicated at the meeting to go back and look at all of South Kitsap, just from this point forward.

The Planning Commission asked when they would get to see the map showing the Urban Growth Area boundary. Laura Ditmer stated that it was probably months away as the county needed to outline the tasks and the schedule for what was needed for the whole process. Then the committee would be brought together to work out for when the boundaries would begin to be outlined. Additionally, the process would have to wait for the population allocation for 2022 which would lead them into the fall before they could start making those adjustments.

The question was posed as to whether the entire population allocation could be lumped together for the County and then, as developments came on line, be disbursed. The reasoning was that there were a lot of planned developments that hadn’t happened and
may not happen for 20 more years, but they could lock up the allocation uselessly when it could be applied elsewhere. Laura Ditmer stated that the Growth Management Act requires them to do something along that line. The County is to plan in 20-year increments or blocks and the allocations are to be applied for those specified periods. An example was given, however, of how Bremerton had previously received a large allocation when, in fact, it had reduced in population and the allocation was unable to be utilized elsewhere. Laura Ditmer indicated that was being worked out between the City Directors and the County Directors to determine how to address the issue.

It was again recommended that the allocations be put into one pool with the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (with is comprised of the City and County Directors) doling out allocations to those areas as necessary. Laura Ditmer stated that pooling the allocations was not allowed by the Growth Management Act. The allocations could not be held onto with no action and drawn from at later dates. It was felt that this was what had occurred in Bremerton and Laura Ditmer again stated that the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council would have to address that and that it was her understanding they were actively working on it. Darryl Piercy was attending the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council meetings and she would obtain additional information as it became available.

Monty Mahan had also been attending the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council meetings and provided an update. It was his understanding that the Council was attempting to work out a resolution to the problem but was still unsure how to proceed. It was noted that at some point it might be reasonable for the Council to renegotiate the allocations if they weren’t utilized as planned, or again put into a general pool where whoever is ready to use it gets the allocation. Another suggestion was that there be a three-year window in which the allocation must be used. Laura Ditmer stated that would essentially negate the planning processes at a more intimate level. It was agreed by the Planning Commission that this subject was going to lead to some interesting discussions and hopefully suggestions over the coming year. Although the allocations under the Growth Management Act were supposed to be based on historical growth, that didn’t appear to be what was occurring. Laura Ditmer again noted that the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council was addressing these problems with the process and attempting to find an amicable resolution.

The Planning Commission restated the Bremerton situation where they pressed for their allocation even though there was no historical growth to support it and now have actually seen a reduction. Laura Ditmer stressed that the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council was aware of the problem and that by the time the 2022 allocations were made it was their intent to have those past issues resolved.

Lary Coppola, Chair, returned the discussion to ULID #6.

Laura Ditmer asked that the Planning Commission attempt to complete the proposed amendments to the zoning code by addressing the design criteria guidelines that start on Pages 11 and 23. She stressed that these were broad bookends that were not addressing the Sub-area Plan document. They involved proposed amendments to the Kitsap County Subdivision Code and Zoning Code.
As an example, Page 23, Section 354 at the bottom starts the design criteria for the Urban Village Center. Recognizing that this is a new development, the Planning Commission is being asked to set forth a section in ULID #6 to establish a concept for an Urban Village; noting that it is intended as an urban area, not rural. It should also be included in the consideration process that this could potentially develop into its own town. Recognizing that, the Planning Commission was being asked what type of guidelines they felt would be appropriate. The County has set forth a town/village center and green area as a central meeting place.

On Page 27, the location and use of centers and common open spaces are detailed as they relate to the urban village. It requires that there be one internal open space that serves as a center around which the commercial, retail and housing exist. From there the Planning Commission is asked to begin thinking about how they envision a village and what type of minimum standards they think would be required to meet that vision.

Laura Ditmer also stated that McCormick submitted some general language that hasn’t been reviewed or brought forth at this meeting, but it sets forth a character in ULID #6 similar to what currently exists in McCormick. That information would be addressed at the next meeting.

It was clarified that, as it pertains to the Urban Village Center designation, this would be part of the regular zoning codes. It was also clarified that whatever is ultimately agreed upon as part of the Urban Village Center should be appropriate through Kitsap County, not just applicable to ULID #6. Staff was therefore requesting that the Planning Commission determine what sort of minimum standards they would want to see with this type of application countywide.

Regarding Page 24, Residential Development, it was clarified that, by law, manufactured housing could not be prohibited from ULID #6. That situation could, however, be addressed as the master planning occurred for different areas. The proposals could specify how each use would be similar in design; similar rooflines, facades in some form or fashion. That could prevent a 5,000 sq. ft. home being placed next to a small manufactured home. It could be addressed as part of the master planning process. It was clarified, however, that there could be a trailer park in ULID #6 if it was put in the master plan and met the design guidelines, though that was unlikely.

Further detail regarding parking requirements was requested as it was not very specific in the current document. It was recommended that each residence should have three off street parking spots mandated, otherwise there would be no place for nonresidents (i.e. guests) to park if the street were completely taken up by residents. It was stressed that this three-car parking recommendation did not necessarily relate to how many vehicles the average resident might own, rather to the fact that the garage is frequently used for storage instead of parking. Without the extended parking requirement, streets would be lined with residents’ vehicles and no room for visitors.
Laura Ditmer stated that she did not have the code with her outlining parking requirements, but that she believed it was 435 sq. ft for parking. She would look into that and possible amendments, providing the information to the Planning Commission at a later point.

Another recommendation was that there be mandated storage underneath the homes, thereby enabling the garage’s use for parking. It was pointed out that having mandated storage space under the home would still not ensure the garage was used for parking and would not really address the parking situation. One member stated that in Florida it was mandated that all parking had to be screened, either in the garage or otherwise off the street. Parking on the street in front of the residence was prohibited. That would not, however, address the matter of visitor parking.

Page 27 was noted to use the term “shall” with regard to requirements and “should” for guidelines. The third guideline under Item B was not consistent with this pattern. Laura Ditmer proposed revising the wording to “consider surrounding” or “should.” The Planning Commission was not concerned as much with the exact verbiage as with ensuring there was a consistency in terminology; “shall” for requirements and “should” or “should consider” for guidelines. Staff agreed to amend the wording in this guideline to ensure consistency.

Laura Ditmer asked if there was anything that was of serious concern that they would like to discuss further, as opposed to reviewing it and discussing it further at the next meeting.

Further clarification was requested as to why a document written specifically for and around a single development was part of this; for that reason alone it could prevent a vote in favor. Some specifics were provided as examples, such as Page 5 (and throughout the document) when referring to densities, the documentation would state that the Urban Growth Area ULID #6 Sub-area Plan had a maximum number of residential units committed to the sub area until such time as further population allocations were made. This was not an expression of density and applied only to the specific project.

Laura Ditmer asked for suggested changes. One of which was that if the documentation was referring to densities, it should just be about densities, not going into details about a particular project.

Additionally, it was noted that in both documents, ULID #6 and South Kitsap Industrial Area, reference was made to South Kitsap Urban Growth Area. Clarification was requested.

Laura Ditmer stated that it was ULID #6 that led to the recommendation that there was, again, a need for consistency in terminology. This was of some importance since there were other parts of the Urban Growth Area in South Kitsap that were not part of ULID #6.
Laura Ditmer stated that the terminology had been used just to clarify the boundaries. Various other options were discussed for referring to the area. McCormick Woods was one of the options discussed, but that would refer to a specific development. ULID #6 encompassed more than just that one area. No decision was made regarding a change in terminology from ULID #6.

Page 23, Paragraph 060-A, related to a new height limitation of 45 feet. Some Planning Commission members thought that the limitation had been set at 35 feet based on input from the Fire Marshall. Other members clarified that they had actually requested the increase and that it was reflected accurately based on that request. It was then noted that it should be verified that the Fire Marshall was comfortable with this increase. Laura Ditmer stated she would obtain the Fire Marshall’s opinion prior to the next meeting. She also stated that it was her understanding that this increase pertained only to the Urban Village Center.

On Page 25, paragraph 010, the last sentence states that “nothing in these design criteria shall be construed to create a duty on the part of the County or its operatives, agents….. with respect to public safety and welfare of the users of these structures and surrounding....” Laura Ditmer stated that it was being taken out and should be put at the beginning of the Code and that it was a legal requirement. There was some confusion expressed regarding the precise meaning and intent of the term “duty.”

The Planning Commission also stressed that these materials were meant to be guidelines, not law. The Planning Commission did not want to get overly detailed with regard to the guidelines, but felt the County should be careful not to become too excessive with them.

Laura Ditmer referred the Planning Commission to the Requirements put together with the guidelines to consider how they hold up. The guidelines are just suggestions but may become requirements when everything is put in place.

The Planning Commission stated that they understood the need for zoning to have requirements. Guidelines should be another document that provided suggestions on how to meet those requirements. It was suggested that when the zoning code begins providing guidelines in addition to the requirements, it has become excessive.

It was also suggested that some of the requirements were possibly too rigid and would perhaps be more appropriate as guidelines. It would appear that the effort was to incorporate accepted architectural standards, with which anyone could find fault. What needed to be determined was what was wanted, as a minimum standard, for the county. There are requirements relating to required ornamentation to break up buildings and provide variety. This could be interpreted in many ways, many of which would not be considered aesthetic by the majority. Although there are a lot of requirements, they also leave a lot of room for personal interpretation and opinion.

Laura Ditmer agreed but stated that, at the same time, the goal was to provide all options to the Planning Commission and have them determine what they wanted to see as a minimum standard. A lot of items had already been removed and the County was
now asking the Planning Commission to review the material further to make further
recommendations as to what the minimum foundation should be for developing a
village center that could be applied throughout the county.

The Planning Commission stated that a lot of the material could be included as long as
it was clearly stated that it was intended as a suggestion, not a requirement.

Page 24 was referenced by Laura Ditmer, where it starts to outline everything in
particular, streets, centers, and open space. Those are all given as requirements based
on their location within the Urban Village Center. If there are things that the Planning
Commission feels should not remain or should not be listed as requirements, they
needed to provide that input to Staff so they could develop a minimum standard and
move forward.

John Ahl brought up the matter of gateways and focal points and whether or not a
section was necessary for these. Staff noted that, based on the Planning Commission’s
input, they could remove it, leave it in or perhaps find more appropriate wording. John
Ahl stated that he didn’t have a problem with gateways and focal points specifically, he
was just using those as an example of how the guidelines were possibly too extensive.

It was stated again that a lot was left up to personal opinions and therein was the
problem that needed to be resolved. It was also noted that there was a general feeling
that some of the language was ambiguous and difficult to interpret. Laura Ditmer
stated that the language was meant to be ambiguous so that when Master Planning was
done there was room for interpretation. The details may be a bit ambiguous, but by
their inclusion they ensure that certain, required areas are addressed in the Master
Plan.

An example of ambiguous language was the statement that internal street networks
must be pleasant. Who was to determine what “pleasant” was?

Laura Ditmer agreed and reiterated that what Staff needed from the Planning
Commission was what, specifically, they want in the Urban Village Center requirements
and recommendations. That question did not need to be answered at this meeting.
The Planning Commission needed to decide what type of village was going to be
created, what things they specifically object to and believe won’t work based on their
experiences in other areas; etc.

The matter of Public Hearings was brought up and it was noted that this was the first
time these issues had been addressed and were being worked through with the
Planning Commission. This meeting was a work study with the Planning Commission
with a public hearing to occur at a later date. The document would be addressed with
the Planning Commission with a Citizen Review Committee meeting scheduled for
March 20. Staff would be working with McCormick Land Company between now and
March 20, with a Public Hearing scheduled for March 25.

It was noted that, to date, Planning Commission members have not heard any
complaints about the content of the documentation so far, only complaints regarding
the slowness of the process for getting everything done. It was stressed among the
members that the Planning Commission should not attempt to interpret too much what
the public would want and what their problems would be. Perhaps there should be
minimal changes until there has been some input received from the public and then
they could proceed from there.

Reading materials relating to this meeting and the next were distributed. A lot of the
items that had been addressed were summarized on the one sheet that was distributed.

Laura Ditmer again reminded the Planning Commission that this wasn’t just about one
particular area. The Urban Village Center and its design guidelines were for the entire
county. The guidelines would be taken through Kelly Robinson’s process as he is
amending the Code and going through his other processes, recognizing the fact that
even though it pertains to a specific site at this point, ultimately it will be for the entire
county. It was noted that, at this time, there were no other areas utilizing this new
zoning; this was the first. The County would, however, also be looking at Silverdale,
Kingston, Keyport and other community plans. Over the next 4 or 5 years it is
anticipated there may be the opportunity to look at this Sub-area Plan in other areas.

The opinion was expressed that this Sub-area Plan was not feasible for other
communities and that they were dealing with boilerplate language that would need to
be adapted down the road for other communities.

Alice Strand stated that, based on her experience in other areas, these guidelines were
not outside the normal standard. They were very similar, in fact, to a lot of urban area
guidelines in place in Gig Harbor and Olympia.

Laura Ditmer stated that the guidelines were actually a combination of Olympia and
Mill Creek with revisions applicable to Kitsap County’s vision.

With regard to the comparison to Gig Harbor, it was noted that their development of
the Home Depot shopping center was an opposite of what was being presented at this
meeting.

Alice Strand stressed that the difference was that the Kitsap County plans were more
for a pedestrian oriented area, an Urban Village Center, versus a high traffic shopping
complex. It was noted by Mike Gustavson that most types of shopping is not done on a
bicycle or on foot, carrying home bags of items; most shopping is done with a car. In
some ways this appears to be an anti-car plan which doesn’t work with modern society

Laura Ditmer stated that Gig Harbor is intended as a big bucks type of development
that addresses larger needs, intending to draw extensively from outside areas. The plan
being presented here would be more for the immediate, daily needs of the
neighborhood.

Alice Strand stressed that, if Gig Harbor was being used as an example, downtown Gig
Harbor had urban design guidelines that were very different from those at the larger
shopping complexes. They would differ just as the South Kitsap Industrial Area design
guidelines would differ from the Urban Village Center concept that is being presented. They would be completely different with different intended usage. One Commissioner noted that the guidelines for downtown Gig Harbor were seven or more years old and that later development followed a different plan based on growth and changing requirements.

Laura Ditmer stressed that what the presented plan intended was to layout how streets would run relative to the buildings and surrounding residential neighborhoods. Then the plan would incorporate commercial retail areas in that proximity. To address Monty Mahan’s concerns, this is a countywide zone. Even though it will be going through Kelly Robinson’s process as well, it is ultimately going to come back to the comp plan amendment process and be adopted this summer. All the processes are occurring simultaneously, so nothing is being delayed; all the Sub-area Plans are going to be adopted at the same time.

Lary Coppola, Chair, questioned whether the standards were really too extensive and offensive. Based on his experience, there were communities that did take the details too far, with Scottsdale as an example where everything had to be in pink stucco. But at some point the County needed to have criteria that could be reviewed to make sure the intent had been met or that any variance from the intent was acceptable. He questioned who would have the responsibility for that review and determination.

Laura Ditmer stated that would be the responsibility of the planning staff, Public Works, Development Engineering, Environmental (Rick Kimball), the Fire Marshall and other agencies that might be impacted. All parties would review the proposed Master Plan, using the recommendations and requirements as a checklist to make sure all areas were addressed. Basically it would just ensure that the Master Plan addressed all required items beforehand. If there were items that were not addressed, the appropriate agency would point it out and indicate that the Master Plan needed to be amended to address the required item(s).

It was clarified that this was not designed to require a three dimensional set of plans with elevations, etc. It was instead a conceptual master plan. That was detailed and confirmed further in the Master Plan requirements starting on Page 55. Additionally, Page 62 addressed the scaled drawing requirements. Page 63 outlined how to modify the height of buildings and setbacks, actually allowing some deviation to modify the Master Plan according to the lot size, etc.

There was still concern expressed over whether the guidelines were appropriate and could be realistically applied. Laura Ditmer asked for recommendations on how to address those concerns and it was suggested that developers bring in a Master Plan that they felt was applicable and would work economically, without forcing requirements and guidelines on them, telling developers how they had to do the development.

Laura Ditmer asked if it was being recommended that there not be any guidelines regarding the Master Plan?
The concern wasn’t over having guidelines, but over the guidelines being too extensive. Although this concern was expressed, there was no specific alternative recommended that would satisfy all Planning Commission members as well as the numerous other parties involved.

Laura Ditmer stated that if fewer guidelines and requirements were desired, that was what needed to be indicated specifically by the Planning Commission. Since the Planning Commission had only received the documentation the day prior to the meeting, it was suggested that perhaps they review it in more detail and bring specific recommendations to the next meeting.

There was a comfort level expressed with how everything would apply to McCormick Woods, but there was some concern as to how it would apply to other areas of the county over the next 20 years. For some members, there was not as much concern over the amount of detail, but there was concern over unique developments that might occur that don’t meet these standards, but would still be interesting, beneficial additions to Kitsap County. It was unclear whether Kitsap County would benefit by having copies of the Urban Village Center or McCormick Woods throughout the county. The experience in California and other areas has been that individualized communities (comparable to the Urban Village Center) could be developed, allowing for variances while keeping a pleasant appearance and managing growth, as in San Diego County. The primary concern on this note was that the plan worked on a limited level, but might not project well throughout Kitsap County, causing replicates and a lack of uniqueness.

Laura Ditmer stated that she believed the concern might be related to Silverdale, which is already built out so that it would be difficult to envision this concept there. She understood the concern. If Old Town were considered as an example, where there is a park, historic buildings with street and back parking, it would not easily allow this type of planning. Perhaps one approach would be for the Planning Commission to think of the urban areas they liked to go to, considering what it was that they liked about those areas, or disliked. What was it that was unique about one area that made it more appealing? For those who did not generally go to urban areas, perhaps they could consider what might compel them to do so. Staff was asking that the Planning Commission get to that level where there are things they really agree on in a common way. A lot of potential guidelines had been presented with the anticipation that the Planning Commission would need to determine which ones would be appropriate as a foundation for building the communities envisioned for Kitsap County.

It was noted by the Planning Commission that in some cases the guidelines are actually a benefit to the developers, as they are not all architects and may not think beyond the cheapest cube type building with the most parking spaces possible, with Wheaton Way used as an example. The guidelines may encourage the developer to plan in a way that would result in a development more appealing visually. Additionally, the Urban Village Center concept would provide communities with the services they needed in that area. They may still choose to go out to the larger malls and such, but overall the convenience of this type of plan could be very beneficial.
There is always the potential problem that the Urban Village Center shops might not offer what was needed or preferred and people in the community would still shop outside that area. Since part of the intention was to reduce some of the automobile dependence, that could be a major concern. Additionally, it is frequently difficult for the smaller shops to compete with larger stores. Laura Ditmer stated that it depends on whether you’re considering a one-stop shop where it has other amenities to enhance what that one store may offer. Some of the Planning Commission expressed concern over whether the allotted 2500 sq. ft would be enough to offer sufficient variety in one store to accomplish that.

Laura Ditmer asked if the concern was the size, the design, or what it projects. In order to address the concern she would need more clarification.

It was noted that there are niche markets that have led to the success of a lot of smaller stores. If the store offers a unique enough product or service, people will be willing to drive a good distance for that product or service. The small store situation could lead to people coming into the community for shopping with residents driving out for the larger service areas. This could result in more traffic or could result in the success of the Urban Village Center.

Laura Ditmer also stressed that the shops were not the only point of the Urban Village Center. There would be a lot of open space, parks and areas for people simply to socialize and congregate.

At this point the Planning Commission wanted to know what the next step should be. Laura Ditmer said that the Planning Commission should first review the materials more closely. They would come back with the entire packages for South Kitsap Industrial Area and ULID #6, including Sub-area Plan amendments. The Planning Commission should also begin considering how to address Silverdale and how to start that process. That would be a short discussion, initially, at the next meeting. Enough time should be set aside at the next meeting, however, to cover ULID #6 in detail making necessary revisions so that it could be presented to the committee group, landowners and the combined revisions presented at the public hearing on March 25.

John Ahl asked if there was any way that ULID #6 could be removed from the countywide zoning ordinance. It seemed to him that everything seemed to be limited to ULID #6 because it was essentially being used as an experiment. Perhaps it should just be applied to that one area at this time and, if successful, applied countywide at a later date. Was there a legal way, while doing a Sub-area Plan amendment, to make it specific to just that sub area with parts of it potentially expanded later to other areas of the County.

Laura Ditmer expressed her confusion. A month ago she was advised that the Planning Commission wanted the County to be more general and to remove the ULID #6 language so that it could be applicable to the county.

John Ahl stated that modifications to the countywide ordinance should apply to ULID #6 but that there should be ways to not make ULID #6 modify the countywide
ordinance. He felt it should be a stand-alone document that deals with just this one
Urban Growth Area.

Another member confirmed Laura Ditmer's previous understanding that the County
had been asked to make the stand-alone document applicable to the entire county. The
problem, however, now seemed to be that the documentation had become too specific
for countywide application.

John Ahl stressed that he had not been inconsistent in his requests. His point was that
if you are going to make a county regulation, it should not reference a specific
development. If it is going to be tailored to a specific document, it should not be part of
the general regulation for the whole county.

Laura Ditmer did not feel that the document did not address a specific development
and would like further clarification so Staff could address that. In this process, as with
the South Kitsap Industrial Area, they developed new zones that would not otherwise
have allowed these types of development in Kitsap County.

John Ahl stated that Staff should remove every reference to ULID #6 and indicate that
there were guidelines should these types of developments occur in Kitsap County. If
the documentation were divested of all references to ULID #6 and the new items
separated, they would then have basic guidelines for a Mater Plan that could be
applicable to the entire county without seeming specific to one project. He also asked if
there were master plans for the other developments.

Laura Ditmer stated that, as an example, ULID #6 has a business park, an urban
city center, urban medium, and urban cluster, all of those within the boundary of the
master plan and that's where they've been referred to in these different designations.
The rest of the County, however, does not have to have a master plan. If you were
looking at just a business park elsewhere, there would be no need for a master plan.
Reference to ULID #6 is where specific requirements are provided indicating the need
for a Mater Plan.

John Ahl stated that was the part that should be part of the ULID #6 Urban Growth
Area Sub-area Plan, that it requires a master plan. Not part of the countywide zoning
regulations.

Laura Ditmer agrees but, since the ULID #6 was proposing new zones which are being
addressed as part of ULID #6 and zones for the County, they will be pulled out and
then implemented. Once the whole package is put together, it will have the Sub-area
Plan and will simply refer to the map that outlines those land-use designations. Then
in the code it will include those land use designations.

General consensus from the Planning Commission was that it would appear ULID #6
did have universal applicability by making it part of the zoning ordinance.

Some other concerns raised were that this would place a burden on property owners to
bring forth a proposal to the County, forcing the property owner to comply with what
might not suit their needs. There was still a concern that countywide regulations should not be tailored to other areas based on what was begun done on one property. It’s an issue of whether this should be under the auspices of a Sub-area Plan or applicable across the board to anybody who wants an Urban Village Centers in Kitsap County.

Alice Strand stated that when the South Kitsap Industrial Area was developed with the addition of business center zoning, there was so much positive input for its use through the county that it was made more universally applicable.

The Planning Commission agreed that was likely the case, but still felt the wording should stop referring to the South Kitsap Industrial Area or ULID #6. It should be master planned and simply be a countywide addition in designations and zoning.

Laura Ditmer stated that the land-use designations will be universal, but that the wording approved by the Planning Commission would be applicable to the South Kitsap Industrial Area.

Laura Ditmer clarified that it would only refer to the South Kitsap Industrial Area where it referred to the requirements for the South Kitsap Industrial Area Master Plan. If South Kitsap Industrial Area or ULID #6 were used in other places, the name would be changed, eliminating reference to either specific development.

Alice Strand said that, within South Kitsap Industrial Area, most mention of South Kitsap Industrial Area was only in specifically related portions, not in general zoning. This would be reviewed, however, to ensure consistency and for clarification.

The Planning Commission expressed their comfort with considering the ULID #6 Sub-area Plan, with McCormick Woods brought in along the way. There was still a concern with having the developments joined with countywide requirements and recommendations. Some Planning Commission members still expressed a desire to vote on them as separate items.

The Planning Commission also stressed to Staff that developers should be included in the process as they would be the ones most impacted by the decisions. Input should be solicited from both owners and developers. It was stressed that, although developer input was important, it should not be a deciding factor.

Laura Ditmer stated that, with regard to ULID #6 and its countywide application, she was only seeing references relating to densities and density limits for the master planning requirements. She asked if there were any other areas of concern regarding ULID #6 guidelines being applied countywide.

The Planning Commission indicated that they would need more time to review the material and see if there were other areas of concern. Although not all members objected to the pictures in the documentation, which were provided as examples, there were some members who asked that they be removed as they were not necessarily applicable.
Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if the discussion could be wrapped up.

Laura Ditmer wanted to make one more point: she verified that John Ahl was correct in that the Master Plan language referred specifically to ULID #6. As the documentation is merged, that language would be taken out as it pertains to the Master Plan requirements. Although other ULID #6 references appeared to be primarily density related, she would review the documentation to ensure consistency in all areas.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. There was none and he asked if anyone would like to entertain a motion for adjournment.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting and seconded.

(TIME?)

No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.
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