9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions

9:15 A.M.

January 28, 2003 Meeting Minutes Adopted

A motion was made and seconded that the Planning Commission approve the Minutes of January 28, 2003.

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

- Work Study review of South Kitsap Industrial Area.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that the first item on the agenda was to readdress the South Kitsap Industrial Area from last week and asked that Staff begin the discussion.

Alice Strand, Department of Community Development, began by noting that the previous week Staff had provided a brief overview of the Ordinance. The Planning Commission was being asked to provide direction on how they would like Staff to proceed, providing questions or additional recommendations.

Monty Mahan and Lary Coppola noted they would like Alice Strand to review the changes to date and then proceed with Planning Commission questions and comments.

Alice noted the last changes presented to the Planning Commission in September/October 2002 were as follows:

The process was initially set up as a Type II process. After review by Current Planning it was determined that it would be better suited as a Type III process. This decision was based on the permit status and type of permits required with the Type III versus Type II processes.
Lary Coppola, Chair, asked for a quick overview of the difference between Type II and Type III. Although Alice Strand did not have the Ordinance summary in front of her, Type II is generally an administrative process. A site plan review would be a Type II process, where it goes through the current planning staff at the Department of Community Development and is reviewed according to a defined set of criteria. It is approved or disapproved based on that, similar to a building permit. A Type II process does not go through a public review process, go before Hearings Examiner or the Board of County Commissioners.

Type III is one step up from that, such as a conditional use permit. It is more than just a set of rules to be followed. There are specific conditions that have to be met with a more extensive list of criteria. Master Plan Developments currently go through the Type III process. Examples would be the airport Master Plan and those types of smaller Master Plan developments. Alice Strand noted the other issues added related to the processes themselves, what the review process would be for a Master Plan because it is a fairly vigorous process.

It was noted that Staff had met with Assistant Director Dave Tucker and Kelly Robinson, both of whom had indicated that the Type III process was appropriate. Again, this was due to the Type II process being comparable to a basic building permit and having a less rigorous process. Some Planning Commission members noted that the building permit process could be considered rather rigorous, in itself.

Alice Strand agreed and noted that a minor site plan review is a Type II process. The areas being discussed were larger areas and the plan was that, as larger areas, and there are going to be more long-term impacts, such as traffic and parking. A lot of different departments need to be involved, such as the Parks Department, Health District and Public Works. It will also require review by the Hearings Examiner and a Public process to allow neighboring citizens to provide their input on the planning of a large development.

Deborah Flynn noted it was her understanding, although she had not had the chance to review the new version, that the Master Plan is Type III but follow-up permits would probably have a more streamlined process. Alice Strand confirmed this, noting that after the Master Planning process, there would no longer be a requirement for land use permits. The only notable permits would apply to grading, site clearing and any individual building permits that would come through.

Deborah Flynn confirmed the Master Planning phase would then be the only opportunity for public input, noting that seemed appropriate. Alice Strand noted there would be one large review of the entire site plan with subsequent impacts, etc. Any smaller individual permits would then go through either a Type I or Type II process.

It was pointed out that at the last meeting Paragraph 3 was considered to have been confusing and was supposed to have been clarified by Staff. Alice Strand noted that she had not made any of the changes from last week’s meeting and that all the revisions would be implemented from last week’s and this week’s meeting at the same time.
document before them was the same one as from the previous week, as the matter had not been closed and discussion was continued to this meeting.

Page 5, Paragraph 2, third line required a comprehensive analysis of storm water, including the basin, upstream basin and later the downstream basis. This was considered to be a rather excessive requirement. Staff was asked how a developer preparing a Master Plan could have any knowledge about an upstream basis without writing the Master Plan for that as well.

Alice Strand noted that Rick Kimball and Dave Tucker had added some of the language. She would get more information as to the reasoning and provide it to the Planning Commission. With regard to the downstream basin, everything flows downhill so that would have to be analyzed which was deemed to be reasonable. The question regarding upstream basins however, would receive further clarification and review. It was noted that Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4-F all related to basins and it was questioned whether the requirements contained therein were realistic.

Alice Strand noted some of it would be based on the Comprehensive Storm Water Management Plan, which is currently being prepared by a Consultant with the County and Bremerton National Airport. They would provide an analysis of the big picture with regard to the South Kitsap Industrial Area and the basin situation would be included as part of that. It was again suggested that Staff reevaluate those paragraphs relating to basins and determine whether they were possibly unrealistic.

It was recommended that Page 6 have an additional subparagraph “M” for mitigation of mosquito breeding areas to reduce the spread of the West Nile Virus infestation. There are ordinances in Kitsap County about tires filled with water; now we’re developing storm water collection basins that could very well be looked at in the same way. It was felt that this was a matter that should be addressed, as well. Alice Strand noted that Staff would review the matter, but that the State was also looking at different ways of approaching that problem. She would review where the State was in that regard and make appropriate revisions.

Page 9, with the first arrowed item, required bicycle parking facilities and changing areas to enable people to walk or bike to work. The South Kitsap Industrial Area was quite a distance from housing areas and, although possible, it was unlikely anyone other than the most aggressive bicyclist would ride a bike to work. Walking was even less feasible. Alice Strand directed him to the last sentence above the first arrowed item. It stated that it was intended to provide a broad list of potential transportation management strategies. It was not a requirement, only a suggestion for the developer to look at and determine what would be appropriate.

Another area that was questioned was the suggested subsidies or transit fares for carpooling or vanpooling. Alice Strand noted that the State required as part of the Commute Trip Reduction Act that every business with 100 or more employees provide some incentive for carpooling and transportation-demand management. It’s normally left up to the company how to provide those incentives. They could be financial incentives, such as a subsidy, or providing preferential parking for carpooling. There
was an objection voiced to subsidizing these kinds of activities and that they should be self-supporting. It was, therefore, recommended that the wording be revised to clarify that it was based on State Law. Alice Strand again stated that it was not a requirement, only a list of suggestions. It was still asked that the State Law be referenced as the reason for the suggestion.

Item 6 referring to rebates was also objected to, although there were no specific recommendations regarding alternative wording. Alice Strand noted Staff would review it and attempt to clarify the wording to make it more acceptable.

Page 10, Paragraph 1 in the middle, under Section 4-15-300 appeared to need some clarification, possibly by having the standards defined. Alice Strand agreed to address that matter and attempt to clarify it further.

Page 10, Section 4-15-400 was noted to have been previously addressed by the Planning Commission. It was questioned how a company could be required to provide 60% of their jobs at average or higher wages. Alice Strand noted that per the Planning Commission and South Kitsap Industrial Area group the wording was revised to “shall strive” as part of the economic development. It’s not a requirement, only a goal. It was felt that it still read as a requirement and should be better clarified as an objective. It was noted that a lot of industries would not be able to compete with a requirement like that. If global competition were taken into consideration, that type of requirement could completely prevent a company from operating in a competitive manner.

Page 11, Paragraph 3, Design Standards: Staff was asked who would write the standards. Alice Strand noted there is a part of the plan that covers that. The South Kitsap Industrial Area and Kitsap County will work together to develop the Design Standards within six months of adoption of the plan. It was suggested that this should be included in the document. Staff noted the document before the Planning Commission was meant to be a broad document, applicable to any area, not just the South Kitsap Industrial Area. There was existing wording stating, “Master Planning shall adhere to any design standards adopted as a requirement of the sub area in which the development is located.” Some sub areas may not have any design standards and, in that case, there wouldn’t be design standards associated with the Master Plan.

It was pointed out that the Planning Commission had addressed the issue of a 10-year sunset law in the industrial plans and that it seemed arbitrary and/or awkward. Alice Strand noted there had been approximately six meetings with current planning and others covering that very issue. It was agreed that there would be a ten-year time frame, with five-year extensions allowed thereafter, if necessary. Each extension, however, would require review by the Hearings Examiner to ensure there had been no substantive changes in standards since the previous approval. Since there were certainly going to be circumstances where the entire process exceeded ten-years, yet no way to anticipate how standards might change during that period, this was an attempt to cover that potential situation from both angles. It was also noted that the County LAS System would be used to track the ten-year period and any subsequent extensions, just as it was currently used to track building permits.
Page 16 at the top, Subparagraph B, appears to have conflicting information regarding setbacks. Initially there is reference to a 75 foot setback in Residential Zones. Further down, three lines from the bottom of the same paragraph it states that in other cases minimum site setbacks can be 20 feet. Subparagraph F states you can put up a fence, wall or hedge. If you’re going to put a wall or a hedge along your property line, what would the benefit be of requiring an additional setback of either 20 or 75 feet?

Alice Strand noted that most of the site requirements came out of the existing zoning code for either Business Park or industrial type uses. Subparagraph B is specific to properties abutting a residential zone, where you might have a heavier industry, such as manufacturing or some other industrial use, next to a residential development. Those setbacks would be to provide some screening and buffering from noise or any other impact the industrial use might cause. The option of fences or hedges is to allow some flexibility while still providing a good buffer, depending on the type of industry. If noise were the concern, a fence or wall might be more appropriate; visual impacts could be handled more appropriately with a hedge or other landscaping as the buffer.

Mike Gustavson noted that it seemed excessive to require a wall as a noise buffer, then also require landscaping requirements for setbacks in addition to that if noise were the primary concern. If it were in industry that involved trucks coming and going, what purpose would the additional landscaping requirement serve. Alice Strand asked that she be allowed to review the paragraphs in question, compare them with current codes to determine what the intention was and provide better clarification at a later date to the Planning Commission members.

William Matchett also noted that the final sentence was worded in a way that seemed to indicate a prohibition on manufacturing fences. He suggested the wording be revised to “fences may not be around or in the required public right of way.” Alice Strand asked if changing the wording to “located” was acceptable. William Matchett agreed but also felt “around” should also be noted for better clarification.

Page 16, Subparagraph A, required 150% bonding of the gross labor relating to landscaping. The question was posed as to why this was not simply 100% of the cost. Alice Strand stated that she believed this was the standard used for bonding and would research the matter further to determine the precise reasoning. The Planning Commission noted that there was no reason they could determine for the bond covering more than the cost of the job with Alice stating she would obtain additional information on the reasoning behind the 150% requirement.

The question was posed as to whether the building could be occupied before everything was finished, in which case there shouldn’t even be a need for a bond. Staff clarified that there were two options:

1. All work could be completed, including landscaping, in which case an Occupancy Permit was issued without the need for a bond.

2. The building was complete but landscaping had not been completed, possibly due to seasonal planting requirements (i.e. planting shrubs in the Fall when they are
dormant). In that case, if the bond were provided, an Occupancy Permit would be
issued so that the business could proceed. Laura Ditmer noted that seasonal planting
constraints often were an issue and that this had specifically been addressed with the
South Kitsap Industrial Area group, noting that buildings might be ready to occupy but
landscaping couldn’t be completed due to the season.

It was noted that the bond was a sort of guarantee of good faith to complete the
required landscaping. There had been instances when an Occupancy Permit had been
issued with assurances to the County that the landscaping would be completed when
appropriate, only to have it left incomplete. The bond ensures this would not occur.
Mike Gustavson noted that the bond made sense, but he maintained that it should still
be only for 100% of the cost. Alice Strand noted she would check on the reasoning and
see if it could be revised.

Clarification was requested with regard to the difference between a Business Park and
Business Center. Alice Strand noted that generically a Business Center is meant to be a
larger area than a Business Park. It’s also meant to be more of an employment
generator; almost a small business incubator in some ways. With a Business Park you
have to have a minimum lot sizes of seven acres. A Business Center, however, does not
have a minimum lot size. It would allow businesses to start with a smaller investment
in the land, such as a small manufacturer. Additionally, Laura Ditmer noted a Business
Park has restrictions that do not apply to a Business Center, encouraging more
innovative approaches. Based on that, Mike Gustavson questioned why Page 19
specifically prohibited storage facilities in Lines 3, 15 and 18 within a Business Center.
If the site plan review was intended to be more flexible, why would it prohibit these
applications? Staff noted that the primary reason was employment. Large cold storage
plants and mini storage facilities would provide a minimal number of employees. A
Business Center was designed to provide for larger employment centers.

It was clarified for the Planning Commission that a significant difference between a
Business Park and Business Center was the encouragement of higher density
employment. Laura Ditmer noted that they were trying to avoid those businesses that
would provide building storage for businesses, but not provide jobs for the county.

Alice Strand also noted that the type of permits, which were discussed earlier, were
different for Business Parks and Business Centers. With a Business Park, for example,
there would have been a Master Plan review with many uses that might require a site
plan review or conditional use permit.

Page 26 refers to the cost of permitting but when compared to the Tables on Pages 24
and 23 there appeared to be a number of permit activities that were not listed in the
Fee Schedule. Alice Strand noted the Fee Schedule had just been readopted and Dave
Tucker had the information on that adoption process. She was unsure why there were
activities missing but would check into it to determine if they had been consolidated or
needed to be added to the table. The Planning Commission noted the list of permitted
activities on Page 26 should be consistent with the Tables on pages 22, 23, 24 should be
consistent. If there is no fee or an activity was consolidated into another fee, it should
be indicated on the table. Alice agreed and noted she would review and make changes as necessary.

William Matchett requested that Fees on Page 24 under Public Works regarding Oversize Vehicle Permits should specify if that was per vehicle or per project. Alice noted she would find out which was the case and have it clarified accordingly.

John Ahl noted that it had earlier been mentioned that the document was not designed exclusively for one project. There was reference on Page 3 where the South Kitsap Industrial Area was used as an example, which shouldn’t be a problem. On Page 15, 13-365, Master Planning Required, there are references to the South Kitsap Industrial Area that should be removed. Staff agreed and noted that would be cleaned up. Additionally, Laura Ditmer noted that when the South Kitsap Industrial Area and ULID #6 were melded together, all inappropriate, specific references would be removed.

John Ahl noted on Page 17 under Performance Standards, Paragraph C states smoke and particulate matter air emissions must be approved by the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Authority. He suggested that the wording be revised to indicate “must meet standards established by the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Authority.” Otherwise it reads as though the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Authority would be required to check every business individually.

Additionally, on Page 17, Paragraph D prohibits the emission of noxious gases in a manner or in such form as to be objectionable at any point beyond the property line. John Ahl asked that this be clarified. There were a lot of setbacks and barriers relating to noise and visual impact, but noxious odors would be a different matter entirely. Alice Strand noted she would look into that further and see if this could be meshed with the pollution issue.

William Matchett noted on the Administration page there was a hyphen that didn’t belong. It came over from a section where it made sense but it didn’t make sense in the final sentence.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if Alice Strand had any other changes to review with the Planning Commission. She noted that the other changes were basically the addition of the Sections relating to Process on Page 12 under Section 4-15-600. Staff held about six meetings with the Current Planning Division and started out with a broad outline. Staff then filled in the gaps, met with the environmental group, the Fire Marshall’s office and various other departments. Most of the County’s offices had reviewed and agreed to the process. Additionally she distributed a diagram that clarified it further.

Lary Coppola, Chair, clarified that the portion that said “Department of Community Development issues of incompleteness within 45 days...” was referring to incompleteness on the part of the application. He then asked how long the applicant had to complete the process after the 45 day period. Alice Strand noted that was left open because the Master Planning itself would be done by the Applicant. Staff had attempted to ensure the Applicant had as much time as was necessary to do a good job at meeting the criteria for the Master Plan. The completeness and incompleteness
wording as it related to the Master Plan acknowledged that it would be a fairly lengthy document. With the analysis and various steps involved, it could take a while for Staff to ensure all requirements were met. The 45 day limit was intended to allow for that process. The technical review of the Draft Master Plan goes into three specific timelines in the Land Use and Procedures Ordinance. It was noted that the timeframe was 120 days from Notice of Completeness. The 45 days was established as a separate step from Notice of Completeness and was not included in the 120 day timeframe. It was also clarified that all timeframes referred to calendar days and were maximum limits; the process was not required to take the entire amount of time allotted. At the end of these processes there would then be any subsequent applications for site development and building permits consistent with the Master Plan.

Appeals of the Hearings Examiner’s decision for a Type III Master Plan process was noted to be the same as any other Type III appeal. The amendment processes are also comparable with the Hearings Examiner comparing the plans to current standards.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other items to address with Alice Strand regarding the Master Plan and that the Planning Commission had no other questions or comments.

Laura Ditmer verified there would next be a Public Hearing on March 25, 2003 from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Givens Center. The Public Hearing would address the South Kitsap Industrial Area and ULID #6. Both items would be addressed separately to avoid confusion. It was noted that the end-time of the Public Hearing was established based on availability of the technical staff who would be video taping the hearing. The Planning Commission noted that was not necessarily a sufficient reason to limit the length of a Public Hearing.

Deborah Flynn asked for clarification of what would be addressed at the Public Hearing. Laura Ditmer noted that they would only be implementing ordinances, not the Subarea Plan. They would not be going over the ULID #6 plan in its entirety, just looking at changes that had been made since last year. Essentially the purpose was to address additional policies.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if the Planning Commission would be able to give final approval on these matters immediately following the Public Hearing. Laura Ditmer noted they could unless they determined a need to modify the documentation after the Public Hearing. Either that or the Planning Commission could continue the matter to the next work study session.

Lary Coppola, Chair, expressed his desire to hear Public Testimony, make any revisions and get the matter approved so they could move on to other items. Deborah Flynn pointed out that the Planning Commission usually received written comments at the Public Hearing and they would need time to review those before a final decision.

Lary Coppola, Chair, stressed that there was an extensive amount of work to get done in the coming year with regard to the Comprehensive Plan and he would like to resolve as
many items as possible to ensure they completed the Comprehensive Plan work in time for it to be implemented for 2003.

It was verified that the Planning Commission was not legally required to receive written testimony after the Public Hearing. John Ahl asked if the Public Notice regarding the March 25 hearing specify that written comments had to be provided no later than March 20. It was agreed that this could be done, but that it was still likely they would receive written comments at the Hearing itself. Laura Ditmer recommended perhaps it could state written testimony would not be accepted after the 25th, since it was almost assured that handouts would be distributed at the meeting by some of the public. John Ahl noted his intent was to truly limit the 25th to oral testimony with an earlier cutoff for written testimony, which would allow the Planning Commission to review any materials prior to the hearing and potentially make a decision immediately after the Public Hearing.

One suggestion was that the Notice be worded that “written testimony is desired prior to March 20, 2003.” John Ahl stated it should say that “written testimony would not be accepted after March 20, 2003.” Laura Ditmer proposed “the deadline for submitting written testimony is March 20, 2003.” William Matchett noted that would be confusing to those people who often distribute handouts of what they say at the Public Hearing. It was noted that they could submit them anyway. The point of making notice of an earlier deadline for written testimony was that it gave the Planning Commission a legal basis if they wanted cut public testimony off and make a decision on that date.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted they didn’t necessarily want to cut public testimony, they just don’t want to be dealing with it after the Public Hearing. The point was restated that they can’t receive, read and understand thick documents written by lawyers that are submitted on the night of the public hearing.

Deborah Flynn recommended that, in order to ensure they could review all written testimony in its entirety before making a decision, they postpone any decision until the next work study. She further noted that the timeframe allowed was not sufficient for a Public Hearing, let alone to review documents received at the hearing. She noted that Staff generally provided a 15-20 minute presentation, which only allowed just over an hour for all public testimony. For those individuals coming from North Kitsap, they were going to be driving an hour to attend the Public Hearing. She asked that the meeting time be extended to ensure there was enough time to receive public testimony without the need for a continuance, and that the Planning Commission make a decision at the next work study session.

Laura Ditmer noted that they would try to work that out from the technical/television schedule and see if they could get the end time changed to 8:30 or later. Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if the television crew were truly essential to the meeting. Was there a reason why public testimony could not be taken without the television crews?

Laura Ditmer noted they would work that out and would come up with some type of resolution. The meeting would, therefore, be scheduled to last until 8:30 or 9:00.
Lary Coppola, Chair, verified that, after the Public Hearing, the Planning Commission would receive all Recommendations and Findings at their next work study. Additionally, he recommended they go through the meeting schedule once more to ensure everyone had the correct dates.

Staff verified that the next meetings were scheduled for April 8 and April 15. From that point forward the meetings would be held every first and third Tuesday of each month.

Lary Coppola, Chair, clarified that April 8 was to be a Public Hearing and that the next work study was April 15, which was when they could work on the Recommendations and Findings.

Deborah Flynn requested clarification regarding the change from the first and last Tuesday of each month. It had been her understanding that was to be the schedule as it allowed two week vacations and, generally, a longer time period for scheduling other items between the meetings without risking being absent from a meeting. She noted that the schedule was part of the bylaws and required a vote to be changed. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that they had voted on the revised schedule at the last meeting, although she had been absent at the time.

Laura Ditmer noted the primary reasoning for changing the schedule was that the old schedule allowed Staff only one week to turnaround materials for Planning Commission review prior to the next meeting. It ultimately led to Staff and the Planning Commission operating a month behind with regard to documentation and review. One week, between the last and first Tuesday of each month, didn’t provide enough time. Document preparation and revision was being delayed and preventing projects from moving forward in a timely, efficient manner. The process would always be in tandem. In addition to addressing ULID #6 and the South Kitsap Industrial Area, the Silverdale area was going to be addressed. Operating week-to-week did not allow Staff enough time to produce the materials the Planning Commission required for their review at each meeting.

Deborah Flynn stated she understood that and possibly the turnaround issue is more important than potential absenteeism.

Lary Coppola, Chair, again verified the schedule as having a Public Hearing on April 8 for Kingston at the Fire District and then a work study with review of Findings on April 15. Laura Ditmer also noted there was an Open House in March and she would advise the Planning Commission of the date.

William Matchett noted he would be out until May.

- Work Study review of **Silverdale Subarea Planning, Phase I**.

Laura Ditmer noted they were starting with the Existing Conditions Phase of the Subarea Planning with the intent to work on the Subarea Plan through the end of the year. Staff would cover the objectives of the first phase: what Staff intended to
produce, the intended process and the composition and role of the Citizen’s Advisory Committee as part of the planning for sub areas.

Laura Ditmer went on to review the materials presented to the Planning Commission. The first page, Objectives, covers the compiling of information for Staff. This includes bringing together the different maps, looking at the infrastructure, the environmental issues, different facilities, transportation, etc. This information would be put together so Staff can start looking how it applies to the current Urban Growth Area boundary. The first phase is really about looking at the area in its current context. After that Staff could begin looking into the expansion, land use, boundaries, etc. Staff would look at building an initial foundation, look at revision plans, review what the community wants and start putting all of that together.

The second page of the Silverdale Subarea Plan is very similar to what was done with the ULID #6 Subarea Plan, integrating GIS. Staff will go through the same land-use, population, urban design, transportation, public facilities and environmental protection issues. They can then develop all the goals and policies for this particular area.

The next page pertains to the Citizen’s Advisory Group. Staff will be working with this Group to create alternatives and looking at the listed conditions to help identify a preferred plan alternative that will serve as a basis for the Silverdale Subarea Plan. Staff, therefore, requests the Planning Commission’s guidance on forming the Citizen’s Advisory Group to ensure appropriate representation. The initial thought was that 13 was a manageable number; anything much larger makes it harder to reach a consensus and potentially extends the process. Larry Coppola, Chair, noted that’s why Manchester took so long, with that group being composed of approximately 40 people.

William Matchett asked where the Central Kitsap Community Council fit into the plan. He noted it seemed like they kept putting together groups whose input was then just set aside with a new group started. Laura Ditmer noted that the Central Kitsap Community Council was charged by the County to develop the Vision Plan, which they had done over the past year. The Vision Plan did not include specific policy or technical analysis. It represented what the Central Kitsap Community Council envisioned for the community over a 50-year period.

Staff was now taking a portion of that Vision Plan as it applies to a 20-year Subarea Plan and looking at implementing policies. The Vision Plan established by the Central Kitsap Community Council would not have a more detailed analysis to determine how to support that vision. William Matchett asked if the Citizen’s Advisory Group would now have to be convinced to accept the Vision as proposed by the Central Kitsap Community Council? Laura Ditmer noted they would be working with the established Vision, with the policies and analysis to now include a broader representation of the community. Staff would be looking at including the Chamber of Commerce, the Port of Silverdale, developers and environmental interests that would offer a diverse view. William Matchett thought all those groups had been involved in the Central Kitsap Community Council. That led to the question as to why the Central Kitsap Community Council was being dissolved and a whole new group being created.
Laura Ditmer noted that the Central Kitsap Community Council had been charged by the County to develop the Vision Plan. It was always the intent that the Vision would then be presented to other groups within the community. William Matchett noted that the Central Kitsap Community Council thought they were representative of all parties. Laura Ditmer noted that Kitsap County made it very clear that it was Central Kitsap Community Council’s ownership with regard to the Vision. However, once the process moved into the Subarea Planning, Kitsap County would take it out to other groups within the community.

The conversation then returned to the recommended size of the Citizen's Advisory Group. John Ahl agreed that anything over 15 people in a committee was difficult to work with and reach a consensus; however, larger groups are like democracy. They aren’t very efficient and often take longer than they should. Experience shows, however, that out of that comes the greater ultimate consensus and less criticism for excluding certain voices in the process. He is all for efficiency but thinks the reality of planning in Kitsap County is that the doors should be open to allow as balanced representation as possible.

Laura Ditmer agreed. That was the point she wanted to make with broadening the composition. She agreed that a larger group would take longer. If that’s understood in advance by the Planning Commission and all involved parties, that would be fine. William Matchett noted that it might take longer but would be healthier in the long run. John Ahl noted it would be more difficult working with a larger group, but it allowed all parties to feel they were represented.

Laura Ditmer then asked with the Planning Commission to provide further direction to Staff on how to proceed with the Citizen's Advisory Group.

Lary Coppola, Chair, first noted that there should be Planning Commission members in attendance. It was agreed that the process would probably take at least one year. At that point, Richard McConaughy noted he would be moving to California before the end of that period and, therefore, should not be a participant.

Monty Mahan noted that, although he was from South Kitsap, he had been on the Central Kitsap Community Council for a great deal of the process as a county employee. He volunteered to attend the meetings and be involved in the Citizen's Advisory Group process.

Mike Gustavson noted that he had been to 1 or 2 of the meetings in Silverdale and that he would be willing to participate. It was agreed that primary stakeholders should also be represented.

Laura Ditmer recommended that, when looking at the Chamber of Commerce, they should ensure there was also a representative from Old Town. Additionally, any representatives should be ones who would relay information to other retailers and Old Town groups, rather than just representing them.
The role of the Planning Commission members who would attend was clarified as well. It was determined that they could either attend as a Planning Commission member, in a nonvoting, unbiased capacity, providing input on past Subarea Plans, legal requirements, etc. Or, if they were to become voting members of the Citizen's Advisory Group, they would then have to recuse themselves from voting on the Planning Commission. Monty Mahan stressed their role should be very clear. He expressed a preference for attending as a representative of the Planning Commission; as a nonvoting attendee of the Citizen's Advisory Group.

Laura Ditmer confirmed they would serve as an ex officio. Monty Mahan confirmed he was comfortable in that regard, but it should be clear what the Planning Commission members’ role was and the consequences of that role.

Deborah Flynn noted that two Planning Commission members attending the Citizen's Advisory Group meetings should be sufficient, with other Planning Commission members agreeing. The purpose was to attend the Citizen's Advisory Group meetings and bring the information back to the Planning Commission. Ostensibly the Planning Commission member could also provide advice to the Citizen's Advisory Group as to how matters had been handled at various other locations and discuss legal issues that had been raised or resolved elsewhere.

Lary Coppola, Chair, confirmed that it was Monty Mahan and Mike Gustavson. At one point it was recommended that Richard McConaughy’s replacement be included, but Deborah Flynn pointed out any new member would have enough material to review to get caught up, without that added responsibility.

Laura Ditmer asked that the Planning Commission continue on the suggested composition. A list had been provided and the Planning Commission was asked for any areas they thought had been missed or for any general suggestions.

- Lary Coppola noted the Mall was included and that Dan Engelhard the Manager of the Mall, would be a good person to include.
- Lary Coppola confirmed that, with regard to the Chamber of Commerce, they should ensure at least one person representing Old Town, as well as the general retail community.
- Tribes were listed and deemed to be self-explanatory.
- Local Environmental Organizations and Agencies should have a couple of people included. Clear Creek was proposed.
- Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners should be added.
- Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any other groups to include; specifically if there were any thoughts regarding cultural organizations. It was noted that there was a museum in Old Town and may be an Historical Society.
• Neighborhood Organizations should be looked into with the suggestion that there might be a Ridgetop Neighborhood Organization.

• It was noted that a lot of the groups mentioned appeared to represent business interests and didn’t really include general people who resided in the area.

• The School District was noted for possible inclusion.

• Representatives from a technology group, such as West Sound Technology Group or someone from the Telecom Committee; although those might overlap with the Chamber of Commerce.

Laura Ditmer noted that the Comprehensive Plan amendment process would occur on an annual basis, say from January to July every year. All Subarea Plans would have to go through that annual process. In order to meet those timeframes, the Citizen's Advisory Group would likely have to plan on having meetings on a weekly basis, rather than every other week. The process would have to be condensed if the group were larger in an attempt to complete the process within the allotted timeframe. If the Subarea Plan for Silverdale were not completed in the appropriate time frame, it would mean postponing it to the next Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle, the following year. Either the meetings could be condensed or the process could be approached with the intention of waiting a year and going into 2005 for adoption.

Laura Ditmer noted that part of that, also, depended on each Planning process and how it evolves. It may be necessary to take it through a lengthier process due to more complex, unanticipated issues. It still would have to be looked at as a 2004 or 2005 process. Looking at the anticipated project schedule the meetings could start in April. In the meantime Staff would be doing all the listed items, contacting the appropriate groups. In April the Citizen’s Advisory Group would start the meetings, anticipating two meetings in April and possibly four meetings in May. If they have to add more meetings, that would be addressed as needed. Phase I should be taken through July before actually getting into the draft and Subarea Plan objectives, goals, policies, etc.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any questions. One Planning Commission member asked how the Manchester program had ultimately resolved. It had been a difficult process and it was asked whether they had reached a consensus, did they vote or how did the issues get resolved. It was noted that everything was decided by voting and that it had taken a year to decide just where the boundaries were going to be. That was noted as one of the problems with having so many people involved in the process.

It was noted that the problem with a smaller group, such as 13, it could easily be dominated by specific interests. That had occurred in the past leading to results that were unacceptable and ultimately rejected, with specific reference to the Charter Process.

It was agreed that it was better to do it right and ensure everyone was represented as well as possible so that any agreement would hopefully reflect the interests of the
community. The challenges may take them to a later date, but it would truly represent a consensus. Deborah Flynn noted that when Manchester came to the Planning Commission, it seemed like the majority was in agreement. Although the process had gone on for over two years before reaching the Planning Commission, it appeared to have been done right and had not, ultimately, been challenged in court.

Another member noted that part of the delay with Manchester was that specific individuals kept bringing the same items back to the table because they didn’t like the consensus reached by the rest of the group. This “readdressing” of the same issues slowed the process down considerably. It was noted that at least once the consensus was reached it was legal and not legally challenged. It was also noted that the delaying members eventually got tired of being told no and let it resolve.

It was also brought up that there were a lot of individuals in Manchester who didn’t understand what was occurring until after it was done. Unfortunately, that will happen even with extensive efforts to advise everyone. In the end there always seems to be a group or groups who feel they were left out and either challenge it through the courts or begin a “stop government encroachment on your rights” type action; even when they didn’t participate in the process when the opportunity was presented.

The Planning Commission agreed it was not an efficient or easy process. The bottom line, however, was that it works if they try to have as many interests as possible represented. Part of the problem with Manchester was that there was no specific targeting of stakeholders to ensure balanced representation. That should be considered when compiling the Citizen’s Advisory Group; try to make a focused effort to represent various organizations as well as citizens at large.

Laura Ditmer then asked the Planning Commission if they were making a recommendation as to the size of the group. If it were left wide open as to “citizen’s at large” you could get 20 or you could get 70.

Deborah Flynn recommended that they begin by determining who would want to participate, particularly if it had an aggressive schedule. They should also make an effort to involve residents in the area who did not necessarily represent any one group; just ones who were interested in the community. Perhaps that should be limited to 3 or 5 in addition to the targeted groups.

Laura Ditmer verified that the Planning Commission’s intent was that the Citizen’s Advisory Group be made up of individuals who resided in the area of Silverdale and the immediate vicinity. The Planning Commission preferred excluding the North and South parts of Kitsap County from participating in Silverdale planning.

Monty Mahan noted that they did a very large scale survey project in the Silverdale area when he was still there. As part of that, they split Silverdale into four distinct areas. As part of that process, it was found that there were fairly substantial differences of opinion from each area. He recommended that the Planning Commission consider looking at it in a similar manner when getting citizens in the group. Perhaps look at the four areas previously used for the survey project: Central, West, Northeast and
Southeast. By getting one representative from each of those areas, they could keep the number manageable but still provide representation for the individual interests of each area.

Kingston’s Planning Group was noted to be similar in that it included various individuals who were not associated with any given group. Monty Mahan again noted that when divided into areas, the difference of opinion was substantial, as was the case with Kingston. It was important that they at least attempt to have those differences represented for Silverdale.

Laura Ditmer confirmed that the understanding was they may just bump this first process out longer as it shakes out in the group. The Planning Commission note that perhaps they could also look at the list of recommended members and determine if they really represented a significant interest in the process. It was questioned whether the Port of Silverdale was really necessary, with Laura Ditmer noting they had an interest all along in shoreline use. They had not been involved in the earlier stages of the process, which was why they were being included at this point to represent that interest.

One method that could help keep the Citizen's Advisory Group to a manageable size could be to look at potential overlap as mentioned previously with technology groups and the Chamber of Commerce.

Cultural, historical or religious representation was still in question. One suggestion was possibly the Silverdale Historical Alliance, although Silverdale was not noted for having the same historical nature when compared to areas like Manchester, Suquamish and Kingston.

Deborah Flynn stressed that younger families generally seem to be underrepresented in groups like this. That was partly due to time constraints of jobs and children, but there should be some sort of outreach to try to draw some of those in. Family Service Centers were suggested, as well as potential navy groups representing enlisted personnel.

The Navy is working toward a trend of developing private/public partnerships for Navy housing. At least in terms of the housing element associated with Silverdale, any groups should be working very closely with the Navy to determine what their future housing needs are and what types of programs and partnerships they might be looking for. The Navy had worked with the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council on a regional level and could be brought into this discussion, as well.

Vivian Henderson, from the Public, noted that the Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners would appoint a member who lives specifically in Silverdale. Additionally, Deborah Flynn noted that some of the housing developments might have a homeowner’s group that could be contacted.

John Ahl noted that a good point of contact with the Navy would be the Engineering Field Activities, Northwest (EFA, Northwest) in Poulsbo. Dale Rudolph from the
Poulsbo Counsel might be a good point of contact; he was retired but would be a good starting point.

Tom Nevins noted that many times with groups like this economic and environmental sectors were strongly represented. Social equity seemed to be most often underrepresented and there needed to be a local area drive to include the social equity aspect. Citizens at large could be social, if we could be brought onboard. Certainly Kitsap Mall, Chamber of Commerce and the Port of Silverdale all represented economic interests. They needed to ensure average citizens were represented so that the plan truly represented what would make a better community; not just for economic and environmental interests. He did not have a particular plan as to how to achieve this goal. Tom noted he would like to see it given attention to get better results and avoid some potential future challenges.

Laura Ditmer asked if High School Students could represent the social equity that he was referring to, since they had actually been involved in the Vision part of the process. Although they might lack the experience or the history to be involved in some of the more technical or historical aspects, in terms of social equity they seem to be right there. Tom Nevins and John Ahl both encouraged that involvement. It was noted that the previous High School participants had represented themselves and the community interests very well in the past. Laura Ditmer noted the High School students would like to continue to be involved, but it does limit them in some ways.

It was noted by the Planning Commission that it would be a good way to get the Central Kitsap School District involved, as well. Laura Ditmer noted that they could give the student’s projects that give them a better voice, as they did in the Vision process. That had allowed them to actually commit to the issue more fully in a way that may have been missed by just attending meetings and looking at paperwork.

A final area of note was that Silverdale had one very notable feature: its trails. That should be represented with any group for Silverdale. It was noted that Tex Lewis worked closely with the Vision process and would be good for this process, as well.

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

Break Was Called.

- Work Study review of **Buildable Lands Report**

Darryl Piercy began the discussion, stating that the Planning Commission had requested an update on Buildable Lands Report. The initial report had already been covered, which represented old data that had been compiled due to specific requests and questions addressed by the Legislature. Additionally, the Buildable Lands Report had been mandated by the State for continuing analysis but funding had not been included as part of the process. It was one of those mandates that the County must comply with, although there was no funding to support the process.
As an update on the County’s progress to-date, the first 5-year report has been issued. The last update provided to the Planning Commission had indicated Staff had gone through 1999 and were developing the data for 2000; intending to move forward with data for 2001 and 2002. As of September 2002 data had been compiled for 2000 and was contained in the report provided to the Planning Commission. The 2000 data had not been included yet within the 5-year analysis. The County was first waiting for 2001 and 2002 data, which is forthcoming. Additionally Kitsap County was working on developing similar year-by-year reports that would be incorporated into the overall analysis. The process would be ongoing with the continued collection of data with the cooperation of the cities in terms of maintaining data in a format that could continue to be used.

The yearly compilation of that information is anticipated as a difficult task. The difficult aspect of the process, which Staff is working on, is what the information actually represents. What is the practical application of a buildable lands analysis? Are there situations in Kitsap County where the raw data and the analysis for the five-year program could be useful?

The answer is twofold. The information gives a good base of information in one location to begin an analysis and determine practical applications, such as Subarea Plans.

The information is lacking, however, and needs additional work at the level of analyzing the raw data and whether it accurately reflects buildable land. Within the buildable lands program, there were approximately 12,000 lots identified as currently available in Kitsap County. Those lots meet the criteria of the buildable lands analysis. In reality, however, they might not meet the County’s criteria as to what constitutes a buildable lot or what constitutes a lot that will be available in the marketplace over a 20-year period.

At this point Staff have been working with a small group with some technical experience in terms of market needs, building needs and building characteristics of properties. The goal at this point has been to identify what additional information would be usefully in the Buildable Lands Report to make the numbers more realistic an applicable to Subarea Plans. It is certain that Kitsap County needs take the information from the buildable lands analysis at least one step further. Constraints within the identified land need to be identified to determine if the vacant lands identified in the Buildable Lands Report really are viable for future development. That process is being referred to as a “Constraint Analysis.”

With regard to the lack of current funding from the State for this analysis, Kitsap County has been able to leverage the funding that had already been received up to this point and carried it forward into 2003 and 2004. That provides Kitsap County with a relatively reasonable amount of money in our budget over the course of the next two years to begin to take the information out of the buildable lands analysis a step further. This should provide the County with a lot of information that will really be more practicable in terms of how we can apply it to predicting growth rates and land
availability in both our rural and urban areas. It will also help to better define the actual density projections that are being touted in the report for each of the Urban Growth Areas.

There is additional analysis needed to provide an accurate reflection of the densities that will be achieved within the Urban Growth Areas in relationship to the rural areas. Building permit data, for example, shows that 80% of building permit activity over the last five years has taken place in areas outside of Urban Growth Areas. That information is critical for comparison with the level of activity desired in our Comprehensive Plan.

Additional analysis needs to take place with more refinement of the data. A very troubling issue that is raised is whether the land supply really is available for promoting urban development. Are the numbers identified in the report realistic in terms of future building capabilities within the County? The additional analysis should answer should address these two issues and take out some of the guesswork that is currently part of the Buildable Lands Report.

That work is ongoing with the intention of expanding the existing group to include a wider group of individuals within the community to work together on these concerns. Staff anticipates bringing at least an initial report before the Planning Commission later this year, possibly in the fall. The analysis is anticipated to progress through the next 6-7 months, with funding available as previously mentioned.

With regard to what is being done with the Buildable Lands Report, Kitsap County is attempting to identify the intent of the legislation, how the information will be used. The Office of Community Development has provided a fourth draft indicating what they propose as a Report to the legislature, combining information from all five counties. It appears that the real goal is to demonstrate whether or not the Growth Management Act is working on a countywide basis within the Puget Sound urban counties. Kitsap County has some real issues in terms of the representation made within that draft report regarding Kitsap County’s Buildable Lands Report. It does not appear that the proposed presentation accurately reflects either the data or the conclusions presented in Kitsap County’s Buildable Lands Report. It appears that other counties have similar concerns, as well. Kitsap County is working with the Office of Community Development to correct what are deemed to be misrepresentations of the data provided to this point. The Office of Community Development’s goal appears to be to make their presentation during the 2004 legislative session. Based on their presentation, it would appear that, as a State Agency, the intent would then be to make specific recommendations to the counties to bring the Growth Management Act closer to compliance with the overall legislative goals. Work will be ongoing between Kitsap County Staff and the Office of Community Development, attempting to resolve some of Kitsap County’s concerns.

In summary, Staff would like the Planning Commission to know that they have made some progress and are providing a brief summary. But the process is ongoing and will involve the community in an attempt to resolve any issues or concerns they may have regarding the information. The process should evolve, as well, so that more accurate
and applicable data can be presented going forward. This is just a first step, with considerably more work and effort needed in terms of getting this to a point where it’s useful within the community.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked who was involved within the Business Community. Darryl Piercy noted that to date they had been working with individuals from the Board of Realtors and Homebuilders, with a Consultant at the table with Staff. The initial goal was to try and address some of the questions in regard to land supply issues and whether or not sufficient lots are available, or could be available, on the market. That information provides multiple benefits. It potentially keeps the cost of lots at a level that’s reasonable, in terms of realistic, affordable housing opportunities. It helps clarify whether or not Urban Growth Areas are being sized to adequately accommodate projected future growth based on available lot supply. It also helps to determine whether market factors contained in the analysis are suitable and appropriate or whether they need to be revisited as part of future updates to the Comprehensive Plan. The group will be expanded now that the basic questions are out on the table. At this point the discussion needs to involve a broader spectrum of the Community, rather than just those particular interests.

Mike Gustavson asked if they would wind up with an index of apparently buildable lots. Darryl Piercy noted they may not get down to specific lot-by-lot availability. The intent was whether to try and establish more accurate assumptions countywide. Assumptions will be taken and applied to a general area with an analysis of how those assumptions fit in realistically. By determining how many lots really are buildable and how many aren’t for whatever reason, it is hoped that they can develop a formula and apply it countywide. To date there has been no actual verification of the formula used in the Comprehensive Plan or the assumptions used for the Buildable Lands Report. Those assumptions will now be tested to determine if they really are applicable and to, if possible, to develop a more reliable formula.

It was noted that as of two weeks ago, there were reportedly 21,416 undeveloped lots in Kitsap County. Builders in the area, however, constantly complain that there aren’t enough buildable lots. Either part of the 21,416 lots have constraints that make them technically unbuildable, they’re not on the market or there is some other issue making them unavailable.

Darryl Piercy agreed and provided an example of how current assumptions did not reflect actual availability. Specifically, he was aware of a large lot with a historical underlying plat from when logging was conducted that indicated there were in excess of 30 lots. For the purpose of vacant land all 30 of those lots would be counted in the Buildable Lands Report. The reality is, in developing those lots, that the builder actually only had six lots available. This was due to a variety of factors such as critical areas and water supply issues. This is just an example from one lot. If that is, in fact, what’s happening on a broader scale, the information presented in the Buildable Lands Report is very misleading. More analysis is needed.

It was noted by the Planning Commission that, due to various constraints, Kitsap County may not be able to justify an additional Urban Growth Area so having accurate
data would have an impact on a lot of areas. Darryl Piercy agreed that they could have similar circumstances within the Urban Growth Areas. They could be potentially over calculating the number of available lots and therefore the density that could be placed within an existing Urban Growth Area. So those are the kinds of questions that are being addressed. Staff noted there were no preconceived ideas as to what the ultimate information might lead to. It was important that the analysis be done, however, to provide the County with a defensible position when it comes to making assumptions with regard to the Comprehensive Plan.

Darryl Piercy noted that the State was only requiring basic, raw data with an analysis based on that. There was no provision for any additional steps. The additional compilation of information and analysis was a County initiative versus a specific request from the State. The State was satisfied with the basic assumptions contained within Kitsap County’s Comprehensive Plan as reviewed by the Growth Hearings Board. The assumptions, based on State requirements, were to take a particular market factor reduction and take a particular critical area factor reduction. All of those are done through some very broad assumptions that apply throughout the region. The new analysis would give Kitsap County the opportunity to go to the Hearings Board and note errors in the initial assumptions and justify the proposed changes in those assumptions. Although the direction the new information would take the County was unknown, it was already clear that the assumptions have been off base on various specific sites. The County was now trying to determine if that carried over to a broader spectrum.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that if the Buildable Lands Report was off by a factor of 5, that would result in a reduction from 12,000 available lots to somewhere around 2500. Darryl Piercy confirmed that if the one example provided were consistent countywide, that was a distinct possibility. It was also possible that the example used thus far was an isolated situation. There are a lot of 1.5 acre lots out there that have been created historically that could be built on and those are vacant lots that should be recognized.

Staff continues to hear from builders that there are simply not sufficient lots on the market to meet the demands of the people in this county who go into the development business. That is a common theme and Staff would like to get to the bottom of that. They now have a process that should help resolve this matter with developers and builders willing to work with the County, regardless of the outcome.

It was noted by the Planning Commission that another issue was that small builders may not have the same opportunities in the County if it’s determined that the available lots are held primarily by single owners. Those would like go to a contractor with a larger building corporation who can do 2000 units. That would then be 2000 units that were unavailable for the smaller builders. That type of information would be of considerable benefit as part of this analysis. Another member noted that a lot of builders had expressed similar concerns with regard to ULID #6.

Darryl Piercy noted that ownership was one of the issues that was being looked at; whether there were big blocks tied up in single ownerships. That could affect the future market of available lots, if the majority were controlled by a select group of
owners who could then influence the market accordingly. One Planning Commission
member noted that was a big concern with ULID #6 from the very beginning.

Darryl Piercy noted that these questions lead to another question. If it is determined
that there is a shortage of lots, the real area to create lots is in urban areas. The number
of lots you can create on any given acre is considerably more than what could be
created in a rural area. The next question would be where those urban lots are located,
if there is a shortage, and how to proceed in a way that meets the market need and
demand. That’s probably the final question to this process. It’s a good process and
there are a lot of good questions that need some answers to help with future planning
efforts.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any additional comments or questions and
there were none.

➢ Work Study review of South Kitsap ULID #6.

Laura Ditmer noted that they had left off last week with design guidelines. She had
started the conversation by pulling all the guidelines together, not as requirements, but
to see how it all came out. The Planning Commission was now being provided with just
the requirements and what they potentially mean in terms of the Urban Village Center
designation. Once that was resolved, the Planning Commission could begin to look at
the overall Subarea Plan document that was also provided previously. It was hoped
that the Planning Commission could come to some conclusions before the Public
Hearing on March 25.

Deborah Flynn verified that only the guidelines had been removed from the document
and that what remained were the actual requirements. Laura Ditmer confirmed that,
noting that guidelines had been included previously as a subsection ‘b’, outlining
suggestions on how to meet the actual requirements. Those recommendations had
been removed as requested, although they would likely be collected in an appendix or
another document for reference purposes. The requirements before the Planning
Commission were just outlines of the plan, potential bookends addressing what was
and was not desired in an Urban Village Center. The Planning Commission was now
being asked for their input on these requirements.

William Matchett noted that the page numbering was incorrect with Laura Ditmer
noting that would be corrected with any other revisions.

Laura Ditmer used McCormick Woods as an example. Referring to Page 29, Section
230, Materials, there is a requirement that may not be appropriate. It would, however,
require that a developer address the matter and propose what they planned. With
Poulsbo Place in mind, there are always uses that wouldn’t apply to all standards. With
the specifications noted, it would be necessary to have urban design requirements that
guide the developer in how to lay out a village. There would be a center, an orientation
of buildings and what’s around that center. In terms of the colors or architectural
character, there could be broad requirements that would need to be addressed at the
Master Planning level, not necessarily spelled out in the requirements.
Laura Ditmer clarified that she was not proposing that the design standards be kept out of the main document and placed elsewhere. The document provided was solely for the purpose of removing the options from the document they had reviewed last week so the Planning Commission could look at what was actually required in the planning designation. The Planning Commission may not want to hold to some of these requirements, which was where Staff was asking for their input. Color requirements were a good example. They could be addressed as an architectural character or theme, but not necessarily have specific requirements such as “colors will be subdued.” The Planning Commission was asked to go through the requirements and provide their input.

Deborah Flynn asked where the subdued colors language came from initially, since it sounded like Laura Ditmer was questioning the need for that wording. Laura Ditmer noted they took Olympia, Mill Creek, and a third area’s design guidelines, noting they were all fairly consistent. Those were then used as basic concepts to be fleshed out and revised based on the Planning Commission’s input. It may not be appropriate throughout Kitsap County and there may be some things the Planning Commission simply doesn’t want included.

Deborah Flynn noted she tended to agree that color and style could define a neighborhood and it was not necessarily desirable for all neighborhoods to look the same. So by putting in subdued colors, when the colors of the northwest are pretty subdued, it might be too limiting. She further stated she liked the idea of having some areas that were a little brighter and cheerier.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted how common it was for people to live in a beige house with white trim. Deborah Flynn noted that was nice in some rural areas, because it sort of blends in with the character. But in urban areas, it might be more desirable to have communities with more defined character; not all subdued colors. It would be good if it could somehow be worded to ensure high quality and pleasant appearance, but she disagreed with the subdued colors.

Agreement was noted, particularly from a historical, architectural perspective. In a lot of Scandinavian countries, where things are gray and dark most of the time, there is a tendency toward coloring the buildings in bright colors. That’s part of where the idea of Poulsbo Place arose. If you want to capture a Norwegian village, you’re going to have bright colors. It was agreed that everything shouldn’t be beige.

In response to questions posed by the Planning Commission, Laura Ditmer noted that the version before the Commission was an attempt to simplify the document, per their request, by removing the subsection recommendations. At this point Staff was looking for the Planning Commission to indicate what they didn’t feel was appropriate.

The point from the Planning Commission was that there still appeared to be reference to the guidelines. If the intent in the final document was to distil this to just the requirements, the reference to guidelines should be removed. Laura Ditmer noted that
this was just to serve as a working document and it would be refined from there based on Planning Commission members’ input.

Page 29, Paragraph 325-A, third line down was noted to be too subjective with the wording “high quality.” Additionally, Paragraph 230-A should have the second sentence deleted.

Laura Ditmer noted that the second sentence applies to an area being Master Planned: the matter would be addressed in the Master Plan in terms of consistency so that you’re not looking at half fisherman’s village and half something else.

It was noted that the Master Plan document could obviously cut down on the requirements for one area. Laura Ditmer agreed and noted that from that level it would be up to the developer to address that issue.

It was noted that the subcategory “a” should be removed if there were not a subsequent subcategory “b”. For example, 260 should just be 260, not 260-A if there are no other subcategories. Laura Ditmer agreed that was intended when the other revisions were implemented.

Laura Ditmer clarified that they were looking at requirements with the guidelines removed. The Planning Commission noted that there were multiple subcategories with a heading of “guideline.” Laura Ditmer noted that all guidelines would be removed and placed in a separate section for reference.

Deborah Flynn noted that the guidelines were useful and should be available, regardless of where they were placed. William Matchett preferred a separate document for recommendations; another member preferred that it be included with the requirements.

Mike Gustavson specifically asked that the guidelines be deleted. It was suggested that the developer come to the county with economically feasible concepts that will work, as opposed to the guidelines being determined by groups who have no monetary stake in the matter. The developer can research it on his or her own – that’s their problem not the County’s responsibility. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted disagreement, as did William Matchett, noting that there should be some guidelines, even if they were minimal. If there are none, substandard housing could be developed without any regard to surrounding properties. Mike Gustavson noted that was what some might refer to as affordable housing.

Laura Ditmer noted that without guidelines there may be no attention given to the layout as part of the urban design, separate from the architectural character of what’s in there. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted if there were no guidelines something totally out of character with the surroundings could be established.

It was noted that if you look at large developments and individual developments with single family structures; the single family structure has no criteria at all. You can get
the plan through the building department. That then leaves the issue of larger developments.

One member noted that even single family developments had covenants. But again it was not for the County to designate, individuals had the right to build according to their tastes on their own properties. There is not a countywide restriction on colors or types of schemes. It’s an individual engineering concept. Another member noted the intent was to avoid incompatible developments. There was still some dispute regarding applying these standards throughout the county, with individuals potentially being unable to meet these standards.

Deborah Flynn noted this was for Master Plan Village Commercial and Residential developments. Mike Gustavson noted that single lots should be removed from the table then, if they were not included. A Master Planned community is going to come up with something that’s quite desirable and will look good; they don’t need the guidelines to make them do that. Lary Coppola stated that was not necessarily the case.

One member noted Poulsbo did it the hard way. They established their design review committee after they had standard commercial properties that were not compatible. Franchises like Schuck’s and Hollywood Video, those galvanized Poulsbo, unfortunately after the fact, to establish design standards.

One member made a suggestion for a word change as they mulled over the color issue. The sentence should read “use exterior building materials that have texture, patterns and colors which lend themselves to a high level of quality and detail.” Then delete the last sentence. The question was posed as to who determines “high level of quality.” Laura Ditmer noted that although it was rather subjective, there were standards that were acceptable; i.e. a community that was all purple or orange could be considered as less than acceptable quality. Deborah Flynn proposed the term specifying that they are somehow coordinated. It was noted that single family houses are still exempt from other regulations, but they’re talking about village centers and town centers.

Laura Ditmer asked for clarification of Deborah Flynn’s suggestion. She noted that rather than using the term “high level of quality,” somehow they incorporate the wording “coordinated”. Somehow specify that the texture, color and materials go together, provide a consistent theme for the area or something like that. Laura Ditmer proposed “consistent with the overall theme of the development.” William Matchett noted it was very hard to legislate taste. Deborah Flynn noted the idea might lead to more variety and agreed that taste was an individual matter. Some individual in the group had used Poulsbo Place as a negative example, but she personally though it was a nice development. Other members noted that it was at least an improvement over what had existed previously.

Laura Ditmer directed the conversation back to the multifamily design guidelines. Although they were not handed out this meeting, the same discussion could apply. Is it necessary to have design guidelines specifically for multifamily developments that would occur in Urban Cluster, Urban Medium and Mixed Use zones? Is it appropriate
to have design guidelines for multifamily developments? Those materials were handed out at the last meeting for the Planning Commission to review.

Deborah Flynn questioned whether “guidelines”, Part B, were required or just suggestions and ideas. Laura Ditmer verified Part B was just ideas and options for the developers to reference. The requirements would actually be part of the code.

Deborah Flynn noted that hopefully all of the guidelines went with the requirements. There may be other guidelines that were not listed that should also go with the requirements.

John Ahl noted, with regard to the question of whether they were all necessary, Categories 300 and 310 on Page 30, addressed accessory dwelling units. Were accessory dwelling units Master Planned? His concept of an accessory dwelling unit is something you build after the fact. Laura Ditmer used Holly Park as an example where accessory dwelling units were incorporated into the Master Plan Concept. Where there is something built out, it may not be logical. When you’re looking at a new development, however, and trying to incorporate these different types; the single family, multifamily, town homes, condominiums, etc. it could potentially apply.

John Ahl asked what the definition of an accessory dwelling unit was. He understood it to be more of a mother-in-law apartment or living area over a garage. Alice Strand noted there were instances where someone might know in advance that they will want an accessory dwelling unit; say their mother-in-law was sickly and needed to be close by. There are situations where it might be preplanned.

Alice Strand clarified that the requirements were that the accessory dwelling unit be similar to the house it was accessory to. Additionally it could only be 50% of the primary dwellings square feet or 900 square feet; whichever was less. It was also noted that the accessory dwelling unit must be within 150 feet of the primary residence or shall be a conversion of an existing detached structure, like a garage.

Another member noted he had seen Master Planned communities that specifically designed the accessory dwelling units for over the garage or right behind the garage. It was part of the house structure. John Ahl noted that would be a great idea. Laura Ditmer referenced a development where for every 7-10 homes there was one that would have an accessory dwelling unit. The question was posed as to whether it was classified as an accessory dwelling unit if it was located above the garage, as opposed to guest living quarters. Laura Ditmer noted that the difference was whether or not it was attached to the home and had its own kitchen.

One member noted the concept of “smart houses” might be referenced as they allowed individuals to live independently under various circumstances. Smart Houses included things like no step entries, no step showers, all sorts of tangible things like on-demand hot water systems. Those are very inexpensive to incorporate and would be a good addition to the guidelines for developers. Laura Ditmer stated it could be worded that they attempt to meet ADA requirements. It was clarified that it could be encouraged, not put in as a requirement. Deborah Flynn noted that the trend toward even single
family homes is toward a master suite on the first floor, just for that reason. As the
population ages you want to keep living in your own house and not have to move.
Another member noted little things like no steps can make a big difference, as well as a
fully functional main floor.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked what needed to be done with this. Did it need to be adopted
or did they need to wait for more information. Laura Ditmer asked how comfortable
they were with moving forward with what was presented. Were there any items the
Planning Commission wanted completely struck out. She had guidance on high quality
materials, windows, materials, colors and that’s about it.

William Matchett said she had already indicated the last sentence in 3-40-10 of design
criteria would be struck, per the previous meeting. Laura Ditmer noted it would be
changed but would be done along with today’s revisions.

Mike Gustavson noted he had a really hard time with the little 60 x 60 lots. After
setbacks, etc. you would only have a 1317 sq. ft house if you take away the 2-car garage
which is 483 sq. feet. So 1300 sq. ft. house isn’t much of a house on the main floor that
is where people generally live. He expressed considerable concern over how well the
small lot concept would work.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked where everyone stood with regard to this. Monty Mahan
felt the document should stand as is; Staff should move forward with it. Deborah Flynn
thought they looked good other than a footnote relating to a transportation element
that was questionable. John Ahl noted he voted for the thinner edition for the Public’s
initial review, before addressing the more detailed guidelines. William Matchett
agreed, provided the guidelines were retained in some area; they didn’t necessarily
need to be with the requirements. Laura Ditmer verified that, as a group, the Planning
Commission wanted to keep the guidelines in some form or fashion, as opposed to
doing away with them completely. The general consensus was that the guidelines were
good and should be available for clarification and assistance to developers.

Monty Mahan noted one potential exception to that, under section 0-20, which deals
mostly with traffic and streets. Some of the guidelines are really good ideas regardless
of what part of the county you are in and he’d hate to lose those. He could give some
specific examples. Referring to Page 24 of the thinner document, site design, streets,
trails and open space (Page 26 of the document that included the guidelines). He
would like to make sure they are applied throughout the county; not specifically to
McCormick Woods since they pertain to transportation planning.

Laura Ditmer agreed. In terms of the urban design those are important even in terms
of the architectural development. It was agreed that the recommendations would be
incorporated into a separate document and not apply only to a specific project.

John Ahl asked if this would be more appropriate to the transportation part of the plan,
rather than the design guidelines. Laura Ditmer agreed. Design guidelines are more of
a “taste” issue, whereas traffic was a functional issue.
Mike Gustavson noted he had some questions from last week’s document.

Page 24, the bottom sentence, it said nothing in these guidelines shall be construed as a duty. He wanted to verify that was being dropped. William Matchett noted that it had been agreed the previous week that it would be deleted and would be removed from the final document at the same time as all other changes.

Mike Gustavson also had questions on the building table from last week’s document, as well. One member noted they were just looking at the new document as presented, that the document last week would have those recommendations, etc. addressed later.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if they needed a motion to approve the document. Laura Ditmer stated they did not. Staff would make the requested corrections and changes.

Laura Ditmer asked for any concerns or comments in terms of the proposed amendments to the Code, after which they would move on to the Subarea Plan.

William Matchett noted that the minimum lot area question should be addressed on pages 5 and 6.

Mike Gustavson noted page 4, Policies, had the 25,000 square foot limit for pharmacies questioned. It was noted that limiting the size could prohibit competition with the larger retailers, such as Wal-Mart. If they are three miles from Wal-Mart, why would people feel the need to go to the smaller, more expensive stores. It was hard to envision the smaller stores making it unless they are able to draw people from other areas of the county. They had talked about that previously, with national competition also being addressed. John Ahl asked if it was being suggested that there be a Wal-Mart there? That was not being suggested, only that the restriction of 25,000 sq. feet may be unrealistic in terms of competitiveness.

Alice Strand noted she couldn’t find a reference to 25,000 sq. feet on Page 4 with Mike Gustavson stating the actual square foot limitation was on Page 23. William Matchett noted it was just a definition of Pharmacy. Mike Gustavson noted he still wasn’t sure it could be done. William Matchett noted that may be the case, but all they were doing was defining it. The person wanting to build on the lot would have to make that ultimate decision.

Mike Gustavson continued to note that square footage limitations had been discussed a number of times and he had a hard time with that. Deborah Flynn asked if he was asking that the limitations be removed entirely or revised. Mike Gustavson noted that the restrictions weren’t realistic; the developer should be able to develop it in a commercially realistic way. Laura Ditmer noted that it was specifically referring to the Urban Village Center and just north of that was a Business Park, Urban Medium, and it only applied to that area. Mike Gustavson noted it just grated on him. If a developer comes in and sees that requirement, he may walk away because of that limitation.

Deborah Flynn noted that it would be to the benefit of the Urban Village Center to have smaller specialty shops that you can walk by, look in the windows, rather than having a
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1 Wal-Mart there. Laura Ditmer noted that there were other areas where they could go
to the Wal-Mart, etc. just that the Urban Village Center was not designed for that. Mike
Gustavson noted he stood on that point, that it was an unrealistic limitation.

2 It was also verified that the reference on page 5 to a lot area of 60 x 60 feet was a
minimum standard.

3 Mike Gustavson noted on page 7, Item 235-10 he thought halfway through the
paragraph there were zero lot lines and it was unclear to him as to whether or not there
were setbacks. William Matchett noted this was relating to Urban Clusters. Laura
Ditmer noted it allows for zero lot lines; it doesn’t require or demand, but it allows for
that, even for single family dwellings.

4 On page 8, C3, Mike Gustavson asked how it was determined whether a restaurant was
high turnover. Alice Strand noted there is a definition in the zoning code of high
turnover restaurants. High turnover restaurants shall be retail establishments
providing food or beverages for sale in which there are one or more of the following:
food containers that are disposable, restaurants that are self-service, take-out food and
beverages or drive-in facilities. Lary Coppola, Chair, clarified they were talking about
fast food and, if so, why don’t they just say that. Alice Strand noted that the zoning
code defined it as a high turnover restaurant. Staff was attempting to keep the wording
consistent with the Zoning Code.

5 Mike Gustavson noted that the top of that page, under Residential, Items 3, 4 and 5,
there appeared to be an inconsistency. Townhouses and multifamily housing units are
allowed under the site plan review process. Mobile home parks, however, were
permitted without a site plan review. It should be one way or the other, applied
consistently. Laura Ditmer agreed to note that.

6 Mike Gustavson noted that when you get down into C-3, 4 and 6, brew pubs are
conditionally allowed and drinking establishments are not. Again, there seems to be an
inconsistency. Alice Strand didn’t see brew pubs defined and wanted to know if there
was a specific definition for it. It was noted that the definition was located on page 3.
Mike Gustavson noted that on Page 10 at the top, Item B refers specifically to
McCormick Woods but should be generic. The title is Urban Growth Area/ULID #6.
He asked for clarification as to whether this was a ULID #6 document or countywide.
Laura Ditmer verified it would be countywide and that Staff would make sure
references to specific projects were removed.

7 Item 040-C notes that multifamily units allow for virtually no setback, then later calls
for yards for recreation, etc. It appears to be an inconsistency in the yard requirements
for multifamily units. Page 11 Paragraph 010-E is the open space for multifamily
developments. It was noted by other members that the document allows zero landlines
as acceptable, but does not promote them. It’s not mandated. Mike Gustavson
continued to note that it was not good to have a multiple unit building without a
mandated yard. William Matchett noted the yard could be behind the building. Mike
Gustavson agreed, but it should be in the immediate proximity of the building where
the parents could keep an eye on the younger children. There could be zero lot lines,
but there should be a yard at some place. Laura Ditmer noted that a front yard on a busy street would not be desirable for playing. What came out of this was the intent to be predictable and flexible, so there are those areas where there is some struggle with meeting all the needs.

Page 11 Paragraph 010-A, Mike Gustavson suggested the word “alternatives” be substituted for “better.” Another member noted that alternatives might not work; both words were rather vague. Staff was asked to look at a way to better clarify the intent.

Lary Coppola, Chair, posed the question to Mike Gustavson, in the interest of time, as to how many more items he had. Mike Gustavson noted he was almost done.

He did want to note concern over parking being located behind grocery stores. That was discussed last week. In particular a person would not want to go into a secluded parking lot day or night; that’s why we build stores with parking out in front, because they can be seen from the street. There is a great desire visually not to see parking lots, but for safety it may be better to have them visible.

Lary Coppola, Chair, proposed that maybe it could be worded in a way that the façade facing the street had to have one kind of face with the parking lot behind it and that could still be the main entrance. Another member noted that one of the failings of the Bethel Avenue plan is that it mandates that nobody will be there because of the parking requirements.

Laura Ditmer noted that, considering the Urban Village Center where you wouldn’t have a parking lot if you have a store that fronts the center, the town square, village square, you wouldn’t have the parking lot right there between the store and that village green. That’s where the intent came from; parking could either be masked, moving it to the side or behind the building so as not to detract from the village green. There were also lighting requirements in place with regard to parking.

Mike Gustavson voiced he would be concerned about parking being located away from a store or not having easy access to their vehicles when closing up for the night. He’s just not sure the concept works. Granted, it promotes more bicycle travel and walking, and so forth, but it doesn’t necessarily happen that way. That’s it for his input.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was anything else.

Laura Ditmer asked if there were any other comments they wanted to make before adjourning on the Subarea Plans.

It was clarified that removal of references to McCormick Woods or specific projects did not apply to Subarea Plans. Removal of specific project references related only to the amendments to the County Ordinance.

Mike Gustavson noted he had one item of concern. Page 6 – 36 Policy 2.4, fifth bullet down. This calls for narrower roads, which he does not support. He expressed his concern that this would lead to complaints from people who don’t have any place to
park, as well as potentially creating issues with the Fire Marshall. He asked that his concerns be noted on the record. Laura Ditmer indicated she would look into that item further.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was any other business and there was none.

P.M.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.
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