The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Givens Community Center, 1026 Sidney Avenue, Port Orchard, Washington. Members Present: Monty Mahan, Tom Nevins, Mark Flynn, Lary Coppola, Chair, Mike Gustavson, Deborah Flynn, John Ahl. Not Present: William Matchett. Staff Present: Darryl Piercy, Eric Toews, and Laura Ditmer.

6:30 P.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

6:35 P.M.

- Public Hearing to receive oral and written testimony regarding the proposed amendments to the South Kitsap ULID #6 Subarea Plan

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked that public testimony be held to a maximum of four minutes. Prior to beginning public testimony, however, it was requested that a brief summary on the background of ULID #6 be provided.

Eric Toews, representing Cascadia Community Planning Services, had served as the Consultant working with the Department of Community Development Staff to prepare the proposed legislation before the Planning Commission this evening. There were three main component parts to be considered.

1. Proposed amendments to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Countywide Plan, to ensure consistency between the Countywide Plan and proposed ULID #6 Subarea Plan.

2. Proposed final South Kitsap ULID #6 Subarea Plan.

3. Proposed amendments to Kitsap County Code to implement the Subarea Plan through new and revised development regulations. These are primarily contained in amendments to Title 17 of the Kitsap County Zoning Code.

More than a year ago, after considering public testimony and the Planning Commission’s Report and Recommendations, the Board of County Commissioners adopted a modified Preferred Alternative for the South Kitsap Urban Growth Area. This was adopted via Ordinance 269-2002 as modified by the Board of County Commissioners. The Preferred Alternative seems to foster an attractive plan and livable community guided by flexible development regulations. There are several
components of the modified plan, including the concept of a mixed use County center that would serve as a focal shopping and gathering place for the emerging local community. The Board of County Commissioners also modified the Subarea Plan from January 2002 as follows:

- Up to 10 gross acres of Commercial Use, rather than the draft plan’s original 6 acres.
- Up to 90 gross acres of Business Park uses which was modified somewhat from the draft plan’s 94 acres.
- A minimum of 70 gross acres, a minimum not a maximum, of Medium Density Residential use that would include provisions for affordable housing and mixed densities.

The Board of County Commissioners Preferred Alternative plan is based on a dwelling unit cap of 4,172 units on the Subarea, which correlates with the proposed population allocation. The Board of County Commissioners directed Staff and the Consultant Team to prepare amendments to the Plan, Zoning Code and other County regulations to implement the preferred Subarea Plan alternative. That really began in earnest in August 2002 year when they began meeting with a Citizens Advisory Committee to help craft the proposed development regulations for the Subarea Plan.

The Citizens Advisory Committee met between August and late October of last year. Their report and recommendations were included in a packet provided to the Planning Commission some time ago, prior to their initial work study session. There were four major concepts articulated in the South Kitsap plan as modified by the Board of County Commissioners.

1. The promotion of a mixture of uses to provide both employment and convenience shopping opportunities in close proximity to the housing development.

2. Accommodating an appropriate share of urban growth. This is found chiefly in chapters 4-5 of the proposed Subarea Plan.

3. The preservation of open spaces.

4. Providing adequate public facilities and services necessary to serve the new development.

Significant changes from the Subarea Plan before the Planning Commission last year include new policy language that would require the preparation of a Master Plan to ensure comprehensive and coordinated development within each Zone located in the subarea. Specifically, future Master Plans for the subarea would have to address the following:

- An integrated and interconnected network of parks, open spaces and recreational areas;
- Clustering of new residential development;
• Integrated transportation system improvements;
• Integrated water, wastewater and stormwater management facility improvements.

Consistent with the Board of County Commissioners’ Preferred Alternative, the proposed Subarea Plan modifies the amount and location of land uses within the subarea. Those are reflected on the proposed Use and Zoning Map (indicated at the meeting).

Due to the removal of the Environmental Impact Statement portions from the proposed final plan, it represents a far more user friendly and streamlined document. It’s probably only about one third the size of the Plan reviewed about one year ago.

In order to implement the proposed final Subarea Plan, as mentioned earlier, Staff and the Consultant Team, with the assistance of the Citizens Advisory Committee, began to develop proposed Code Amendments. There are several key features to these amendments.

The proposed code changes would create two new Zoning districts. These Zones would be applied only within the subarea, although they could be applied in other areas of the County in the future. The first is an Urban Cluster Zone (UCR), which would allow Residential development in a wide variety of configurations at densities that are identical to those in the Urban Low Zone. That is currently 5-9 dwelling units per net acre. The proposed amendments also set forth bulk and dimensional requirements for this zone as well as permitted, conditional and prohibited uses.

The proposal also includes a new Urban Village Center Zone reflective, again, of the Board of County Commissioners’ direction which would allow for a mix of Commercial Convenience uses, as well as multifamily development within a center located just on the north side of Old Clifton Road. This was indicated as a pink 10-acre area on the map, almost in the middle of the section of Old Clifton that traverses the subarea. This new zone is intended to serve as the focal point for the new and emerging neighborhoods within the subarea, consistent with the Board of County Commissioners’ direction and the policy direction of the Subarea Plan. The code also includes language that would place a dwelling unit cap of 4,172 total units within the subarea, ensuring that the proposed population allocation to the area will not be exceeded.

Consistent with the direction of the Board of County Commissioners and the revised final Subarea Plan, a mandatory Master Planning provision has been established to guide new development in the undeveloped portions within the subarea. The process is intended to ensure high quality and coordinated development that achieves the promise articulated in the Subarea Plan.

Finally, the proposal before you in the way of Code Amendments includes Design Guidelines that would be established for multifamily development, as well as development within the Urban Village Center Zone. These guidelines are intended to
encourage better architectural and site design/planning. It should be noted, however, that these plans would apply countywide.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any questions and there were none. He then opened the matter to Public Testimony.

Art Castle, Executive Vice President, Home Builders Association of Kitsap County, indicated that a letter was included in the Planning Commission’s packet, which he read for the record.

Dear Commissioners: On January 30, 2003, the Home Builders Association of Kitsap County’s Board of Directors adopted a resolution supporting the final Urban Growth Area ULID #6 Subarea Plan. The Home Builders Association urges you to recommend adoption of the final McCormick Village Plan and the implementing Ordinances to the Kitsap County Board of County Commissioners. The Home Builders Association has one reservation regarding the draft implementation Ordinances regarding Design Guidelines that are addressed below. When the earlier version of this plan was considered by the Board of County Commissioners in April 2002, the Home Builders Association urged its adoption. Now the Home Builders Association support is even stronger. With direction by the Board of County Commissioners the Plan has been modified and strengthened so that it can serve as a model of efficient, effective, urban development for Kitsap’s future. As revised, the Plan proposes an Urban Village with the opportunities for residents to live in close proximity to a Village Center with opportunities for recreation and work. The permitting requirement and standards, including an extensive Master Planning process, assure that critical areas will be protected, neighborhoods will be defined, a variety of housing choices will be offered, and trails and paths will link the neighborhoods to the Village Center with the approximately 50 acre Business Park and over 2000 acres of permanent public park land. The Plan, which will accommodate future planned growth in a portion of South Kitsap, maximizes efficient use of existing public sewer and water. The Plan has been a work in progress for almost 10 years with extensive public participation. With an increased understanding in the community of how to manage future growth, the Plan has evolved and improved. The standards have already been established within the McCormick Woods development. Now the County has worked with the willing land owners to set the stage for the future. It is time to do the real work of building this community. We need increased opportunities for new homes, and jobs here in Kitsap creating a lively future for our families. Regarding the Design Guideline section of the proposed Ordinance, the Home Builders Association strongly urges that the concepts, including the requirements, be attached as an Appendix to the Zoning Ordinance. Instead the Master Planning Overlay Ordinance would include a requirement that detailed Design Guidelines be proposed as part of the Master Plan application. This would allow the variety and specificity of different Design Guidelines from place-to-place in Kitsap County. Again we recommend positive recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Board of County Commissioners.

Bob Johns was scheduled to speak next but requested that Linda Niebanck go first as their presentations were coordinated.
Linda Niebanck, McCormick Land Company, expressed her pleasure at being given the opportunity to address her issues with the Planning Commission, noting it was an opportunity for the Planning Commission to both step back and come forward to consider the possibilities presented by the Board of County Commissioners’ Preferred Alternative Plan. Due to time constraints, she would not provide a complete history, but would like the Planning Commission to understand the land use patterns and see a vision for an Urban Village in South Kitsap. Eric Toews had already provided a brief history and description, and the history was also outlined in documentation before the Planning Commission. Ms Niebanck additionally submitted materials for the record going back to 1994 to ensure all the Planning Commission members were familiar with how the process had evolved through time. Referring to Page 2 of her handout, relating to an Urban Village Center conceptual plan, there had been a lot of questions from Planning Commission members as to how this land really works. Maps were provided with Ms Niebanck noting various portions throughout her presentation. It was noted that the process started as a sort of concept plan, very rough and hand drawn that was initially used by the Board of County Commissioners with their agreement that this was how they would like to proceed. That’s what the Staff and Consultant Group have been working on all this time. At the same time McCormick Woods has been working on it, as well, in anticipation of certain issues being raised relating to how McCormick Woods and McCormick West were set up. Both areas had been set up in a manner that took into consideration protection of the wetlands while providing trails and the linkages among the various parts of the communities. Additional questions that were considered as part of the McCormick Land Company evaluation included how to develop Urban Cluster development away from sensitive areas and provide protection for those areas? How does McCormick North work with the peninsulas of land? How would the Village Center connect? What about this Urban Medium and the Business Park; how does all this work? In anticipation of these questions, McCormick had provided copies of documents looking at these questions in detail, with all the wetlands in ULID #6 field marked and typed. The development pods shown on the maps, clustered in McCormick West, made assumptions about where the appropriate stormwater retention will be, as well as wetland setbacks and how the land works to support urban level development in a cluster pattern. McCormick North is the really important one and we’ll come back to that when we get back to Zoning.

Again, the areas addressed include McCormick Woods, McCormick West, and McCormick North with the Village Center. The land works in pods with indentations between the pods. Ms Niebanck indicated on her maps where the Northwest corporate campus Business Park would be, as well as the corporate campus residential area. It was noted to be McCormick’s intention that this all work as one area. With one of the pods, they’ve created a central park across the street from the Village Center so there will be a permanent green space, a Village Park right in the middle (noted on the map). It includes about 19 usable acres. The Village Center is part of the site for the Urban Housing, Medium Urban Housing, because it would be incorporated with the Urban Village Center. It would then be surrounded by Housing, Urban Medium Housing and then the Business Park. There is also a proposed school site for the South Kitsap School District (noted on the maps) where they have already expressed an interest in having 6 acres there as opposed to what they already have. That implies that there would be a change in Zoning from what’s proposed in the final draft to something that’s
slightly different. Again, it's the Urban Low, the Urban Cluster, the School site, the Village Center, Medium Density Residential and the Business Park.

Plans have been developed for how the trails would work, as is required in the Plan. Transit Center location has also been considered in terms of both employment and the Urban Medium and the Village Center. That is the entire plan.

For clarification Ms Niebanck also pointed out on the map where the South Kitsap Industrial Area, which would be discussed later, and McCormick Woods were located. It was noted that there is a 2000 acre permanent public park that will be owned the end of April 2003, in its entirety, by Kitsap County with the exception of the Square Lane Park which is a State-owned park. The reason that’s important is that it does what the Growth Management Act requires. It puts a firm, green, permanent edge to the Urban Growth Area, so that the Urban Growth Area cannot expand in that direction. It distinguishes between one Urban Growth Area and another.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any questions. Mike Gustavson asked how many platted home sites there were in McCormick Woods? Ms Niebanck noted that, platted today, there are approximately 1139 minus 470. Mike Gustavson asked how many would there be at full build up? Ms Niebanck noted that they had looked at each of the pods within each development and come up with estimated plats. There would be 1139 within McCormick Woods, with another development providing 1700 and the other approximately 1300 (all pointed out on the map). Assumed densities per acre ranged from 5 to 11 with a total of 4,172 units. The specific density in McCormick Woods is 2.9 dwelling units per acre, excluding the golf course.

Mike Gustavson noted that it would appear the density would be 5-6 times as great in the new urban areas compared to McCormick Woods. He was looking at the yellow and pink portions, noting how many lots were allotted. Ms Niebanck pointed out the golf course and because the way the land works there is a huge green area that feeds into the park.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other questions.

Bob Johns, Attorney for McCormick Land Company, noted that the document he had distributed at this meeting was not required reading before the end of evening as he would be providing a summary of the document and the process it involves as part of a continuing work product. As Eric Toews described, one of the components of the updated Subarea Plan is the requirement for Master Plan processing. That is also a component of the South Kitsap Industrial Area. One of the things that he understood from the Planning Commission was that they wanted a single process for Master Planning that would work for both of these areas, as well as other areas in Kitsap County that the Planning Commission might determine should also require a Master Plan. At this point, there are two different drafts relating to two different Subarea Plans. Mr. Johns noted he had attempted to create a merged process that could be used for both plans, as well as Countywide for other subareas, such as Kingston or wherever the Planning Commission deemed appropriate. The draft contemplates Master Planning as a concept, not as standards that are going to be decided. The
standards would be established by the individual Subarea Plans and by Zoning imposed on a property, but you need a Process Ordinance to do this. What he had done was take both processes and come up with a single process. He noted the intention was to continue to work with the County Staff to ensure it meets with their requirements and those of the Planning Commission.

Basically, what he was presenting was an Ordinance stating that if the Subarea Plan says Master Planning is required, there is an outlined process that is required. It would also allow for concurrent processing of other permits. For example for the ULID #6 area, there is an application for the Urban Village Center site plan that could be processed with the Master Plan. This would allow a single approval process, eliminating the necessity for people to repeat the process to decide, essentially, the same issues. It would continue a set of requirements that would have to be submitted with a Master Plan. Basically a general plan would be submitted, showing proposed densities and uses. It would have to have an open space recreational plan and a transportation component that identifies all the road improvements, within the timeframe that the Master Plan area is being developed. It would require a comprehensive stormwater plan that integrates stormwater on the site itself and water coming into that area from offsite and where it goes once it leaves the Master Plan area. There would have to be a plan for public sewer systems, improvements for public water, transit and the other components of the infrastructure that may be necessary to support the area. In this particular case that may include the schools because the South Kitsap School District has a site within this area that would be integrated as part of this plan. Obviously the South Kitsap Industrial Area doesn’t need a public school so one is not required there. It’s designed to be flexible, to require the components that are applicable based on whatever the Subarea Plan is but flexible enough to provide a single mechanism for the County to use to process Master Planning. It needs a little bit of work; we’ve been working on it for just the last couple of weeks to try to make this effort to respond to the Planning Commission’s comment that they would like a single plan. One component that had been left out relating to the South Kitsap Industrial Area, in error, was the economic development component. That was an unintentional oversight. Bottom line, he was providing a draft combining the Ordinance that could be used for either one of these plans. Mr. Johns noted that he was asking the Planning Commission to look at the document as something to be developed further with Staff assistance and adopted at the same time as the balance of the development regulations.

As a final comment, he noted that with regard to Design Guidelines, a letter had been sent on behalf of McCormick a few weeks prior to the meeting, urging that part of the Plan be an Appendix or a separate document, not a part of the Subarea Plan. For clarification of the letter’s intent, he noted that both the Requirements and the Guidelines be adopted as a separate document, an Appendix to the Zoning Code or some other sort of standalone document. It could be provided to applicants as a tool when planning their project. But to propose Design Guidelines without the master plan, expecting them to be used as part of the development, would not encourage specific, customizable designs that are good and well integrated with the whole area. It’s part of the Master Planning process and should not be a separate set of rules that everyone has to use. The idea is to let the people doing the Master Plan suggest, as part
of their application, Design Guidelines that would be imposed as part of that process at
the finish line.

John Ahl asked if Mr. Johns was proposing that the draft Ordinance put together on
behalf of McCormick be considered in lieu of the draft implementing Ordinance that
the Planning Commission was considering at this meeting. Mr. Johns noted that it was
an attempt to combine and come up with one Master Plan process. The South Kitsap
Industrial Area currently has a Master Plan section; ULID #6 also has a Master Plan.
There are some slight differences with ULID #6, some were even quite a bit different in
the Master Plan process. Since the Planning Commission had indicated in one of the
work-study sessions that they preferred one process, this was an attempt to do that. It
doesn't significantly change the language from ULID #6; it took the components from
both Subarea Plans and tried to merge them into a single process. It was presented
with the hope that ultimately there could be one master process countywide.

John Ahl stated that the Public Hearing was on ULID #6 Ordinance and how they
should proceed with the documentation presented by Staff. He asked that Mr. Johns
clarify if he was recommending that they not act on the Ordinance before them, that
they in fact act upon the document he had provided. Mr. Johns noted that the
document he handed out is a complication of sections from the two other Ordinances.
There were no substantive changes to what was required for a Master Plan, only that it
was integrated into a single process. John Ahl then clarified that Mr. Johns had no
objection with the Planning Commission proceeding with the existing, proposed draft
Ordinance with the encumbrances of Master Planning. Mr. Johns agreed, stating that
it was his suggestion that if they should decide they only wanted to have a single
Ordinance, he had provided a starting point for Staff to work from in combining the
two current Master Plan processes.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any other questions with Mike Gustavson
presenting a question to Darryl Piercy. He asked whether the proposal presented by
Mr. Johns would require more Staff attention and time. Darryl Piercy noted that it
would as they had not had a chance to review the document prior to the meeting or
discuss it with Mr. Johns. Staff understood what he was attempting to do, based on his
testimony, but there are elements that are necessary and specific as they deal with each
Master Plan. Staff would need to look at the submitted documentation closely to
ensure the policies of each Subarea Plan, which are different, were reflected in the
process. There are very specific implementation issues dealing with the South Kitsap
Industrial Area that may warrant it being treated differently from Master Planning for
communities. Darryl Piercy confirmed that it was something Staff would like to
address and look at in further detail. Once Staff had the opportunity to review it in
detail, they could provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission prior to the
Planning Commission making a decision, but it would require additional time and
review.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if any of that would require an additional Public Hearing.
Darryl Piercy responded that, if it were going to be proposed, the public would need to
have the opportunity to review the proposed revision and it should be distributed to
interested members of the public for them to respond. Staff would anticipate that,
depending on the action of the Planning Commission this evening, there will be
additional opportunity for either written testimony or even additional oral testimony
on the agenda items addressed this evening prior to making a final decision. The
decision was tentatively scheduled for April 15, 2003 and that date could provide the
opportunity for the public to review and comment on any proposed amendments. It
would not necessarily hold up the implementation or adoption schedule as an element
of the Comprehensive Plan amendments. Darryl Piercy did note that Staff and the
Planning Commission were reaching a period of time where it was critical that certain
issues be addressed in order to maintain their schedule and include these elements
within the Comprehensive Plan amendments. Ultimately, Staff would need to review
the proposed combination of Master Planning processes and see what it involves. Staff
could be prepared to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission at the next
meeting if that’s their recommendation.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no further questions and proceeded to the next
public speaker.

William M. Palmer, Land Use Planning Consultant, noted that he came from
Snohomish County before Kitsap County. During the 7.5 years in Snohomish County
he worked on four different Master Plan projects, not the least of which was Mill Creek.
Mill Creek is now a city, but back in the early-to-mid 70’s it started as 1,000 acres of
undeveloped land. On arriving in Kitsap County, while serving as Director for
Department of Community Development, he assisted with establishing the Master Plan
process for the Bucklin Hill Ridgetop, which involved about 650 acres. There was a
limit of approximately 4,000 dwelling units for the amount of residential activity
accommodated on the site, involving about 19 property owners. In today’s terminology,
that had to be coordinated as an integrated SEPA process. Mr. Palmer wished to
emphasize what Mr. Johns had presented to the Planning Commission. Essentially, a
Master Plan project is a process. That’s how Mill Creek was approved in Snohomish
County. That’s how Bucklin Hill Ridgetop was Master Planned. It involved a relatively
short document, approximately ten pages, setting forth the process by which the Master
Planning would be accomplished. For the Ridgetop Subarea Plan, the Comprehensive
Plan for Central Kitsap County included about 4 or 5 pages devoted to the necessity for
Ridgetop planning and what was to be included in that process. The only other thing
that Kitsap County had to work with at that time was the 1983 Zoning Code. There
were a lot of things approved under this code, not the least of which was the Kitsap Mall
and most of the shopping centers that were developed in the 10-year period of time.
That includes McCormick Woods, although it was not Master Planned in the same
sense as Ridgetop. McCormick was built upon a very small section of Code, by
comparison, in the 1983 Zoning Code. Mr. Palmer pointed out that they now had a 72
page document. In the past they had a 50 page document that covered the entire
County and addressed many, very substantive issues while allowing for a lot of
flexibility in design. As an example, McCormick Woods provided some really nice
products as a result of the kind of planning process that was in effect during that 10-
year period of time. Again, Mr. Palmer emphasized his point that what was needed was
a Master Planning process, whether it’s a large industrial complex like the South Kitsap
Industrial Area, ULID #6, McCormick Woods or even a smaller project. If it calls for a
Master Plan in the Comprehensive Plan, you need some kind of consistent process to
structure how that will work. Mr. Johns’ proposed Ordinance may very well do the trick.

Mr. Palmer also noted that in consideration of the planning for Mill Creek, the parties involved were most concerned that they couldn’t know what the end product was going to be, anticipating a 10-15 year period for it to be fully implemented. As planners, we like to think of ourselves as having a lot of vision for what happens in the future. But we cannot anticipate all the changes in design or the changes in market that could take place. It starts out with a general plan which works out to the specifics, with the Ordinance controlling that. It doesn’t have to have to specify all the Design Guidelines, structured as you find in your proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments. All of these Design Guidelines, in Mr. Palmer’s opinion, should be moved to a separate book. He stressed that they don’t belong in an Ordinance. If not a separate book, they should at least be moved to an Appendix in the Zoning Code, to be referred to by the reviewing agency and the applicant as to the things they might look to include in their Master Plan.

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

Richard A. Brown, a former member of the Citizens Advisory Committee, began by expressing his appreciation to Lary Coppola, Chair, and Mike Gustavson for attending their meetings. Additionally, he thanked Staff, noting that Laura Ditmer had done a very good job, guided by Darryl Piercy. Mr. Brown also noted that the Consultant did a very good job bringing forward information from the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Planning Commission. The only area where Mr. Brown felt the system had not worked was with regard to the Planning Commission meeting with the Citizens Advisory Committee to review what they had covered over the 6-8 months they had been in effect. One of the things covered was ensuring maximum flexibility at McCormick Woods for developers, ensuring they could work within a plat to develop an elderly complex, develop larger lots, multifamily dwellings, etc. They also worried about roads, schools, open space and parks. Mr. Brown noted that it would be preferable, in the future, that when a citizens’ committee works for months on an issue and agrees to changes, that the Planning Commission should meet with that committee to find out what they’ve been doing. The only one who showed up at that meeting on the 20th was Lary Coppola; there were no Staff members represented at all. Mr. Brown expressed his irritation with that lack of consideration.

With regard to the proposed Ordinance, he noted that he did not agree with a maximum lot size in ULID #6. Mr. Brown noted that presently 82% of development in Kitsap County is being done outside the Urban Growth Area. He expressed the opinion that this was due, in part, to the Urban Growth Area not allowing enough space to build decent houses. The communities of Bremerton, Poulsbo, and Port Orchard had an average density of about 3.5 homes per acre. Now Kitsap County is saying that there are to be 5-9 units per acre, but not allowing them to be spread out at all. The plan is excellently prepared, but at this point there is not real definition of where South Kitsap is and where the center of Port Orchard is. Mr. Brown stated his belief he doesn’t agree that Port Orchard has a problem with sprawl. He would like to ensure that any development be done properly and that the developer be able to provide the product
the community wants, needs and will build on. There are currently 750 building permits issued a year and we have 4000 units. South Kitsap has traditionally taken about 28% of the population so, at that percentage, how long will it take to develop McCormick? It won’t happen overnight; it is a 20 year process that Kitsap County and its residents will have to go through. Another issue was with regard to the Design Guidelines with everything put in as recommendations.

As one final issue, Mr. Brown noted that there were currently four large property owners with big holdings around Urban Growth Areas. Once the Subarea Plans and ordinances are approved, they take the population. We need to spread population out and give back to the people as McCormick has done, once the numbers are used. He asked Chair Coppola understood Mr. Brown’s point.

Deborah Flynn asked what Mr. Brown considered a “decent sized” house as he previously stated. He noted that the average $225-235,000 house on a moderate lot that used to cost $28,500 and now costs $40k to build is about 1800 square feet. His son is currently building a couple of homes in Port Orchard on 12,000 to 16,000 square foot lots. The Subarea Plan had homes being built on as little as 6000 square feet in the last plat. He pointed out as a reminder, also, that about 80% of Kitsap County isn’t covered with sewer and that no matter what size is developed, it would require a septic tank and the appropriate square footage allowed. It was clarified that the 1800 square feet was what he considered to be a “decent sized” house. It was his understanding that the average 3 bedroom, 2.5 bath, 2-story home with a garage was about 1800 square feet; ramblers were somewhere around 1300-1500 square feet. Deborah Flynn then asked if his concern was the lot size or the cost to build on it. Mr. Brown noted he had recently visited some zero lot line plats in Seattle and some were done very well. But he is not one who would like to see us building on postage stamp lots when we have thousands of undeveloped acres in Kitsap County. He would prefer to see kids playing in their own yard, watched over by their parents, not having to go down the street to play in a park.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no further questions.

Ken Attebery, Port of Bremerton, indicated the Port’s support of the Subarea Plan process, the Urban Village plan and the inclusion of McCormick West in the Urban Growth Area. Knowing the proponent for this project somewhat closely after four years, he knows that the project will produce a fine product for Kitsap County and one that we can all be proud of. Additionally, Mr. Attebery stated he understood the interest in a unified Master Plan process, but agreed with Darryl Piercy’s comments regarding the care that needs to be taken with a Residential or Urban Village Master Plan as opposed to an industrial development, such as the South Kitsap Industrial Area.

A third dimension, one that is important to the Port, is that through the South Kitsap Industrial Area planning process the Port of Bremerton have compromised or negotiated into being subject to some of those Master Planning requirements. They might otherwise argue that their ground was designated as Urban Industrial in 1998 and that they therefore have rights or expectations as to what was in place at that time. This had been resolved through negotiation and compromise, however, finding a way to
get to a common goal. There are some subtleties for the 1998 Urban Growth Area lands and there are probably half a dozen sentences that would be very important to the Port in whatever Unified Master Planning Ordinance the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners might ultimately consider. Those will be addressed later as part of the South Kitsap Industrial Area. Regarding ULID #6, however, he wanted to stress that the Port of Bremerton was supportive of what was currently before the Planning Commission in regard to the Subarea Plan.

Jerry Harless noted that he was taking a slightly different tone. A little over a year ago the Planning Commission had unanimously voted to reject this plan. What was now being presented was a plan that had been changed only in its outside packaging with just a little bit more detail. Fundamentally you still have a proposed Urban Growth Area that violates the Growth Management Act very clearly and very directly. Rather than readdressing his issues over the past two years, he highlighted the key points. This plan still rests on a population assumption that does not comply with the Growth Management Act. The Growth Management Act, the County’s own countywide planning policies and the County’s Comprehensive Plan require a 20 year population forecast. That forecast must be adopted by the County legislative authority as part of the Countywide Planning policies. A 2017 forecast has only been recommended by the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council; an advisory body such as the Planning Commission, doesn’t make it. It’s not 20 years, it’s not Countywide and it has not been adopted by the County legislative authority. It, therefore, violates the Growth Management Act and contradicts the County’s own policy documents. This hasn’t been fixed; this hasn’t been changed. This plan also defies the locational criteria of the Comprehensive Plan, Countywide Planning policies and the Growth Management Act. Those require that Urban Growth Areas first be located in areas that are already characterized by urban growth. Only when there’s nothing else left should they be located in vacant tree farms that are three miles outside of town. This has been addressed many times before and hasn’t changed. The one thing that has changed a little bit is whether or not the Buildable Lands Requirements of the Growth Management Act applied because the County had policies for early implementation of those. Those arguments are all moot now because the statutory deadline passed last September. That section, Section 215 of the Growth Management Act, required counties to take corrective action when actual growth patterns don’t match the Comprehensive Plan and Countywide Planning goals. In this case our Countywide Planning policies and the 1998 Comprehensive Plan directed that 5/6th of new growth be in the Urban Growth Areas established in 1998. There is actually a lower proportion of our County’s population living in those areas today than lived there in 1995. We’re achieving the opposite. Better than half our growth is occurring outside the Urban Growth Areas. The Growth Management Act says you have to fix those problems and moving the Urban Growth Boundary is the last resort. It is a violation of the Growth Management Act to go on expanding a Urban Growth Area that isn’t even receiving the growth it was planned for. This Urban Growth Area was designed to hold 63,000 people in its 20 year lifespan up to 2012. If you take the difference between half and 5/6th you wind up with approximately 20,000 people in the 20 year life of this plan who are moving into the rural areas instead of the urban areas where they were planned. This plan expands the Urban Growth Area to handle 6400 people. You don’t need it. You’ve got 20,000 who aren’t coming to the urban areas unless something’s
Mr. Harless provided some background documentation for the record and for the Planning Commission to review, to save Mr. Johns the trouble of objecting to them later. Essentially, the Planning Commission’s decision the last time was the correct one. Mr. Harless appealed to the Planning Commission’s integrity as planning professionals not to recommend approval of a plan that on its face clearly violates the growth planning laws.

Deborah Flynn questioned Staff regarding a letter received a few weeks before the meeting. The letter stated that the Hearings Board has determined that the Ordinance the Board of County Commissioners adopted in April 2002 did not expand the Urban Growth Area or adopt a Subarea Plan. Basically the decision on appealing the Urban Growth Area was not timely. Deborah Flynn asked for clarification from Staff.

Darryl Piercy noted her characterization of the letter was accurate. The Hearings Board was noting that the action taken by the Board of County Commissioners did not adopt a Subarea Plan or change the land use map. That was recognized and clearly identified within the Ordinance that was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners at that time. The Board of County Commissioners’ intent in the adoption of the Subarea Plan was simply to recognize agreement with the elements of the Subarea Plan. It modified the Subarea Plan as it was presented from the Planning Commission and it instructed Staff to do a number of things that would be consistent with the new policies and directions identified within the Subarea Plan. The process to be undertaken for the actual adoption of the Subarea Plan, Urban Growth Area boundary and changes to the County’s comprehensive land use maps will take place as a result of amendments to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan. That process is scheduled to take place and be finalized mid-year 2003. The action that would be forwarded by the Planning Commission to the Board of County Commissioners would either be a recommendation to amend the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan consistent with whatever their recommendation might be or if there even was a recommendation to amend the Comprehensive Plan or not to amend it. Deborah Flynn asked for more clarification.

Darryl Piercy responded that the action by the Board of County Commissioners will be to amend the Comprehensive Plan. That would include adopting the Subarea Plan for ULID #6 as well as the implementing regulations that will change the Zoning Code. The recommendation by the Planning Commission, which would be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners, would give the Planning Commission’s recommendation to take or not take action with regard to amending the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan during this current 2003 cycle for amendments.

It was clarified that the Comprehensive Plan cannot be amended more than once a year but must be opened for amendment at least every 5 years. The Board of County Commissioners have chosen to conduct a Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle in 2003. This would be an element of that process based on the Planning Commission’s recommendations. The Board of County Commissioners will either choose to accept the Planning Commission recommendations or choose an action different from those recommendations. If they were to take action to amend the Comprehensive Plan and
adopt this Subarea Plan it would come about as result of the Comprehensive Plan amendment process.

Deborah Flynn clarified that, as part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment process they would be going through later this year, they would be establishing the Urban Growth Area boundary in addition to adopting the Subarea Plan. Darryl Piercy confirmed that. He further stated there has been no formal action to expand the Urban Growth Area boundary at this point.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no further questions.

Ron Wright, a former member of the Citizens Advisory Committee for the McCormick Woods project, ULID #6, strongly recommend they be allowed to proceed with their project. Mr. Wright noted the McCormick Land Company provides an excellent product as shown by the existing McCormick Woods development. Mr. Wright emphasizes that one important issue that came out of the Citizens Advisory Committee was that developers be given maximum flexibility to respond to the market conditions when developing properties. He agreed that the County has the responsibility for ensuring the environment and surrounding properties are protected, as well as that the facilities, such as sewer, water, storm runoff, and the infrastructure are provided for. It was Mr. Wright's opinion, however, as well as that of the Citizens Advisory Committee, that they didn't want the County to substitute its opinion for the opinion of the developer, especially as it relates to the marketplace. The developer should be allowed to develop in response to what the marketplace tells them to do. Obviously the County isn't putting up the money; it's the developers who have to put up their funds to make this work.

Ron Underwood, a former member of the Citizens Advisory Committee, noted that he lives in McCormick Woods and supports the Subarea Plan. He envisions a community mirroring the one he lives in, which he moved to after considerable thought and research. Ms Niebanck referenced a proposed County Park, and he noted there was a trail system leading from the Park up through the trail systems in McCormick Woods and crossing the street into the new development. It was likely that trails on the other side would be good for the community and good for people around it, not just the people that live there. It's for the County.

Fred Deepee noted he was in favor of this project. He was also on the Citizens Advisory Committee. The one item he would like them to attach to it is that there are no minimum lot sizes. Developer flexibility is important and they should have the ability to determine the lot size to meet their needs. If a development meets all the building codes, health codes, safety codes and environmental codes, that’s what the issue is about. Not what size the lot is. It’s to ensure all the County requirements are met. If a developer can provide a product on a smaller lot that the market wants, it should not be dictated by the County, again provided it meets the previously mentioned code requirements. Mr. Deepee noted that he sells real estate and believes there are going to be a lot more people going back to smaller homes because of cost. You're going to start seeing 1 and 2 bedroom, World War II era homes with 1 bedroom 1 garage homes because of cost. Not because of preference. The cost of land is accelerating so fast right
now that a 2.5 acre parcel in South Kitsap is going for $50-60,000. Putting no restrictions on the lot size, there can be more products on the market leading to more stabilized pricing. The pricing is just going crazy right now. He was against McCormick Woods initially going through. That’s changed tremendously since he originally voiced his opinion against it. It is a good project. For buildable lands in South Kitsap it’s the only logical area now to expand. Especially with what’s taken place, with the MOA getting negated for all intents and purposes and a boundary line adjustment that’s going to alter the whole program as we know it anyway. He would very much like to see this Subarea Plan and ordinances approved but with the condition that there are no minimum lot sizes.

Ron Ross noted that he only wanted to address the Village Center Zoning. He noted he wasn’t familiar with what it is and didn’t object to it in McCormick Woods. His concern was that in all the various notices, they all referred to ULID #6 or the South Kitsap Industrial Area; none of them addressed development of a new Zone. This certainly might be well done and appropriate to McCormick Woods and if they like it that’s fine. But if it’s going to affect, and be a zone available to, the entire County, he felt that it should be made available for review by many others.

John Ahl asked Mr. Ross if he was proposing that the Planning Commission hold up action on what’s before them until such time as a separate set of hearings and public testimony can address the new Zone. Mr. Ross responded that he hadn’t thought that out but that, no, he would not like to see anything held up here. He’s never for delay in projects and believes it is always detrimental to the people. Maybe there would be a way that they could adopt that Zone for this piece of property only, then consider public comments and adopt it Countywide later on. But he was not recommending holding up the Subarea Plan or ordinances for the new zone issue.

Gloria Eghert from Fig Leaf Road noted that this would deeply affect her neighborhood. She noted that her home was on 5 acres and most of the people in her vicinity have at least 2.5 acres. Traffic is already bad and she didn’t now how it would accommodate this additional growth without having a “super highway” planned. There was also concern about how the development would affect the diverse wildlife, such as bear, deer, etc. She doesn’t approve of the Plan. The road she lives on is a narrow, windy road that goes into Gorst and everybody uses it. She could not determine how it could even be widened to accommodate the increase in traffic.

Mike Schutz, a homeowner in McCormick Woods, noted he had taken part in the process of putting the Plan together. He believed that all of the issues and concerns noted at this meeting had been addressed to the right level of detail and he supports the Plan.

Ms Niebanck noted she did not have some of the materials and asked if she could order them directly from the County Staff. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted he had no problem with that.

➢ Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that this portion of the Public Hearing was closed and called for a 10 minute break.
Public Hearing to receive oral and written testimony regarding the proposed amendments to the Kitsap County Zoning Code for the South Kitsap Industrial Area Plan.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted they were here to continue the Public Hearing and consider the proposed amendments to the South Kitsap Industrial Area Subarea Plan.

Darryl Piercy noted before them for consideration this evening were the implementing regulations for the South Kitsap Industrial Area. There is a slight difference between these documents and what was considered and reviewed this evening for ULID #6. Specifically the South Kitsap Industrial Area Subarea Plan has been accepted by the Board of County Commissioners, it has gone through a full public process, reviewed by the Board of County Commissioners and they are prepared to move that forward in the Kitsap County Annual Comprehensive Plan amendment process.

The element that was missing in the course of that review was the implementing regulations, actually amending the Kitsap County Zoning Ordinance. The elements before them for consideration are specifically related to the Zoning Ordinance, not the Subarea Plan itself. There are a number of items contained within these implementing Ordinances to be highlighted.

Before beginning his summary, Darryl Piercy expressed his appreciation to the community members for their hours of effort regarding the South Kitsap Industrial Area and the development regulations. It represents many years of commitment from property owners, from the Economic Development Council, from the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners in regard to developing this site.

Darryl Piercy noted that the primary interest in developing the South Kitsap Industrial Area was to provide an area in Kitsap County that would provide an opportunity for the development of primary family-wage jobs. He noted that the Plan forwarded by the Planning Commission to the Board of County Commissioners anticipated nearly 10,000 jobs in the South Kitsap Industrial Area. With regard to the implementing regulations, one of the key elements in the South Kitsap Industrial Area is that this land represents tremendous challenges in terms of environment protection. It involves bringing together three separate watershed areas within South Kitsap and siting industrial development within them. All three watersheds were deemed to be very important to a variety of streams that support numerous habitat elements, as well as being salmon streams, with some containing threatened species.

The South Kitsap Industrial Area is primarily an undeveloped area. It borders and surrounds the Bremerton National Airport and property owned by the Port Of Bremerton which is currently involved in industrial development. The area that is being added to the boundaries for the South Kitsap Industrial Area is primarily in private ownership. One key element is that the privately owned land will be available.
for sale, whereas land owned by the Port of Bremerton would only be available for lease. This expansion will open up an additional element of marketability for Kitsap County for the development and creation of jobs. The draft Ordinance has been provided to the Planning Commission, is on the website and is on a table at the meeting.

One of the key elements is the Master Plan element. Master Planning is required under the newly created and newly developed Business Center Zone. It will be done at a sub-basin level within the watersheds. Within the existing turquoise/blue areas (noted on the map) to the northwest of the Business Center Zone are the areas that are currently zoned industrial and would continue to be zoned industrial under the development regulations. Within these areas the Master Planning element of the development regulations would be optional. Staff thinks this is a very key element based on testimony received prior to this meeting as well as development of the Subarea Plan as well as at work-study discussions.

The Port of Bremerton had previously testified regarding their development rights within this area, with or without a Subarea Plan. It was important to maintain the integrity of those rights as well as maintain maximum flexibility for the Port. It’s interesting to note in testimony from previous hearings that one of the key issue is to have flexibility in plans as they move forward. The purpose of the Master Planning in the South Kitsap Industrial Area is to provide that flexibility. It also provides a high level of predictability in regard to protecting those sensitive areas of the environment within that are provided within these three watersheds.

The purpose of the Business Center Zone is to set the stage for large scale business development and job creation. Within the land use tables the primary focus for the Business Center Zone is for the types of uses that would support and create family wage-jobs within the South Kitsap Industrial Area. This again is intended to be a process that will provide flexibility and predictability. It will also provide for a significantly expedited permitting process once the Master Plan process has been achieved and approved. This is a key element that is important to point out based on earlier discussions where the Planning Commission was shown a Zoning Ordinance with 50 or so pages compared to the development regulations that contain considerably more pages. One of the key elements is to provide for a very expedited process once you’ve gone through Master Planning. With that, there is a need to do more with the Master Planning up front. There needs to be more detail; there needs to be more specific information provided in that Master Planning element. Ridgetop was used as an example earlier. In Ridgetop, a Master Plan was accomplished and it was a fairly generalized plan. It identified certain uses in certain areas; it identified densities; it identified a number of issues, mainly the roadways and some of the transportation networks. It touched on some of the areas such as sewers, drainage, and those kinds of issues. What also happened in Ridgetop was that, as each development came forward, it was necessary to go through a separate site-plan review process that involved a public hearing and it had to be ratified by the Board of County Commissioners prior to approval under that 1983 code.
Under the Master Planning process proposed for the South Kitsap Industrial Area, an applicant can go directly to the permitting process for a building permit. There is no intermediate step of site-plan review, provided the proposal is consistent with the Master Plan as it was presented and approved. There are significant times and, ultimately, cost savings for an applicant going through a process that is undertaken through Master Planning as it is outlined in the South Kitsap Industrial Area and ULID #6.

Darryl Piercy thinks there are some distinct differences in the Master Planning process for industrial areas versus residential areas, particularly because of the elements that we’re dealing with in the South Kitsap Industrial Area pertaining to those three watersheds. There are significant issues in regard to those watersheds; while the impacts may not be more severe, they may be more potentially impacting to critical areas and environmental issues within an industrial development than in a residential development. Therefore, the Staff feels there is a need for the Master Planning process to provide that additional level of detail for industrial and business center development. Those elements are in fact different in some respects from the residential South Kitsap Industrial Area versus the residential process outlined in ULID #6. The differences are subtle and Darryl Piercy agrees that in terms of process, outcome is generally the same. There still needs to be, however, that level of flexibility between the Business Center Zone and Industrial Center Zone in the South Kitsap Industrial Area. Staff believes it is important to have those differences. Staff would be happy to look at the proposal by Mr. Johns but it also wants to ensure that the vital level of flexibility and predictability provided for in the Master Planning process of South Kitsap Industrial Area remains, for it also allows us to get to where permitting is extremely expedited for the applicants, thereby promoting development and creation of jobs.

One of the issues that came forward in previous testimony under the Subarea Plan and comments received by the Planning Commission in work-study was the issue of structure heights. The South Kitsap Industrial Area implementing regulations and the South Kitsap Industrial Area plan do not specifically prohibit building heights over 35 feet. They do provide for a process that incorporates discussions with both the Fire Marshall and the Fire District with buildings over 35 feet regarding what criteria would have to be met. It’s important to point out that they are allowed with the provision that we coordinate those issues with the local Fire District and local Fire Marshall’s office. It also provides for the discretion of the Director of the Department to allow for buildings over 35 feet in height. The purpose of that would be to maximize the available land and to once again maximize the number of jobs that can be created as an element in development.

In the Subarea Plan there are specific provisions for the Master Planning process. These deal with a host of issues, primarily things such as transportation, utilities, networking and planning for infrastructures such as roadways. There are issues such as broadband and other high-tech needs that might be associated with business development, as well. All are included within the policies of the Subarea Plan. The Master Planning process would call these out and identify how within the Master Planning process those would be called out and identified as an element of how they should be addressed.
Lary Coppola, Chair, noted the Mr. Johns had passed on providing further testimony. Testimony was next given by Ken Attebury.

Ken Attebury, Port of Bremerton, stated he had provided comments to Darryl Piercy last week regarding the Master Plan overlay and other Ordinances before the Planning Commission tonight. The major issue regarding the level of review was addressed by the new draft. Mr. Attebury noted that there had been a four-year, collaborative process culminating in September 2002. One of the documents produced at the end of all that work was a September 24, 2002, County-published draft of the Master Planning Ordinances. Subsequent to that, Staff had been going back over the document for review. The latest proposal of that Master Planning Ordinance, however, came out with a half dozen sentences removed or changed, contrary to what he understood had been agreed to. The Planning Commission had, therefore, been provided with a letter regarding this matter. He had also discussed the situation with Darryl Piercy and, without quoting Darryl, it appeared Staff had acknowledged their comments and considered them to be administratively workable between this hearing and before the final decision.

Additionally, with regard to height limitations, the Port of Bremerton expressed their agreement with Darryl Piercy’s comments. He stressed that the goal of “simplicity” should not be missed.

Mr. Attebury also pointed out an apparent discrepancy in documentation. One of the proposed changes to Section 17-370-090, which was addressed on Page 3 of his letter, stated that any Master Plans (such as those for the Port of Bremerton) must be approved prior to January 2003 or the new Subarea Plan and ordinances would apply. The policy in the Subarea Plan, however, notes the Master Plan must be approved prior to the adoption of the Plan. Adoption of the Subarea Plan may not be for another six months, allowing the Port to take advantage of existing ordinances. This discrepancy needed to be addressed so they could determine how to proceed. That same section also notes that developments which are “exactly” the same as the approved Master Plan could be submitted for permits. Whereas the policy in the Subarea Plan has wording to the effect that they be “consistent with” the Master Plan. It was recommended that the term “exactly” be clarified or removed, perhaps with wording that stated “development applications that are not inconsistent with the Master Plan may be submitted.”

Darryl Piercy noted he had reviewed Port of Bremerton’s comments and, in general, they are supportable by the Staff. They are issues of wordsmithing to a large degree which aren’t intended to change the intent of the policies as they have been interpreted and placed within the implementing Ordinances. Darryl noted he felt the policy was very clear in the Subarea Plan where it refers to consistency with the Master Plan as it has been approved. As this has gone through internal review throughout the department and other County agencies, some of those words may have been changed from what was in the original draft. The intent is to follow the policy. So submissions by the Port of Bremerton that are consistent with the policies within the Plan, Staff would implement with some minor modification within the text. Staff is prepared to go through the text and identify any inconsistencies based on the comments of the Port.
Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any public comments.

Rod Reid with Alpine Evergreen part of the South Kitsap Industrial Area noted he had pointed out some map corrections to Darryl Piercy during the break, although he realized the purpose of the meeting was not related to mapping issues. He noted that he wasn’t going to speak today, until he heard that the Master Plan Ordinance might be changed to meet more than one thing, meaning ULID #6 and the South Kitsap Industrial Area. They had worked a long time on the Master Plan to fit the conditions at the South Kitsap Industrial Area. Although there were valid reasons to have one master plan for the county to use in the future, he felt it was not appropriate to stop at this point and try to merge the processes. It could delay the Subarea Plans for each item by months. Mr. Reid noted that he felt the Master Plans and supporting Ordinance should stand alone with their differences.

Linda Niebanck, McCormick Land Company, noted for the record that McCormick Land Company, after consultation with the Staff and a preapplication meeting, has submitted a proposed mineral resource overlay for a portion of the South Kitsap Industrial Area property. This included a geological assessment and all the conditions required by Staff. It was not clear to her how this would get folded into the process, but she had been directed by Staff to present it as a proposal to the Planning Commission for the proposed mineral resource designation, rather than as a site-specific application. It was therefore being submitted concurrent with the South Kitsap Industrial Area Subarea Plan. She presented copies to the Planning Commission, with copies provided previously to Staff. She noted on the map where it applied, noting that reports had been submitted. If it were included with the South Kitsap Industrial Area, they would provide any reports necessary to include it in the industrial development there.

Ms Niebanck also wanted to make sure they had memorandum from Zoltan Szigethy, the Executive Director of the Kitsap Regional Economic Council, in support of this.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked the purpose of the mineral resource overlay? Ms Niebanck noted there were mineral resources available. McCormick Land Company had worked closely with Mr. Reed and Mr. Palmer on the situation. In the conceptual plan there is a road going through part of the South Kitsap Industrial Area and they will be working on that road while excavating mineral resources.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there was no further public testimony or discussion.

➢ **Upcoming meeting schedules and agendas.**

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that the Public Hearing was being continued to April 15, 2003. It would be held at the Silverdale Community Center, Poplar Room, from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon. The Public was invited to attend and provide both oral and written testimony.
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The deadline for written comments was 4:30 p.m. on April 8 at the Department of Community Development Office located at 614 Division Street, Port Orchard, Washington.

The agenda for the April 15, 2003, meeting would include:

- South Kitsap Urban Growth Area Subarea Plan ULID #6, including implementing regulations and policy revisions to the Subarea Plan as approved under Ordinance 269-2002.
- Implementing regulations for the South Kitsap Industrial Area Subarea Plan.

Deborah Flynn asked why the hearing was being continued. Darryl Piercy noted that the Public Hearing was being continued due to potential action by the Planning Commission on some of the proposals brought before them at this meeting, specifically the request to look at and consider a combined master planning process. The public had not had the opportunity to review that proposed process, nor had Staff. If the record is left open with written testimony received in additional to oral testimony on April 15, that would allow the Planning Commission to make a decision. There were also some recommendations made by the Port regarding the South Kitsap Industrial Area that Staff would incorporate into the current language. That would be provided to the Planning Commission one week prior to the April 15 meeting.

Laura Ditmer also noted that all these items would be brought back to the Planning Commission in May for a final decision. April 15 is the anticipated date for a decision on oral testimony but the schedule allowed them to hold off on a final decision until May.

8:30 P.M.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.
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