
7:00 P.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

7:05 P.M.

- Public Hearing to receive oral and written testimony regarding the proposed draft Kingston Sub-Area Plan/SEIS: Preferred Alternative (Alt.B).

Darryl Piercy stressed that at the last Public Hearing there was a clear message that it was important to take the time to plan correctly and, in so doing, consider all options and alternatives that are available. It was not anticipated that this process would run into 2003. The plan is now about to meet the Kitsap County population projections to the year 2025. Kitsap County and Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council are currently working on these projections to identify and determine what the population projection should be into 2025 (exceeding the standard 20 year timeframe to coincide with the state’s 5 year increments). The population projections are underway and anticipated within the next several months. Based on that, the current Board of Commissioners has indicated they would like the community and Planning Commission to continue to work with the process and recognize this other element taking place in our community. In order to avoid the need to come back in either a year or two to update the Kingston Sub Area Plan based on new population projections, it is requested that the Planning Commission consider a long term planning projection to 2025 prior to making a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Work that has taken place up to this point in the community would not be lost. The environmental work that has been completed would continue to move forward. There would be an additional time delay in the actual adoption of the Kingston Sub Area Plan. It would also possibly open the door for additional opportunities to be considered by the community prior to making a final decision on the plan itself. This would be asking the community to take on additional work, additional effort and additional meetings, to determine whether or not it would be appropriate to plan out to that period. What we want to avoid is having to come back and change the plan in a few years due to new population projections that
could affect this Sub Area Plan, making it almost immediately outdated. It would be appropriate to go forward with the information we have available this evening, and to begin to think in terms of melding with this new population projection. Population projections are unknown at this time and we could very well end up with the same piece of work that we have today; or it could be modified as a result of the new population. In either case, it seems appropriate at this point in time to at least consider the possibility of extending that period out, doing an appropriate job and benefit the community in looking at a longer term process than 2017 as is currently being considered. Darryl relayed the message from the Board of Commissioners that they would like this issue to be given some consideration. He restated that the process should continue forward and take Public testimony on Alternative B. Regardless of final population projections, previous work would be preserved on the option that was being presented, while considering any additional information if it becomes available.

John Ahl asked what the anticipated delay or extension was.

Darryl Piercy stated that, under action that was undertaken by the legislature last year, Sub Area Plans can only be adopted as an element of the comprehensive plan as an amendment. It would therefore fall into an annual amendment cycle for Kitsap County. The annual amendment cycle for 2003 is anticipated to conclude around the end of July 2003. We would, therefore, be looking at the 2004 comprehensive plan amendment cycle before this actually became an official part of the County's comprehensive plan. This would lead to about a one year delay in the process in order to take us out to the 2025 timeframe rather than 2017.

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

Shannon Bauman indicated the draft Kingston Sub Area Plan and Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS) were issued on October 11, 2002 and Public comment period was open until November 26, 2002. The Planning Commission met to discuss and review the plan on November 26, 2002, January 7, 2003 and again on February 4, 2003. In addition there was an open house in late March 2003 to discuss new items and issues since October 11, 2002. As a result of Public testimony and Staff discussion with the Planning Commission, Alternative B was selected as the preferred alternative and was being presented for review. Based on further analysis and review, there were several changes made to the Alternative. Several parcels have been recommended for Urban Restricted (1-5 dwelling units per acre) rather than urban low as shown on the original version. These properties were changed due to environmentally sensitive areas. She indicated the revised areas on the map. In response to concerns that were raised about the economic liability to downtown Kingston and information that resulted from planning at the south end of the County, the land use designation called Urban Village Center was introduced. This designation is primarily a mixed uses designation. As indicated on the map (pointed out by Shannon), Urban Village Center is primarily neighborhood and commercial-like uses. This is almost exactly the same as what was previously allowed in Neighborhood Commercial zoning. It allows a mixture of single family dwellings, cottage type housing or town home type housing. In conversations with Steering Committee, it made sense to try and look at the geography
of downtown Kingston and what was already existing in designating the Urban Village Center. A revised version of the goals, policies and projects chapter of the plan was also provided. Additional revisions to the SEIS portion of the document are underway and will be included with a response to comments in the Final Plan/SEIS.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any other questions; there were none. He then stated that Public Testimony would begin, with comments to be held to five minutes or less.

Jean Sherrard addressed the committee as one of the owners and operators of Reliable Storage, the new mini storage in Kingston. He stated that he had owned the property since 1986/1987 and during that time has observed zoning changes. In 1992 it was zoned Medium Density Residential that, at that time, allowed mini storage facilities in that zoning.

Chair, Lary Coppola stopped Mr. Sherrard’s testimony for clarification. The documentation distributed by Mr. Sherrard indicated he was requesting a site specific zoning change. Lary Coppola stated that this meeting was not the appropriate forum for that issue but should be limited to specific comments on the plan itself.

Jean Sherrard indicated that he was directed by Planning Staff to come here and testify with regard to the zoning issue.

Shannon Bauman stated that they had advised Mr. Sherrard to bring his issue to the meeting since they couldn’t accept a site specific amendment or change to the plan while there was an ongoing planning process. Mr. Sherrard had been advised that this would be the forum to bring this kind of request for change forward since the plan was in process.

Jean Sherrard stated that he had applied for a site specific change in the zoning and in a preliminary meeting with County Planners he was told to use this process to address his situation/request.

Chair, Lary Coppola again stated that the hearing tonight was on alternatives to the Kingston Sub Area Plan specifically. He went on to state that this was a comprehensive plan meeting and requested clarification if there was some point he was missing.

Darryl Piercy spoke to clarify the situation. He stated that this was the proper forum for this discussion as they were in the process of identifying not only the boundaries of the Kingston Sub Area Plan but land uses that would be an element of that Sub Area Plan. A zoning change from the preferred alternative would be an appropriate discussion to have if you were receiving a specific recommendation or request to do that. It should be considered whether or not this particular parcel has appropriate zoning under the Sub Area Plan proposal. He stated that Mr. Sherrard was trying to represent that this particular parcel, under the Sub Area Plan, was not appropriately zoned and was asking for consideration in modifying the preferred alternative zoning map to recognize this existing use.
Chair, Lary Coppola requested that Gene Sherrard point out the property location on the map and requested clarification as to whether it was within the area proposed as Highway Tourist Commercial. After clarification that it was an adjacent parcel, and with further clarification, he agreed that it was an appropriate item for this forum.

Jean Sherrard then referred to his handout, indicating that the County Commissioners removed mini storage from Medium Density Residential zoning. He had the building in process, properly permitted and within the allotted time and with all appropriate procedures. When attempting to obtain the final occupancy permit on the existing buildings he discovered that he was in a Medium Density Residential zone that does not allow for mini storage facilities. He is now requesting a mapping change since Highway Tourist Commercial is immediately adjacent to his property. He stated that they were not requesting this mapping change for any other reason than its current use; using other Reliable Storage properties as an example of their intentions. He stated that a rezone would give them the opportunity to fit within and be part of the community. He reiterated that nonconforming uses are like a sore thumb, they always get in the planner’s way and take up an inordinate amount of planning time. They become unique because by definition they don’t fit and this could be prevented with the requested mapping change.

John Ahl asked whether the property was within proposed Urban Growth Area boundaries, with the proposed usage over the line just outside highway.

Darryl Piercy brought in the map for John Ahl to see, indicating that the existing parcel was well within the Urban Growth Area boundaries and currently adjacent to the highway.

John Ahl asked whether there was currently a reason for excluding this from Highway Tourist Commercial.

Darryl Piercy indicated that up until approximately 1998, mini storage facilities were allowed in Urban Medium zones. With 1998 zoning code changes, it changed to a nonconforming use. He further clarified the issues. A nonconforming use is a use that is out of character for what normally would be built in that zone today. Due to Kitsap County’s liberal nonconforming use policies, the Planning Staff was comfortable with the use located on the property, knowing it could be replaced in kind, receive maintenance and repairs under current County code. He acknowledged that lenders are hesitant when dealing with nonconforming uses. It was also stressed that, should the property be rezoned to Highway Tourist Commercial, despite Mr. Sherrard’s testimony regarding intended use, any use that is allowed in Highway Tourist Commercial zone could be undertaken on that property; rezoning would not just limit the use to what is currently in place today.

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

Bill Arness indicated his support for further study to ensure all issues were address, including population projections. The continuation would only amount to approximately 10% of the total time spent on the project and would be justified. He
indicated a belief that there were going to be large increases in the population over the coming years and that we should plan accordingly. He also stated his opinion that some of the mapping was distorted with regard to community property, schools, P.U.D., etc. and that this would benefit from further evaluation and long term planning. He also stated a desire to see larger areas zoned for commercial use. The plan should be looking at ways to enable larger companies to move to the area, employing more employees and provide an economic base for the area. He again indicated that the committee should not make the final decision at this time but go into a little more detailed study.

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

John Johnson stated that he is currently involved in a project called Kingston Meadows, town homes that have been built on a site originally planned for apartments. He stated that there is a tremendous need in this community for affordable housing. He stated that his understanding was that some of the Urban Medium Density had been changed to Urban Village density, thereby diminishing the ability to create affordable housing in this community. To eliminate Urban Medium Density in this community would make it more difficult to create affordable housing. He stated that he represented Tom and Rosalie Warriner, the owners of Kingston Lumber. Adjacent to the Warriner’s property is property owned by Dorothy Bradley, who will be represented by Gary Henley. It was being requested that the Planning Commission consider redesignating the property owned by the Warriner’s and the Bradley’s as Medium Density. His reasons were further set forth in the summary that he provided. The properties are adjacent to currently zoned industrial property that has been set aside for ferry traffic. It is not conducive for single family residents due to difficulty with buffers. It is, however, the perfect place for Urban Medium Density, which he stated North Kitsap needs. Secondly, immediately north across Highway 104, the property is currently zoned Urban Medium Residential, as Mr. Sherrard testified. It currently contains apartments and a mini storage facility. He concurred with what Mr. Sherrard proposed, stating that there were enough “sore thumbs” in the development community and a zoning change would be appropriate. The development of multifamily housing in close proximity to the ferry would minimize the traffic impacts and allow residents to walk to the ferry or use Kitsap Transit.

Chair, Lary Coppola requested that he show exactly where that property was located on the map.

John Johnson indicated where the property was located and, again, stressed the shortage of affordable housing. Revising the plan would give them the opportunity to continue to work on projects that are conducive to multifamily housing. Existing critical area regulations would protect critical areas, such as Carpenter Creek. The property is in close proximity to an elementary school and would provide excellent pedestrian access for families and children. Finally, the Growth Management Act goal is to provide housing within the designated Urban Growth Areas. He stressed that he didn’t want to see opportunities that are presented by Urban Medium designation eliminated and asked that this be revised in Alternative B as presented at the meeting.
Thomas Nevins requested clarification of an unlabeled picture on Page 2 of Mr. Johnson’s handout that looked like current high density housing. He specifically inquired as to whether it was what Mr. Johnson had in mind for these pieces of property.

John Johnson stated that the particular picture was not exactly what was planned. What was intended was more similar to Kingston Meadows with its 55 town homes or Poulsbo Place. Either one would be indicative of the model they had in mind.

Thomas Nevins indicated concern with regard to the amount of impervious surface as compared to the land area and how it was going to be handled adjacent to Carpenter Creek.

John Johnson stated that Kingston Meadows was a good example of how they could handle wetland delineation. It was created with a significant area of open space. The advantage of the Medium Urban Density was that it provided more creativity and flexibility in designing a site plan to protect just such issues and would provide them with the tool needed to do it right.

Deborah Flynn indicated there was a property in the map in the back of the handout with dashed lines around it and requested clarification as to what this was.

John Johnson stated that the area indicated with the dashed line was Dorothy Bradley’s property and that they were both taking the same approach with regard to the property designation of these properties. This would give them the opportunity to develop them as a cohesive property. Even though they will be developed separately, they would be able to cooperate in the process.

Deborah Flynn clarified that the Waggoner property was adjacent to that with the dashed lines. She also stated that in earlier meetings they had discussed property southeast of that. She asked if there were any critical areas on the indicated property and how these would relate to the zoning of the property?

John Johnson stated that there were critical areas to the west of this property along Carpenter’s Creek. The Urban Medium Density would allow for buffers and open space, protecting the property more than the minimum requirements of the County. With regard to the access, there is an opportunity to share access between both properties and they would be enhanced if site planning were looked at as one cohesive unit rather than separately.

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

Gary Henry, representing Dorothy Bradley, expanded on those points made by John Johnson. The property discussed is currently zoned Urban Low Residential and he requested that it be changed to Urban Medium Residential. Due to adjacent zoning, the property’s proximity to the highway, and the lay of the land it would lend itself very nicely to multifamily dwellings. The property is mostly sloping with some views and no wetlands. The lack of multifamily housing was stressed with examples provided.
showing the limited number of multifamily rental vacancies in the area, as well as the multifamily rentals ranging from $975 to $1200 a month; single family rentals ranged from $950 to $1500 a month. Even if an family is willing to pay higher rent, there were not a lot of units available for rent. Changing to a higher density zone would allow more multifamily dwellings for better planning for the future. With the eventual addition of a foot ferry to downtown Seattle, growth in Puget Sound will definitely increase. Having limited parcels zoned for multifamily would not be conducive to that growth,

Chair, Lary Coppola requested clarification on the list of multifamily units in the handout. One was a seniors’ complex and 4 were condominiums, stating these should not figure into available rentals at all.

Gary Henry stated that the condos listed were owned by people who rented them out. They were included in his handout information in an attempt to include all available rentals in the Kingston area. He also added that two were also subsidized housing units. This further supported the need for multifamily units; if you don’t fall in the subsidized income category, your rental options are even more limited.

Mark Flynn requested clarification regarding the four properties that were not privately owned, asking if they were Publicly owned.

Gary Henry clarified that they were not publicly owned. He had attempted to differentiate between property managed by an apartment manager, for example, and individual owners that had just one unit to rent out.

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

Darryl Piercy next addressed the Planning Commission and Public to clarify the intent of establishing the mixed zone in downtown Kingston. This zoning was established to allow for a variety of housing types as well as to provide for higher densities. The Medium Density previously referred to is allowed within the downtown core in the mixed use zoning. Historically the zoning code had distinct separations between commercial uses and residential uses; not allowing apartments to be placed on top of a business. The new zoning concept will allow for that type of development to occur. Historically in communities where that has been allowed it provides for more affordable housing within that downtown core. It provides for more rental opportunities, typically, and higher densities that are the goal of establishing a village center zone.

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

Sonny Woodward urged the Planning Commission to consider waiting a few months and getting information in on the 2025 population allocation before they make a final decision. He would like to see the decision made as soon as possible, but believes that with all the newer developments; i.e. the possibility of a foot ferry and a new High School, it behooves the Planning Commission to really take a serious look at the next
allocation of the population. A few more months on this project would not be too big of a deal.

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

Edgar Toth, also representing his wife and mother-in-law, requested that the Urban Village Center be extended further than was currently planned. The question he posed was why can’t the Urban Village Center extended so that there is mixed use for properties (with possibly having condos and stores available) on the waterside of NW Kingston Road? To that effect, he submitted a request that the Urban Village Center be extended over to these properties.

John Ahl requested that Mr. Toth indicate which properties he was referring to on the map.

Edgar Toth indicated where the properties were located and, again, requested that the Urban Village Center be extended to include those properties.

Deborah Flynn asked the staff if the Kingston Design Standards apply to property in the Urban Village Commercial and, if the designation was expanded, would the Design Standards automatically include that property, as well?

Darryl Piercy stated that he did not believe there would be an automatic application of those without specific action by the Planning Commission to extend those Design Standards. The boundaries for those Design Standards are fairly clearly established within themselves. But it might be appropriate to extend those Standards into any additional zoning that might be placed on the map.

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

Zolton Szigethy, Executive Director of the Kitsap Regional Economic Development Council (EDC), stated that the EDC would like to ensure there is a distribution of industrial zoned lands throughout the County to ensure there is a place for businesses; primary jobs to locate in small business parks or larger business parks. He noted that the plan, at this point, does not really provide for business parks; it focuses on tourism, cottage industries and the like. This was not the economic engine needed in the long run. While considering a possible extension and further review, he requested that the committee take into account how to achieve business locations enabling people to both work and live in the northern end. Secondarily, with respect to population, he stated that the County’s population growth is about 1% per year, however it’s apt to be greater for the northern region of Kitsap County, particularly the Kingston area. This is primarily due to the ferries and their proximity to north King County and hopefully downtown Seattle; the high quality of the schools; and it is an attractive location for telecommunication business. A survey by the EDC of businesses in Kitsap County noted that telecommunication businesses were the fastest expanding businesses. Although there are no precise figures and even the final numbers will be an approximation, it is likely that the population projections will be higher for the northern end than for the County as a whole. His third point echoed earlier comments
that a Comp Plan takes a long period of time and that it would be better to be faced
with a delay, rather than stopping/ending the process, and then starting all over with a
whole different set of appeals and issues to address.

Mr. Szigethy then stressed the EDC’s involvement in processes throughout the County,
such as development of the contents of the current plan. The EDC was also very
involved in trying to ensure Kitsap County has a telecommunication business structure
so businesses would have the opportunity to locate in the area. Lastly, they have been
strong advocates for the Kitsap Transit solution for a passenger-only ferry, thereby
allowing for better access to King County, making this area more attractive. At the
same time, they would like to have future plans include the perspective of
independence and self-dependence, making work opportunities available closer to
home rather than people needing to live here and work on the other side of the water.

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

Betsy Cooper, who had previously participated in the Steering Committee, expressed
her appreciation to the Planning Commission and Kitsap County Staff for their time
and consideration. She particularly noted their efforts to give serious consideration to
the current availability of both utilities, particularly water. She stressed that water is a
resource that is frequently considered to be available in copious amounts in the Kitsap
area; however, the reality is whether water is truly available for future development or
when it will be available. She noted that it now appeared there was the possibility the
plan would be extended for another year in order to take possible population
projections into consideration. She cautioned that extending the process may not be
truly a good decision for moving Kingston forward; rather it may be an opportunity for
certain alternatives or other situations that didn’t work today to perhaps work a year
from now. The components of the plan presented at this time, particularly recent
changes in zoning, will offer residents and owners of these properties the flexibility that
may have been lacking to date. It would enable development in the urban core to move
forward, which is the key to revitalizing Kingston. Any delay would just mean a further
delay in the ability to move forward. She supported the changes made in Alternative B;
particularly the additional Urban Restricted areas that were presented. She believed
one of those additional restricted areas possibly was related to the property Mr.
Johnson had discussed, but she did not know the particulars of that property. She was
concerned, however, about what type of development would occur if there were
wetlands and the development was limited to lesser acreage. It might require taller
structures and she questioned whether that would be in a reasonable context outside of
town, next to farms, etc. She again stressed her support for the Urban Village Center
zoning, providing flexibility to the urban center. She expressed concern, however, over
yard requirements. She asked that the Planning Commission look much closer at
whether no yard requirements was really appropriate. She requested that this be
explored further, as well as whether there was a conflict between multifamily home
designs and restricted floor area limitations as mentioned earlier.

Chair, Lary Coppola stated that Ms. Cooper was out of time and she ended her
comments.
John Rose stressed that the Growth Management Act was meant to achieve planning in order to achieve great communities. It’s not about moving a line and looking at small issues, but looking at 10, 20, 30 years down the road, ensuring that we end up with the best community and community plan possible. He supported postponing a final decision until population projections were received for 2025. To do community planning in two steps instead of one comprehensive step, runs against great planning and against most of the principals the Growth Management Act. It would not benefit the County to do only half the job. It would be better to take a little more time, a fraction of the total, and do the job once rather than doing it in two steps, regardless of whose property a delay would benefit. If it takes a little bit more time to really make a leap and end up with a great community, we ought to do it. He also reiterated Mr. Szigethy’s position with regard to economic development issues in Kitsap County. Most of the zoning is set up for areas such as retail, tourist and smaller office jobs. Although these are important elements of an economy, they do not make for a robust economy. It takes jobs at a primary level; industrial business type jobs to accomplish that. Not making provisions for larger industries, planning for potential population growth and transportation changes allowing for direct access to downtown Seattle and a large customer base, seems like an opportunity lost. Although planning for a future with cottage industries, retail, and tourist commercial is important, they’re not the whole story. He requested that the Planning Commission give this matter further consideration.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any questions related to Mr. Rose or Ms. Cooper; there were none.

An unidentified audience member asked what was the largest area set aside for commercial industry; that it appeared to be less than five acres as one contiguous parcel.

Darryl Piercy stated that he was unsure of an exact amount, but that the speaker was probably accurate. The 1992 urban design study came up with a total of 53 acres of commercial.

The audience member clarified that number related to commercial but not other industry. Although he stressed he was not an authority, he did not think there were many parcels larger than 5 acres.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any other speakers who did not sign up but would like to testify.

Annie Humiston stated that she was on the Steering Committee as recently as 2001 and that, at that point, they were operating without a population allocation. They were told to use the 2.7% population growth that was in the Comp Plan at that time. They were later told to allocate for 0-3000 and worked with those numbers. She expressed concern that if there should be further delay for population projections we could be looking at 2025, 2030, etc.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any questions; there were none.
Michelle Toth asked for clarification as to where the ferry parking was located on the map and whether accommodations had been made.

Darryl Piercy stated that the State had looked at a variety of parking alternatives to support the ferry terminal. Some of that was located on the map with the land currently owned by the State, although there are no funds allocated for developing parking at this time. Although there are no specific proposals before the County to consider parking at this time, in the long term when funding is available, the property would be appropriately zoned for moving forward with that type of consideration and the State already owned the property.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked for clarification whether the parking parcel was the one adjacent to the Bradley/Waggoner parcels?

Darryl Piercy confirmed that it was.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any other individuals who would like to testify.

Tom Waggoner, represented early by John Johnson, stated that he would like to clarify some earlier issues. On was with regard to a picture that had been referenced when Mr. Johnson was speaking. That picture had been included as an example of the type of property bordering his land for a comparison current area usage. Next was in response to comments regarding critical areas on the properties in question. One of those parcels was currently landlocked and it had been determined that he would have to cross Carpenter Creek in order to eliminate the landlock situation. However, if the properties were rezoned as requested, this might open a window for perhaps working out an easement with the Bradley’s, eliminating the need to cross Carpenter Creek. He reinforced the fact that they would still be required to comply with all regulations relating to critical areas should they receive the requested zoning changes.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any other speakers.

Suzanne Arness stated that she had been on the Committee some time ago, and she wanted to comment on some previously mentioned items. She liked the Urban Village Center concept with the availability of single family homes, encouraging people to stay in town. She also felt that, rather than going to the highway, people would be more likely to walk to the ferries if they were “up the hill” and that this seemed like a more natural way for people to flow to a public facility like the ferry.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any other questions or speakers, there were none.

8:31 P.M.

Public Testimony Concluded.
Chair, Lary Coppola thanked the Staff for their hard work and asked if they had any additional comments to make.

Darryl Piercy advised those in attendance that there is a work-study session scheduled for the Planning Commission to consider and discuss this evening’s testimony on May 6, 2003. It will be held at the Silverdale Community Center and the Public is welcome to attend. There will be no additional Public testimony taken at that meeting and it is not anticipated that there will be a final decision at that meeting.

Deborah Flynn had a question related to the population projections. She had attended all the Steering Committee meetings as a member of the committee and representative from the Planning Commission. It was her understanding that the Steering Committee was never given an actual population projection to work with; they were told to develop a plan to fit the vision and not to worry about populations. After requests by the Steering Committee, they were eventually given the broad range of 0-3,000 for population projections. She now asked what Staff intended to do with additional population projections if they weren't utilized for development of Alternative B in the first place.

Darryl Piercy stated that the initial intent of the Steering Committee process was to try to identify what the vision of Kingston would be over the course of the next 20 years. Through that vision the County could begin to develop and craft a Sub Area Plan to reflect that. The Sub Area Plan does call into place a very technical element, to address population issues and whether or not they could support that vision. They would not normally have had a population allocation at the time, but the County had gone to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council and requested an interim population projection out to 2017, as allowed under the provisions of Growth Management Act. This information was specifically requested for the planning efforts of Kingston and South Kitsap to obtain an interim population. The initial numbers were used to see how the population range fit with the vision that was being proposed. In the case of Alternative B it was determined that the initial population projections were supported, using the range of 0-3,000. Neither the County nor the community anticipated that the Sub Area Plan would be close to finalization so close to the time that new population projections going out to 2025 would become available. Although he stated the work of both the community and the Staff did a great job developing of this plan and the Urban Village Center concept, he did not want to see the plan finalized, only to find the next year that they had to go back and do it again.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if that answered Ms. Flynn’s questions?

Deborah Flynn stated that she was still unsure if Kingston would get a population projections since it was part of an unincorporated Kitsap County projections that include Silverdale and parts of south Kitsap. She again stated that the original plan did not have populations specific to Kingston allocated and wanted to know if there were going to be specific allocations made for Kingston with the new population projections.

Darryl Piercy stated that the 0-3000 range was specific to Kingston. Although this was an unusual allocation, it was the one provided by the Kitsap Regional Coordinating...
Council. The Urban Growth Area cannot be expanded without population projections to support that expansion. In the case of Kingston, the County wanted to see the vision without the community considering specific numbers. All urban areas in Kitsap County are identified with the population allocation. First the County is given a population projection, established by Kitsap County, which is taken to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council. The Countywide projections are allocated out to all of the Urban Growth Areas, both cities and unincorporated Urban Growth Areas, such as Silverdale and Kingston. Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council is currently in the process of developing how the analysis for allocation will be performed and there are amendments to the Countywide planning policies that are currently out for public review. They give a pretty clear indication of how that allocation takes place. Anyone interested in reviewing that process was advised to let Darryl know and he would get them a copy of the proposed changes which will be instrumental in determining what that allocation should be. The population numbers for Kitsap County would not be known for several months and it was unknown if and how those numbers would affect communities within the County. These changes would, however, go out to 2025 and could potentially affect this plan and the future of Kingston. Since that window of opportunity was so close, he again asked that the Planning Commission take that into consideration before making any final decisions.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any other questions.

Evan Stohl said that it didn’t seem like Alternative B picked up many housing units. He then asked how many units were actually included in Alternative B.

Shannon Bauman stated that the plan looked at the vacant land, undeveloped and underutilized land that had potential for additional development. In that analysis they used the low range of the density (i.e. for Urban Low, 5 units per acre), then used the high end of the range (i.e. for Urban Low, 9 units per acre). Potential dwelling units ranged from 768 up to 1760 for alternative B. That number has a percentage reduction for roads and critical areas.

Evan Stohl asked if that included schools and other public facilities.

Shannon Bauman indicated that available land did not include public facilities.

An unidentified audience member asked whether critical areas were included?

Shannon stated that an approximate percentage was used for excluding critical areas from available land.

An unidentified audience member asked whether public water and sewer were considered.

Shannon Bauman stated that they were.

Chair, Lary Coppola asked if there were any other questions.
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8:45 P.M.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.
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