
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions and Agenda Review.

A motion was made by William Matchett, seconded by Monty Mahan that the Planning Commission approves the Minutes of February 4, 2003.

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

Work Study Comprehensive Plan Amendments Part II: A) Site Specific Amendments to the Land Use Map and Zoning Map

Laura Ditmer provided a brief introduction before individual applications were reviewed. Twelve site-specific applications were being presented to the Planning Commission for review prior to the Public Hearing on July 1, 2003. Map corrections were also being provided for Planning Commission review, with hard copies of the map correction Staff Reports to be mailed out the following week.

Resolution 219-2002 was distributed, outlining what was going forward on the initial docket and how Staff would proceed with specific applications. On Pages 2 and 3, Item 5, Areas Not Open for Review, was covered. Those areas excluded by this Resolution could still be considered in another year, although those site-specific proposals would not be considered in this annual review of the plan. Specifically regarding Urban Growth Areas the Resolution states:

1. Not open for review are site-specific amendments that propose to expand the Urban Growth Area boundaries except for those proposed amendments that have support from the City associated with the Urban Growth Area; or

2. Site-specific amendments to revise the boundaries of an Urban Growth Area to include any land presently designated as a joint planning area; or

3. Site-specific amendments that propose to revise the boundaries of any Urban Growth Area presently engaged in an ongoing Subarea Planning process where the
Study Area has been physically identified in the Sub-Area Plan context. If the site is included in the study area during dependency of the application review for site-specific amendments, the Sub-Area Planning process shall determine the outcome.

The Resolution goes on to address Rural Designations and proposals with Environmental Impact Statements. Staff has used this to determine whether or not to accept site-specific applications. As the Planning Commission goes through the site-specific applications, they will note some of those applications have moved forward and were reviewed. specifically relative to any ongoing or pending Sub-Area Planning process.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked how the Urban Growth Area situation impacts ULID #6 and whether ULID #6 was affected by this Resolution with Lary Coppola, Chair, noting that they would be included as part of the ULID #6 planning process.

The Planning Commission was asked if they would like to make any revisions to the Agenda before proceeding. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that Interim Growth Forest should be discussed, and it was agreed that it would be included after the other Agenda items had been covered, prior to the Public Hearing on July 1. Laura Ditmer also recommended that the Findings of Fact be removed from the Agenda with Lary Coppola, Chair, noting he had already bypassed that item.

Jason Rice provided the presentation on all twelve of the Site Specific Amendment applications, noting that the Rallis proposal had been withdrawn. Packets were distributed for each application with Jason specifying that they were distributed at the meeting to ensure they were received in the same manner and order they would be addressed at this work study, as well as at the Public Hearing. The order in which they were being presented was based on the number of interested parties calling the County for information or to provide input on the applications.

Jason Rice clarified some confusion regarding the new handouts, noting that they should not be placed in the binder until after they had been covered at the meeting. They were specifically handed out in the order they would be discussed, which differed from the notebook. Although the notebook could be considered as providing backup information, the critical information was included in the Staff Report that had been provided.

Lary Coppola, Chair, suggested the Planning Commission take a moment to glance through the materials. John Ahl asked if the Staff Report they had just received conformed to the Staff Report already located in their binders. Clyde Stricklin clarified that their binders contained the Application Form, Checklist and Maps; the Staff report was new material that was being covered by Staff at this meeting. Laura Ditmer clarified that the Staff Report would go with the Preapplication Reports and Application contained in the binders after Staff had completed their presentation.

**RALLIS:** Formally withdrawn June 4, 2003. Being vested, the original project was no longer moving forward through site-specific amendment process.
KITSAP TRANSIT: Staff had received numerous phone calls regarding the Kitsap Transit Proposal. The parcel included 21 acres within the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area with a requested change from Urban Residential Low Density to an Industrial designation with a Public Facility Overlay. The Urban Residential Low Density designation had been adopted by the City of Poulsbo with the County’s approval within the Urban Growth Area during the Sub-Area Plan proposal process. Kitsap Transit was now asking to establish a facility that would include a Bus Barn, Warehouse and Maintenance facility. The property is located within the Urban Growth Area. It does not currently have sewer and is within approximately 300 feet of existing water lines. Staff has addressed each of the questions outlined in requirements under the Ordinance for the Staff Report and is recommending approval. There is one caveat, however, on that approval. It is further recommended that the applicant receive additional support from the City of Poulsbo Planning Commission before a final decision is made on the application.

John Ahl pointed out that the City of Poulsbo appeared to have already denied this request and asked for Staff to clarify the status. If Poulsbo had denied it, John noted that the site-specific amendment should not be considered based on Rule 1 of the earlier referenced Resolution. Darryl Piercy stated the Kitsap Transit application was not proposing an expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary, since the property was already located within that boundary. They were only requesting a rezone. With regard to the City of Poulsbo’s previous response, the application had only been presented to the Planning Commission. There was no input received from the City Council or the Mayor. County Staff does not have any indication from their City Council or Mayor as to whether or not they support the application. The Interlocal Agreement between Kitsap County and the City of Poulsbo does not have a specific requirement that the County obtain City Approval for a Comprehensive Plan amendment of this type. The Staff Report, therefore, states the City’s approval is recommended, although not required. Kitsap County Staff believes obtaining approval from the City is a good idea and it would be appropriate for the applicant to approach the Poulsbo City Council for a letter of support. This is not, however, required under the Interlocal Agreement between Kitsap County and Poulsbo.

Laura Ditmer provided an overhead showing the specific site and that it was within an Urban Growth Area boundary. Staff also anticipates that before the Application is presented to the Board of County Commissioners the City will have discussed this application and provided a formal position. In follow up to these questions, Darryl Piercy specified one element of this application that differed from what was reviewed by the Poulsbo Planning Commission and that is the Public Facilities Overlay element. This initial request had only related to rezoning and it was Staff’s opinion that this change introduces a significant, new element that had not been previously considered by the Poulsbo Planning Commission.

John Ahl expressed his opinion that it would be prudent for Kitsap County to get permission from the City of Poulsbo before making any changes within the Urban Growth Area.
Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was a physical address for the property. An address was not available, but Laura Ditmer noted that it was off the Poulsbo exit and three blocks down from the State Patrol office; between the State Patrol and the ball field on the right side.

William Matchett asked what buildings were located across the road and was advised that those buildings included a mini storage warehouse facility and Chico Towing heavy storage facility across from Viking Way on the left side. William Matchett initially thought the property was located in Central Kitsap, near the Peterson Farm. Staff clarified that the location of the property was north of Poulsbo.

Jason Rice noted that the Planning Commission would definitely hear testimony at the Public Hearing related to the use associated with this proposal. The Staff Report process attempted to distinguish between the specified use and the allotted uses. The Public Facility designation limited development options to public uses, eliminating a potential change in the plan to one of the multiple operations allowed within an Industrial zone.

Monty Mahan clarified that the purpose of the Work Study Session was to allow Planning Commission members to ask questions and learn more about the applications prior to the Public Hearing. Additionally, with a Public Hearing scheduled for July 1, he asked when the Planning Commission would actually be making a decision on these applications. Jason Rice noted that there was another Work Study Session scheduled for July 15 and it was at the Planning Commission’s discretion as to whether or not to make a final decision at that time.

Mike Gustavson expressed his extreme outrage and displeasure at the performance of the Staff by providing this material on the day of the meeting, thereby not allowing the opportunity for a thorough review. As a volunteer public servant, he made every effort to review the materials in advance, making notes and highlighting pertinent items so that he was prepared when he attended the meetings. This was the second time in two meetings that this had occurred and he had voiced his concern. He stressed that he was sick and tired of getting a pile of materials dumped on him at a meeting. If he was going to represent the public, he needed to learn about the information, yet could not review it properly while the materials were being discussed. He further stated that it was his opinion that the Planning Commission not consider anything that was not received several days prior to any meeting, whether it’s a Study Session or a Public Hearing. He was being prevented from doing his job due to what he perceived as a lack of Staff support.

**A motion was made by Mike Gustavson that the Planning Commission not consider any materials that were not received at least three days in advance of any meeting. John Taylor seconded the motion.**

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was any discussion on the motion. Tom Nevins agreed that he was uncomfortable with receiving materials the day of the meeting, but noted that the Planning Commission had until July 15, 2003 to review and digest the information. Although it would be nice to have materials in advance, he was also aware
that there were multiple factors that potentially prevented that from occurring. A
decision certainly couldn’t be made on these applications today, and Staff was not
asking for a decision. These materials were being provided for review prior to the
Public Hearing. He further expressed his preference that the motion be withdrawn
rather than carried forward.

William Matchett stated that his sympathies were with the motion, but that he agreed
with Tom Nevins. This was a Work Study Session, providing the Planning Commission
with the opportunity to ask questions and receive Staff input, with the materials
provided for review prior to the Public Hearing. The Planning Commission could even
schedule another Work Study if they felt it were necessary. He, therefore, expressed his
desire to proceed with the opinion that the motion would not do any good.

John Ahl had no intention of asking questions about the materials handed out at this
meeting. He noted that he agreed with Mike Gustavson that it was a bit of a disservice
to dump materials on the Planning Commission members the day of the meeting and
then expect a discussion. In spite of that, however, the Planning Commissioners all had
their binder that contains comparable information without the Staff Report
Recommendation. That information, which they had already reviewed, could possibly
provide them with enough substance to proceed. It was his suggestion that there may
be the need to schedule another Work Study after this meeting if any Planning
Commissioners felt it were necessary after the Staff’s presentation. With regard to
future meetings, it was his hope that materials would be provided ahead of time, noting
that he shared the frustration expressed by the other members.

Mike Gustavson didn’t totally disagree with what John Ahl had stated. The information
in their binders could probably allow them to muddle through the information. He still
felt the motion was beneficial, noting that the Planning Commission had received a
large pile of materials from multiple individuals at the last meeting. The last minute
dumping of materials on the Planning Commission members should not be allowed to
continue.

John Ahl stressed that the Staff were not necessarily the real villains in this situation.
Staff had been asked to meet a very ambitious schedule involving a substantial amount
of materials. Under the circumstances, it was likely they were doing the best they could
with what they had available.

Mike Gustavson noted the materials received today were dated Friday and if he had
been given the option, he would have been willing to pick them up in order to have time
to review them before the meeting.

Lary Coppola, Chair, pointed out that he was also partially to blame. He had
specifically asked Staff to complete a substantial amount of work in a very short
timeframe in order to allow the Planning Commission to cover everything in the time
allotted. Additionally, he noted he had been at the Staff’s office and it was obvious how
hard they were working to meet the various deadlines. William Matchett noted that
was the reason he would not vote for the motion.
Mike Gustavson continued to express his feeling that the Planning Commission was being held hostage by the Staff. Lary Coppola, Chair, acknowledged that there was a lot of frustration, but noted that referring to the situation as being held hostage was a bit overdramatic.

Monty Mahan was very sympathetic with the frustration that had been expressed. It was important to note, however, that a lot of people had taken time to attend the meeting; it was his opinion that the meeting should go forward. If questions were generated after the meeting and there was a need for more discussion, that could be addressed at that point, even if it resulted in an additional Study Session.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there was no further discussion on the motion requested a vote.

**Vote: Aye: 1, Opposed: 7. Motion defeated.**

Lary Coppola, Chair, redirected the subject to the Kitsap Transit application. John Taylor voiced his concern that there would not be any sewer provided. In his opinion large complexes seemed to be getting developed without sewer and he questioned the wisdom of that and whether it was in line with the Growth Management Act. Darryl Piercy noted that the Application indicated connection to sewer at some point in the future. This would probably also be noted during the Applicant’s testimony. At this time, the septic requirement for this facility would be comparable to that of a single family home based on the number of employees anticipated at the site. In any event, the application would still be required to go through the site plan review process or, in this case, a conditional use permit process, using the Poulsbo Code guidelines, as well as the requirements of the Health District. Kitsap County Staff agrees that industrial sites in urban areas should plan for eventual sewer connection, whether at the time of development or in the future. The proposed use with the Public Facility Overlay would appear to allow for an interim or temporary onsite septic system, which would be adequate for the proposed use.

Staff shares and appreciates the concerns expressed by John Taylor regarding sewer connections in urban areas. Wherever possible sewer connections were encouraged or required.

William Matchett asked for further clarification regarding how Kitsap County could proceed without approval from the City of Poulsbo. Darryl Piercy specified that the Interlocal Agreement allowed Kitsap County to amend the Comprehensive Plan which would include approval of the application at this site within County jurisdiction, excluding the need for approval from the City of Poulsbo. In the spirit of that Agreement, however, Kitsap County would like to have consistency between what is happening with the Urban Growth Area between Kitsap County and Poulsbo. The adoption of Poulsbo’s zoning code was an example of how the County was trying to be consistent regarding developments within the County’s Urban Growth Area jurisdiction and the City’s jurisdiction. Although it was not a specific requirement of the Interlocal Agreement, the Staff Report encourages or recommends that the applicant obtain approval from the City of Poulsbo and the applicant appeared to be willing to move
forward with obtaining some form of approval from the Poulsbo City Council. Prior to any action by the Board of County Commissioners, the City’s response should be received and could be considered with the application.

William Matchett asked what would happen if Poulsbo denied the request. Darryl Piercy speculated the elected officials would then make a determination as to whether or not it was within the spirit of the Interlocal Agreement to approve the application and decide how to proceed at that time.

Tom Nevins indicated a gray area at the top of the map that was where extensive sewer work was going on, with a large line to run down Highway 303. That seemed to indicate the proposed site was not far from having sewer available. Darryl Piercy noted proximity and availability were not the real issues in this situation. The decision would be up to the City of Poulsbo as to whether they would extend their sewer outside the City Limits. There is a possible exemption in the City Code allowing for sewer extension to public facilities outside the City limits, with the County waiting to determine whether the City interprets their code in the same manner. Sewer hookup is in close proximity but was unknown whether that hookup would be allowed prior to annexation.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other questions. Before continuing, however, he expressed concern regarding the Staff Reports that were distributed. It was his understanding that the Planning Commission had previously determined they did not want County Staff to include a Recommendation of approval or denial on pending applications, with that conclusion left to the Planning Commission. John Ahl was unsure if there had ever been an actual decision made on that matter, with Lary Coppola, Chair, feeling it had been voted on and approved with a specific request that Staff not include Recommendations. This had occurred several months ago and he asked if it was possible to go back and determine whether there had actually been a vote on the matter.

Laura Ditmer noted it had been discussed and recommended at one point but there was no formal motion or vote. The entire process had been evaluated with discussions on ways in which it could be streamlined. The Staff Recommendations were one of the elements discussed with the intent that they eliminate specific recommendations. In reviewing the matter with the Director, however, it was the Director’s opinion that it was appropriate for Staff to come forward with the rationale of a recommendation as part of their process. Lary Coppola, Chair, stated that would appear to indicate that what the Planning Commission had requested of Staff really didn’t matter. Laura Ditmer stressed that wasn’t the case, only that the Recommendation was also a process that was used when Staff discussed an application internally. She asked that the Planning Commission refer to the Staff Report they were now reviewing. The Report develops Findings and addresses all the different pertinent issues, such as infrastructure, transportation, water, sewer and environmental issues. The Planning Commission would use that information as part of their decision making process. From Staff’s perspective, the report would be incomplete if those findings were developed without summarizing them into some sort of conclusion/recommendation. The Recommendation was intended solely to offer the Planning Commission more
information, summarizing the findings in a manner that attempted to make decision-
making process easier.

John Ahl recalled that this was discussed and thought it had some genesis within staff-
itself because of frequent disagreements between the Planning Commission and the-
Staff Recommendations. He stressed that he didn’t recall there ever being a vote. Today, looking at the Staff Reports, he is more comfortable and believes it is part of-
Staff’s job to provide their opinion. Lary Coppola, Chair, felt they had talked about it at-
one time and made a decision and still felt that had been overruled by Staff continuing-
to provide Recommendations. John Ahl again noted that he recalled the discussion-
and that no decision had been made. He noted it might be worth going through the-
older minutes to determine exactly what had occurred, but he was certain there was no-
actual decision.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted it was already done and going through the old minutes-
would be a waste of their time. Laura Ditmer agreed it had been discussed with the-
suggestion that recommendations be excluded and Staff had begun the process with-
that intent. Internally, however, when evaluating how to flesh out the Staff Reports to-
improve what had been provided last year, it reach a point where Findings appeared-
incomplete without a summarizing recommendation. The decision was still up to the-
Planning Commission, regardless of the Staff Recommendation. William Matchett-
noted he likes having the Recommendation and he likes it when his decision agrees-
with Staff. When he disagrees with Staff’s Recommendation, it encourages him to-
evaluate his decision closely. He stressed that he finds Staff Recommendations are-
helpful.

Lary Coppola, Chair, agreed to leave Recommendations in the Staff Reports. The-
discussion was then directed to the next application.

CHOI: Jason Rice noted that the property was in North Kitsap and consisted of two-
parcels totaling just over 20 acres. The request was for a revision from the-
Comprehensive Plan designation of Rural Protection to an original request for Highest-
Best Use, which has since settled on Neighborhood Commercial. Regarding-
discussions in Phase 1 of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process relating to-
George’s Corner and LAMIRDs, these parcels are directly west of that area, heading-
toward Kingston on the north side of Highway 104. The parcel is approximately 1200-
feet from the Albertsons Complex. Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if it would be possible to-
get a copy of the maps used for overhead presentation with Laura Ditmer stating an 11 x-
14 copy would be provided at the next meeting.

It was verified that the property was near George’s Corner, going toward Kingston. Staff-
was recommending denial with a list of findings discussing each of the concerns-
regarding wetlands on the property, access, ingress onto the Highway and, basically,-
the lack of support for converting this Rural Protection land, which is a headwater to-
one of the main salmon bearing streams in the North Kitsap County area. Lary-
Coppola, Chair, verified with Jason Rice that the property did, at one time, have a-
Comprehensive Plan designation of Light Industrial.
John Taylor asked that the parcel be pointed out on the overhead, asking if it was the one directly across from Albertsons. Jason Rice noted it was not, indicating its location while noting it was toward Kingston, just past Premier Rentals.

John Ahl noted this appeared to be similar to a proposal from last year that involved trading off of property with development on the approved site in exchange for other land remaining undeveloped. Jason Rice verified that had been the North Sound Bank application and part of the commitment was for a mitigation site of five acres. John Ahl asked where that was located, and Jason Rice noted it was the headwater area. He also noted that the latter half of the Staff report packet included a map that indicated wetlands and critical areas.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked it was known that the property contained wetlands when it was originally designated as Industrial Zoning. Jason Rice noted in 1993 and 1994 EEP did a countywide analysis for industrial, commercial or business park lands. Often their analysis took lands with existing commercial development and, basically, blocked in an area based on that, without considering all the constraints used now, such as access, ingress and environmental constraints.

John Ahl and Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if George’s Corner was also on the candidate list for LAMIRD or was that still being discussed. Jason Rice noted that the applicant had directed Staff that he wanted to be include within the LAMIRD boundary. Staff has since determined that there were natural limitations, such as the streams, hydro soils and wetlands on the property. That criterion alone would prevent the property from being included in the LAMIRD boundary. Laura Ditmer asked if there was any development prior to 1990 on the proposed site with Jason Rice noting that both parcels were currently vacant. One of the parcels, which had more environmental constraints, currently had several acres of forest and timber.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other questions, moving on to the next application.

**BJARNSON:** Jason Rice indicated this property was on the other side of the intersection heading toward Poulsbo, across the street on the westerly side of Highway 104 and Hansville/Miller Bay intersection. The property is roughly 13 acres, with only 5 acres included within the proposal for a rezone from Rural Residential to Neighborhood Commercial. The applicant is obtaining the legal description of the specific area being requested for a rezone. Until the legal description is received, the request only indicates that it is for 5 of the 13 acres. There is also a condition for preliminary wetland delineation outlining wetlands on the site, as well as setbacks and buffers for those. The area is under consideration along with the LAMIRD discussions. It was suggested that during the Planning Commission’s deliberations or discussions, it would be beneficial if a decision were made regarding this specific proposal based on size and scale prior to consideration of the final LAMIRD boundaries. William Matchett asked why it wasn’t just being included with the LAMIRD. Jason Rice clarified that the LAMIRD boundary would be based on development existing prior to 1990. There would be infill and outfill development, with Staff attempting to whittle it down so it’s contained.
John Taylor clarified that of the total 13 acres the property owners only wanted to rezone 5 acres. He also asked for the location of the closest sewer line. Jason Rice noted there was no sewer in the area, with water to be provided by the PUD. John Taylor received confirmation that potential sewer services were located in Kingston.

Mike Gustavson noted the Resolution handed out at the start of the meeting seemed to require that some of these applications be reconsidered. Under the Resolution’s rules, the Bjarnson property would not have been allowed. He also asked that Staff look at the Resolution and determine how it would specifically impact the LAMIRD. Laura Ditmer asked which rule, in particular, he was referring to, with Mike Gustavson stating it was the rule relating to expanding Urban Growth Areas.

Darryl Piercy clarified that this proposal was not requesting expansion of an Urban Growth Area; it was only requesting a change in zoning. The property was not adjacent to the existing Urban Growth Area. Although there was the possibility it might be included in a LAMIRD, it was stressed that a LAMIRD did not constitute an Urban Growth Area boundary. The rules Mike Gustavson was referring to would not apply. This application fell under Rural Designations since they were not requesting Industrial Zoning and the property was not within an Interim Rural Forest, with Staff concluding that the rules of the Resolution did not apply.

William Matchett asked, if the LAMIRD goes forward, would part of this property be included? Also, would the application go forward without the LAMIRD going forward. Jason Rice stated the decision of whether or not to include the property within the LAMIRD boundary was left to the Planning Commission. If the property were zoned commercial, it would seem appropriate for it to be included.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other questions and moved on to the next application.

**BLACK JACK VALLEY ASSOCIATES:** Jason Rice noted the proposal was for 6.33 acres, currently designated as Rural Protection with a requested rezone to Highway Tourist Commercial and inclusion within the Port Orchard Urban Growth Area. As required by the Resolution, a letter of support from the City of Port Orchard had been provided. The parcel is near Highway 16, west of Sidney. The location of Albertsons and Chevron were indicated on the map with relation to the property. Jason Rice noted that last year there was a rezone proposal approved, shown as a red area on the map. The rezoned property was owned by Talmo and the subject parcel was directly west of that.

Mike Gustavson noted there were three parcels in the same Sidney/Sedgwick interchange area which were all small, disjointed and separate. Gig Harbor’s new development was cited as a good example of a shopping, commercial area done on one parcel. The Silverdale Mall was another good example, having multiple, individual parcels aggregated and developed by a single developer to look like they were one. He noted that this location looked like there were a lot of individual, disjointed, uncoordinated developments that aren’t integrated well together. It was his opinion
that the entire thing should be aggregated under one big development plan, as one
property, rather than as a bunch of strip malls.

William Matchett asked, if this application were approved at this time, would they be
establishing a precedent regarding discussions going on now for the entire area? Laura
Ditmer noted that was addressed in the Staff Report with the Recommendation for a
deferral at this time until the conclusion of the Urban Growth Area discussions.

William Matchett noted that if decisions were made on small, individual pieces, the
Planning Commission would be predetermining what was being discussed regarding
the Urban Growth Area. Lary Coppola, Chair, wanted to know if any of the applications
being deferred were related to applications that were approved last time. Staff clarified
that this recommendation applied only to the Black Jack Valley, Brown-Rice-Krueger,
Waters and Sedgwick Joint Venture applications. Lary Coppola, Chair, wanted to know
when the Planning Commission could anticipate receiving information from the City on
this matter.

Darryl Piercy was unable to provide a precise timeframe, noting they were in the
process of doing two things. A Memorandum of Agreement with the City of Port
Orchard was developed, reviewed by the City and adopted. The Memorandum should
go before the Board of County Commissioners on Monday, June 23 for consideration.
When that was in place, it established the scope of the planning process, identifying
and adopting a work program. Within that work program, Staff will convene a Citizens’
Group to look at options for development within South Kitsap. It is anticipated that
that Group will identify a number of areas of interest or as options for future growth in
South Kitsap. From there, Staff will evaluate those areas further, providing additional
information. It is anticipated that the final information will be presented to the
Planning Commission some time in the fall, probably October or November. This
information would include recommendations from the Citizens’ Committee with
backup material associated with those recommendations. The Planning Commission
would review the information, choosing either to accept those recommendations or to
make their own. The result would identify boundaries that would be appropriate for
the Urban Growth Area of South Kitsap. Staff would then present that to the Board of
County Commissioners, anticipating actual completion either at the end of 2003 or
early 2004. The proposed boundary revision for the Port Orchard Urban Growth Area
should then be included as part of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle.

Lary Coppola, Chair, clarified that Darryl Piercy was suggesting that the Planning
Commission pass on any action until the described process was completed. Darryl
Piercy clarified the recommendation was that the matter be deferred for now and be
addressed as an element of that later process. That would allow each of these areas to
be addressed in conjunction with other areas that might be identified by the Citizens’
Group as development alternatives.

Tom Nevins noted that one consideration should be how any rezone would affect the
designation of other properties. Every new property creates a new edge, potentially
leading the adjacent landowner to feel it was necessary to request a zoning change. He
agreed with Staff in deferring these applications so they could be looked at in a
consistent manner, determining what degree of development was wanted at that
intersection.

John Ahl noted that in Port Orchard the Sedgwick/Sidney area appeared to be a
popular choice for commercial development. He felt that in the past the Planning
Commission had fought for joint planning in the Port Orchard Urban Growth Area,
which was not always successful. He was unclear as to the intentions of the City of Port
Orchard, whether they wanted to have a joint plan or just submit letters on what they
agreed to in a piecemeal manner. He would like to know who, at the City, was in charge
of that. Darryl Piercy was hesitant to answer on behalf of the City and Lary Coppola,
Chair, verified there was not a representative present at the meeting from the City.
John Ahl felt that by sending letters relating to their approval, the City appeared to be
abdicating that responsibility or participation to the Planning Commission. Darryl
Piercy stressed that the County Staff’s relationship with the City Staff in working
through the planning process had been met with enthusiasm, support and participation
by the City of Port Orchard. It was Staff’s opinion that the City was fully onboard with
the process of Joint Planning for South Kitsap and were active participants in the
Memorandum of Agreement and work program. Staff believes the City is committed to
be at the table to work out the issues and details related to planning for South Kitsap.

Lary Coppola, Chair, expressed a concern about this, as well. The Planning
Commission has watched $1 million a year in tax revenues leave the County while
continuing to address this intersection. Property owners had been put on hold for
going on ten years and now further continuation was being considered by including it
in the next Comprehensive Plan amendment processes. He questioned whether that
was truly fair to all parties. Darryl Piercy recognized that was an issue because of
historical expectations in this area. These areas were included in commercial zoning
for both the 1994 and 1996 Comprehensive Plans that ultimately were found to be
invalid at the Growth Hearings Board. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that those plans
weren’t found to be invalid because of this particular intersection. Darryl Piercy said
there were a number of issues resulting in that decision. Although he was unsure if this
intersection was one of those, he recalled that the area was addressed in terms of
environmental concerns as one of the arguments before the 1996 plan. Staff recognizes
the history and expectations from some areas of the community regarding that area.
There is also an expectation from the community that the area will be looked at in a
more comprehensive approach. Based on the Board of County Commissioners
directive to Staff regarding resolution of this matter, it would appear that there is an
ongoing process to identify a study area with this location to be part of that study area.
It was important thing to recognize that, at this time, the Citizens’ Committee had not
met or formally identified study areas for the South Kitsap Area. Although it is
anticipated that this location would be included in any study area and it’s likely the area
will be identified before any action by the Board of County Commissioners. There is a
timing element relating to this that would allow Staff and the Planning Commission to
move these applications forward now for consideration because there is no specific
study area identified yet. Until that happens, Staff feels the application is not
prohibited by the Rules of the Resolution.
Mr. Brown asked to speak on behalf of the City of Port Orchard. There is an Agreement between the City of Port Orchard Growth Management Act Committee that they would block in Sedgwick at Sidney. This was set forward in the Memorandum of Agreement. County Staff then advised the City that they would not support the block-in and that site specific plans should be submitted instead, which were submitted for properties that were all around City of Port Orchard. It seemed as if the County needed to make up its mind whether it was going to cooperate with the City of Port Orchard, rather than wondering if the City would cooperate with the County. The City has been very cooperative and expressed that they want this area in the City but that can't occur until it is included in the Urban Growth Areas. The area is surrounded by sewer and by the city on three sides. There appears to be no valid reason for further delays.

Darryl Piercy clarified that the original application for this was property was submitted as a very large area from about the Sidney/Sedgwick intersection back to Port Orchard, covering a fairly sensitive area. The County reviewed the application, which included about 23 parcels, and determined that it would be subject to some additional environmental review, which would disqualify it based on criteria in the Resolution, Item 2-C. An Environmental Impact Statement would be required for a Master Plan of that size. Staff spoke to the applicants, indicating that, without a broader findings concept, they were unable to support a project to that extent. Due to the very nature and location of the property, it would be subject to additional environmental review. At that point the applicants revised their application to the three parcels now before the Planning Commission. There was a fourth application within close proximity but it was near the intersection of Bethel and Highway 16 near the Fred Meyer Complex. Regarding the review of South Kitsap properties, there was a need for consistency in terms of the deferrals.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked how long it would take for the County and the City to get on the same page and move this forward. It seemed as though the property owners had been left dangling for ten years. Darryl Piercy noted they were in that process now and he believed they were committed to a schedule that would get them into an Urban Growth Area boundary to be considered with the next Comprehensive Plan amendment process. Lary Coppola, Chair, asked what would it take to get this considered in this Comprehensive Plan cycle.

Darryl Piercy felt that was almost impossible, due to the steps required under State law and County policies in terms of public involvement and participation to set those boundaries. He did not believe there was adequate time to address all the required issues. Additionally, it was not possible to support an Urban Growth Area boundary based on current population growth numbers that for this area go out to 2017. An element of this was the anticipation of population numbers with the next planning cycle extending out to 2025. Without those additional population numbers, there would not be a justifiable case to consider any expansion of the Urban Growth Area boundaries.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked what would happen if each of the parcels were considered individually. Darryl Piercy noted that was what the Planning Commission was currently being asked to do. Laura Ditmer clarified that the site specific application
process was the only way these properties could be considered for this year’s Comprehensive Plan amendment process.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that he would entertain a motion from one of the Planning Commission members on how to proceed. William Matchett noted this was just a work study and no decision was needed at this time.

Darryl Piercy stated that, under the Resolution, the Planning Commission could consider the applications until such time as action is taken to formally establish the study area boundaries. The applications before the Planning Commission today were all currently allowed for consideration. The Staff’s recommendation was to defer these for inclusion as part of the overall planning process for the area. However, as long as the study areas were not formally set, these are all viable applications and should be considered.

Tom Nevins had a general comment relating to earlier comments. Whenever someone comes before him with the “he said/she said” scenario, he would like to be provided with specific names and dates, perhaps something on paper so that action could be taken. This scenario had happened a lot last year, as he recalled, and he was frustrated by the vagueness and inability to question specific individuals.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no further questions and moved to the next application.

**BROWN-RICE-KRUEGER:** Jason Rice asked if the Planning Commission wanted to go through each application individually, given that they were all in the same vicinity with the same zoning requests. Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if he could cover them all at one time in the interest of saving time with Jason Rice replying that at least looking at individual mapping would help with the orientation, but that they could eliminate certain aspects that had been addressed, such as avoiding lengthy discussion about the City of Port Orchard and Urban Growth Area planning.

Jason Rice stated this proposal was comparable to the previous application. There were six total parcels for a total of 10.81 acres. The property was presently zoned Rural Protection with a requested change to Highway Tourist Commercial and inclusion within the City of Port Orchard Urban Growth Area. There has been a delineation of the approximate location of the wetlands and buffer setbacks. Those were contained in the applicant’s site-specific-amendment questionnaire. Staff is recommending that this be deferred and included as part of the Urban Growth Area process. It was noted that the Planning Commission members’ packets did not include the Staff Report for the Brown-Rice-Krueger application. There also appeared to be two copies for the Waters application. Staff Reports for this application were distributed with it noted that some were missing pages. Staff was eventually able to provide complete Staff Reports to the entire Planning Commission.

After verifying that everyone had received the correct materials, Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was any additional information to be provided by Staff. Laura Ditmer
Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other questions and moved on to the next application.

**ROBERT (PAT) WATERS:** Jason Rice noted that the property consisted of 4.32 acres just north of the two previous proposals on Sidney road. It is currently zoned Rural Protection with a request for Highway Tourist Commercial designation inclusion within the Port Orchard Urban Growth Area. The site was indicated on the overhead with the City limits located across the street and sewer in close proximity.

John Ahl clarified the Planning Commissions’ options on these applications, particularly that the applications could be consider as standalone site requests with the assumption that they would never be included in the Urban Growth Area. Laura Ditmer and Darryl Piercy verified that the Planning Commission had that option. John Ahl then indicated that seemed to be their only option, to consider them as standalone site specific requests outside the Urban Growth Area with no joint planning area established at this time. It seemed they should be simply evaluated as being county land with a proposal to rezone. Laura Ditmer verified that was an option. She added that the properties were all contiguous to the City Limits. Jason Rice also noted that, even as standalone applications, they would be allowed access to sewer. John Ahl confirmed that these applications, at this time, were standalone, county land, site specific requests.

Darryl Piercy noted that John Ahl was correct but that the Planning Commission had other options available. The Planning Commission could approve the rezone and approve the Urban Growth Area boundary expansion to include rezoned area. They could approve only the request for rezoning the property without recommending an Urban Growth Area boundary adjustment. Finally the Planning Commission could defer the matter or deny the application altogether.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no further questions and moved on to the next application.

**SEDGWICK JOINT VENTURE:** Jason Rice noted the parcel was 9.8 acres, currently designated Urban Reserve with a request for Highway Tourist Commercial zoning. The property is located near Highway 16 on Sedgwick Road, east of the existing Fred Meyer property. The property was located next to a map correction that occurred last year. It was noted that the property between Fred Meyer and the proposed parcel was already designated Highway Tourist Commercial with an existing chiropractor office and espresso stand.

Mike Gustavson asked if the owner of the property owned the parcel that had been rezoned last year, with Jason Rice noting they were two separate property owners. Monty Mahan asked that rezoned properties be indicated on the overhead. There were three parcels identified. Monty Mahan noted there was a history and various commercial development regulations in that area, wanting to know if the Bethel
Corridor Regulations extended to the parcel being considered with Jason Rice verifying that those Regulations would apply to this property.

John Taylor requested clarification regarding the availability of sewer and water and whether it was a requirement that the developer hook up to those services. Jason Rice confirmed it was a requirement if the property was within the Urban Growth Area and sewer was within 200 feet. That was why all these applications include requests for inclusion within the Urban Growth Area boundary associated with them. That would ensure they received those urban services.

Michael Gingerich, asked to speak, with Larry Coppola, Chair, noting this was not a public hearing. Mr. Gingerich noted that the southern portion of the parcel was one of the three proposed sites being considered for remediation of the flood situation in that area. Jason Rice verified this was the Converse Street area that was having storm water retention/drainage problems.

The motion was made by John Ahl that the meeting be closed to any further public testimony. Tom Nevins and William Matchett seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: 7, Nay: 1. Motion carried.

BURGESS: Jason Rice noted the parcel was on 1.28 acres, currently located within the Manchester Rural Village. The current designation was Village Low Residential with a request for Manchester Village Commercial. The area was located at the intersection of Mile Hill Drive and Colchester and adjacent to Alaska Drive. The parcel was vacant but had a store on it in the 1950-1960 timeframe. The area is notorious for having used car sales and junk cars. Staff has recommended denial. This area recently underwent a Rural Area More Intensive Analysis and Study. There was a Community Council that met for 18 months, coming up with a recommendation for a Village Boundary and Sub-Area Plan for the area. One of the major discussion points in that planning effort was a component dealing with commercial areas. They recommended that all commercial areas be maintained downtown and requested existing scale and zoning that existed there today.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if the opinion was that junk cars were more appropriate for that location with Jason Rice noting that was what the Enforcement Division was for.

MCCORMICK LAND COMPANY: Jason Rice indicated the property was located near the South Kitsap Industrial Area with a parcel size of 120 acres. The current designation is Rural Residential with a request for Mineral Resource Overlay for the purpose of mineral extraction. The applicant’s report to the staff, indicating there is a resource there to be mined, was included in the Planning Commissioner packets. Laura Ditmer noted this had been brought before the Planning Commission earlier this year within the context of the Sub-Area Planning process and it was deferred to the site-specific process.

Monty Mahan asked if the creek running through the property had a name, which did not appear to be the case. Laura Ditmer stated the property was currently Rural...
Residential, but once the South Kitsap Industrial Area plan was adopted the proposed site would have a Business Center designation. At that time, if this application is approved, there would be a Mineral Resource Overlay included with that. Mike Gustavson noted an area on the southeast corner that appeared to be a bog or lake. Darryl Piercy noted there was a wetland system that goes through a portion of the property in that area. Staff is involved in other discussions relating to other developments in this area and have a pretty detailed wetland analysis. There is a wetland system running through this area that will need to be maintained and protected as an element of any type of gravel extraction or mining operation.

William Matchett verified that if the application were approved as Mineral Resource Overlay, when the South Kitsap Industrial Area was approved, the business zoning would be designated on completion of the mining and extraction process. Darryl Piercy noted there was an obligation under the RCW where it specifically identifies that available mineral resources are to be recognized in the Comprehensive Plan. With the analysis and background material that have been provided, this application was consistent with the requirements under the Growth Management Act and our own Comprehensive Plan to recognize those areas with mineral resources.

John Ahl asked if there were any gravel operation in proximity to the proposed site with Staff verifying there was a gravel operation located to the south. Sunnyslope was noted to be located to the east of the site. John Ahl recognized the priority placed on mineral resource extraction, but would like to know how compatible they were with any nearby residential areas. Darryl Piercy stressed there were definitely buffers in these zones to distance them from residential uses, as well as requirements regarding hours of operation, noise and dust. Those types of things were all considered as an element of the Code for the actual permit that would be issued for the activity. This simply designates the land as being a mineral resource based on the technical and geological analysis that was done in accordance with the application.

John Taylor asked for an example of the buffer requirements for this specific type of facility. Laura Ditmer referenced Page 5, Item 5 of the Staff Report noting that it specified there would be a substantial buffer area of 400-1000 feet identified between the quarry activities and existing residential uses along Sunnyslope Road. Access was also addressed, which would be shared by the existing Alpine Evergreen quarry. Darryl Piercy noted that one of the issues being addressed in the Sub-Area Plan for the South Kitsap Industrial Area was a new access road. The proposed road would come from the north and go through these sites, continuing further south through the South Kitsap Industrial Area. A portion of this site would be used for that access road or new roadway which would be constructed as an element of the South Kitsap Industrial Area. The mining and gravel operations would be part of that road so there would be the buffer next to the road and probably an additional buffer with the gravel operation.

John Ahl noted that in all the mineral resource applications, there is a paragraph relating to restoration of the site. He requested an example of one of those plans that was been fully in effect anywhere in Kitsap County. Darryl Piercy referenced a property owned by the Port of Bremerton, the Olympic View Industrial Park. That had been a gravel extraction operation that has since been reclaimed as an industrial area.
Although there was not a building in place at this time, the property was prepared for development. John Ahl noted the example was public property, not private, with Darryl Piercy agreeing while stating that the same rules and standards would apply in either case.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there were any other examples relating to private property with Darryl Piercy indicating that would require further research. Staff would develop some information and identify sites that they would provide to the Planning Commission. John Ahl expressed concern that, while gravel operations are essential operations with the rocks needed to build up the industrial areas, there is an underlying fear that what will be left is a wasteland, a big hole in the ground. Somehow it may not become the golf course that was promised when the gravel extraction was started. It would be good to have some specific sites for the Planning Commission to look at as examples. Laura Ditmer noted that she worked many years ago with the DNR and understood the mineral resource process. Staff would be able to provide examples at the next meeting of how mined areas are worked into some sort of development, usually residential. This property, however, will be going into a Business Center Designation and Staff would also research how that was handled in the past. With topsoil removed as part of the mining process that would need to be brought back to return the area to a healthy site.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no further questions. Before addressing the next project, he called a short break.

**BREAK 10:35 A.M. – 10:40 A.M.**

PAT LOCKHART: Jason Rice noted Phil Struck of Parametrix was representing the applicant. The site is located on 21.02 acres. It is currently zoned Urban Reserve/Urban Joint Planning Area with the City of Bremerton. The Zoning is one home per ten acres with a request to add a Mineral Resource Overlay to reflect the mineral resource extraction and expansion of the current facility existing on Sherman Heights Road. Some of the Planning Commission members were missing Staff Reports in their packets, which was corrected by Staff. William Matchett asked what this site would revert to with Jason Rice noting that would depend on what occurred within the Urban Joint Planning process between the County and the City. William Matchett verified that, at present, it would revert back to Urban Reserve. Staff recommended approval, indicating the location on the map with relation to Old Belfair Highway and the railroad tracks. Lary Coppola, Chair, asked where the property was located in relation to Jarstad Park, with Jason Rice noting it was within the Bremerton City Limits. Mike Gustavson noticed a strip on the south edge of the site that appeared to be Urban Reserve along the railroad tracks. Jason Rice noted it was not part of the request and was under different ownership with an existing home located on that site. Laura Ditmer clarified that this was not a change to the designation, only a request to add Mineral Resource Overlay to the current designation.

Tom Nevins noted a separate segment on the Highway about one block to the south. Jason Rice believed that would be the access point with the railroad having leases through there. One of the proposals was to utilize the railroad as part of the extraction
operation, as well as putting in a crossing for truck access to the site. William Matchett noted the railroad tracks did not appear on the map, with Jason Rice confirming the tracks were not shown, although the map did show the right-of-way.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no additional questions and moved to the next application.

DONNA LONGWELL: Jason Rice noted this was a 2.5 acre parcel owned by Donna Longwell, located on Clear Creek Road, adjacent to Sub Base Bangor, indicated as the gray area on the map. The property is surrounded on two sides by a gun club and firing range. The proposal is to rezone the property from Rural Residential to Neighborhood Commercial. Staff recommends approval. There has been a former, nonresidential type use on the property. It was recently used as a contractor storage yard in 1998.

John Taylor asked that the gun club be indicated on the map in relation to the property, with it noted to be a large parcel that partially surrounds the site. William Matchett asked if the nearest Neighborhood Commercial was on Viking Way with Jason Rice noting there was a small grocery store nearby at the south end of the Sub Base Bangor. It was noted that the store had recently been remodeled and was operating well. William Matchett asked what was across the road off of Clear Creek. Jason Rice noted it was an unnamed, unimproved County right-of-way. South of that location were single family residences. William Matchett questioned the reason for putting commercial property in the middle of nowhere, with Lary Coppola, Chair, clarifying that there was an existing, commercial building on the property that can’t be used as a residence at this time. Additionally, being surrounded by a gun club would discourage upgrading the property to a residential use.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other questions and proceeded to the next application.

OLMSTEAD LAND DEVELOPMENT/CLEAR CREEK NURSERY: Jason Rice noted that Olmstead was also located on Clear Creek Road. There were two parcels as part of the proposal, with Gary Lindsey representing the owner. The southern parcel is 3.71 acres and the northern parcel is 3.5 acres. The current designation is Business Park with the application requesting Commercial Designation with Neighborhood Commercial considered the most appropriate. There is an existing Nursery business on property that had expressed a desire to expand northward. Business Park designation prohibited that expansion, although it would be allowed with a Neighborhood Commercial designation. Staff is recommending approval. The property was a grandfathered, nonconforming use under the Business Park Designation. The owner now wanted to expand the operation but could not do so with the existing designation. Approval of the request for a rezone to Neighborhood Commercial would allow that expansion. John Taylor asked if utilities were available on the property, sewer and water. Jason Rice noted there was no sewer but water was provided by the Silverdale Water District. Laura Ditmer referred John Taylor to pages 6 and 7 of the Staff Report that indicated what services were available to the site. John Ahl noted that was another reason it would be good to receive the materials before the meeting so they could be familiar with that information in advance.
Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no more questions or comments and proceed to the next Agenda Item.

- Work Study Comprehensive Plan Amendments Part II: B) Map Corrections to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted there was a request from the audience that FW Outlook Apartments LLC be addressed first as the attending individual needed to leave.

William Matchett noted that while reviewing the proposed map corrections there were pages and pages of blank forms with no information filled in. Jason Rice noted that the reason for these blank pages was that some of the map corrections were County sponsored, while others were sponsored by the applicant. The blank pages were related to ones the County had found to be in error which would not include an Ownership Certification, so that page was blank. William Matchett asked if there was a need to even include the blank Ownership Certification pages. Jason Rice noted he did not believe it was actually required if it was a County identified error, but he would verify that. Laura Ditmer noted that the other perspective was that if the incomplete page was not included, the Planning Commission members might believe they had an incomplete package before them. She understood the concern regarding the number of blank pages, but they provided for some assurance that the package was complete.

Jason Rice restated, as earlier indicated by Laura Ditmer, that the map correction packets did not include the Staff Reports, which would be mailed to the Planning Commission on completion. The Staff Report consisted of just a one-page summary of the findings relating to the need and justification for the map correction.

FW OUTLOOK APARTMENTS LLC: The property was being corrected from Urban Low to Urban High designation with Jason Rice directing the Planning Commission to the map that had been provided, which was an aerial image showing the parcel in yellow and cross-hatched. The parcel currently had an apartment building on it and had been zoned Urban Low Residential when it should be Urban High Residential. The Planning Commission noted there was no aerial image included in the packet. Staff noted they would ensure one was mailed with the Staff Report. Jason Rice proceeded by noting that this change just recognized an existing development in the Ridgetop Area as reflected in the Master Plan and the correction should be fairly straightforward. Lary Coppola, Chair, verified that it was already an apartment and the only change was related to mapping.

BIG O DEVELOPMENT: This property is currently going through Land Use Approval in the Department of Community Development. The problem arose with the initial Staff Report when it was determined that the parcel located on Highway 303/Bentley Drive across from Wal-Mart was tied to the original commercial development proposal and restricted by easements and access. This would appear to indicate the property would be more appropriately designated as Commercial, as part of the proposed project proposal. John Taylor asked that the Bentley Drive residences be indicated on the map with Jason indicating where Bentley Drive was located, with
the first road being across another easement road servicing another plan. Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was something located directly in front of this, which was left undetermined as possibly being the Taco Del Mar, a vacant lot or possibly access or some other element associated with that development. Darryl Piercy noted that there was a development proposed for adjacent parcels. The plat had been developed in error with both a residential and commercial component on a single plat. The commercial component included the referenced parcel, but was never mapped properly. William Matchett verified it was a map error receiving clarification that map corrections were all that was being addressed for all these items.

BRASS RING BUILDINGS: The map correction was submitted by the County. Brass Ring was a hairstyling salon with miscellaneous uses associated with it. The property was approved for a rezone in December 1986 from R5 Residential to Business General. When the County went through its Comprehensive Plan mapping process, the property was left off in error. It is now being proposed that it be corrected to a Highway Commercial Designation. John Taylor asked where the theaters were located in relation to the property with it noted that the theaters were located in relation to the property with it noted that the theaters were within the city limits.

SUN AE CHOO: This property is on Southworth Drive past Colchester and Manchester in the direction of the Southworth Ferry Dock. It was an abandoned store at the corner of Banner. The property had been brought to Staff’s attention by the Appraiser who noted the property wasn’t zoned commercial, although the owner had intended to remove the gas tanks and bring the property up to standards. When mapping was done in 1998 the mapping erroneously switched parcels, picking up the adjacent parcel, which is a privately owned residential house. The properties are, essentially, being switched back to their property designations. The residence will be properly identified as Rural Residential with this property to be zoned Neighborhood Commercial. This was a twofold change, combining both properties in this requested correction.

EDGEOATER BALLFIELDS: This was still being worked on by Staff due to various issues. The Edgewater Ballfield is owned by the Parks Department and has a Parks designation. The property to the north of the Nielsen rezone from last year was improperly designated and should be reflected as a Public Facility Designation to be consistent within the Comprehensive Plan with other gravel pits owned by the County Public Works. The problem, however, is that the Park property and the gravel pits are tied together somehow. Staff is still getting information from the Assessors Department and the GIS Department as to how that happened. It currently shows as two parcels when, in fact, Staff is only concentrating on sand and gravel pit on the northern parcel to add a Public Facility Designation to that location. Mike Gustavson asked what the end result from this change would be. Jason Rice stated the parcel to the west was already a ballfield and would not be affected. William Matchett verified the other portion was a sand and gravel site used for sorting equipment by the Public Works Department. It was stressed that Staff was attempting to be consistent within the Comprehensive Plan. Other County-owned sand and gravel pits located throughout Central and South Kitsap are designated as Public Facilities and this change was an attempt to be consistent with those. Darryl Piercy clarified that both parcels were
owned by Kitsap County and used for public service, which is why the Public Facility Overlay would be placed on both. John Ahl noted a triangular portion on the map and asked if that was a property that had previously been discussed that was approved by the Board of County Commissioners as an Industrial Area. Jason Rice confirmed that the indicated property had been discussed previously, with Laura Ditmer noting that it was zoned Residential.

**KITSAP COUNTY GENERAL:** This property was the former Hansville landfill area that is currently designated Rural Protection. Staff had noted that the property was County-owned and the appropriate designation would be Public Facility.

**PILGER:** This property is located on Mile Hill Drive just past Woods Road and currently has a Dental Office located on it. There is a Veterinary Clinic and a Mini Storage Facility also in the vicinity. Jason Rice had researched the property back to a resolution from 1978, which approved a rezone from RS-3500, which was a Residential Zone, to Agricultural, which was no longer a designation within the County. The specific purpose for the zoning is to allow for the dental office that currently exists on the property. This was all contained in one lot but the rezoning applied only to the front half to reflect the dental office proposal. With development of the dental office, the property was segmented off with the other portion remaining as a vacant, undeveloped, wooded rural piece of land. During the Land Use Process, existing commercial properties were identified within rural areas. All vacant parcels that were not zoned commercial were removed. The same thing had occurred at George’s Corner, with parcels removed that did not have either a land use proposal, an existing commercial designation or an existing commercial business established on the property. In this case, the noncommercial, segmented property was converted back to Rural Residential. The applicant has brought forward a request that the 1978 zoning provided to the front portion of the property be applied to the remainder of the property, which was previously designated Agricultural. Staff is recommending denial based on there never having been a commitment to establish a commercial business on that portion of the property. Nothing has transpired on that property since 1978 with the owner having segregated off that portion and actually built on the property. William Matchett verified that the properties on each side of the discussed property were currently zoned commercial. He then asked if it would make sense to draw a line across the property, allowing the front portion to be commercial but not the back portion. Jason Rice noted that was a potential approach, as long as a legal description were to accompany that request, with the request having to be provided by the owner. At this point the owner had approached the County to address this as a mapping error, not as a rezone request. The requested correction was for a nonresidential type use based on the previous agricultural zoning designation. That designation, however, was not as intense as commercial zoning was in the 1970s. William Matchett asked if the Planning Commission could make the recommendation that the front portion be zoned commercial but not the back portion. Jason Rice noted that there was no building on the site and there was a five-year requirement for beginning development. Lary Coppola, Chair, asked where the dental clinic was located and Jason Rice noted it was on an adjacent piece. Darryl Piercy asked if this could be a candidate for a LAMIRD designation in the future. At that point, findings would probably support it as a suitable boundary, as an infill. However, since LAMIRD is not part of this discussion, it
would have to be considered later. Laura Ditmer stated LAMIRD was a possible option but it was noted that the property was part of the Manchester area, which should be considered before including it in any LAMIRD study. Jason Rice noted that the LAMIRD process was discussed during the Manchester effort due to the location of the Manchester Village boundary. The discussion covered properties all the way up to Woods Road and that commercial area. At that time it was felt that was a stretch for that area to be viewed as the Town of Manchester.

John Ahl requested a copy of the letter referenced in the application. Jason Rice noted he would provide the letter and the Resolution that had been attached to it which had been adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in 1978.

Mike Gustavson disagreed with William Matchett's recommendation to draw a line across the property. The right segment of the dental office is zoned higher usage. If a line is drawn past that, it would take up the whole property. He suggested that this be discussed in more detail at a later date. William Matchett agreed that it was a puzzle as to how it could be resolved.

**RIDGETOP:** Jason Rice noted that this mapping correction involved several hundred parcels and expands the previous mapping correction for the Outlook Apartments. There are areas up on Ridgetop that were developed based on the approved Master Plan. The zoning developed for the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, however, did not accurately reflect the Ridgetop Master Plan’s intent. When proposals came in and were developed the Comprehensive Plan was referenced, resulting in inappropriate zoning for multiple areas. There are problems with Urban High Residential Zoning on single-family residential homes. There are problems with Urban Medium Zoning on single-family homes, as well as the problem with Apartments being zoned Urban Low Residential. There are well over 100 parcels affected. Staff is just reconfiguring the color coded zoning on the map of brown, dark brown and yellow to reflect what has actually been built. William Matchett asked if the map they were looking at reflected what was proposed or what was existing, with clarification that it reflected the current, inaccurate zoning. The area outlined in blue indicated those areas that would need to be adjusted. William Matchett asked if there was a map available to show what the area would look like after the corrections. Jason Rice noted he could provide a map once the correction was approved. He would attempt to get a map showing the three areas requiring adjustment and provide it to the Planning Commission. Mike Gustavson asked if the area in black (clarified to be dark brown) was high residential, which Staff was saying had actually been built as Urban High. Jason Rice noted all of that area had been built as Urban High. There were no parcel lines, just solid lines, because they were apartment buildings.

**BILL SCHOURUP:** This property is located in the donut hole, surrounded by the Bremerton City Limits on Warner Road off Auto Center Way. When the 1994 Comprehensive Plan was invalidated, the County adopted interim development regulations and an interim zoning map that has an entire strip (indicated on the map) zoned Light Industrial. That zoning was in place between 1995 and 1998 when the County adjusted its Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map. Once again, only those properties that had existing industrial uses were identified with only a few parcels
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included at that time. The County missed one existing industrial property that was in
the process of Land Use Approval. That property is Idea Street Repair and Assembly,
which had been approved in 1998 and was left off the map in error. The County is now
requesting a correction to reflect this. William Matchett verified it was an existing
building being used for light manufacturing. Some unidentified audience members
noted the property had not been in existence for very long and was only recently built.
Jason Rice noted that the land use approval occurred in 1998. Another unidentified
audience member made some unclear references to the size/dimensions of the parcel.
Jason Rice noted this was originally one parcel that had extended out to Warner Road,
which had since been subdivided.

SUE SEHMEL: This property is currently designated as Urban Low Residential. The
applicant came forward and indicated there was a longstanding nonresidential use on
the property. There was a home that had been converted to a Cobbler Shop type use.
The owner was requesting this be considered as a map correction. William Matchett
verified the location of the property and that it was located next to a gas station.

STEVE STEINMAN: The property is on Riddell Road, with a map correction
submitted from Steinman last year. There were two rezones, with the second one done
in 1995, converting an existing house to an office building. Staff had not picked up on
that rezone and was now requesting a map correction to reflect the change from Urban
Medium Residential to Business General. William Matchett clarified location of the
property, with the location identified on the map in relation to Pine Road.

WOOD-PRO CABINETS: The property is located in North Kitsap at the intersection
of Stottlemeyer Road and Bond Road north of Poulsbo. Wood-Pro Cabinets has been in
operation since the 1980’s with a rezone to Light Manufacturing occurring during that
time. Additional buildings have been added to the site and the operation employs
approximately twelve employees in a cabinet making business. The mapping
correction is to change the property from Rural Residential to Industrial. William
Matchett verified that the property was located North of Gunderson, with clarification
that the address was indicated as being on Bond Road since that was the access point.

Laura Ditmer asked that Lary Coppola, Chair, defer the Interim Growth Forest
discussions until issues under Other Business from the agenda had been addressed.
Lary Coppola, Chair, agreed.

➢ Other Business – Combined Meeting Between the Planning
Commission and Board of County Commissioners

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that a process was underway to schedule a meeting between
the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. There had been a lot
difficulty in determining an appropriate date and he asked Darryl Piercy to provide
an update.

Darryl Piercy indicated the Board of County Commissioners had met the day before this
meeting and discussed this issue. They had asked him to relay their message that they
do, in fact want to have a meeting with the Planning Commission. They feel it is very
important and value the time spent hearing back from the Planning Commission. The Board of County Commissioners also expressed their regrets that current circumstances had prevented them from attending the previously scheduled meeting, with the Chair being out of town at that time. The Board of County Commissioners were anxious to reschedule, although there were some very difficult scheduling problems. The month of July, in particular, appears to be unavailable for a meeting based on the dates presented to them. The Board of County Commissioners offered a number of suggestions on how to accomplish this meeting, again stressing that they did want the meeting to occur. The Board of County Commissioners discussed the potential need to meet on a quarterly basis, rather than just semiannually or on an annual basis. They felt it was important to check in with the Planning Commission and for the Board of County Commissioners to get a retrospect of what was happening and what could be done to improve the process, rather than having the meeting be for the purpose of addressing specific issues coming before the Planning Commission. The Board of County Commissioners expressed their preference to hear issues encountered by the Planning Commission, to include any difficulties or procedural problems they were encountering. It was also discussed that it might be appropriate to establish a requirement for the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners to meet on an annual basis. The Board of County Commissioners talked about doing this in the fall, with many reasons for that timing. A meeting in September or October would help to develop a work plan for the coming year, to look at common goals for the coming year and, more importantly, how those issues fit into the Budget Cycle. The Board of County Commissioners would be looking at the Budget Cycle during that period of time, either amending the annual budget or developing the budget for a two-year period. The Board of County Commissioners felt there was some merit to having the Planning Commission’s ideas presented and ready to go forward as they looked at the budget cycle. It was, again, stressed that the difficulty in obtaining dates should not be construed as a lack of desire to meet with the Planning Commission, as they were very desirous of having such a meeting.

Lary Coppola, Chair, had received an email from Commissioner Angel indicating the Board of County Commissioners would be willing to meet in the evening or possibly have a breakfast meeting if the Planning Commission were willing. Darryl Piercy verified there was an indication from the Board of County Commissioners that they would be willing to attempt to schedule such a meeting. One of the things the Board of County Commissioners discussed, which they would also like to discuss with the Planning Commission, was if an annual meeting were established, perhaps there should also be a quarterly check-in with the Chair from the Planning Commission. This could occur at one of the work study sessions to discuss issues that might be coming up as the year progressed. It is clearly difficult to get all of the Planning Commissioners and all of the Board of County Commissioners together on a particular date unless it is scheduled well in advance. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that there had been a tentative date of August 26, 2003, but he was pushing to get something ahead of that. Darryl Piercy noted there was concern expressed, probably only in the mildest form, that when the meeting does take place that it not be to discuss specific applications, the merits of those or related issues. It was preferred that the meeting address more general areas in terms of procedure, philosophy, Planning Commission goals and how those relates to the work that is being done. The Board of County Commissioners sees these meetings
as opportunities for such discussions, rather than discussions regarding site-specific applications or discussions regarding matters on which the Planning Commission is currently deliberating. In August, Darryl Piercy recommended that the topics of the agenda should not include items such as the current Comprehensive Plan amendment process. That would probably not be an appropriate topic to discuss. If the date in August worked for the Planning Commission, the Board of County Commissioners was very willing to move forward in planning for a meeting on that date. Darryl Piercy acknowledged that Lary Coppola, Chair, had expressed his desire to have the meeting sooner and he would see what could be done. In reviewing the Board of County Commissioners calendars, an afternoon meeting was definitely not available. Lary Coppola, Chair, thought it was incredible that it would take three months for the Board of County Commissioners to find time to meet with them. Monty Mahan expressed a preference for a breakfast/morning meeting but would also be willing to attend an evening meeting if it allowed them to meet sooner, with Lary Coppola, Chair, expressing his agreement. Monty Mahan and Lary Coppola, Chair, also recommended that, going forward, they set up a standard date and time for these meetings, scheduling them in advance. Lary Coppola, Chair, specifically stated he would like to schedule three meetings with the Board of County Commissioners between now and the end of the year.

Laura Ditmer asked what the Planning Commission would like to have on the agenda for those meetings. Lary Coppola, Chair, stated that would depend on what was occurring at the time. Monty Mahan felt the initial agenda should be for a general philosophy discussion such as the way things should be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners or Planning Commission, which could prevent potential problems with miscommunication.

Darryl Piercy felt the Board of County Commissioners would probably be agreeable to establishing a regular meeting schedule. They would also like to establish specific periods for the Board of County Commissioners to meet with the Chair from the Planning Commission. The Board of County Commissioners were very interested in that kind of approach. Setting up a regular meeting schedule that might include a procedural monologue with the Planning Commission each year as a body, while also allowing the opportunity for the Board of County Commissioners to meet with the Chair on a more regular basis. William Matchett noted the opportunity had always been there. Monty Mahan clarified that Darryl was referring to a Board of County Commissioners Work Study Session, with Darryl noting that the Work Study Sessions would be when the Chair of the Planning Commission could come before the Board of County Commissioners and provide a report or update, taking any input back to the Planning Commission.

Mike Gustavson felt that the Chair, alone, might not represent the concerns of the entire Planning Commission. He would prefer that there be an established schedule, such as the first Tuesday of each quarter or whatever was determined, as a meeting with the Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission. If only two Commissioners and six Planning Commission members could attend, that would have to suffice. It was stressed that it was important that the entire Planning Commission be included in the meetings. Not only does the Planning Commission Chair rotate every
year, but there are issues the chair may find of interest that differed from the rest of the Planning Commission. There are issues each member had concerns about, such as where does Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council fit with regard to the Planning Commission. There appears to be some serious overlap that he would like to discuss with the Board of County Commissioners. The Chair might not adequately represent all of the diverse views within the Planning Commission.

Darryl Piercy noted that one of the agenda items for the meeting with the Board of County Commissioners might be to discuss and establish the need for regular meeting dates. Rather than identifying it here, it should be included on the agenda. The Planning Commission could then discuss the frequency of the meetings, how they should be developed and what they wanted to accomplish through that process. As it stood, they already had a very good starting point for conversations with the Board of County Commissioners, just in working out the details. It was noted that the dates might be established ahead of time and, as the date approached, if it was determined there was not a significant agenda to support holding the meeting, it could be cancelled. This would have to be done in concurrence with the Board of County Commissioners, noting that even if the Planning Commission didn’t have any significant issues, the Board of County Commissioners might. Darryl Piercy, again, noted it needed to be decided if they should maintain the scheduled date in August or try, once again, to go to the Board of County Commissioners calendars and see if there was the potential for an evening or breakfast meeting that could be scheduled prior to the August date. Darryl Piercy had reviewed Board’s schedule yesterday and it would appear that July was pretty much out of the question if they wanted to meet with all three Commissioners. There were very few dates in July when all three Commissioners were available and in town.

Mike Gustavson noted August appeared to be the only window available early in the fall to discuss the upcoming schedule. Darryl Piercy said he would still try to see what could be put together, but would keep the August date on the schedule, as well. He then asked if he should notify the Lary Coppola, Chair, of any progress regarding scheduling or how they would like Staff to proceed. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that they should email the entire Planning Commission and call with, or mail, the information to those who did not have email.

Regarding the schedule, Darryl Piercy asked what agenda items should be included. Laura Ditmer noted there was the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council discussion and future scheduling. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted the Planning Commission had a lot on their plate and he would like some guidance regarding the prioritizing of issues. Monty Mahan noted his preference for breakfast or morning meetings over evening meetings.

Laura Ditmer confirmed, unless they could schedule an earlier meeting, the Planning Commission was scheduled to meet with the Board of County Commissioners on August 26, 2003 at 3:00 p.m. It was unsure whether the meeting would be in the Board of County Commissioners Conference Room or the third floor of the Public Works Conference Room. Confirmation of the location would be provided to the Planning Commission once the meeting date was finalized.
Clyde Stricklin noted a number of letters had been received on the Interim Growth Forests, some of which were distributed at the meeting. The Planning Commission should have received packets with proposed policy revisions. It was verified that the Planning Commission had the correct materials in their packets and from the handouts.

Clyde Stricklin noted an email from the Tribe had not been included in their packets and one page was missing from the Consultant Report, which was a list of Committee Members. Staff recommendations had been provided which were an attempt to document the process that had occurred to-date. The Comprehensive Plan currently indicates that there will be a process. There had been a partial process in the past, which now included some policies results. The staff report specifically states that the goal was to develop and implement policies for Interim Growth Forests. Something that it doesn’t say, which is also important, is that it does not propose the Planning Commission or County proceed with rezoning the Interim Growth Forest lands. It does not make a recommendation on the actual zoning on those properties. The stated intent is that the Committee complete the work to develop the process further. The Committee needs to develop standards and criteria to be use in zoning for those areas. The Committee was unable to reach a complete agreement on how to accomplish the desired goals. Some of the committee preferred that the zoning remain unchanged, while a lot of the committee wanted to have an incentive program. Most of the discussion related to the need for an enforceable incentive program. There was an agreement on that. The details of that program, however, were never agreed upon. It was never decided how many units to allow per acre or how to approach the program in each area. There was no decision made if everyone should participate or if it should just involve a portion of the lands. The fact that there should be an incentive program was about as far as the Committee could get with regard to an agreement. This was, therefore, being placed in the Comprehensive Plan, noting the Committee agreed to continue working on developing general guidelines. The Committee recognized the next step, noting that often when you get a plan such as this there are mapping considerations that will affect the zoning. Clyde Stricklin stressed that the Planning Commission was going to receive a lot of letters suggesting entirely new zones and other things. It should be stressed that the Committee never got that far. They only got to the point of discussing what they wanted to see, with no consensus regarding how to accomplish their goals.

William Matchett asked if there was any discussion of TDRs. Clyde Stricklin noted that the Committee had never reach a point where there was serious discussion of TDRs. There was some discussion, but not in any real detail. John Ahl noted the only TDR discussion was in the context of the former study. Clyde Stricklin felt there would be significant discussion of the TDR at later meetings. He noted that it was interesting that even members of the Tribe on the Committee were making suggestions regarding incentive programs. Tribe representatives expressed the opinion that it might be useful if people would transfer rights and expressed a willingness to move forward even more than some of the other members. It was interesting and encouraging to have that type
of support from the Tribe. That would seem to indicate that the TDR is going to have some interesting developments.

Clyde Stricklin noted that a lot of the letters that were being submitted related to the discussions that had occurred and how far the decision process had gone. Staff was noting that the process had not actually gone that far yet with it being taken as far as it could in the time allowed. It was acknowledged that there was going to be another process and the Committee wanted to get to that process. The Committee could then look at densities, some proposed to be as high as five units per acre with 25 units selected. The Committee wasn’t there yet, though, and they realized that. It was something that they would continue to evaluate and discuss.

Darryl Piercy noted that a corollary discussion regarding TDRs and the Interim Growth Forest zone was going to be needed. It would address how the County should be looking at future Sub-Area Plans in terms of urban zoning. There was a need to set up, within Urban Growth Areas, receiving areas for those development rights. It may end up with identifying development right receiving areas within Urban Growth Areas and Sub-Area Plans in the future. The Committee should include this aspect as part of their discussion regarding the entire process. William Matchett noted that should have taken place ten years ago.

John Ahl stressed that part of the reason the group was unable to reach a consensus was that there were only three, short meetings. It was his belief that the Committee might get closer to an agreement if given the opportunity under a facilitator to go ahead and flesh this thing out. There might be some other way to reach a consensus. It seemed like the Committee was comprised of the right mix of people. In his opinion it was astonishing to see how far they came in three short meetings. Darryl Piercy noted that was certainly the intent to get the placeholder in the Comprehensive Plan, then continue to move forward in the process toward resolving the Interim Growth Forest issue.

Tom Nevins recalled that the placeholder initially included densities. Darryl Piercy noted that they would be taking a more critical look at that aspect. Comments were coming in from the Committee and others indicating that the language may need to be even more generalized. Based on testimony and input they had received, he would not want to make a decision. Some were indicating there was a consensus, while the point they had reached may not actually represent a true consensus from the Committee. There may need to be broader, more general language to ensure the wording captures what was really agreed to within that group. The County will be taking a look at that, receiving different perspectives across the table that may or may not have been heard before.

Laura Ditmer noted that the Committee was now being given the opportunity to digest the information received to-date. It was also verified that the Report was contained in the Planning Commission’s binders. William Matchett asked if the Planning Commission would be receiving a new draft with Darryl Piercy indicating the language might be softened up to be less specific regarding densities, but Staff was still working
on that aspect. William Matchett asked that the final wording would be provided to the Planning Commission for their review as soon as it became available.

Mike Gustavson noted people investing in real estate expect a return on that investment. If people had purchased large parcels, historically they will sell off small pieces either to make their payments or extract some money out of the land. The concept being presented, which he applauds, needs to be reviewed to ensure that affected property owners will receive a return on their investment. This might prevent those large property owners from being able to sell off small parcels to generate income. The suggestion of selling off development rights didn’t clearly indicate, in his opinion, how the property owner would get money back into his pocket. Staff noted that the property owner would be paid for the right to develop elsewhere, similar to actually selling the title to the property.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked if there was any decision on how this would affect property taxes. Staff was noted that the process had not reached the point where that was even addressed. Darryl Piercy noted most of the properties are currently in either forestry or open space and already receiving a substantial tax break. One of the issues that would need to be addressed with the Prosecutor’s office and the Assessor was to understand how those tax advantages could apply to the set-aside forestry areas that would still qualify. The development rights would be a totally different category with regard to taxes. There were many questions and answers needed to be developed as the committee moved forward.

Mike Gustavson felt there was a very straightforward solution. A lot has a value, as will development rights. Once development rights are accepted, there are now lots that the developer needs to pay taxes on. The real problems related to the mechanics of being able to transfer them to an owner if someone comes back to buy those and make them viable in a timely fashion, to prevent a person from paying taxes for 5-10 years while the County worked it out. Darryl Piercy noted there were a number of different programs and different mechanisms that help facilitate that. Those just all need to be brought out and reviewed to determine which have value and which fit best with the property owners of the County and the administration of that program.

William Matchett was encouraged that the new Director had experience in this area, which would be helpful. Monty Mahan noted this was something he was working with over in Pierce County right now. The gain or loss of developability is an appraisable value. It’s relatively easy to set the increase or decrease in the property’s value. Any appraiser or the Assessors office should be able to do this. It was noted that it was done in Snohomish County based solely on the values. People were surveyed to find out what it would take for them to participate as a developer or landowner, what would make a program like this have value so they could get something from the TDR program.

This all raised the issue on there being a benefit connected to the TDR for both the property owner and the developer. What was the advantage to buying TDRs unless it costs less than developable land in urban areas? So developers needed encouragement or incentives to participate in the TDR program. But it’s a double-edged sword. There
must also be value for the property owner, while the cost needs to be lower for the
developer than it would be to purchase acreage outright, then have it rezoned and
developed.

Staff noted the goal is to find areas around Urban Growth Areas, mixed Urban Growth
Areas or Reserve areas. There must be a TDR in order to develop that property, but it
would be available and could provide enough of a return on the owner’s investment
without the expense of building the development itself. The market has to somehow be
developed and involved to make this work.

Mike Gustavson noted there was trap in this plan because the developer is finding a
parcel near urban areas that would cost market value, then pay market value again for
the TDR to develop the property. Before long the price gets too high and we’re back
into high priced housing.

Darryl Piercy noted they needed to determine whether there are artificial values on the
property that the developer is buying. Artificial values can be placed on a property by
up-zoning it in advance, rather than later. If there is rural land out there now it has a
particular value, especially if it is near an Urban Growth Area. If that rural property
were changed to accommodate five times as many lots, the value would be increased.
That’s the value of the TDR.

Mike Gustavson noted that if he owned 100 acres, with these standards he could put 20
houses on it in clusters. He still didn’t understand where the advantage was with the
TDR as opposed to just building on his own property. It would seem to be the cheapest
way to go and would even allow him to retain ownership of the land. Staff noted that
this program allowed the owner to retain ownership of the property and continue it as
forestry, while selling development rights to someone else to build next to an Urban
Growth Area. The commitment is to the owner, allowing them to continue to log it and
keep it in their family. Mike Gustavson stated it was his understanding the land they
were discussing wouldn’t support growing suitable timber. Darryl Piercy clarified the
land being discussed grows marginally, economically viable timber. The question was
whether it is economically viable enough for the owner to use that as the highest land
use. The input Staff had received was that the marginal forests were not economically
sufficient unless there was a return on that land by selling of development rights. At
that point it becomes economically viable for the owner to maintain part of the land as
forestry. Mike Gustavson still felt there would be more of a financial return for the
owner if they sold the property at one house on twenty acres. Darryl Piercy noted that
even if they break even on a cap basis, the ability to maintain ownership and maintain
marginally viable forestry provides some cash value to the owner’s pocket. Staff
believes there is a real advantage to the property owner to do that, but it is also an
individual choice property owners will need to determine on their own.

It was noted that in Snohomish County it tended to work because people liked to build
one home for themselves and sell the development rights to others. The owner got
their house and it was perceived as “a bird in the hand.” The owners feel they have
received something that is marketable, yet they can also sell TDRs on the other
properties. What this program is looking at is that you can just have your home on the
property, or you can sell development rights to others. The Suquamish area deemed
the program to be a success. The owners retain their home and add value by selling off
the development rights. That value was enough to allow them to get their new house,
and they could sell the rights to the developer on the rest with more value added to the
rest of the property than if they had just developed one home on their own. The
program seems to be working very well.

William Matchett asked what precisely was to be addressed regarding this matter by
the Planning Commission. This had been discussed 10-14 years ago and it finally
seemed to be moving forward. Clyde Stricklin noted this was primarily an update for
the Planning Commission with a minor revision to the Comprehensive Plan regarding
Interim Growth Forests. With the concern being preservation of the Interim Growth
Forest, the details had not been worked out by the Committee yet, such as densities and
how to accomplish their goals. Establishing densities just sets the value of the Interim
Growth Forest TDR at one site. It doesn’t address whether the development must be
done on just one site. The Committee simply hasn’t gotten that far into the process.
The Planning Commission requested a copy of the Snohomish County information
regarding their TDR program. Clyde Stricklin noted he had located their website and
would attempt to provide that information to the Planning Commission. There were a
lot of different programs and a list would be provided to the Planning Commission.

The motion was submitted and seconded that the meeting be adjourned.

12:30 P.M.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.
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