The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County Fairgrounds, President’s Hall, 1200 Fairgrounds Road, Silverdale, Washington. Members Present: John Taylor, Mark Flynn, John Ahl, Deborah Flynn, Monty Mahan, William Matchett, Lary Coppola, Chair, Mike Gustavson. Member Absent: Tom Nevins. Staff Present: Kamuron Gurol, Darryl Piercy, Laura Ditmer, Jason Rice, Clyde Stricklin, Stephanie Pawalski, Holly Anderson, Pamela Younce.

6:30 P.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions and Agenda Review.

6:35 P.M.

A motion was made by Deborah Flynn and seconded by Mike Gustavson that the Planning Commission approve the Minutes of April 8, 2003.

Vote: Aye: 6, Abstained: 2 (John Taylor and William Matchett due to nonattendance). Motion carried.

Lary Coppola, Chair, reminded those in attendance that this evening’s meeting would be aired on BKAT on Wednesday, July 9, at 9:00 a.m. and Friday, July 11, at 2:00 p.m.

Continuation of Public Hearing on Comprehensive Plan Amendments (Phase I) Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD)

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted there were three people signed up to testify with one additional audience member noting they would also like to speak on this issue. Lary Coppola, Chair, noted he would call them after the signed up individuals had completed their testimony. Lary Coppola, Chair, also advised all speakers that they would be limited to three minutes, with the timekeeper to notify them when there was one minute remaining.

Tom Donnelly, Kitsap Citizen's for Responsible Planning, expressed his support of a LAMIRD designation at George’s Corner, subject to the condition that the logical outer boundary be limited to existing development and areas rezoned Commercial last year. Mr. Donnelly noted that it was his understanding, before last year’s rezone, that Staff had been directed to identify candidate LAMIRDs from crossroad locations where two or more corners had been developed prior to 1990. In his opinion George’s Corner was mistakenly selected. Only one corner had been developed prior to 1990, with the greater portion of existing development being the Albertson’s based shopping center.
The post 1990 development, coupled with the additional uses allowed by last year’s rezone, results in a level of intensity greater than should be allowed in a LAMIRD. The manner in which this process has occurred, approval of the rezone without first determining whether the rezoned area met the requirements for a LAMIRD designation, justified the public being cynical about the meaningfulness of participating in this process. In general, Mr. Donnelly, stressed that any crossroad LAMIRD should not be designated where only one corner included commercial development prior to 1990.

Dusty Meyer noted that, generally speaking, water is a problem in the County, State and for the Federal Government. There are two countries in the world with enough water for their populations: New Zealand and Canada. The U.S. is the third most overpopulated country in the world. That stated, Ms. Meyer inquired how many acres are protected in Kitsap County. The newspaper today indicated 400 acres in North Kitsap County were being set aside for Heritage Park. There is not sufficient water for drinking or flushing toilets. We also need the trees for clean air. Development in this County is beyond all reason. The Growth Management Act was established to build within the cities, not in rural areas. Development has gone on with houses all over, with flushing toilets, dishwashers and showers. The toilets hook up to an inadequate sewage system. We don’t need to spend our tax dollars on extra things that are only going to deplete what’s needed in the County. Somebody has got to start thinking.

When McCormick Woods’ septic system failed, they paid for the sewage line to hook up to an inadequate sewer system. Wal-Mart has been added, even though there are twenty empty stores in Port Orchard just on one street. Ms. Meyer noted six homes for sale just in driving home today, which does not support a need for more houses. The County needs to have people that are thinking about what is really needed and what this County’s taxpayers can afford.

Richard Brown had not signed up but asked that he be allowed to testify. He noted that LAMIRDs will be the only place Kitsap County Housing Authority will be able to buy and put land for affordable housing. Most of the money comes Farmers Home Administration Money and they have boundaries that now reach to Mullenix Road. The County needs to ensure there is a supply of affordable housing for our population that is now down to almost nothing. It was suggested that this be placed under the Planning Director’s approval. There are places like Parkview Terrace, with water and lots of land around it, that should be developed based on this criteria.

Phyllis Meyers was scheduled to speak next but requested that her name be moved to the Interim Growth Forest portion of the Public Hearing.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other speakers regarding LAMIRD.

- Continuation of Public Hearing on Comprehensive Plan Amendments (Phase I)
- **Interim Rural Forest (IRF)**

Phyllis Meyers expressed her appreciation for the Planning Commission’s work, noting that they spend a lot of time reading some pretty long and tedious documents. The efforts of the Planning Commission adds value to the decisions made in Kitsap County.
and, for that reason, as a citizen and a taxpayer she wanted to note her appreciation. Ms. Meyers then noted that she and her husband own a small business in Kitsap County, the sort many in Kitsap County would encourage. It’s an Internet based business, with low impact, has three employees and is located in a rural part of Kitsap County. They chose their locate due to the uniqueness of Kitsap County. They value the clean air, clean water, native birds, wildlife and native plants. Ms. Meyers expressed her opinion that this plan would place those in jeopardy.

As a representative of The Mountaineer’s Foundation, Ms. Meyers used the Chico Watershed analysis as an example. It included an Alternative Features Analysis that resulted in a long, complicated report with a presentation anticipated by Staff. The key finding appeared to be that the future of Chico hinges on whether or not the forest land in the basin is developed. The results of the Moderate Scenario and the Conservation Scenario were similar, with both entailing not developing the forest lands. The Moderate Scenario had a TDR provision and a LAMIRD provision, which was sort of optional for the results. The results really hinged on not developing the forest. Ms. Meyers expressed continuing skepticism that a TDR program could work in Kitsap County. Why would anybody buy rights to a development when they could just purchase a lot, with plenty of undeveloped lots in Kitsap County. The Mountaineers Foundation has asked that Ms. Meyers set up some meetings with other land trust, conservation organizations. To date they have met with the Greater Peninsula Conservancy and some other funding agencies in an attempt to develop a package to present to the County. There are a lot of natural resources that need to be preserved in Kitsap County. Chico Creek is a very productive system for fish/salmon and she could provide more information on that but was limited in time. If, however, the development potential on the forest lots is increased, it will eliminate incentives needed to make this TDR program or some similar program work. There was an announcement this morning on national public radio that the growth rate in Washington is the lowest it’s been in twenty years. Ms. Meyer urged the Planning Commission to be careful, thoughtful and to work with those who want to preserve what’s unique about Kitsap County.

Tom Donnelly, Kitsap Citizen’s for Responsible Planning, noted that the County has about 54,000 acres of forest land zoned for one dwelling unit on twenty acres with about 2700 dwelling units authorized. The Planning Commission has received a proposal from Rod Reid and some other forest owners who were on a Committee that examined changes to the Interim Rural Forest Zoning. A number of those on the Committee, close to a majority though not a full consensus, were represented in that proposal. However, the membership of the Committee was chosen for their special interests, not for their countywide interests. The Planning Commission was asked to be wary of just adopting that report. There are members who are extremely disappointed that County Staff adopted the proposal, or seemed to adopt it, as their own. In Mr. Donnelly’s opinion it is much more a Rural Development Incentive Program than a Forest Conservation Incentive Program. As such, it constitutes a recipe for growth management disaster. If adopted, it will lead to the degradation of our quality of life, to include a reduction in property values. The addition of more than 10,000 buildable lots to those already available in inventory will reduce the value of every existing lot, vacant or developed. There will be dire environmental damage with impervious surfaces
replacing existing forest. There will be endless sprawling developments, attracted by cheap lots in rural areas causing total population growth to exceed projections. Urban and City Growth Allocations will not be achieved. This will all result in increased property taxes, overcrowding and congestion. There are two alternative proposals: one from the Suquamish Tribe and one from Kitsap Citizen’s for Responsible Planning. Both stressed there is no urgency or compelling reason to change the existing zoning. It’s not broken and doesn’t need fixing. Hasty action to serve one special interest at the expense of the public interest can have disastrous consequences on the environment and undermine responsible growth management. Kitsap Citizen’s for Responsible Planning asks that the Planning Commission delay action on this issue until County Staff has fully evaluated all three proposals and recommended an alternative that will best serve County interests in the long-term.

Ed Bass of Poulsbo, President of the West Sound Conservation Council, participated in the Interim Rural Forest Advisory Committee Meetings held in May. The County Staff proposal does not represent a consensus of the participants at those meetings. It appeared to be taken entirely from proposals submitted by real estate development, forest owners and property right special interest groups. The concerns of the environmental community and the Native American Tribes were not addressed. Contrary to its name, there was little discussion on forestry or forest values such as watersheds. The focus was on how many homes could be built on the forest land. The current situation has Forest Land zoned for one dwelling unit per twenty acres. At 54,000 acres of forest land, that makes 2,700 dwelling units if fully developed. The Rural Wooded Incentive Program would allow four times that number, or 10,800 units, clustered on one corner of that forest. This proposal is asking for little clusters of 1.25 acre lots scattered over the rural forest. In addition, the other 75% of forest would retain the one dwelling unit per twenty acres zoning, allowing for an additional 2,025 dwelling units. Altogether this is 12,825 dwelling units; over 10,000 more than the current situation. If this proposal goes through as it is, the Planning Commission will be allowing for 23,000 new residences in the rural forests of Kitsap County. Never mind the Growth Management Act. Forget about Urban Growth Areas. Forget about watersheds or forestry. Where will you get the water for these people? Who will be paying for the roads, school buses and fire protection. The County needs all the forest it can preserve to maintain a high quality of life. Current zoning would be far more effective than the development proposal submitted by County Staff.

Laura Overton Johannes encouraged the Planning Commission to adopt the program outlined in Rod Reid’s letter dated May 20, 2003. That letter was supported by a lot of the Committee members and included their names. Adopting a program such as this would preserve trees and encourage forestry. This is the program that will work. The property being discussed is not long-term forest land or forest land as defined by the Growth Management Act. Contrary to previous comments, many of the Committee members, including her, are environmentalists who care about the property. Those in favor of the plan did not represent just one faction. This program has been discussed since the early 1990s, prior to Growth Management Act. If a program such as this is not passed it is inevitable that these lands will be developed over time. There will be one house for every twenty acres with both large and small landowners considering this to be a waste of land at a very high cost to the consumer general public. Kitsap County
will be missing an unbelievable opportunity to preserve several miles of waterfront and
miss the opportunity to keep many lands in active forestry. The Planning
Commission’s assistance is needed to make this program a viable tool. It was stressed,
again, that these lands were not long-term forest lands as defined by the Growth
Management Act. They have poor soil compositions with the better soils being located
near streams, where logging wouldn’t be allowed due to the new DNR rules. If the
Planning Commission limits an owner’s flexibility to develop at a higher density, it
would just encourage more land to be converted from forestry to housing. A letter was
submitted to the Planning Commission from April 16, 2002, regarding the most recent
bad news about the timber industry, which was deemed to be educational for the
Planning Commission’s review.

Rod Reid, Alpine Evergreen Company, had spoken at the June 3, 2003 hearing with his
comments standing. Additionally, the delay on this matter had gone on long enough.
Tom Donnelly had alluded to the possibility of taking more time. The review process
was begun in 1998 and now in 2003 it’s finally coming around. There was no valid
reason for further delay. Mr. Reid noted his agreement with Laura Overton Johannes
that this issue was not about long-term forestry. Commercial forestry was not the topic
being discussed. This issue related to rural lands that also happen to have a category of
Interim Rural Forest. The intention was to try to preserve the marginal forest land for
the future. The majority, which happened to be eleven members, signed off on the
document provided at the June 3 Public Hearing. The Planning Commission was asked
to read through that document as it was a good agreement and well worth reviewing.
Developing land was not the area of concern. The Planning Commission was asked to
keep in mind that this was about saving marginal forestry for as long as possible.

Jon Rose, representing Olympic Property Group at 19245 Tenth Avenue NE, Poulsbo,
Washington, indicated his company had been involved in this discussion. David
Cunningham, his predecessor, had participated in discussions with long term
commercial forestry. Olympic Property Group provide a lot of the expertise and science
that supported the fact that, while the land was there and had a many trees, they were
not what an industrial timber company looks at and considers as long term forestry. It
had been suggested that they were “rushing” into a program of Interim Rural Forest,
which was hard to conceive given the years that had been involved in the process.
There had been a lot of thoughtful debate and information presented to the Planning
Commission over the years. This evening Mr. Rose had suggested that laws were being
passed at the expense of the public. Although the Growth Management Act had many
laudable goals: open spaces, preserved forestry, critical areas buffering lower density,
concentration of growth. Those were laws that were passed for the good of society as a
whole. Any improvement results in an expense. The excellent goals of the Growth
Management Act came at a very painful expense to people who had owned property for
over 150 years in this County; not real estate speculators. That leads to the question of
whose expense is it and whose forest are we talking about. These are not national,
public forests. They are private lands that have been managed responsibly. There has
been little change of the past 150 years on these lands and there is nothing to indicate
this will lead to a big torrent of development. Only a few landowners, 20, 100 or even
1,000 bore a lot of the expense and pain of the Growth Management Act. Right now the
Planning Commission has the opportunity to ease a little bit of that pain and provide
some flexibility and tools to those same landowners. Olympic Property Group has
20,000 acres of land in this County. When the Growth Management Act took effect,
virtually 99% of those acres were down zoned to one dwelling unit per twenty acres. As
early as the 1980s there was a density of one dwelling unit per acre. That’s a lot of pain
for one company, as well as individual land owners. It was all promoting social goals.
This is a chance for the Planning Commission to say they recognize good things were
accomplished at the property owners’ expense and the Planning Commission is
prepared tonight to ease a little bit of that burden by providing the landowners with
some tools to manage the lands. The Planning Commission was asked to consider how
it feels when something is taken away from them.

Richard Anderson, North Kitsap, Conservation Chair for Kitsap Audubon Society,
opposed the Rural Wooded Incentive Program because it does not preserve enough
forest land. There is nothing forcing the County to change the current zoning. The
Kitsap Audubon Society feels the proposed changes would undermine the Growth
Management Act.

Vivian Henderson, Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners, was also on the Committee.
After working cooperatively with these property owners for many years, it was to the
point where the County and Planning Commission should not continue to hold these
property owners hostage. That’s what the opposing group appeared to be trying to do.
These property owners had worked with the County and were very conscious of the
environment, otherwise they wouldn’t be in this business. To continue limiting them to
one dwelling unit per twenty acres would only result in them selling out. If the
properties sold at one dwelling unit per twenty acres it would end up creating estates in
this County. The need is for affordable housing, not twenty acre estates. The Planning
Commission was asked to adopt the Staff Report and the Report submitted with the
majority of signatures from the Committee. The report was fair, considers impervious
surfaces and open space. Further delays or holding the development to one unit per
twenty acres would do nothing more than put these private landowners out of business.

Ted Labbe, Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe, Natural Resources Department, expressed his
appreciation for all the work the Planning Commission does in public service, as well as
for the opportunity to comment on the proposed 2003 amendments to the Kitsap
County Comprehensive Plan. As a representative for the Tribe, Mr. Labbe had
participated in recent stakeholder meetings on the Interim Rural Forest land issue.
There was a lot of fruitful discussion on several viable alternatives. There was not,
however, a consensus reached on any appropriate changes to the current zoning.
Although the majority of the large landowners on the Committee supported the Rural
Wooded Incentive Program proposal, there was no corresponding support from many
other members. Mr. Labbe emphasized that, in spite of the Staff Report, it was
important to note that there was no agreement or mutual support for the Rural
Wooded Incentive Program proposal by all members of the committee. The Rural
Wooded Incentive Program has some attractive features such as incentives for forest
conservation. The details of the proposal, however, are not acceptable to the Port
Gamble Tribe. The plan would reward developers with a four-fold increase in
development densities which was simply too large of a reward. Reward densities
cannot be transferred offsite to more appropriate locations, such as Urban Growth
Areas. The incentive program applies to 100% of the current Interim Rural Forest lands, approximately 54,000 acres, which is a tremendous amount of land to experiment with. Only 25% of the subject properties participating in the program would be protected as Permanently Protected Forest Land. There are several viable alternatives that the Planning Commission was encourage to look at, possibly even encouraging the Committee to continue their work. There were only three meetings and inadequate time to delve into the issues to any great detail. The Planning Commission was also encouraged to look at the alternative proposals put forth by Kitsap Citizen’s for Responsible Planning and the Suquamish Tribe. The Planning Commission could also consider leaving the zoning unchanged. There is nothing forcing a change and it is very important that the Planning Commission understand how these zoning changes would impact downstream aquatic resources. These lands provide critical watershed processes and functions and maintain healthy downstream aquatic habitat. To a large extent they mitigate for past development impacts that would be removed if they were developed. A lot of watersheds are teetering on the edge of over development due to impervious surfaces. Removal of forest would just push them further down the path of degradation. Lastly, the County is expected to have updated the Development Regulations to be consistent with best available science, specifically to address conservation of fish habitats in 2004. Whatever is done on this issue could potentially jeopardize that next year. Mr. Labbe asked that the Planning Commission not do anything that would make it harder for the County next year.

Dawn Pucci, Forest Practices Coordinator, Environment Program, for the Suquamish Tribe, noted that her background was in forestry and wildlife management. She had worked with the Small Forest Landowner Advisory Committee, which advises small forest landowners at the DNR office regarding programs for small landowners to maintain their viable forestry industry. Ms. Pucci had also worked with the adaptive management and research for State Forest Rules. She had been in touch with some of the recent research into the new programs available to landowners to keep their forestry sustainable and productive. It was important that the County and Planning Commission support the small and large landowners and keep them in forestry on the land they have been harvesting for 100 years. It is obvious they have been getting timber off their land and it should be supported by finding ways to help them continue to do so. The Comprehensive Plan noted that Phase II of the Interim Rural Forest would be to “discuss and recommend a potential program for encouraging forestry activities within rural areas.” Unfortunately she found that the Committee was more about discussing how to develop the land at 400% density if possible. While supporting cluster development, the thrust of the Committee in the future would hopefully be finding ways to help the landowners maintain and produce timber for our County. There are a couple of proposals before the Planning Commission: the Staff Report and the Rural Wood Incentive Program, which are not the same thing. The new Staff Report does not have the 25% permanent open space included in the original Rural Wooded Incentive Program. It also applies to 100% of land instead of 25% of the land. Whenever there is extensive research for adaptive management, there is always a smaller, pilot study done first so it is not done on a large landscape where you can’t go back. Despite the obvious opposing views on the committee, there were some items where there was a consensus. If the language were limited to those areas of consensus in the Comprehensive Plan amendment this year, that would be something to build on
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and work toward. Ms. Pucci then read into the record proposed wording from her letter dated June 25, 2003:

RL-31: Kitsap County shall develop and implement an incentive program available to Interim Forest Lands to encourage forestry activities within rural areas. This program may include rural cluster developments. Through this program, units could be clustered if designed to retain rural character while preserving large areas for forest production.

RL-31A: Kitsap County shall consider clusters provided clusters do not encourage, or result in, urban level development or services. Interim Rural Forest Land areas shall be included in subsequent discussion of potential additional incentives through the development of rural design standards and/or transfer of development rights.

With this language there is something to build on and work from and the Planning Commission was encouraged to consider this proposed wording.

Peter Schrappen, Executive Director of the West Sound Conservation Council, noted that it is a coalition of eight conservation groups representing over 2,000 members. More intense development would only bring more sprawl, strip malls, crowded classrooms and increased traffic. Definitely a new way of life for Kitsap County Residents. The addition of 13,000 units would require a multitude of new services such as fire, police, concrete and asphalt. The Council is not against growth; they’re against cutting down forest land for cul-de-sacs. There are plenty of other “cookie cutter” communities in other counties in Washington. The Planning Commission was asked not to allow Kitsap County to become another one. Protect our land from concrete companies and preserve the quality of life that keeps us here.

Richard Brown was also on the Committee and of 18 members with 11 voted yes and 7 voted no or abstained with regard to the Plan. This is still America and through that vote, the remaining 7 members lost. The biggest loss in Kitsap County history will be if you force these large landowners to sell off their land as twenty acre parcels, with nothing left. At the current rate of zoning, usable land will be gone within less than twenty years. There are numbers thrown around showing 10,000 lots left for development, which he stressed he did not believe. If there are a lot of old plats, they can’t be used so let’s not be kicking around 10,000 lots. If there truly were 10,000 lots, there wouldn’t be a crisis in housing today. Housing has never been in worse shape than it is now. Somebody had better start paying attention because the working man is having the bread taken out of his mouth. The average working man won’t be able to live in anything but a rental; not when you’re at $178,000 to $200,000 for a home, depending on where the property is located in the County. Mr. Brown noted that there were a lot of average working people who could not afford homes at that price and felt that the Planning Commission should proceed with proposed report as written.

Fred Depee, of South Kitsap, noted he was also on the Committee. The quality of life currently enjoyed in Kitsap County has been brought to them by this same type of proposal. It was PUDs that gave Kitsap County the character it has today. Rural areas
were developed under PUDs all along. If zoning were limited to twenty acre sites, it
would create a real mess with the amount of road and all the things involved with
getting sites on those twenty acres. By going ahead with this, the Planning Commission
could look at what Kitsap County is now and realize it is just a progression of what has
been going on all along.

Doug Scrobut was not signed up but asked to speak as a representative of McCormick
Land Company. It was important that Kitsap County keep trees and the quality of life
within Kitsap County. The existing zoning would not do that. McCormick Land
Company has approximately 1,000 acres in the Interim Rural Forest zone, which would
be approximately fifty 20-acre lots. If they were not able to look toward some sort of
clustering program as put forth or some variation thereof, they would have no other
option other than to sell off those lots as they exist. Once that happens, those trees
would come down with examples of that occurring throughout the County. If we want
to keep some trees, as Fred Depee said, we need to look at some sort of clustering
incentives.

William M. Palmer was not signed up but asked to speak on this item. Although not
addressing the particulars of the Interim Rural Forest and the proposal before the
Planning Commission, he noted that not too long ago the County undertook an analysis
of buildable lands. He had reviewed the information thoroughly and developed his own
projections utilizing that data. If current trends continued, the County would be faced
with utilizing their rural lands due to a lack of urban area to support the population
growth. If that growth were to continue, Kitsap County would have no available land to
develop within about 7-10 years. If the Planning Commission looks at that report and
the Charts provided by the Consultant, they will realize the reality of that situation.
Therefore, there were two things that needed to occur. The size of the Urban Growth
Areas must be increased and the development densities in rural areas needs to be
increased. Those were not bad things if looking at the history provided by Fred Depee.
Prior to Growth Management Act, Kitsap County had the opportunity to do what was
referred to as a Rural PUD. The worst case scenario was that the County would have
wound up with 50% of open space in the rural areas. That might seem like what would
occur now, or possibly even a higher percentage. That’s not the case, however, because
of the inadequate size in Urban Growth Areas and inadequate densities in rural areas.
The Planning Commission needed to realize that Kitsap County was now facing a crisis.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified there were no other speakers. At that point Lary Coppola,
Chair, closed the Public Hearing portion Phase I and II. Staff would accept written
testimony through close of business on July 8, 2003. Written testimony could be
directed to the Kitsap County Department of Community Development at 614 Division
Street, MS-36, Port Orchard, WA 98366-4682. Additional information could also be
found at “www.kitsapgov.com” which was the County’s website.

BREAK: 7:40 P.M. – 7:45 P.M.

Lary Coppola, Chair, began the Public Hearing portion addressing the Comprehensive
Plan site-specific amendments, beginning with the North, Central and then South
Kitsap. Testimony was again limited to three minutes, with the timekeeper to advise
the speaker when there was one minute remaining. It was stressed that testimony should be as brief as possible since the building must be vacated precisely at 9:30 p.m.

KITSAP TRANSIT: Urban Low to Public Utility with Underlying Industrial Zoning; approximately 20 acres in the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area located north of State Route 305 and east of State Route 3 and Viking Avenue.

Richard Frederickson stated he owned property in the Big Valley just southeast of the proposed site of the Kitsap Transit Facility. He is also a Human Biologist, teaching courses in Human Health and Disease as well as Environmental Ecology. For that reason, Mr. Frederickson expressed his concern regarding the possible biological consequences of locating the facility at that particular site due to the possibility of soil contamination from an industrial site of this nature. The geological survey maps distinctly show the slope of this property is away from Big Valley. The water runoff and storm management, however, are not as much the problem as ground seepage water that goes into the core surface into the glacial formation found underneath the soil at this site. There are numerous streams coming down from the east side of this property into the valley where they live. Soil contamination will contain diesel emissions that have been aerosoled and deposited into the soil, carcinogenic aromatic hydrocarbons and soil contamination from bus maintenance. As noted, this contamination will affect the springs that have been seen for years emanating and bubbling up out of the ground from the west slope of the valley. Additionally, Dog Fish Creek is adjacent to this area, with the runoff eventually making its way down to the salmon creek. Kitsap County Public Health has been investing a lot of time and energy in trying to maintain the salmon population, providing a healthy environment. This is counterproductive to the health and vitality of the salmon stream, as well as to the health and vitality of the public living in this valley. Mr. Frederickson thanked the Planning Commission for listening to his comments as a Biologist.

Ann Frederickson noted this was a very emotional matter for her. There was no understandable reason for even considering changing this beautiful property into an industrial site, especially a bus barn. Ms. Frederickson noted she also lived on Big Valley Road with her property directly abutting the proposed site. Mr. Lindsey and Mr. Hayes had come to a meeting and her house to address the concerns of those how were opposing this plan, but there were still many unresolved concerns. There were concerns about air, ground, and sound pollution with 40-50 buses starting up at 4:30 a.m. in her backyard. The trees would not provide a sufficient sound buffer. Additional concerns related to retention ponds. Despite reports there were serious concerns that this would run off into Big Valley because everything runs off the ridge into Big Valley. There would need to be septic systems installed. Kitsap Transit had addressed none of these concerns to the satisfaction of those residents opposing this site plan. On November 19, 2002, the Poulsbo Planning Commission turned down Kitsap Transit. On December 4, 2002, Kitsap Transit withdrew their request and went before the County in an apparent attempt to bypass the City of Poulsbo’s decision. Ms. Frederickson noted that her husband’s family has lived on and cared for that property for 114 years, having five generations raised there. If approved, this plan would put an end to that.
Mike Rice expressed his appreciation to the Planning Commission for allowing him to speak on this matter. He also owned property in Big Valley in close proximity to the proposed Transit Site and had the same concerns regarding various forms of pollution. As a different perspective, looking at an aerial view of the proposed site it was surrounded by green, despite the fact that there were 17 homes in close proximity to the site. In comparison, looking at an aerial photo of the Ojava project, it just showed devastation and ugly brown dirt. The property being considered was currently zoned for four houses per acre. In theory there could be 82 houses built on this piece of property. If there were an aerial photo after having 82 houses built, it would likely still show a lot of green. The current use is appropriate for this property and was wisely zoned that way. Mr. Rice asked that the Planning Commission not consider changing it to ugly brown dirt or blacktop.

Lana McCollum noted her property abuts the proposed Kitsap Transit site and stressed her opposition to the proposal for the same reasons mentioned earlier. Primary concerns were noise, pollution and fumes. She asked that this property not be industrial and retain its current zoning. If, however, it should be rezoned, it was requested that Kitsap Transit provide a minimum buffer of 200 feet; although it was preferred that the plan not be allowed to go through at all.

Jeff Haines lives at and owns property a few hundred feet from the parcel being considered for rezoning. Within his family, they own approximately 17 acres that have been in the family since the late 1940’s. It’s a nice, quite neighborhood and it would stay that way if this plan were disapproved. Mr. Haines stressed he is against the rezoning.

Karla Boughton, Associate Planner for the City of Poulsbo, noted she would like to comment on the proposed site specific Comprehensive Plan amendment for Kitsap Transit. A letter was entered into the record from the City of Poulsbo City Attorney directed to the Kitsap County Prosecuting Attorney, Sue Tanner. The City Attorney addressed numerous City concerns on this proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment in the letter. Ms. Boughton, however, noted that the main legal point of the letter was that the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area was subject to extensive planning efforts by both the County and the City, resulting in the Poulsbo Subarea Plan and implementing an interlocal agreement. Interlocal Agreement Section 3.1.1 agrees to utilize the Sub-Area Plan and City’s zoning ordinance as the land use control for the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area. Either the Subarea Plan or the City Zoning Ordinance include Industrial Land Use Designation. The plan identifies Light Industrial. Further, neither the Sub-Area Plan nor the City Zoning Ordinance include a public facilities overlay. Counties and Cities have no authority to redesignate or rezone property to land use or zoning designations that do not exist in both the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. The City Attorney sites the court case that clearly establishes this law. County Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission undertake an arbitrary and illegal act of redesignating the Kitsap Transit property to a designation and zoning that simply does not exist. In conclusion, the City of Poulsbo does not support an unlawful Comprehensive Plan amendment. If Kitsap County chooses to pursue the public facilities overlay, they are asked to do so outside of the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area.
Richard Hayes was scheduled to testify next but it was requested that he be moved to the end as he had not arrived yet. Lary Coppola, Chair, agreed.

Deb Grigg lives on Viking Way, which is very close to the proposed bus barn. It would appear that Kitsap Transit is asking the Planning Commission to change the Comprehensive Plan after the fact. Kitsap Transit had a lot of input with regard to the Comprehensive Plan relating to park and rides, who would be utilizing their services and how many buses they would need. Somehow they seem to have been unaware that they also needed a facility throughout this process. In 1988 the Planning Commission designated enough area as industrial. Kitsap Transit should have addressed their requirements at that time, not after the fact. Ms. Grigg urged the Planning Commission to deny their request.

Jim Grigg submitted a letter to the Planning Commission, signed by him and neighbors who were unable to attend, expressing their opposition. This is not the right site for this facility and it could potentially gut the Urban Growth Area. Instead of dressing it up, everyone will need to rezone his or her properties. The people who signed the letter are not “anti-business” or “anti-growth.” Two of the signatures are from existing business owners in the area. It is just agreed by all signing parties that this is the wrong site for a Transit Facility. There are other businesses in the area that are low impact. They keep regular hours and have been good neighbors. This project will have too high of an impact on the area; operating 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year. It would seem that it would be better sited across the Highway or near Ojava or Finn Hill, which are already high impact development areas. Those locations would provide good road access Mr. Grigg understood there were already 60-70 acres zoned industrial. The streets are in place, as well as power, water and sewer. Kitsap Transit indicated it only needed 7-10 acres and it is likely they chose this site because the land is probably less expensive that other potential sites. It is not the job of the Kitsap County Planning Commission to help Kitsap Transit find cheap land and rezone it. Kitsap Transit spends millions to study passenger ferries and light rail, which is improbable for Kitsap County. That money would be better spent on purchasing a more appropriate piece of property for their facility. Additionally Mr. Grigg expressed concern over the lack of Public Notice Signs. The City of Poulsbo put them up and it would seem that any change in the Comprehensive Plan and Urban Growth Area would be important enough to notify the public. The possibility that some of the hundreds of people taking their kids up to the ballpark might have been interested in this. With only one minute left to speak, Mr. Griggs questioned whether it was even possible to have a fair and impartial hearing, given that the applicant was a quasi governmental agency. Kitsap Transit had potentially months to lobby the County and Planning Commission, while the public was limited to three minutes. The whole process appearing to be slanted in Kitsap Transit’s favor. Not only was there a lack of public notice, but when his wife found the information on the Kitsap County website, the location of the meeting was incorrect – indicating Silverdale Way, further increasing his skepticism regarding the entire process. Mr. Grigg asked that the Planning Commission deny this zoning change and, instead, help Kitsap Transit find a more suitable location for their facility.

Susan Ogilvie and daughter Maggie, live next to the proposed site for Kitsap Transit. Ms. Ogilvie agreed with her neighbors. All of the issues raised are of major concern to
them. She had brought a petition that included 36 signatures from neighbors who couldn’t attend the Public Hearing but were also in opposition to this. Ms. Ogilvie noted that they had five children being raised in this residential area and she had major concerns for air quality. The State Department of Health, State Toxicologist, advised Ms. Ogilvie that this plan would pose a very serious concern regarding air quality. Mr. Hayes and Mr. Lindsey had stated there would be approximately 200 buses located at this site. Ms. Ogilvie had also contacted Children’s Hospital and spoke with their Toxicologist about the situation. She was told “fight with all your might, these are your children.” The Planning Commission was asked to consider this information.

They had a beautiful neighborhood and there were plenty of other places to build this facility.

Wally Harrison lived on Big Valley Road and attended the meeting at Ann Frederickson’s house with Mr. Hayes and Mr. Lindsey. This group behind this plan may have good intentions, as did those on the Growth Management Committee about ten years ago and now the Planning Commission was attempting to do things in a proper manner. Ten years ago, with the Growth Management Act, that property was zoned one dwelling unit per ten acres. After negotiations with the City of Poulsbo, it was revised to 4-5 units per acre, based on whether it was incorporated. It was now being considered for Light Industrial. This property will be right next to what is often referred to as “Pristine Big Valley.” Mr. Harrison’s spring has 50 gallons a minute overflow and, up until a year ago, the water wasn’t even treated. The only reason it’s treated now is that small children use it. Mr. Harrison appealed to the Planning Commission to use common sense, not to rationalize them into thinking this would be appropriately zoned light industrial.

Gary Lindsey spoke on behalf of Kitsap Transit, stressing that this application was the culmination of approximately 2.5 years of searching for a suitable location to place their North Kitsap facility that would be suitable for a fifty year planning period. The facility they are currently operating out of is not appropriate due to congestion. The property is also currently in a month-to-month tenancy, having been unable to negotiate a long-term lease. They are in the precarious position of having to leave their location at any time. Even today Kitsap Transit needs to operate some of their routes out of Bremerton, including maintenance. In order to serve the North Kitsap area of 60-70,000 people with two ferry routes, there needs to be a North Kitsap Hub where they can maintain and dispatch their buses. The first choice over the past 2.5 years was to locate on existing industrial property in the City of Poulsbo or the within the Urban Growth Boundary. An analysis was performed of every site zoned industrial, including an engineering analysis of the only site that could provide about 21 acres. From that analysis, none of the existing industrial zoned properties would allow them to assemble an appropriate site. That analysis also determined that there are only 56 vacant acres of industrial land in all of the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area. This facility must be within the Urban Growth Area under Growth Management. Kitsap Transit needs about a 10 acre site. With the addition of a bare minimum 50 foot buffer around that 10 acres and the addition of a 2.5 acre storm pond, the required land is up to 16.5 acres. The proposed property would provide 21 acres plus some adjacent land. Kitsap Transit intends to buffer 13 acres around a 10 acre portion of the parcel. With all the requirements, there is no way they could complete the site on just 10 acres. The entire
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parcell must be zoned industrial, even though the plan is to end up only using 10 acres in the middle. Drainage issues are certainly important with drainage intended to be away from Big Valley into a retention pond where it would be treated. Noise is also an issue, although the intended Fleet will be the 2007 model buses which....  Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that Mr. Lindsey was out of time.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified that Mr. Hayes had not arrived and, therefore, moved on to the next proposal.

BJARNSON: Rural Residential to Neighborhood Commercial; 13.5 acre site at the NW Corner of George’s Corner at Highway 104.

Gary Lindsey was the only person signed up to testify on this matter. Before beginning testimony he distributed some maps including Kitsap County’s Critical Area map within the Georges’s Corner Vicinity, as well as presenting site plans for Albertsons, Frontier Bank and the convenience store. The Convenience Store and Albertsons already exist, with a site plan currently in for review for Frontier Bank. The Bjarnson parcel is within the boundaries of this map. The wetland delineations on Bjarnson and Frontier Bank are actual, surveyed wetland boundaries. Everything else is the County’s mapping, but those two parcels are exact representations of the existing wetlands.

George’s Corner is probably the most significant crossroads location in North Kitsap. As such, it is the most convenient location for the traveling public and local residents to get services, resulting in the success of any business located in that area. The Albertson’s shopping center has only 900 sq. ft. of vacant space remaining. The Frontier Bank site is going through a permitting process and, even without any signs, there are calls on available space for that project. The Bjarnson parcel is the only remaining location at that intersection. It would provide services for years to come. Whether this application is approved or not, once the LAMIRD boundary is established, it is potentially forever. The Planning Commission was asked to include Bjarnson based on the fact that it was needed and would provide service to the people in that community.

CHOI: Rural Protection to Neighborhood Commercial; two sites at 9.63 acres and 13.85 acres located east of George’s Corner on Highway 104.

William M. Palmer, representing the owners Choi Byong Jik and In Sook, was the only person signed up to testify on this matter. Some of the comments presented by Mr. Lindsey regarding the Bjarnson application are also applicable to this application and he asked that they be considered along with his testimony regarding the need for additional commercial development in this area. Mr. Palmer designated an area on a map, indicating the locations of adjacent parcels with a total of approximately 24.3 acres. There is an intervening parcel between Mr. Palmer’s client’s parcels that is classified as rural protected, followed by industrial and then neighborhood commercial that has already been developed. At the time Mr. Palmer’s clients acquired their property, a portion was zoned Interim Industrial, which was one of the motivations in purchasing the property. In the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, it was not included on the map, although Mr. Jik believes it should have been. He is, therefore, looking for some relief at this point for his investment. A green boundary was indicated on the map,
indicated as the existing buffer for the defined wetlands. As noted by Mr. Lindsey, there was a wetland study done, with most of this was encumbered by wetlands, including other properties which he indicated on the map. The proposed property is developable with approximately 11 acres. It is functionally related to the intersection via State Route 104. The Planning Commission was asked to include this property as part of the Neighborhood Business area as part of George’s corner. It was stressed that properties east of this location did not provide the same access opportunities as those available for this parcel and the other properties abutting State Route 104.

Lary Coppola, Chair, verified that concluded testimony for the North Kitsap applications, moving on to the applications for Central Kitsap.

DONNA LONGWELL: Rural Residential to Neighborhood Commercial; 2.5 acre site on Clear Creek Road east of Bangor next to the Poulsbo Sportsman Club Gun Range. There was no testimony scheduled for this application.


Phil Struck, with Parametrix, spoke on behalf of the applicant. The site is very well suited for the proposed use. It is adjacent to the applicant’s existing quarry to the North, with an industrial-type public facility/power substation on the other side. Rail lanes bound it to the east. This proposed amendment would coordinate well with the applicant’s existing quarry operation and allow some efficiency in operation by providing a traditional mineral resource. The site can be used in a manner that mitigates any potential impacts. It’s very close to a good transportation access point and the adjacent land use is generally compatible with this sort of heavy machinery, intensive operation. There are very few basalt quarries in Kitsap County, particularly ones that are centrally located and have good access to the transportation system. This proposal will help to ensure that these limited mineral resources are effectively managed and preserved in Kitsap County.

Dusty Meyer had signed up in error and had already left the meeting.

Gary Anderson, from South Kitsap, expressed his support for Mr. Lockhart’s proposal in Gorst. As previously noted, it is an excellent location for this intended use. Gorst is a business hub and always has been. There does not appear to be a better use for this site. Additionally, Mr. Anderson encouraged the County to continue to look for funds to provide sewer in the Gorst area so that this type of use could be expanded.

Janet Garcia noted that she had the misfortune of living directly across from Solid Lane West, which appeared to be their version of an ingress and egress from this site. She was aware of the Staff’s Recommendation, noting she had been provide with maps after the Staff Recommendation that were not very specific. On the date of the meeting, she received a map from Parametrix, which had been requested in a letter from Mr. Strickland dated June 18, 2003 requesting more information and a newer map. Review of the new map seemed to show that the present quarry is operates a notable distance from the proposed site. The new map indicates the 21 acres does not provide more
rocks, it just allows easier hauling of materials from the existing quarry. That’s not the purpose of this sort of plan. How they haul their materials is their problem. Despite the areas noted by Mr. Anderson, there is not one commercial use currently adjacent to this property. The change in zoning would be extreme, going from Urban Reserve to a Rock Quarry. The Belfair Highway is zoned Highway Tourist Commercial, which should be used to attract, not repel, tourism. Gorst has received a lot of publicity lately, essentially as the armpit of Kitsap County. An article in the Seattle Times on January 16, 2003 was written regarding Ms Garcia’s house that, at the least, is significant for the community. Previously discussions about the Kitsap Transit proposal were also applicable to this project. Ms. Garcia urged both the County Staff and Planning Commission to take a long look at the second map and reconsider the Staff’s recommendation. In closing Ms. Garcia noted she would forward a copy of the Seattle Times article to the Planning Commission for their review.

OLMSTEAD LAND DEVELOPMENT/CLEAR CREEK NURSERY: Urban Business Park to Urban Commercial; 7.29 acre site North of Silverdale between Clear Creek Road and Highway 3.

Gary Lindsey noted the Staff Report lays out the history and the facts relating to this property. It began as a nursery in 1977 with a Conditional Use Permit granted on half of the property in about 1985. In 1999 the Business Park Zoning was implemented, resulting in the Nursery becoming a nonconforming use. The Nursery is an extensive activity, employing a full-time staff of 25-35 individuals with average wages being approximately $15 an hour, well above minimum wage. The Conditional Use Permit applies to the southern portion of the property that is impacted by Clear Creek. Any expansion on this site should occur on the north end, which is currently zoned Business Park thereby disallowing the Nursery usage. Neighborhood Business Zoning is being requested to allow the property owner to continue their existing operation. The Olmstead family has invested a lot of money in this property, with a loan in place of over $1 million. They are definitely planning on being their for the long-term and have done a nice job with their existing development. There current development is very compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. When rebuilding or any changes occur on the site, it would still be required that storm water access and all the other applicable issues be addressed. There would be no significant change with the revised zoning, other than allowing them to become a legal entity. The owners are in a precarious position, as is their lender, as long as they are classified as a nonconforming use. Although they continue to occupy it, lenders look at that classification more closely now, knowing that if it should be vacated for one year, the rights of the property go away and the lender could be left without anything securing the loan. Mr. Lindsey noted that there was an RV Sales operation just south of this property that was also nonconforming since the 1999 Business Park Zoning was put in place. The Planning Commission was asked to approved the application to change the zoning on this property to Urban Commercial.

Joyce Merkel was missed during the initial round of Testimony for the Olmsted application with Lary Coppola, Chair, expressing his apologies. Joyce Merkel owns 2.5 acres which she purchased fifteen years years ago directly adjacent to Olmsted property, on the west side of Clear Creek Road. Ms. Merkel expressed her support for the request.
for the Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezone. The property should not be
designated as Rural Residential due to its close proximity to the existing business uses.
There is good access to a main arterial and the property is within two minutes of
another major arterial, regional shopping center and other nonresidential uses. From a
planning standpoint it’s important that commercial uses have ready and good access,
rather than continuing to clog up residential streets. Ms. Merkel submitted a letter and
map showing where her property was located in relation to this property.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that concluded testimony on Central Kitsap applications,
proceeding to applications for South Kitsap.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that William Palmer was signed up for five of the six
applications. He asked if Mr. Palmer would be willing to testify last, to streamline the
process and eliminate the need for him to get up and down as each application was
address. Mr. Palmer agreed.

BURGESS: Manchester Village Low Residential to Manchester Village Commercial; 1.2
acre site located in Manchester at the corner of Southworth Drive and Alaska Avenue.

Richard Brown noted the property Mrs. Burgess owns on the corner of Alaska and what
is referred to as Mile Hill Drive or Manchester Road was initially a Grocery Store, then
a feed store and then a pet shop. For a period of 20-30 years the property was zoned
Commercial. It is a long, narrow piece of property, abounded by two roads,
intersecting a third road that goes into Manchester. With the heavy, constant traffic,
the only appropriate use would be Highway Tourist Commercial. The current zoning
prohibits Mrs. Burgess from using it for anything automotive related, even though that
would be ideal based on its location. Mr. Brown asked the Planning Commission to
take this into consideration. The property had been in the Burgess’ family for a
considerable amount of time and it would appear that the best use would be Highway
Tourist Commercial zoning with some sort of automotive use.

Rose Burgess asked that the Planning Commission consider rezoning her property to
what it was when her family purchased it in 1974. It remained commercial for about
five years after they purchased it, with her husband and son-in-law attempting to
establish a landscaping type business there, but their application was denied. It was
requested that this be reconsidered, or possibly allow for an office building, contractor
or some use that would not be disruptive to the neighborhood community. As vacant
land, the property had been abused over the years with individuals dumping garbage,
sheetrock, paint buckets and the like on the property. Her husband and son-in-law
cleaned that up for many years, but they are now both deceased. That now leaves the
cleanup to her or whomever she can get to do it. If a business were allowed, the
property and situation would be improved, discouraging the type of dumping that is
occurring while the site is vacant.

Judy Mobley lives off California in the Manchester area and has been going to PJ’s for
years. Regardless of what might be decided on the property across the street, she
would continue going to PJ’s. The corner of Alaska is an eyesore and she is tired of
seeing cars parked there and trash dumped there. It should be zoned commercial to at
least improve the appearance within the neighborhood, possibly leading to more areas getting cleaned up. The property is right on Mile Hill with constant traffic going by. It would not seem inappropriate for Residential, particularly for families with children due to the high traffic levels. The street is too busy to consider the property for a duplex or a house. Ms. Mobley asked that the property be rezoned so that it could be used constructively, benefiting the entire surround area.

Bob Lamb, Resident of Manchester, was one of 40 members on the Manchester Committee. The Committee spent an extensive amount of time developing their plan, taking over a year to complete the process. They wanted to comply with what the law had set up for the Manchester Village, which was a central location to preserve the old community. The Committee looked at zoning commercial and decided that the best opportunity was to keep Commercial Zoning centralized in the old area of Manchester. The Committee heard all the various positions and still opted to stay with their original plan. Three months ago, the same presentation was made at the Manchester Library, with the same conclusion reached. The Manchester Area was set up, with approval of the Planning Commission and Kitsap County. The Manchester Committee was now asking that the Planning Commission and Kitsap County keep faith with their decision and planning. Regarding the inability to develop a residence on the property, Mr. Lamb noted there are homes locate all the way up and down that area. There are inadequate facilities for a commercial use at that location and it would not fit with the long term goals of the Manchester community. The Planning Commission was asked to support the original decision of the Manchester Committee.

Daniel Fallstrom lives approximately 400 feet from the Burgess property and is concerned about rumors that there might be a 24-hour convenience store located at that location, which is one plan he had heard. He submitted a petition with over 400 signatures from various people within the community who opposed the rezoning. Mr. Fallstrom asked that the petition be entered into the record and that the Planning Commission take it into consideration.

Dave Kimball, Manchester Resident, was also part of the Sub-Area Planning Committee, along with Lary Coppola, who referred to the Committee as the “Manchester 42.” Mr. Kimball noted there were about five people from that Committee attending this meeting. When reviewing potential areas for commercial zoning, the Committee voted on the matter. There had been no prior discussion relating to this particular parcel or any discussion related to its prior use. Mr. Kimball considered it premature to even be presenting this application to the Planning Commission at this time. It should be returned to the Sub-Area Committee for them to determine the impacts of the application and best use of the property. Despite the disagreements in this area, something positive has occurred from all this. There has been a rousing of the community due to a potential challenge to the Sub-Area Plan in what is, essentially, spot zoning. Again, Mr. Kimball stressed it is not appropriate for this matter to even be brought before the Planning Commission at this time and it should be deferred for the Committee’s consideration.

Dusty Wiley had lived in the neighborhood being discussed for his entire 55 years. The previously mentioned store on the property was misrepresented to some degree. It was
a grocery store and feed store in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s. It then became a pet store and operated until almost 1970. Mr. Wiley felt there was no clear justification for putting another store in that area or why there was the need for a commercial use. The Manchester Committee had looked at the commercial area and the commercial core for Manchester, deciding to keep it confined to the commercial district. There were existing commercial properties in the area, such as Wiley’s Body Shop that was started in 1941 by his father with Commercial Zoning, which was later changed. His brother then ran the body shop, eventually selling it. Although the business has been in place since 1941, the property is zoned as Residential. If anybody should be getting a Commercial designation, it should be the body shop. If it were to burn down, they would be able to build a “like” body shop based on the preexisting use. With the proposed property, zoning it as commercial would mean “anything goes.” Traffic issues have been mentioned, questioning whether the property could be used for residential purposes. Mr. Wiley noted he had multiple family members who lived adjacent to the highway just past South Park, which has more traffic than this area. When the original store was put in, the new one across from PJ’s, there were a lot of problems get it up and running. Requirements included putting in a traffic light due to existing traffic problems. There is also going to be a traffic light next year at California, as well as Long Lake Road when it gets widened. The area has enough issues already. There does not appear to be any reason to change this property to Commercial Zoning. In closing, when the Committee expressed their opposition when they looked at these properties and met with Mr. Palmer and Mrs. Burgess. There were a few Committee members in support of the rezoning, but the majority was in opposition of redesignating the property. Mr. Wiley expressed his hope that the Planning Commission would uphold the Committee’s decision.

Vivian Henderson, Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners, noted it was difficult for her to be in opposition of some of the previous speakers. Although she was not a Resident of Manchester or involved in the Manchester plan, she had observed this matter for some time. Based on her experience with the area and her position with Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners, there would not appear to be any association with this property and downtown Manchester. The property is on a busy highway and she would not want to sell a house on that busy of a corner. It seemed that Mrs. Burgess had been quite generous over the years, having allowed the lot to be used by commuters who carpool without any complaints. Ms. Henderson expressed her disappointment that there were 400 people who felt they have the right to deny a property owner the use of her property. She appealed to those people to reconsider based on how they would feel if they wanted to build a garage or dwelling unit for an ill family member and all their neighbors petitioned against them. With regard to the body shop, she agreed that it should also qualify for rezoning. Ms. Henderson closed by urging that the Planning Commission to approve this application for rezoning.

Susan Plunkett, Manchester Resident living on Alaska, expressed appreciation the community with its vision and forethought regarding developing the community and their plans for the future. There is no service or business that any Resident of Manchester needs that is not readily available, either in downtown Manchester or surrounding areas. There is no need for another storage facility, convenience store or any other commercial activity. That was expressed with the unanimous vote not to
change the Manchester Plan in the meeting held at the Manchester Library several months ago. The vote was unanimous with the exception of Mrs. Burgess. When the property had a feed store, there wasn’t the existing situation with traffic going to the Southworth Ferry or an endless stream of cars coming around a blind curve intersecting at Colchester and Alaska followed by a Fire Station. Putting a business in that location would cause a real potential for disaster due to parking and traffic getting in and out. Ms. Plunkett noted that the real problem wasn’t even really related to zoning. The real problem for Mrs. Burgess was the property next door to her parcel. It was a problem that the County was well aware of and had not been able to handle for years. It would not be solved by a zoning change. The Manchester Plan is less than a year old with a lot of effort having gone into developing it. The result was a consensus, and now there was a change being requested without notification to everyone in the community who participated in creating the Manchester Plan. Only a few people were notified even though this pertained specifically to the Manchester plan. The fact that the people of Manchester, as a whole, were not informed of the application and subsequent hearing, given the opportunity to come forward and present their objections or approval was seriously questioned.

Krysteen Seelen, Manchester homeowner, questioned the legality of this hearing. The Burgess rezoning petition affects the entire Village of Manchester. Since rezoning that property repudiates the fundamentals of the Manchester Plan, everyone in Manchester should have been properly notified and given the opportunity to attend this hearing, not just property owners within 400 feet of the site. The community had put forth a lot of effort to draft the Manchester Plan and for the property owner to come forward after the fact showed a lack of involvement and concern for the neighborhood. There were literally dozens of opportunities for the owner of the site to make objections or ask for a variance before the plan was enacted. Under the definitions of Rural Villages and their boundaries, it clearly states that commercial uses will be small in scale and provide necessary services to the Village Community. Another convenience store or other business less than three miles from PJ’s or less than 1.5 miles from the stores in downtown Manchester was not necessary. Mapped wetlands are located near Mile Hill Drive on either side of Alaska Avenue and are identified by the Kitsap County Critical Area Ordinance. They provide wildlife habitat and contribute to the healthy hydrology of the area, as well as holding significant amounts of water. If displaced, this would add to the storm water problems already existing in Manchester. A retail establishment with the necessary parking would be an enormous amount of impervious surface in this fragile area; an area the County is charged to protect. The Manchester Village Commercial Zone is sized appropriately for the community. It provides a generous area for mixed commercial uses and additional commercial zoning with this proposed revision being unnecessary and unwanted. The suggestion that the site is appropriate for automotive repairs and/or bodywork is raises serious concerns with regard to the Kitsap County Critical Areas Ordinance and protection of the wetlands. This is also an area where a lot of Manchester planned commercial uses are specifically prohibited. For all these reasons, the Planning Commission was urged to listen to the people who live in Manchester, in the neighborhood that would be affected, and asked that they reject this proposal.
Stuart Dedrick was not signed up to speak but asked that he be allowed to testify with approval by Lary Coppola, Chair. Mr. Dedrick’s backyard was literally right behind the Burgess property with the fence abutting her property. He had purchased the property 1.5 years ago for the purpose of living in a Residential neighborhood. He had reviewed the Staff Report and was in agreement with it, as well as those neighbors who had spoken or signed petitions against the application. Mr. Dedrick expressed his firm opposition to this proposal, noting that he had intentionally moved into a residential area, choosing not to purchase property next to a gas station or convenience store. The community he selected was one he recognizes as a retirement community and would like to keep it that way.

Lary Coppola, Chair, noted that concluded testimony on the Burgess application, other than Mr. Palmer, who will speak after the other applications were addressed.

MCCORMICK LAND COMPANY – Rural Residential to Mineral Resource; 120 acres southeast of State Road 3, West of Sunnyslope.

Doug Skrobut, representing McCormick Land Company, clarified some information on the Staff Report. On Page 2, Item III, Paragraph C, regarding access/transportation level of service he noted the access/transportation will be consistent with the South Kitsap Industrial Area, if that Sub-Area Plan is adopted. The South Kitsap Industrial Area would contain this property and access/transportation would be consistent with that plan. On Page 3, Paragraph E regarding Environment/SEPA, second paragraph, second sentence, states that the applicant had delineated wetlands. That work was yet to be completed. Consultants have prepared maps, aerial maps, and such, but there had not been a full delineation. Additionally, at Staff Meetings, there had been questions raised regarding specific site characteristics. Mr. Skrobut indicated he had an overhead prepared that would address those questions and could be presented in a minimal amount of time. Mr. Skrobut noted Figure 3 on the overhead, noting it was in the report, about halfway through. Staff had asked where residential areas, wetlands, and such were located. State Route 3 was noted on the overhead, with the nearest residential property located to the east, with its location indicated in relation to Sunnyslope Road. The proposed area of the McCormick Land Company mine was indicated on the map, showing its relation to tributary forestry to include a 200 foot setback from that creek. There was also a pond on the property that would have a 150 foot setback, with its location indicated on the overhead.

Rod Reid, representing Alpine Evergreen, wished to speak on this application because the outcome would have an impact on two other property owners with mineral overlays in the proposed area: Stan Palmer, who currently has a gravel mine in operation, and Alpine Evergreen. Gravel comes in pockets in Kitsap County. When it was originally located, it was on the three referenced properties, Alpine, McCormick and Palmer. McCormick had originally submitted their application as part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment process and it somehow slipped through the cracks. Alpine Evergreen had anticipated a subsequent mapping adjustment, although that didn’t occur. The outcome of the McCormick Land Company application would be a determining factor as to whether it was even feasible for Alpine Evergreen to proceed. The results of this application would have a threefold impact. The property is currently
zoned Industrial through the South Kitsap Industrial Area, which should make it appropriate for approval.

SEDGWICK JOINT VENTURE: Urban Reserve to Highway Tourist Commercial; 9.84 acres east of the Fred Meyer Shopping Complex at Bethel and Sedgwick. There was no testimony scheduled for this application.

BLACK JACK VALLEY ASSOCIATES: Rural Protection to Highway Tourist Commercial; 6.33 acres near Highway 16 and Sedgwick interchange, adjacent to the Port Orchard City Limits.

Richard Brown noted this parcel was adjacent to a recently annexed, by vote, Talmo Property on the corner of Sedgwick and Sidney. The proposed property was located between the roadway and the Talmo Property. The matter was discussed with County Staff in order to get additional parking for the shopping center, with the feeling that was how it should be utilized. It was the only piece of property left in that corner that was not already in the City of Port Orchard. Mr. Brown recommended to the Planning Commission that this be approved, as the additional land was necessary in order get a substantial shopping center in there.

BROWN-RICE-KRUEGER: Rural Protection to Highway Tourist Commercial; 10.81 acres near the Highway 16 and Sedgwick Road interchange near the Albertson’s Complex.

Richard Brown noted this property was part of a larger picture that included 140 acres and the rezoning attempt had been going on for nine years. The area was pointed out on a map, showing the 51 acres relating to the application, stating that Bill Palmer would provide a chronology when he did his presentation. Tom Nevins had previously asked how this process had developed and Mike Gustavson had questioned why it was being approached in this manner rather than doing the entire property. The simple answer was that the County Staff was forcing them to approach it in this manner. The Planning Commission was asked to review the chronology to understand everything that had been done in an attempt to rezone the property. There were always reasons provided for waiting on a decision, to the point where it was decided to submit an application on a smaller portion with no wetlands, no problems, adjacent to the freeway, surrounded by the City, with water, sewer, power, gas etc. all available. They were attempting to get that portion approved in order to sell it some day. The Planning Commission had suggested at the last meeting that the City of Port Orchard should have attended to provide input. The City was in attendance this evening and were scheduled to testify. Although he had wanted to address the entire 51 acres, he was being forced to address it one small portion at a time by the County. He now had the opportunity to sell this parcel but could not do so until it the application for rezoning had been approved.

Lary Curles, representing the City of Port Orchard, noted that the City provides the urban services for this portion of South Kitsap. Those services covered the City, McCormick Woods and various properties in between. The City also had agreements to serve sanitary sewer to the South Kitsap Industrial Area, Northwest Corporate Campus
and ULID #6 areas. The City also has water agreements in that area. Basically, the City
were in partnership with the Port of Bremerton, the City of Bremerton and Kitsap
County with regard to different areas to provide urban services. The City is deeply
involved in the urban planning for this portion of South Kitsap. The City did not agree
with all aspects of the Comprehensive Plan passed in 1998 but did not appeal it. The
City had been waiting since that time to negotiate on the Urban Joint Planning Areas,
those areas being discussed at this meeting. Mr. Curles noted he is pleased the process
was beginning and expressed that the City was eager to work with the County. Port
Orchard supports the Sidney-Sedgwick Area and South Kitsap Area projects that are
being presented. The City can provide the urban services with water and sewer and
once they annex into the City, police and other services can be extended. The City had
not been represented at the last meeting because they had not realized the Planning
Commission wanted their input. Mr. Curles stressed very clearly that the City of Port
Orchard could serve this area. It was imperative that throughout Kitsap County,
including all the cities, the economic base must be strengthened to move away from
military employment levels. South Kitsap, particularly, needs to be preparing for
increasing populations. The City of Port Orchard is ready to work with Kitsap County
and continue to work with them to meet these challenges.

Lary Coppola, Chair, asked for clarification that the City of Port Orchard would provide
the urban services to all of the applicants in the Sedgwick-Sidney area. Mr. Curles
stated that the City was prepared to serve the three applicants before them this evening
but was unsure what “all” might encompass. The City was ready to serve those projects
in that area that they had seen to date.

Ron Rice had attended a number of these meetings and often was of two minds. He
was born and raised in this part of the country and, when hearing about people having
bought their property twenty years ago, he would recall living here in 1962 and
sometimes think that everyone who wasn’t here back then should pack up and leave.
But that’s not practical and it’s not going to happen. There are people who have come
here to live and have their families here. They want places for their families to live and
work so they don’t have to leave the area. Mr. Rice indicated his property’s location on
a map, recalling how when he was a child Sidney was not a busy road and how the
topography of the Sedgwick Interchange had been reversed. Everything was relative
when looking back and saying how you want it to be. In 1976 the State came in and
said they wanted to put a road across his property. He said he didn’t want a road there,
with the State noting that was not the point. They just wanted to know how much he
wanted for it. He met with them four different times trying to convince them not to put
their road across his property. One of the things they told him, in an attempt to
convince him to sell the property, was that in twenty years it would all be commercial
property. Up until 1998 it was commercial property, then the County Commissioners
determined they didn’t want any development across Highway 16 and down-zoned it
from Commercial to Rural Protection. They were, essentially, pretending it was rural
because with 18-20,000 cars going by on Sedgwick Road and approximately 12,000
cars coming down Sidney Road on each side, it was obviously not rural. It should have
remained zoned commercial and the change in zoning probably resulted in the loss of
at least $1 million due to commercial enterprises going to North Pierce County. It’s
time this property was developed appropriately for its location and Mr. Rice asked the Planning Commission to support the application or rezoning.

ROBERT WATERS – Rural Protection to Highway Tourist Commercial; 4.32 acres near the interchange of Highway 16 and Sedgwick Road, adjacent to Port Orchard City Limits.

Robert Waters purchased the property with all the services necessary to operate a business, even before Albertson’s came in. Like Mr. Brown, he has been attempting to rezone the property for an extensive period of time. In the ULID #6 overlay of the roads, there was a four lane highway going down Sidney, which cuts into part of his property. That alone would seem to indicate the property should not be classified as Rural Protection. The four lane road was more indicative of a Rural Expansion. Mr. Waters purchased the property to operate a business. He already had a car sales business inside the City of Port Orchard that he would like to expand and move to this property. There is a comparable business, Gray Chevrolet, virtually across the street from the proposed site, as well as other existing business in the area. Additionally, Mr. Waters recalled form a previous meeting the mention of possibly “grouping” these properties together for consideration. He would request that they continue to be considered separately as site specific requests. Staff has recommended that nothing be done on this property that would leave a site-specific application as his only avenue to get anything done. Mr. Waters asked that the Planning Commission look at each application individually and determine what is preventing them from moving forward. There does not appear to be any community opposition, as with some previous applications. The area has already been designated for businesses and for unknown reasons it would appear that the County was delaying the process. Mr. Waters closed by asking for the support of the Planning Commission.

Richard Brown had been scheduled to speak but deferred.

William Palmer clarified that he was not a property owner but was representing the owners. He would be addressing five applications and, due to time constraints, he would be addressing Burgess and the Sedgwick Joint Adventure last; combining the other three applications relating to Sedgwick and Sidney.

Mr. Palmer presented maps, indicating a dark blue boundary that represented the South Sidney Business Park area, which had remained pretty consistent with only minor variations following 1994. In 1996 the County made the boundary a little bit larger, with the adopted plan taken away except for those portions annexed to the City of Port Orchard. Port Orchard city boundaries were indicated on the map as outlined in gray, noting that they were contained within the blue boundary. Based on the Comprehensive Plan definitions, all of the properties being considered met Urban Growth Area criteria Numbers 1 and 2, as well as Tier 3 designations for Urban Growth Areas. This sites have utilities, urban services, police, and all other services that would be required. The property owners were now being forced into a piece meal process, going through the site specific amendment process at a substantial cost. This would appear to be the only, after close to six years, for the property owners to proceed in a manner they had intended prior to the adoption of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan.
Without belaboring the point, the 1998 Comprehensive Plan was not well founded with regard to its analysis of this area. That could be debated extensively but chose, instead, to close with that point.

Mr. Palmer indicated on the map a rather odd shaped boundary on what approximates about 30 acres of property. The location of Black Jack Creek was indicated, noting that it was not reflected accurately on the assessor’s map, as it turned northwest/inward at one point that was not reflected by the assessor’s maps, although it would be shown accurately on survey data. Mr. Palmer next indicated a faint, highlighted area in green on the map, adjacent to Black Jack Creek, which represents a 200 foot boundary that the property owners in the area recognize as a commitment to protecting that creek. There has been a preliminary wetlands analysis with most of the wetlands on the properties falling within that 200 foot buffer, although there are a couple of instance where there is a slight cross over. The boundary has been established solely for the purpose of this planning process, specifically to be located where the flood hazard elevation is, having it mapped and surveyed, and chosen as the boundary for the time being. Ultimately that boundary should go away. No doubt flood hazard regulations will affect this property, but it doesn’t mean it can’t be used. You can put in a parking lot or a number of other uses in the flood hazard area that could still be useful. What is being recommend right now is that the Planning Commission allow them to proceed with these three applications. When Kitsap County begins the process of an Urban Area Analysis for all or most of South Kitsap, they can address the areas that were left blank on the displayed map. At the time of the original preapplication process, the property owners were prepared to submit a proposal for the entire South Sidney Business Park area, indicated as white areas within the blue boundary of the map. In discussions with Staff, it was decided that the applications should be limited at this point in time to avoid being caught up in a long, drawn out environmental analysis. They have, therefore, attempted to select sites that can move forward without that drawn out process. They are still committed to the Master Plan process, which would already be underway if County Staff and related parties had committed to going forward with their application at the time. The property owners have backed off from their ultimate goal in order to try to at least get something accomplished. Experience has been that promises in the County can start as months, growing to years and almost to decades. This process seems like the owner’s only opportunity to move forward. There has been a lot of interest expressed in the property, but everything is held up until zoning is resolved. There are more points but, due to time constraints, Mr. Palmer asked that these three applications be approved.

Mr. Palmer the proceeded to discuss Sedgwick Joint Adventures. There were two graphics set ups that Mr. Palmer noted were unlike the County maps. The data he referenced was a combination of an Aerial Survey done by Walker & Associates for the Bethel Corridor Study and an overlay of that onto the County Assessor’s map. Some of the tree massing in the area was highlighted, noting there used to be more in the area that was now the Fred Meyer Complex. The commercial boundary for the area was indicated on his map, noting its location in relation to the proposed site. Next door to the proposed site was an existing chiropractor clinic, which is part of the commercial zoning. There is also commercial zoning across the street and the zoning map shows there is commercial zoning for the BP Station and shops around it, as well as the whole
strip along Bethel Avenue. The Findings and Conclusions of the Staff Report provide information that would seem to support the application, with the exception of the actual Recommendation that asks for a deferral until the County’s Urban Growth Area Study is accomplished for South Kitsap. It is hoped that the Urban Growth Area Study will be concluded by the end of the year, possibly by the end of January 2004. However, the committee is yet to be formed and the process could go beyond January 2004. The longer the wait, the increased loss of opportunity on behalf of the property owners. Regarding this proposal, in terms of the Staff Report, everything appears to be in order to support the application until you get to the recommendation for deferral. There does not appear to be a valid reason not to proceed with these site specific applications. The County is going to look at the entire area, but rezoning this property or those on Sedgwick and Sidney, will not hinder their process in any perceivable way. There is also reference made to a wetland area in the south part of the property. The only wetland that he is aware of was indicated on his map as close to the middle of the property in a very confined area. The property is sloped and at one point was being considered by the County for a stormwater retention area along with three other sites. His client, who was out of town and unable to attend the meeting, noted he was unaware of any further consideration for locating a storm water retention area on the property.

With regard to Rose Burgess’ application, there were some historical issues mentioned by previous speakers, some of which Mr. Palmer wished to readdress. Not long ago there was a convenience store in the South Colby area, which is southeast of Mile Hill Drive and Alaska. There was also a convenience store in South Colby at the old post office building. Further east was a convenience store at Harper Dock. The Convenience Store was relocated from the post office building Banner Road and Southworth Drive, where it operated for many years. The only reason he was aware of for the store no longer being in operation was due to environmental constraints that affected the installation of the tanks, as well as a former State Right-of-Way that lapped up to the store’s entrance. The point of this is that in the evolution of our society, there have been times in the past when people went to small stores in their immediate neighborhood for goods and services. Sometimes those services were not automotive related. As Ms. Burgess and Mr. Wiley testified, there was a store on this site at one time. It was burned down, as he understands it. Ms. Burgess lives in the neighborhood and has done so for a long time. She is well aware of the changes that have occurred in her community. She has shopped in many of the convenience stores sited earlier. Mr. Palmer noted that this proposal would hopefully result in a neighborhood business; not Highway Tourist Commercial as some have mentioned. Interestingly enough, the zoning of Neighborhood Business Commercial, referred to as Manchester Village Commercial that is almost the same thing, does not permit automotive uses. A body shop would not qualify for that type of commercial zoning that was provided in downtown Manchester. Mr. Palmer expressed his respect for the work of the Committee and development of the Manchester Community Plan, with the legacy of that plan standing as it was written. When evaluating policies, particularly the goals and policies that Staff sited in their report, the highway is not really addressed. It is unclear if this was intentional or not, but it does not preclude neighborhood businesses or various commercial uses from being established again on the requested site. The plan had an obvious focus for downtown Manchester and, as a Resident, he respects
that. This application, however, does not conflict with the Manchester Plan. Nor does it conflict with any of the other convenience stores in existence if one were to be located at this site. It should be noted that, should a convenience store be located there, it would be one without fuel or any automotive services.

Lary Coppola, Chair, expressed his appreciation to Mr. Palmer for waiting until the end to testify. He then noted that site specific zoning was testimony was now concluded.

Map Corrections to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map

Robert Pilger was the only individual signed up to testify regarding Map Corrections. Mr. Pilger is a Dentist in Port Orchard who got a UPUC Zoning in 1978 to build his dental office. The Board of County Commissioners allowed the rezone for the north half of his five acre parcel on Mile Hill Drive. His dental office was built in 1981 with the east half of the north 2.5 area zoned accordingly. The location was primarily due to the Washington State Department of Highway requesting that the entrance be located in the middle of the property for traffic reasons. Additionally, in order to build, he had to get a Deed Release on a portion of the property, which he obtained. In the early 1990’s, he noted the map was incorrect and brought it to the attention of the Department of Community Development. At that time he reassured that it was not significant and that the Comprehensive Plan was being challenged with all map issues to be worked out later. Based on that, he didn’t pursue the correction further until attempting to refinance and he was advised that the Clinic, which was built in 1981, was not parcelled out correctly. That issue is something Mr. Pilger has been attempting to correct for the past couple of years. Although he did not have a copy of the Staff Report, he understood Staff was recommending denial of his request for a map correction. Mr. Pilger stressed that his map correction request was to correct an error that occurred when the property was rezoned back in 1978. Denial of his request would seem to be a waste simply from a land use perspective. If unchanged, there would be a small finger of land located on the highway between all the other businesses in that area. On one side there is a Veterinary Clinic and a Dental Office with a convenience store on the other side of Woods Road. Within the last five years a storage unit has also been built next to his property. It had been his understanding that the zoning was always available for the front 2.5 acres and he would like to have the option to develop it as another dental or other professional use, possibly for the use of his family who were entering similar fields. There was no intent to develop a retail or convenience store. Only that the back part of the property could be used as residential property and the access to that would be off of Woods Way or Garfield, it did not appear to be available from the main road. Mr. Pilger stressed his willingness to work with the County and Planning Commission to determine what was needed to accomplish the mapping correction.

Lary Coppola, Chair, closed Public Testimony on Phase I and II, as well as on the Site Specific Amendments. The meeting would be adjourned until July 15, 2003 at 9:00 a.m. in the Silverdale Community Center in the A-frame Building. The Department of Community Development would accept written testimony until the close of business on
July 8, 2003. Written testimony should be sent to the Attention of Department of Community Development, 614 Division Street, MS-36, Port Orchard, WA 98266-4682.

Mike Gustavson moved that the meeting be adjourned. Monty Mahan seconded the motion.

9:30 P.M.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting was adjourned.

DOCUMENTS ADDRESSED AT MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Planning Commission Agenda dated July 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Exhibit 1 provided by Ed Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Exhibit 2 provided by Laura Overton Johannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Exhibit 3 provided by Ted Labbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Exhibit 4 provided by Dawn Pucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Exhibit 5 provided by James E. Haney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Exhibit 6 provided by Jim Grigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Exhibit 7 provided by Gary Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Exhibit 8 provided by Joyce Merkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Exhibit 9 provided by Daniel Fallstrom (Petition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Exhibit 10 provided by William Palmer (Re: Bjarnson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Exhibit 11 provided by William Palmer (Re: George’s Corner)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laura Overton Johannes referenced a letter dated April 16, 2002 regarding problems within the logging industry that was not received.

Susan Ogilvie referenced a petition opposing the Kitsap Transit application. She stated she would forward that to the Planning Commission at a later date after revising her cover letter.

Janet Garcia noted that she would forward the Seattle Times article from January 16, 2003 regarding her property in Gorst.

Richard Brown said that William Palmer would provide a chronology for the Planning Commission to review that was never received to my knowledge.
MINUTES approved this ____________ day of ____________________, 2003.
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