MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 9, 2004


Four citizens in the audience.

1. Chair Nevins Called the Meeting to Order and made introductions

2. Approval of Minutes

February 24, 2004

Chair Nevins began a lengthy discussion over concerns expressed by other Planning Commission members relative to the new shortened summary format for the minutes. Some members felt that listing topics of discussion was not enough, that the actual discussion needs to be documented and a name assigned to comments made. There was a specific concern that more coverage was given to staff presentations than to Planning Commissioner’s comments. Dean Jenniges approved of the new format and Lary Coppola noted that the decision to shorten the minutes was a lack of staffing issue. It was decided that an informal meeting needed to happen between Chair Nevins and Kamuron to sort out exactly how the Commission wants its minutes to look. The Planning Commission members agreed to be more succinct with their comments. Following the discussion, a motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by Dean Jenniges that the Planning Commission approves the minutes of February 24, 2004. The vote: 4-Aye; 3-Opposed; 1 Abstained. Motion did not carry for lack of quorum.

3. Public Hearings:
1. Karanne Gonzales presented the Doreen and Pedro Valverde’s application for Current Use Assessment - Open Space, on approximately 8.1-acres in Section 14, Township 26, Range 1E, in North Kitsap County. This 4.55 acre parcel is zoned Poulsbo Urban Transition Area/Residential Low; 5-acres will be exempt for two existing home sites. Approximately 3-acres are eligible for Open Space classification. The property is located approximately 300 feet south of the NE Brent Road and Little Valley intersection on the west side of Little Valley Road at 20489 Little Valley Road NE.

Gonzales - Corrected an error on the Assessor’s record that showed the site to be 8.1 acres instead of 4.45 acres. Three generations of the Valverde family have preserved this property and intend to continue to do so as long as possible for future generations. They intend to protect the wetlands located in the southwest area of the site by maintaining the existing buffer. It is a wildlife habitat. Gonzales said this property meets all criteria to qualify as open space and that 1.55 acres will be exempt for home sites. The approximate tax shift on this parcel is $155 per year or 60% tax reduction. Public access limited to educational purposes by permission only.

Dean Jenniges - Error in acreage listed. Clarified that the open space application is for 3 acres of the entire site.

Lary Coppola – What is definition of the land use designation Urban Transition zoning, to which Gonzales replied the zoning was in transition at this time.

Eric Baker, Department of Community Development staff, - The zoning designation is located within the Poulsbo proposed UGA. This area already has an adopted Subarea Plan. Now operating pursuant to the Poulsbo Zoning Map and Poulsbo Development Regulations. Therefore, the current zoning of Urban Transition defers to Poulsbo’s Zoning Map and Development Regulations. According to the City of Poulsbo, this area is actually designated as Urban Low, Residential.

John Ahl – Has the Poulsbo Planning Commission had a chance to review this since the property is located in the Poulsbo UGA?

Gonzales - If the property in question is located within the city limits, the city handles the application. Likewise if it is located in the County, the
County processes the application, as in this case. The property has not been annexed into the City but noted that the rating system for open space is the same countywide, whether or not it is located in an incorporated area.

Coppola – Is the intent of the UGA to encourage urban development?

Gonzales – Yes, however in this case, because of the critical areas, it cannot be developed anyway. Further, it is the wetland and its buffer that is intended to be in open space classification.

No further discussion being heard, a motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by John Taylor that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Doreen and Pedro Valverde Open Space application. The vote: 7-aye; 0-opposed. Motion carried.

2. Janet Anderson has applied for Current Use Assessment - Open Space, on approximately 3-acres in Section 32, Township 25, Range 1E, in Central Kitsap County. This 3-acre parcel is zoned Rural Residential, one dwelling unit per 5-acres.; 2-acres will be exempt for two home sites. Approximately 1-acre is eligible for Open Space classification. The property is located approximately ¼ mile south of the Johnson Way and Chico Way NW intersection on the east side of Chico Way NW at 4798 Chico Way NW.

Karanne Gonzales - Presented the Anderson application stating the Janet Anderson was present in the audience along with Chuck McGuire who helped her with the application process. Gonzales reiterated the location of the property as referenced on an aerial map provided for the Commission, noting a densely wooded stream ravine area as the portion designated for open space application. This property qualifies for open space under the public benefit rating system for fish rearing habitat, significant wildlife habitat, secondary stream buffers and geological shoreline features. Ms Anderson has worked the property for some time and has maintained it in its natural state. There are three lots on the property. These have been short plated with one building lot and its buffer dedicated to open space since it is located in the critical area. Therefore the density will be reduced on the property. The property is zoned Rural Residential, one dwelling unit per five acres. Staff is recommending approval with limited public access. This will give them the 60% reduction, with a tax shift of approximately $719 per year.
Coppola - Clarification of tax parcel lines on the aerial photo that run through buildings.

Monty Mahan - The property lines do not actually run through buildings, but are reflective of GIS overlaying process.

Jenniges - Complimented the hand drawn map by Ms Anderson.

Michael Gustavson – Is parcel being given up a waterfront parcel?

Gonzales - Yes but it is contained within the stream ravine and is almost all buffer.

Gustavson – Will the easement going through the set-aside parcel remain an easement?

Gonzales - It appears to be part of the short plat and would not be vacated because of the open space. Also, the easement is not a viable access to the property because of the steep ravine. Legally, the easement remains as part of the short plat.

Chuck McGuire - Worked with Janet Anderson on this application. When he first saw the property he was amazed at how pristine this parcel had remained in an urban environment. The property is a registered wildlife sanctuary. It is Mr. McGuire’s opinion that this property should be protected and preserved. The fact that the owners live on the property and intends to allow limited public access by permission, only serves to enhance the value of the property.

John Taylor - Owner lives on lot A.

No further discussion being heard, a motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Janet Anderson Open Space application. The vote: 7-aye; 0-opposed. Motion carried.

John Ahl - Asked Karanne Gonzales to prepare a correction memorandum on the amount of acreage for the Doreen and Pedro Valverde application. She will also verify the correct total for the tax shift.
4. Committee Reports

Lary Coppola – South Kitsap Planning Committee is trying to reconvene and move forward but not much is happening.

Received an email from someone trying to form Manchester Community Council.

5. Old Business

Continue discussion on a draft ordinance and potential amendments to the County Code addressing regulations for Agriculture and Equestrian activities

Eric Baker, staff – At the February 10, 2004 Planning Commission public hearing, the Commission suggested several changes to the draft ordinance as well as addressed areas of public concern. Also, some Planning Commission members submitted specific written changes. The document Eric sent to the Planning Commission last week has two distinctions. 1- areas the Planning Commission wanted to discuss further are highlighted, and 2-(In underline and strike-out format), there are areas in strike-out that certain Planning Commission members thought should be deleted and areas underlined that other members thought needed to be added. Baker discussed larger issues addressed at the previous public hearing. One such issue was the removal of livestock densities from 5-acre or greater properties. Baker noted the Committee did not create this distinction. He distributed copies of current regulations that have been in place since 1983, indicating existing language addressing no livestock densities for 5 acres or greater.

It was agreed that Baker would highlight changes since the last public hearing and the Planning Commission will discuss them.

Jenniges - Concerned about the animal density table. A comparison between, for instance, chickens and horses is not equitable. Recommends eliminating the last two sections of the animal density table.

Baker - Numbers are intended to address individuals not for practicing livestock management. He referenced specific examples of worst-case scenarios. A farm plan prepared by either the Conservation District or as
Commissioner Mahan suggests, an independent entity, would override any bulk regulations.

Jenniges - Document is too specific relative to numbers of various types of animals. Thinks document is also too restrictive if interpreted verbatim with no exceptions.

Baker - Exception section on Page 2. Current regulations do not allow for any flexibility. For that reason, amendments are proposed to allow flexibility for citizens by way of a farm management plan if specified numbers are exceeded. This would include a site-specific analysis of individual properties.

Gustavson - Referenced a landscape project including a soil amendment that calls for 35 yards of manure at inception of the project and 10 yards annually thereafter. Will take many chickens, horses, cattle, etc. to produce that much manure. A limit of 12 chickens is unreasonable.

Baker – Explained the distinction between specific compositions of excrement versus quantity.

Coppola – Asked how much of a problem is created by current regulations to necessitate changing the Code, given the complexity of other more urgent issues currently facing the County.

Baker - Since current regulations have been in place for 20 years and under the current guidelines, citizens have been generally adhering to the regulations. Believes there is a benefit to citizens to amend the Code. Kitsap County receives approximately 75-80 livestock complaints per year. Complaints are mostly excrement or water quality issues. Mitigation will provide a tangible benefit regarding water quality improvements.

Jenniges - A site-specific plan costs money.

Baker - Conservation District Farm Plans are free except when amenities are required. Based on findings of a plan, there may be a costs involved.

Jenniges – Need further clarification on stories related at last public hearing about the Conservation District’s concerns over height of grass. Agreed with Commissioner Coppola’s comment about the need to amend current regulations.
Baker - It is rare to receive a complaint on property 5 acres and larger. Complaints are normally on smaller parcels without adequate space for animals to move around.

Mahan - It is a problem if neighbors do not manage animals on their property correctly, but believes these cases are in the minority. The DOE indicates it is a problem in their statistics. 12 may be too few and asked Jenniges what he thought might be a fair number.

Jenniges - On one acre, if well managed, the number could realistically be in the hundreds.

Mahan - The issue is commitment to waste management. As an example, if a person moves 200 birds into a neighborhood where it is not permitted. The County needs the authority to resolve the issue.

Baker - The Health District has regulations after water quality violations have occurred. Unfortunately, this will not help the person with a contaminated well. Kitsap County’s regulations are proactive in nature, written to avoid problems.

Coppola - Understands need for regulations, but does not want to get bogged down in counting chickens. Questioned if it might not be best to remand this matter back to the stakeholder group for additional input.

Baker - A member of the Conservation District is present today and can provide the technical data regarding issues related to excrement.

Coppola - Recommended freedom for citizens to utilize property as they choose until they intrude on their neighbors.

Baker - Asked Coppola if he thinks the flexibility of the Farm Plan does not provide for freedom versus intrusion, followed by an explanation of the specific regulations relating to what a person can lawfully do with their land as it pertains to containment of animals.

Coppola - Members of the Planning Commission could not know how many animals might be considered appropriate.
Mahan - The regulations are specific to the numbers and beyond that, a person needs to apply for a farm management plan. He believes the regulations are designed to notify people before they make the decision to keep animals on their property. The Stakeholder Committee was reluctant to set a specific number but thought the Planning Commission needed to do so. It is important to set standards and then beyond the standard set; a person needs to go to an agency for planning purposes. Very reluctant to send this matter back to the Stakeholder Committee.

In response to Coppola’s question on formation of a farm plan, Baker – a Farm Plan is developed in conjunction with the property owner and the Conservation District or possibly a similar agency as suggested by Commissioner Mahan. The District uses Best Management Practices.

Coppola - Is the Farm Plan open to interpretation by the author as to what is or is not good management practice?

Baker – It is, within set parameters established by the Natural Resource Conservation Service.

Gustavson - A problem exists in that a person cannot go beyond what the Conservation Service allows.

Carla Pizzano, District Coordinator for the Conservation District - The Farm Plan process. The Conservation District is a sub-division of State government, with the US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service being the technical advisors. They develop all technical guidelines and science used by the local Conservation District. A Farm Plan must meet their specifications. Each Farm Plan is a unique document, catering to an individual site. Landowners’ goals are determined, existing condition of a site is documented and these two areas are coordinated to produce the Plan that best suits the landowner’s needs.

Minimum standards that must be met address the air, animals, the plan and the human socioeconomic conditions that revolve around the site. Because this is very site specific, it was difficult to produce exact numbers in a bulk regulation situation.

Gustavson – Does the District allows more than 12 chickens?

Pizzano - The District provides data on nitrogen and phosphorus excrement in pounds from different kinds of animals to attempt to get a
sense of the effect on the environment and air, which would be an odor issue. With respect to poultry, for example, roosters would be a different problem than laying hens. Likewise, peacocks are a different problem from roosters and hens. These are good examples of why establishing a specific numbers is so difficult. The District understands the regulations are intended to address nuisance issues. Existing guidelines did not change. Regulations in other local jurisdictions were reviewed and they met the same standards.

Jenniges - Dogs are biggest offenders. With respect to farms, he thinks Kitsap does not have farms in the sense of incoming-producing businesses, but instead has hobby farms. He thinks the County could institute guidelines for new residents requiring them to contact the County for current regulations.

Pizzano - Bulk regulations are set up for newcomers as a preventative measure as stated by Commissioner Mahan. It sets the bar at a specific standard with allowance for flexibility on a site-specific basis. She said the Conservation District receives many complaint-driven referrals and that these initiated the proposed changes. Citizens had no alternatives citizens existing regulations. Therefore the District approached the Department of Community Development with the hope that staff would consider the need for an alternative. Cost of remedial action far exceeds the cost of a preventative amendment to the Code.

Taylor – Asked for assurance that this issue was brought forward based on complaints received and not initiated by Kitsap County government.

Pizzano - Confirmed this to be the case and that it is a means of assistance to people experiencing problems with neighbors as well as assistance to those having complaints leveled against them.

Taylor - 95% of complaints are resolved in a voluntary manner, leaving a 5% problem.

Baker - 95% of all complaints are handled voluntarily, indicating that no citations or further code enforcement actions are taken. There is however still 100% with an issue of some kind. Addressed difference between confinement area and pasture. Existing regulations treat these two issues differently, using a set square footage. This is not necessarily the most scientific approach. Commissioner Mahan has suggested that these be
defined based upon ground vegetative cover, or grass, a suggestion made by the Conservation District many times during Committee meetings. More specifically, anything with less than 80% covered in grass or some other form of vegetation, would be considered a confinement area having setbacks from property lines. Anything with more than 80% vegetative cover would be considered a pasture with no setbacks. Staff reviewed Commissioner Mahan’s suggestion, concluding it to be a sensible approach to this issue. Baker did question Mahan’s provision regarding a phrase at the end of each statement worded, “throughout the entire year.”

Mahan – It means year around. As an illustration of this, he distributed a packet of colored pictures of various confinement areas using bad management practices but noted that good practices outweigh bad.

Baker - Addressed five-acre exemption for livestock densities. Current code and proposed code change does not exempt properties greater than five acres from setbacks, it only exempts them from livestock densities. Kitsap County historically has not had any livestock density regulations for properties greater than five acres. At the last public hearing, numerous comments were made to the effect that this exemption was unfair, specifically that larger landowners have a free pass while smaller parcels do not. Staff has determined that the majority of alleged violations are on smaller parcels, generally less than three acres in size. Additionally, when subdividing properties into that small of an area, a larger possibility of diverse uses is the norm.

Gustavson - Commented on Mahan’s pictures stating that one of the worse cases of poor management is over five acres in size. He therefore supports constant theme throughout for all parcels of land.

Baker - Thanked the Planning Commission for its patience through this difficult process and said that staff will draft changes and provide these for the Planning Commission members by the first meeting in April.

Jenniges – Is it possible to change the setbacks for property line issues?

Baker - Some type of Farm Plan would give flexibility to the Conservation District to lessen the setbacks as farm practices allow.

Mahan - The Planning Commission may suggest different setback requirements.
Gustavson - Suggested the flexibility issue be addressed in the lead-in statement on the draft ordinance and Code 17.110.046.

Baker - That language can be found in the definitions section but flexibility can be included elsewhere.

Gustavson - Confinement area setback language is clear but it might be appropriate to clarify that those requirements are not binding for pastures.

Baker - Such language can also be augmented in an easier to see area of the draft document.

6. Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs)

Kamuron Gurol - Highlighted changes to the latest draft of CPPs. He briefed the Planning Commission noting that the briefing is informational only since the CPPs do not go the Planning Commission but to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC). The Planning Commission requested to be kept updated on this matter. The CPPs will be on the KRCC agenda Monday, March 15, 2004 for a briefing session. There are some problems in developing CCPs through the KRCC process, as it is difficult getting the word out to the public for comments on the document. Encouraged Planning Commission members to read through the document, attend KRCC meeting and provide comments. A Board of County Commissioners public hearing on the CPPs is set for June with a tentative goal of July for approval from KRCC. Explained the color-coding legend on the draft document. Everything in black is current policy/proposed to be kept; language in blue has been reviewed and recommended by KRCC Policy Board but not yet adopted by Board of County Commissioners; and the language in red has not yet been reviewed by KRCC. The Planning Director’s group writes this language. Each local jurisdiction is collecting comments from their citizens on the recommended policy amendments. These comments will be compiled into a document on the webpage called a Public Hearing Draft. The opportunity for public comment will be April 21, 2004. Additional highlights: Bottom of page 3, Policy 2A references amendments being considered on a regular basis. In the A section, “the adopted CCP will become effective on ratification by three or more cities representing the majority of combined city population in Kitsap County and endorsement (this word needs to be changed to ratification) by Tribal councils as well.”
B talks about “if a city or Tribal council does not take action within 60 days, the Board of County Commissioners’ adoption on the subject ordinance, that city or Tribe will be considered as ratifying or endorsing the adopted revisions to the CPPs.” The entire ratification process is now formally being incorporated into the CPPs. Previously, this has been a tradition, but no formal policy requiring 3 or 4 to represent a majority.

Gustavson - Kitsap County voted for a County/City form of government, with the County being superior to the cities. If a city council does not vote in favor of this document within 60 days, it is assumed approved. This means the County is directing the cities in their planning processes.

Gurol - KRCC is an advisory body, not a legislative body.

Gustavson – This fails on both definitions. It is not a legislative body because it does not contain full representation of the electeds and has non-electeds on it. As an advisory body, it has legislative members as voting members. The Board of County Commissioners are members and do vote.

Gurol - Every policy document such as the CPPs goes through Prosecutor’s review. He said he would be happy to pass on Commissioner Gustavson’s comments to that office.

Gurol - Page 5, a new proposed section to be added regarding countywide growth patterns. It is an overarching vision statement. Looking at examples of CPPs in other jurisdictions in the State, most have this section. Intended to be broader than Comp Plan language.

Coppola - Page 5, A, who will define “attractive and well designed.”

Gurol – No one will attempt to define this; it is more of a goal or vision statement. He asked the Planning Commission members to read through the vision statement as broad language and not something by which developmental regulations would be judged.

Gurol - Pages 8, 9 and 10 in blue. This language went through the KRCC process in 2003. This relates to establishing, expanding and adjusting UGAs and coordinated growth management in the UGAs between the County and the cities. This practice relates to Commissioner Gustavson’s earlier concerns. The idea is close to what is in the County’s Comp Plan.
That is the idea of doing joint planning whenever possible with an associated city. The concept relates to the County being an interim urban service provider when a UGA is specifically associated with a city. The best possible approach is a cooperative interaction between the County and a city for specific planning of the joint UGA and to facilitate the city’s eventual ability to annex that area. The goal is that the annexation would then take place within the time horizon of the next population growth out to 2025. Currently have JPA process in place with the City of Port Orchard.

Coppola - Why change “regional buildable lands” to “land capacity analysis” on page 7?

Gurol - The intent is to make the phrase more generic. The term a “Buildable Lands Report” has a specific meaning in State law. He explained the difference between the two terms.

Gurol - Page 10, number 4, “Distribution of the twenty year population increments as forecasted by OFM.” In the red section of the first paragraph, 2002-2022 is deleted and 2005-2025 is inserted. On the remainder of the red paragraph, beginning with the sentence, “The allocation shall be based on Buildable Lands Analysis and shall promote a countywide development pattern directing over 5/6th of new population growth to the designated UGAs.” This is current policy and the 5/6th number has been the source of debate. It is felt by some citizens that the 5/6th number is somewhat ambitious. Kitsap County’s growth patterns have been nowhere near 5/6th or 83%. Staff is currently compiling that information by geo-coding and locating all building permits in the past 3-4 years. This will be visually displayed. The correct number has been identified as closer to 50/50. Page 6, number 4, shows the proposed policy replacing the old 5/6th number and puts it in the overarching vision statement. The policy reads, “To implement this vision, new growth shall be distributed within a range of 65-85% to identified UGAs.” We are now working within a range instead of a specific number. This is a policy goal.

Gustavson - How would this be mandated? Suggested changing the language to read, “the goal of new growth shall be. . .”

Gurol – Need to review the distribution process to answer to that question. Currently, the proposal is to have a range. Page 10, number 4, a-g, are key policies discussed as process, not result, that would be used for
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1. distributing the growth. This is a “Bottoms-up” process. In A it states,
2. “Each jurisdiction with an UGA shall develop an estimate and/or range for
3. the additional population it could accommodate and service during a 20-year planning horizon consistent with its vision for future community
4. character. The estimate shall consider the need for increasing population
density within the UGAs to promote efficient service delivery, avoid sprawl,
and preserve community character.” This is where KRCC serves as a
compiler and a forum. 4.c. states, “KRCC shall compile the jurisdictions’
population estimates, including the estimate of additional population
capacity for areas outside the UGAs and determine whether adjustments
to the overall distribution are required in order to fit within the OFM
projected range. By 2025, the State’s latest projection states that Kitsap
County must plan for at least 268,000 countywide and no more than
425,000.” This is a very wide range to work with since today we have
237,000. The State’s midrange is at 331,000, roughly 100,000 more than
current population. For actual growth activity statistics, the mid-range
estimate is a reasonable goal even with the military variation. There are
actually three ranges to work with: State range given to the counties; 65-
85% local choice and a range developed for each UGA. Currently working
with the cities on their incorporated areas. Having these three ranges will
allow the County and the cities the maximum amount of local control and
flexibility during the Comp Plan update. Page 11, 4.g, “After each
jurisdiction has completed its comprehensive plan update, the final
adopted target should be compiled and reviewed through the KRCC
process and the revised population distribution incorporated into the CPP.
A final distribution to UGAs versus non-UGAs within the range specified
above should then be calculated.” The County does not know at this point
where it will fall in the range but mid-range is good target to shoot for
because it reflects what has actually happened. It is unknown what will
happen with the 65-85% local choice or for individual cities or UGAs. The
County has checkpoints along the way while utilizing the KRCC
participation process of sharing information. An example is that the City of
Bremerton will probably adopt its Comp Plan by the end of 2004 and is
using 2023 for time horizon instead of 2025. To interpolate out from 2023,
will most likely require some adjustments within the initial range originally
targeted by County staff.

Jenniges - Where is Bremerton actually projecting its future growth?

Gurol - Bremerton is doing its growth planning within the city because their
densities are still relatively low as part of the overall revitalization project.
Bremerton will work with the County on the associated UGA Planning Policies to determine the final numbers.

East Park, West Park and the waterfront, were mentioned as large urban densities within the City of Bremerton.

Gustavson - Paragraph 4.g, suggested that the wording be changed to “final population distribution. . .”

Gurol - Encouraged Commission to attend Monday’s stakeholder meeting to ask questions and obtain as much information on CPPs as possible. The policies need to be as clear as possible and the Planning Commission will see direct results of CPP through individual subarea plans. Staff will be compiling a flow chart for the Planning Commission to illustration how all the pieces fit together. Pages 11-13, have many strikeouts, all current policies. The Board directed him to attempt to cut down on the length of the CPPs. They are still 40+ pages long. An example of combining issues is on page 11, r, Fully Contained Communities and Master Planned Resorts. Kitsap County does not have either of these designations yet, but the CPPs provide direction if in the future, this situation changes.

Pages 14 through 23, mostly housekeeping changes. Page 38 shows the County’s roles and responsibilities, specifically as regional sewer provider in unincorporated areas and incorporated areas.

Coppola - Page 24.b.4, infrastructure. Why is the phrase “and telecommunications infrastructure” deleted?

John Ahl – What about consideration of military population on pages 36 and 37?

Gurol – Military population could be considered under the upcoming Land Capacity Analysis since population projections will be available that include the military numbers.

Taylor - How many sewer providers does the County have?

Discussion indicated the County owns only two and that some cities do provide for some unincorporated areas.

Gurol - There are three major areas that pertain to growth patterns; water, sewer and transportation.
Lary Coppola left the meeting at 11 AM.

Gurol - Will keep the Planning Commission updated as the CPPs continue through the review process.

7. Port Orchard UGA Planning Process Update

Staff does not have any handout materials but information is on the County’s Website. Process is progressing with current step being interview and selection of an environmental consultant. Gurol explained that the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) process could also be used to consult on other Department of Community Development projects. Staff has a resolution for review by the Board at the March 17, 2004 Work/Study session that will make a revised work plan official. He reminded the Planning Commission that the work plan spelled out in the MOA between the County and City last year was far too ambitious to be realistic and the Board and staff is now working with the City on a more feasible plan. Hopefully, most of the Port Orchard City Council approves this change and staff will be sharing information with the City officials. Next joint City/County meeting is April 12. Need to get the Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) active again.

Gustavson - Land use consultant, Bill Palmer, submitted a work plan. It would have the Port Orchard planning process completed by the end of this year.

Gurol - That work plan is not reasonable. Draft time line has not changed. Target adoption date for the Board of County Commissioners is targeted for August or September of 2005.

Jenniges – Is the Port Orchard’s parks and recreation program included in the timeline?

Gurol - It is not but is an issue that could be addressed in the Comp Plan.

Taylor – What progress is being made about Department of Community Development staffing needs.
Gurol - A new Planner I has been hired, interviews are set for a Planner III position. Also hired a new Building Inspector and some administrative staff positions.

8. Kingston Town Hall Meeting

A successful event with approximately 200 in attendance. Discussed issues in an open house forum including: Kingston, Phase II, and restoration on Carpenter Creek, culvert project. The CKCC is planning a similar open house at the Pavilion on April 21st. This is also the date for the KRCC meeting on the CPPs. Needs to discuss with staff and Board of County Commissioners because many citizens may be interested in attending both events.

Chair Nevins - Attended the Kingston open house and is glad to see CKCC doing the same.

9. Update on 2004 Resolution and Timelines (Site specs rezones)

Resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners yesterday, addresses amendments to the Kitsap County Comp Plan for 2004 only. Attached to the resolution is the initial draft docket listing projects for staff work in 2004. Also included are site spec amendments deferred from 2003 and table with timeline. This timeline format will also be used for Code amendments as well. The copy is on the website for public comment as of yesterday afternoon, following some changes made by the Board based on public comment. Criteria to meet in order to be eligible for site-specific Comp Plan amendments were main source of debate amongst Board members.

Jenniges – Was the Board’s vote a 2-to-1 decision?

Gurol – That is correct.

10. Joint Meeting Planning Commission /Board of County Commissioners

Gurol referenced timeline noting the first schedule joint meeting is listed for early June (item 29) followed by Planning Commission doing its own deliberations for recommendation to the Board. Intent is to have one joint
public hearing to hear all the same information from the public. Still looking at September for completion of Comp Plan process.

Taylor - Concerned about getting information out to the public.

Gurol - Newspapers, the County’s continually updated website and word-of-mouth are key components for disseminating information to the public. As always, public hearings are noticed in the legal public notice section of The Sun 3 weeks in advance of a Planning Commission public hearing and ten days in advance of a Board of County Commissioners public hearing.

11. New Business

Chair Nevins referenced rules and procedures draft asking for comments

12. Other Business

13. No other business being heard, a motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by John Taylor that the meeting be adjourned at 11:55 AM.

Exhibit No. Description

A. Draft Agenda for March 9, 2004 Planning Commission Public Hearing/Work Study
B. Staff Report: Pedro and Doreen Valverde Open Space Application
C. Staff Report: Janet Anderson Open Space Application
D. Estimated One Year Tax Shift resulting from Open Space Participation
E. Memo dated March 3, 2004 from Eric Baker Regarding Discussion Draft Agricultural/Equestrian Regulations from Planning Commission Comments
F. Washington State Horse Council letter to Eric Baker from Sharon Call, Dated February 17, 2004
G. Email from Monty Mahan to Holly Anderson and Eric Baker regarding ag/equestrian rules proposing edits for discussion
H. Photos of various confinement areas in Kitsap and other county
I. Revisions to the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies dated January 23, 2004
J. Resolution 038A-2004 with attached timeline providing for review and possible amendment of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan
K. Sign-in sheet for public hearings
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