

DRAFT MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION May 11, 2004

The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Eagle's Next Conference Center, 1195 Fairgrounds Rd, Bremerton, Washington 98311. Members **Present:** Tom Nevins, John Ahl, Michael Gustavson, Lary Coppola, John Taylor, Deborah Flynn and Dean Jenniges. **Not Present:** Monty Mahan. Staff Present: Eric Baker, Laura Ditmer, Stephanie Pawlawski and Holly Anderson, Secretary. (One person in audience)

1. Chair Nevins Called the Meeting to Order
2. Approval of Minutes

April 13, 2004

A **motion** was made by John Ahl and seconded by Mark Flynn that the minutes of March 9, 2004 be approved as amended. Motion carried.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

Draft South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) Criteria for Determination of Land Use Process

Eric Baker, Department of Community Development staff, introduced two documents: the first a listing of SKIA criteria with modest revisions based on comments from the previous Planning Commission work study and on a meeting between the Port and staff. Changes are noted in underline and strike out format. The second document is an excerpt from the SKIA Subarea Plan, Section 3.6.1, which is the reason for today's public hearing, to follow that section of the Code. In the SKIA Subarea Plan, a process is outlined that needs competing within a specific timeframe. Prior to subarea development, there existed two sets of land. The existing industrial lands,

1 designated as such in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan and additional
2 lands currently zoned Business Center, located around the exterior.
3 During the development of the Subarea Plan, discussions were held
4 as to how to handle the two types of land in order to maintain as
5 much continuity as possible between the old land use processes
6 applying to these lands and the new land use processes proposed by
7 the Subarea Plan. The SKIA Subarea Plan heavily supports a Master
8 Planning approach that is to be done on a sub-basin basis and
9 includes stormwater, transportation and utility infrastructure on a sub-
10 basin or in cases where properties overlap onto another sub-basin.
11 This would allow for large areas to be planned for at one time and
12 provide a coordinated infrastructure approach. The Master Planning
13 concept was a key component in the Subarea Plan. Section 3.6.1
14 addressed handling existing industrial lands, predominately Port
15 lands and Overton properties further south. For these properties, the
16 Subarea Plan outlines a process where within six months of the
17 adoption of the Subarea Plan, the County will determine what
18 properties are appropriate for two additional land use processes
19 beyond Master Planning. The first alternative is the “Ready for
20 Development” (RFD) lands designation for properties where
21 infrastructure has been developed around them. These lands are
22 located in Olympic View Industrial Park and portions of the airport
23 properties. There is stormwater capacity in places, water and sewer
24 in places making these properties highly developable. Due to the
25 location of infrastructure on these properties, the Board of County
26 Commissioners deemed such properties RFD. This would mean that
27 no additional land use processes are necessary beyond Site
28 Development Activity permits and building permits. As this would
29 expedite development of the properties, development must then be
30 based on specific criteria setting these properties apart from the
31 remainder of the South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA). The six
32 criteria listed on the first handout and address wastewater and
33 water facilities within 200 feet, stormwater capacity, quality and
34 conveyance systems, commercial/industrial road system accessibility
35 and no more than 50% critical area constraints. The Department of
36 Community Development would approve criterion compliance through
37 a one-time administrative decision and an applicant can come
38 forward and request particular sites within their development to be

1 designated RFD. A Type 1 land use decision will be made with the
2 Director of Department of Community Development making the
3 determination if the properties are ready for development, or not. It is
4 a one-time application that can take place within 3-4 months following
5 adoption of the six criteria.

6
7 The second land use process as an alternative option to Master
8 Planning is called Industrial Park. It is currently in the County Code,
9 calling for development on 20-acre basis, smaller than master
10 planning basis but larger than RFD. This process would be available
11 for properties that, in their entirety, are within the 1,500-foot band
12 located along State Highway 3 and Barney-White Road. On the map
13 of SKIA, Baker indicated the Industrial Park area. Applications for
14 Industrial Park designation go before the Hearing Examiner for
15 decision. In addition to the 1500-foot band along State Highway 3
16 and Barney-White Road, there are two sub-basins included. They
17 are Sub-basin 395 and 400 of the Union River (noted area on map).
18 Once these options are adopted, there will be three different types of
19 land within the SKIA Subarea: 1) Ready for Development; 2)
20 Industrial Park; and 3) Master Planning. In other words, one set of
21 lands would have access to all three options, a second set to only
22 Industrial Park or Master Planning, while a third set the ability to
23 Master Plan only. In conclusions, the additional options are proposed
24 to accommodate existing industrial lands in place prior to Subarea
25 Plan adoption, will be able to retain some of the benefits from the
26 infrastructure provision provided historically yet still holding onto the
27 concept of Master Planning, a big portion of the SKIA Plan and
28 important to successful economic development of that area.

29
30 Dean Jenniges asked about a triangular shape of land not included in
31 the SKIA boundary and was told by Baker that the Port of
32 Bremerton's wastewater facility/septic system is located there. It
33 contains about 60+ acres. Jenniges also asked about statement
34 under RFD calling for the Director to approve or disapprove the size
35 and configuration of each site proposed. He asked why not specify a
36 minimum instead.

37

1 Baker – The Port is not broken up into small properties, but is actually
2 one large piece. The Department is attempting to have the Port
3 delineate areas it expects to develop.

4

5 Jenniges – Asked for definition of wastewater.

6

7 Baker – Approved septic systems and/or sewer facilities

8

9 Jenniges - Are septic systems stubbed out?

10

11 Baker – With large, regional facilities, the expectation is that they are
12 stubbed out or accessible for connection to a sewer facility within a
13 200-foot range. Only a small portion of the red outlined SKIA area on
14 the map, currently having wastewater facilities within 200 feet.

15

16 Ken Attebery, Port of Bremerton, asked for assurance that comments
17 he made at the previous hearings on this matter are part of the
18 record. He reviewed some of the comments for those members of
19 the Planning Commission who were not present. Issues previously
20 raised included the Port not envisioning some of its rights being
21 removed when it volunteered to join the SKIA process in 1998. In
22 the 1998 Comprehensive Plan approved by the Board of County
23 Commissioners, provisions were added subsequent to that Plan
24 revision to indicate all 1700 acres of Port property to be considered
25 “Ready for Development.” At this time, the Port is attempting to hang
26 on to as much as the Ready for Development status as possible. The
27 document presented today by the Department of Community
28 Development is acceptable to the Port; it is not what the Port is
29 requesting the Planning Commission recommend based on prior
30 understandings. The Department has done a reasonable job in
31 discussing criteria with the Port, and he addressed two changes the
32 Port is requesting be made to the document. First, Attebery
33 referenced the runway on the map and development of areas off the
34 end of the runway. As a compromise, the Port has added a couple
35 drainage basins to the area allowing this area to comply with RFD or
36 use the Industrial Park process. Second, he asked that the triangular
37 shaped parcel. The Port’s wastewater treatment area, also be
38 included to comply with the Industrial Park process. He also showed

1 the two drainage basins added to the Port's request. As a point of
2 interest, he showed non-buildable areas within the SKIA boundaries
3 and the proposed site for a second runway. He then requested that
4 these areas be added in lieu of the non-buildable lands

5
6 Jenniges asked if this addition would impact the Port's RFD status.
7 Neither area Attebery is requested added would qualify as RFD.

8
9 Gustavson asked about proposed hanger space near Bremerton
10 Raceway. He supports completion of this as it is badly needed.
11 Asked if property at south end of runway was large enough to expand
12 as mandated by FAA.

13
14 Attebery - Process for extension of a small runway has already
15 begun. This includes all physical improvements except stormwater
16 facilities. Job is to make next increment of airport development as
17 expeditious as possible yet at the same time, environmentally
18 sensitive.

19
20 Ahl – Asked if the property dedicated to watershed use and the Port
21 owns the area proposed for new hangers? The answer is yes to
22 both.

23
24 Taylor – Asked a question similar to a discussion held at the previous
25 work/study session on this matter, specifically regarding the re-
26 location of the Bremerton Raceway.

27
28 Attebery – The Raceway people understand they have their facility on
29 a short lease and that a move is in the near future. They are currently
30 looking at other properties; one option being closer to the Mason
31 County line. Other members of the Planning Commission agreed that
32 the need for relocation of the raceway is well known and expected.

33
34 Attebery – Reiterated his request that the triangle-shaped parcel and
35 future hanger site be added to the RFD boundary area.

36
37 Ahl – Asked Baker why wastewater and the proposed new hanger
38 sites were excluded.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Baker – The wastewater site does not meet any of the RFD requirements except for having a septic system in the middle of the parcel. It is a large section of relatively wooded property and did not meet the 1500 feet from right of way. The key is to determine what makes RFD lands distinctive from other lands. There will be certain portions that fall out. One distinction is the 1500 feet from right of way. Looking at potentially 80 acres on the triangle site that would not have to master plan. The proposed hanger site does not have any infrastructure improvements beyond a roadway that is partially graded and must master plan.

Ahl – Clarification: Under the proposal the area within red lines is not RFD but can be subject to Industrial Park development.

Baker – Clarified: Everything within the red line on the map has the option of Industrial Park or Master Planning and other properties within that red line will have the option of RFD depending on meeting 4 out of 6 criteria listed on the document. Inclusion of the Port's requests does not make the referenced lands RFD.

Deborah Flynn – Clarification: Both parcels at this time only have option to Master Plan? Understands Port has previous master plan process from 1998, and asked if these two parcels are not within the 1998 Kitsap County master planning area?

Attebery – Clarified: Master Planning recognized by the County in 1998, were simplistic and nothing comparable to updates in process at this time.

Gustavson – Disagrees with excluding out wastewater facility given that area in red is driven by accessibility to wastewater facilities.

Ken – Staff needed to pick specific criteria, that being 1500 feet from SR-3 and Barney-White, which left the triangle parcel out.

Coppola – Asked what criteria was used by staff to decide on the 1500-foot limitation.

1

2 Baker – Looked at other jurisdictions, used reasonableness as
3 criteria, and several other ways to make this interim distinction
4 between RFD and Master Plan. Staff wanted to make clear why
5 certain lands are designated one thing and others another. Kitsap
6 County wants SKIA to succeed and to that end, believes master
7 planning is the best process. Most infrastructure currently available
8 on Port lands. The Board and staff also want to allow for other
9 alternatives where it is sensible to do so.

10

11 Coppola– Is there a legal requirement or mandate about 1500 feet?

12

13 Eric – As stated, clear determination based on other jurisdictions'
14 practices and an attempt to make a clear distinction based on
15 transportation and infrastructure.

16

17 Chair Nevins closed the public hearing.

18

19 Jenniges – Addressed questions to SKIA criteria regarding size and
20 configuration and on the first of the 6 criteria for RFD, where sewer
21 utilities is shown as deleted and replace with approved wastewater
22 facilities. He thought that if there was not a wastewater stub-out
23 within 200 feet of the property, that criteria for a single-point pick-up
24 might address as part of the original buildable site.

25

26 Baker – Only need to meet four of the six criteria to qualify for FRD.
27 The first criteria means that other wastewater facilities such as
28 individual septic systems, while discouraged by the Health District for
29 industrial development, are still allowed for the development. If such
30 a facility exists within 200 feet of a site that would most likely be
31 considered an approved wastewater facility. The concern was
32 sewers vs. septic systems, since the Port is served by one large
33 regional septic system, not sewers. The facility on site is a
34 wastewater facility.

35

36 Jenniges– Three of six criteria require access to utilities within 200
37 feet. Thinks if unable to get wastewater within 200 feet, unlikely
38 water would be available either.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Baker– Are a number of locations within the Olympic View Industrial Park (OVIP) that have water, but not sewer, within 200 feet.

Laura – Through the SKIA Subarea process, met with the Health District that provided a letter of support stating if certain criteria is met, on-site septic would be approved.

Gustavson – Concerned with wording under Industrial Park Process Available, In their entirety. Does not think property boundaries necessarily follow the RFD line on the map, and suggested wording. To state, “portions of” sites within 1,500 feet of State Highway. . . to accommodate areas 1,500 feet from the road. This would then include small chunks that fall outside the boundary line.

Baker – Works for the Overton parcel on lower end of RFD area line. The Port is two large parcels of property and the 1,500 feet would create a sight line that will appear on a master plan or Industrial Park process.

Taylor – Spending much time discussion issues that are not the Planning Commission’s responsibility, i.e., sewage availability. Suggests the Planning Commission needs a clearer understanding on what information the Planning Commission needs to consider and what is at the staff level.

Jenniges - As a representative of Central Kitsap constituents, needs to understand all related information to make a proper judgment and recommendation.

Baker – Staff is looking for a recommendation from the Planning Commission at earliest possible time. Have already exceeded the six-month deadline, and any further delay will stall the Port’s ability to make the necessary, Type 1 applications.

Deborah Flynn – Discussion held at previous meetings on sewer versus septic. Asked if this was the reason for change in first criteria listed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Baker– No, the goal is to eventually have sewer availability for the entire area in question.

Ditmer– Any on-site septic systems are only to be approved by Health District will only be on an interim basis until sewer lines are in place.

Gustavson – Reiterated other technology becoming available as alternatives to sewers.

Attebery - Wastewater treatment is more universal than sewer.

A motion was made by Michael Gustavson and seconded by John Taylor that the area proposed for new hanger facilities and the triangular shaped parcel where the Port's stormwater facility is located, be included in the Industrial Park classification of the Draft SKIA Criteria For Determination of Land Use

Coppola – Asked if the Draft SKIA Criteria For Determination of Land Use document should be approved first.

Baker – The document will need to be modified to accommodate the changes requested by Commissioner Gustavson.

Ahl – An appropriate motion might be that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the SKIA criteria and inclusion of the two properties proposed by the Port. It should be made in a single motion.

Gustavson – withdrew his motion in favor of Ahl repeating and clarifying his statement above.

A **motion** was made by John Ahl and seconded by Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners approval of the Draft SKIA Criteria For Determination of Land Use Process with the inclusion of the two Port of Bremerton properties including triangular site where the existing septic system is located and the proposed new hanger site.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

Jenniges - Will new criteria include recommended change on the Industrial Park process?

Gustavson – Proposed a friendly amendment to the motion recommending language changes to the Industrial Park Process of the **Draft SKIA Criteria For Determination of Land Use Process**. The words “in their entirety” be deleted and the words “Those portions of” be added to the beginning of that sentence,

Ahl - Accepted the friendly amendment.

Deborah Flynn – Asked how much acreage would be added by the two additional parcels of Port land.

Baker – 15 to 20% of the entire Industrial Park area.

Deborah Flynn – do not like taking anything out of Master Plan process. Would be more inclined to include hanger site in Ready for Development area than triangular wastewater site. Also concerned about changing staff criteria that might cause others to come in requesting to take their property out of Master Planning process.

Ahl – Understood that the additional lands do not contain criteria making them Ready for Development but would be available for alternatives.

Deborah Flynn – It means they would not have to go through the Master Planning process.

Gustavson – Error in Deborah’s presentation. There are two pieces of property; Port property and section to add as Business Center. Portions discussed were part of the Port property in the beginning, and never intended to be included in Master Planning.

Baker – Master Planning was intended for portions of the Port property all along, it is just a matter of how much of the property

1 Master Planning was intended for through current discussions. Need
2 to finally delineate where Master Planning, as the only options, ends.

3
4 Attebery – Agrees with Baker that the County wants Master Planning
5 throughout SKIA and portions of Port property were held back
6 because of this. Certain documents support the County excluding
7 Port properties from Master Planning.

8
9 Chair Nevins – Have the 1500 feet and although somewhat arbitrary,
10 can be recognized. If substitutions and alternations to those limits, it
11 will open the door for other property owners' concerns about doing
12 the same for them.

13 14 The Motion

15
16 A **motion** was made by John Ahl and seconded by Lary Coppola that
17 the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County
18 Commissioners approval of the Draft SKIA Criteria For Determination
19 of Land Use Process with the inclusion of the two Port of Bremerton
20 properties including triangular site where the existing septic system is
21 located and the proposed new hanger site. A friendly amendment
22 was made by Michael Gustavson to wit: **language changes to the**
23 **Industrial Park Process of the** Draft SKIA Criteria For Determination of
24 Land Use Process. **The words “in their entirety” be deleted and the**
25 **words “Those portions of” be added to the beginning of that**
26 **sentence thus reading, “Those portions of sites within 1,500 feet of**
27 **State Highway 3 or Barney-White Road and properties within the**
28 **Union River 395 and 400 sub-basins may use the Industrial Park**
29 **process as an option to master planning.”**

30
31 **The vote: Aye-6; Opposed-2. Motion carried.**

32 33 **4. Committee Reports**

34
35 John Ahl, Michael Gustavson and Chair Nevins met regarding corrections
36 or changes to the Planning Commission bylaws. Agreed to present ideas
37 for discussion that may be proposed changes to rules of procedure. Chair
38 Nevins distributed the document, noting the changes can be voted on at
39 the June 8, 2004 Planning Commission meeting.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

5. Old Business

A. Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs)

Laura Ditmer said that the KRCC board met last week to discuss public comment received on the CPPs. Decided not to make a decision yet based on the Centers concept designation. Suquamish is up for discussion as a transportation hub as well as activity/employment center. The Planning Directors will meet to prepare a matrix as to what this would mean and the Board will meet again to discuss this criteria.

Lary – language being used is not quantifiable. Thinks should leave to chance anything that will delay or form grounds for appeal.

Members of the Planning Commission discussed concerns in the CCPs language specifically whether it is legally defensible, definitions for good planning, livable wages, affordable housing and how these are measured. If not measurable, then meaningless. Concern was expressed over application to the 13 goals of GMA, Specificity of the goal statement was an issue and opinions differed as to whether a goal statement was, by definition, broad in scope or should list more specific issues. Need for specific goals that do not change with elections.

Ahl – Reminded Commissioners this item was just an informational briefing.

Ditmer – Explained rationale behind the broader goal statement and then more refined specifics on a lower level of detail.

Laura – Do have to take broad statements and then at a lower level take more specifics. She also explained that Community Planning is tasked with developing criteria to define livable urban communities. It is done through a community, fact-gathering process to an end that gives each community within Kitsap County what they see for their neighborhoods in future years.

1 Manchester's community planning process was discussed, as was
2 the communities' in general, desire to have a say in their future and
3 not wanting County or KRCC to make that decision for them.
4

5 Planning in general as it applies to Kitsap County was discussed.
6

7 Chair Nevins –Not making any changes today to the CPPs.
8

9 **B. Joint Board of County Commissioners Planning Commission**
10 **Public Hearings on Comprehensive Plan Amendments.**
11

12 Ditmer - Joint public hearings are scheduled with the Board of County
13 Commissioners and the Planning Commission is scheduled for
14 work/studies on Phases I and II of the Comp Plan Amendment process.
15 She referenced a calendar handout listing these hearings and meetings.
16 Board of County Commissioners wants the entire process finished by the
17 end of August because of the bi-annual budget preparation. The schedule
18 is very aggressive but believes it can be achieved.
19

20 Ahl – Asked if written testimony can be cut off at a specific date.
21

22 Ditmer - Will check with legal re receiving written testimony cutoff time.**
23

24 Planning Commission could agree to take turns commenting and stop.
25

26 Planning Commission discussed rotating and taking turns commenting
27 one time only.
28

29 At the Board of County Commissioners decision hearing in August, the
30 plan is to have at least the Chair of the Planning Commission or more
31 members if desire, in attendance.
32

33 Ditmer - Staff will furnish material for draft initial docket and current Comp
34 Plan amendments the week of June 8, 2004. **
35

36 **C. Briefing on criteria for Open Space Apps – Cont to June 8**
37
38
39
40

1 D. Outcome of discussion held April 13 regarding number of votes
2 required to approve items not related to Comp Plan

3
4 6. New Business

5
6 7. Other Business

7
8 8. No further business being heard, a motion was made by
9 Commissioner Coppola and seconded by Commissioner Jenniges that the
10 meeting be adjourned. Motion carried. 11:30 AM.

11
12 **Exhibit No. Description**

- 13
- 14 A. Agenda for May 11, 2004 Planning Commission meeting
- 15 B. Draft SKIA Criteria for Determination of Land Use Process
- 16 C. Page 38 of South Kitsap Industrial Area Plan, December 8, 2003
- 17 D. King County DDES Small Animals and Livestock
- 18 E. Proposed additions to the “Rules of Procedure of the Planning
- 19 Commission of Kitsap County “
- 20 F. Planning Commissioners Journal
- 21 G. Sign-in Sheets for Public hearing on SKIA Criteria (No signatures)
- 22 H. Legal Notification for May 11, 2004 Planning Commission meeting
- 23

24 MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____,
25 2004.

26
27
28
29
30 _____
Tom Nevins, Chair

31
32
33 _____
34 Planning Commission Secretary