

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION June 15, 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, Monty Mahan, , Lary Coppola, John Taylor and Dean Jenniges. **Not Present:** Michael Gustavson and Deborah Flynn, Staff Present: Eric Baker, Laura Ditmer, Jason Rice, Stephanie Pawlawski, Kim Pawlawski, Betty Capehart and Holly Anderson, Secretary.

Chair Nevins Called the Meeting to Order and made introductions

WORK STUDY

Phase I of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process

1. George's Corner proposed commercial Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD), North Kitsap, intersection of Highway 104 and Miller Bay Road/Hansville Highway

Jason Rice, Department of Community Development staff – Today's work/study session is to review Phase I of the 2004 Comp Plan amendment process (CPAs). There were several site-specific requests deferred by the Board of County Commissioners in the 2003 CPA process as well as a potential designation of a commercial Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD) at George's Corner in North Kitsap County near Kingston. Staff originally prepared a review and analysis supporting a LAMIRD designation at this intersection. The Planning Commission recommended denial based on a list of findings signed during the 2003 CPA process. The Board of County Commissioners reviews the Planning Commission's findings and concluded there had not been sufficient public participation. Staff subsequently went back to the public, local residents and the Kingston Community Advisory Council

1 (KCAC) for additional input on this effort. Included in today's packet
2 is a revised staff report for a George's Corner LAMIRD. Most of the
3 information was also contained in the previous staff report. There is
4 however additional attachments tracking the public process staff
5 conducted. First, four initial meetings were held, beginning with a
6 Kingston Town Hall meeting in early 2004. Information regarding the
7 process and a status report were provided and additional input was
8 requested. Next, a mailing notice was sent out to provide additional
9 opportunities for citizen involvement, plus staff identified a 1,000-foot
10 radius around the intersection and mailed out notices to all property
11 owners in this radius. Rice indicated on a map the area in
12 consideration for the LAMIRD process. About 200 notices were
13 mailed out for all the meetings in an attempt to gather interest and
14 comments from affected residents based on last year's process.
15 During the first meeting, staff presented all GMA criteria and Comp
16 Plan requirements for designation of a commercial LAMIRD. Every
17 attempt was made to clarify any confusion. At each meeting new
18 people attended and staff reviewed the criteria each time. At the last
19 meeting, approximately 40 residents attended. At first, even though
20 they received notice they did not intend to attend until one resident
21 went out knocking on doors to explain what was being proposed. It
22 was a good meeting with a heated debate. Most questions were
23 answered by staff with the help of an exercise conducted to assist
24 staff in doing so. Questions mostly addressed justification for a
25 LAMIRD designation at this intersection. Staff summarized the four
26 alternatives (included in today's packet) that are reflective of citizens'
27 concerns. Property owners have a stake in the designated area
28 because of historic zoning. This in itself is not a criterion and the
29 property owners were informed of this. There is also some vested
30 interested because of an historic Unclassified Use status that has not
31 been resolved through Kitsap County Development Review Division.
32 Staff also looked at the community's desire to support a future rural
33 population. Staff continued to emphasize the Limited part of the
34 LAMIRD and that the community needed to focus on a base line
35 foundational piece so they could assist in limiting the area and offer
36 some potential infill. This explains the differences noted on the map
37 in the various alternative boundaries. Staff recommendation is
38 slightly modified in that the boundary has changed somewhat. The

1 recommendation includes the areas currently developed, including
2 Albertson’s complex, the Frontier Bank parcel and the area to the
3 north known as the Bjarnson property (a 2003 deferred site-specific
4 request) there would be appropriate for inclusion based on a four-
5 corner concept making this a complete infill area. The boundaries
6 shown on the map representing the LAMIRD are basically a reflection
7 of what was done on the North Sound Bank parcel except it is flipped,
8 which also avoids the sensitive areas as was done for the North
9 Sound Bank parcel. Staff’s intent was to use public input, criteria and
10 guidance provided in the Comp Plan and the GMA, while using the
11 natural constraints as barriers to both the east and west. Grovers
12 Creek is on the east side and headwaters to Gamble Creek on the
13 west of the LAMIRD designation. Legal counsel is comfortable with
14 staff’s proposal specifically that adequate findings are present to
15 support a LAMIRD designation. A Technical Team meeting was held
16 with all internal departments of Kitsap County as well as the
17 Suquamish Tribe. There appears to be general support for this
18 designation. The Tribe may have concerns if the boundary is
19 expanded.

20
21 Dean Jenniges – Referenced information before today’s packet. In
22 Kitsap County Ordinance 274-2002, that states, “The proposed
23 amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the
24 Comprehensive Plan, followed by criteria to substantiate this. In
25 addition, adding additional property beyond this would not be in
26 keeping with the County Plan.” He thinks whatever is approved now
27 will be quasi-satisfactory and the County will have to repeat the
28 process once again. If the citizens in the area want to expand the
29 commercial limit and it does not adversely affect the community, why
30 would staff recommend a reduction in boundaries?

31
32 Rice - KCAC supports the smaller LAMIRD designation. They will be
33 providing the Planning Commission with supporting documentation.
34 He meant with them June 2 to present staff’s findings. The rationale
35 behind KCAC’s support is that the small concentration does not take
36 away the option of coming to Kingston to utilize the existing
37 commercial businesses there as well. They also do not want to see
38 additional growth in rural areas without adequate services. This area

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

only has water available, no sewers. All areas noted are on drain fields and septic systems. You will not see similar types of developments approved for commercial areas. This area is mostly zoned Commercial. There are three zoned Commercial and one zoned Industrial adjacent to Albertson’s complex. There is approximately one and a half mile separation between the George’s Corner intersection and the Kingston UGA.

Monty Mahan - Asked for a brief LAMIRD criteria overview, benefits vs. leaving it as is.

Rice – A LAMIRD designation at this intersection will preclude any additional requests for rezones. Once this boundary is established as defined under State law, the County is not allowed to change it. This is similar to Suquamish, Manchester and Port Gamble. It is set until GMA is changed to allow boundary expansion. There are four basic criteria for an area to qualify for this designation. 1) It must have been in existence prior to establishment under GMA, 2) It could have some form of infrastructure such as water, sewer or community septic systems and drain fields, 3) Be able to allow for some infill of similar type developments and uses that currently exist or densities where there is a mixed-use residential base as well, and 4) Natural constraints must be considered with any development encroachment disallowed. Rice confirmed for Commissioner Mahan that if the County designates an area not meeting this criterion, it would be vulnerable to appeal.

In response to John Taylor’s question as to which of the four alternatives listed in the staff report is being recommended, Stephanie Pawlawski said the staff recommendation does not include any of the four alternatives. Those are the Boundary Advisory Group’s (BAG) alternatives. The staff recommendation is the last attachment to the staff report.

1
2 **2. SITE SPECIFICS 2003 DEFERRED**

3
4 **Richard Bjarnson**

5
6 Rice – During last year’s process, it was discussed that a more
7 favorable recommendation would be considered if Mr. Bjarnson were
8 to do a boundary line adjustment. His representative, Gary Lindsey,
9 has submitted a boundary line adjustment but it is larger than the
10 area prescribed on the map per the staff’s recommendation. It
11 extends farther to the west. Based on the original request, the
12 Bjarnson approval for a majority of the property would be
13 recommended as Neighborhood Commercial, similar to what is
14 designated at the intersection currently. The proposal was for seven
15 acres, with five to six acres of that being recommended for approval.
16

17 Rice - Told Commissioner Jenniges that the LAMIRD would affect the
18 Bjarnson request because it was deferred from last year’s process to
19 be part of this year’s LAMIRD process.
20

21 Rice – The original proposal as part of last year’s process was the 13
22 acres that you see in the application. Mr. Lindsey recently recorded a
23 Boundary Line Adjustment with the Auditor’s Office indicating that it
24 was 7.2 acres. County staff has recommended yet a smaller size
25 than recorded but the County’s GIS calculations have determined the
26 acreage to be 7.2.
27

28 Jenniges – Asked if the request changed from 13.5 acres to 7.2, then
29 readjusted to a smaller area, is it correct that the application is back
30 up to 7.2?
31

32 Rice – It is 7.2 acres but the recommendation is for approval of a
33 smaller acreage amount for consistency with the other corners and
34 for wetland protection. (Stephanie Pawlawski illustrated the
35 discrepancy on the map).
36

37 John Ahl – Attachment 1, paragraph 3, states that the Planning
38 Commission recommended a LAMIRD be established last year.

1 Thinks this is incorrect and needs correcting. There were reasons
2 given last year as to why the Planning Commission did not
3 recommend a LAMIRD, one being the issue of the 1991
4 development. He asked what is different now.

5

6 Rice – Reviewed what existed in 1991. With regard to the error in
7 language as stated above by Commissioner Ahl, Rice is not sure if
8 the Planning Commission was only focusing on the commercial areas
9 or on the small industrial strip as well to be included in the LAMIRD.
10 There was the development known as Kountry Korner, the
11 southwesterly most corners on the map. There were also three
12 industrial buildings built in 1986, 1989 and 1992. These helped justify
13 the logical intent to utilize and infill and ultimately justify a LAMIRD at
14 this intersection. This is the baseline information used.

15

16 Ahl – It is clear to the Planning Commission members as to what was
17 developed prior to 1991, but recalls that it was not considered enough
18 to declare as a LAMIRD. This will most likely come up again at the
19 public hearing. Does not understand how that can be leveraged into
20 current proposed outer boundaries.

21

22 Rice – A statement was made at a Board meeting that individual
23 rezone requests were being received at this intersection. Rather than
24 dealing with them on an annual basis, the intent was to look at this to
25 seriously reconsider fully if this area could support a LAMIRD
26 designation, thus precluding future rezone requests from coming
27 forward. Once it becomes a LAMIRD, then a policy statement can be
28 made that no more rezone requests will be accepted at the George's
29 Corner intersection because a LAMIRD has been established.

30

31 Lary Coppola – Questioned population of this area and the amount of
32 increase since 1991.

33

34 Rice – The Kingston census track that extends up to Eglon shows an
35 approximately 3.7% growth rate. Staff did a calculation on a five-mile
36 radius that includes roughly 15,000 people. This radius reaches out
37 to Gamblewood and other outlying areas.

38

1 Rice – Held discussion with the Planning Commission members
2 regarding service areas for commercial development in the George’s
3 Corner area. The County cannot dictate what uses will go there can
4 only provide zoning for non-residential type development. Staff
5 provided current population numbers based on today’s criteria. Did
6 not go back to base map.

7
8 Coppola – Requested numbers for the difference in population in a
9 five-mile radius between 1991 and now. Thinks it will help make the
10 decision for the Planning Commission to vote on staff’s
11 recommendation. Wants to know if this North Kitsap area is growing
12 faster than others are.

13
14 Rice – Asked if this was information the Planning Commission agrees
15 it needs.

16
17 Ahl – Suggested that the five-mile radius statistics might make the
18 task more difficult. Not sure census data is split out as such.

19
20 Coppola – Looking for how many people would use that area as a
21 service provider for other things and if George’s Corner is the logical
22 place for it.

23
24 Ahl – From usage standpoint, a commercial development on that
25 corner would be used. However, usage is not being addressed. It is
26 whether a change to the Comp Plan designating a LAMIRD or other
27 zoning changes are necessary to achieve that goal. It is fair to say
28 the north end of the County is growing quickly. On the other hand,
29 Kingston believes it is the central point of commercial focus for people
30 in the far north end.

31
32 Coppola – Concerned that once boundaries of a LAMIRD are
33 established, that is it. Does this limit future growth?

34
35 Chair Nevins – Residents in the area have expressed that they are
36 not interested in commercial strip development from George’s Corner
37 to Kingston.

38

1 Coppola – Curious as to how many people will use this and thinks it
2 should factor into the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

3

4 Ahl – Questions if this is a legal or appropriate approach to the
5 problem.

6

7 Rice – Legal counsel states there is justification. To what extent, is
8 up to the decision makers.

9

10 Ahl –It is within the County’s can legally authority to establish new
11 commercial areas if appropriate infrastructure is or can be made
12 available. This is the ability to create based on need. Cannot depend
13 on a 1991 presence.

14

15 Jenniges – Read from June 4, 2004 document. “The other three
16 corners of the George’s Corner intersection are currently zoned
17 Neighborhood Commercial. Due to the level of existing commercial
18 development and limited developable area of the site, addition of this
19 site as Neighborhood Commercial will not result in additional impact.”
20 The applicant intends to limit the scale of the development and meet
21 all requirements of Kitsap County including stormwater. He was told
22 this is the old proposal. Asked why was it approved and if staff
23 thought the original proposal was a good one, then why recommend
24 change.

25

26 Rice – The change is based on the approval as indicated in the
27 attachment.

28

29 Jenniges – Confused about statement that first staff states it will not
30 have significant impact and now it is recommending a change.

31

32 Rice – Staff has the flexibility and responsibility to provide the best
33 professional recommendation possible based on the facts to make a
34 recommendation. The facts and a recommendation are both
35 provided that may not be consistent with the application. An applicant
36 can provide any proposal they chose, based on the Board of County
37 Commissioners resolution. It is staff’s job to analyze how the
38 application impacts the community, the environment and whether or

1 not it can be supported legally based on Comp Plan policies and the
2 resolution.

3
4 Jenniges – This has already been done once.

5
6 Rice – Yes and staff did not go with the delineation of the boundary
7 provided by the applicant. Staff recommends a smaller boundary as
8 shown on the attachment. It is similar to the procedure followed in
9 the North Sound Bank proposal. Staff asked the applicant to scale
10 back its original proposal and it would recommend approval.

11
12 Jenniges – Questioned the acreage amount again.

13
14 Rice – Already stated not sure who made the error, applicant or staff.
15 He will check it out when he returns to the office.

16
17 Mahan –Requested notes from BAG meetings.*

18
19 Jenniges– Asked if the LAMIRD has adversely affected the Bjarnson
20 application.

21
22 Rice – Impacts would be none by adding Bjarnson to the LAMIRD.
23 However, approval of the new boundaries would adversely affect
24 Bjarnson. The Planning Commission last year did not recommend
25 approval of either the LAMIRD or the Bjarnson application.

26
27 Taylor – The Planning Commission indeed did not approve either the
28 LAMIRD or Bjarnson, which was deferred. Referenced pages 11 and
29 12 of the staff recommendation, show differences from alternatives 1
30 through 4. Understands the reason Bjornson did a Boundary Line
31 Adjustment was to delineate the useable, developable, land he owns
32 with the remaining critical areas not being developable. In other
33 words, he adjusted the line to take maximum advantage of Buildable
34 land versus non-buildable land, which is why staff made the change.

35
36 Mahan– Clarified that staff recommended Bjarnson remove some of
37 the critical areas to make it a stronger proposal.

38

1 Rice – There is a petition circulating at this time by people unhappy
2 with the staff’s recommendation.

3

4 Coppola – Asked if there are any changes to the deferred site
5 specifics since last year?

6

7 **Jean Sherrard**

8

9 Rice – Gave a short history on the Sherrard mini-storage application.
10 It was originally Urban Medium as part of the 1994 invalidated Comp
11 Plan. Under that Plan, Sherrard came forward with a mini-storage
12 proposal that was approved based on the existing permitted use
13 table. In the valid 1998 Comp Plan, mini storage units were removed
14 from the Urban Medium designation, thus making it a non-conforming
15 use. Sherrard has attempted to acquire a conforming use for his
16 property. This requires that he either request Commercial or Urban
17 High zoning. Originally, he requested Commercial. There were
18 concerns because the County had just gone through the Kingston
19 SubArea Plan process and commercial would not be consistent with
20 the recommendation of KCAC and public process. Sherrard has now
21 revised his proposal from Commercial to Urban High, still consistent
22 with direction provided in the Kingston SubArea Plan, even though it
23 is a non-residential use. This makes it a conforming use and staff is
24 recommending approval.

25

26 Jenniges – Read, “Urban High designation is the only residential
27 designation to allow mini-storage facilities.” He questioned this.

28

29 Rice – It is the only residential zone in a UGA allowing for mixed use,
30 both commercial and residential. In the Kitsap County Code, under
31 Urban High designation there is a list of uses.

32

33 Jenniges –High Residential means you need living quarters and then
34 turn around and take up space with a mini storage.

35

36 Taylor – Confirmed that zoning rules have changed over the years
37 and staff’s recommendation for approval allows this activity to be
38 classified as a conforming use.

1

2 Rice – It also provides some certainty to the citizens of Kingston that
3 it will not be converted to commercial use in the future.

4

5 Jenniges – Page 4, paragraph 2, states, “Whether the assumption
6 upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based are no longer valid or
7 there is new information available that was not considered during the
8 adoption of or during the last annual amendment to the
9 Comprehensive Plan. The assumptions upon which the
10 Comprehensive Plan is based have not changed and therefore
11 remain valid.” From this Commissioner Jenniges concluded that
12 since this was done, no changes have occurred that would adversely
13 affect this decision.

14

15 Ahl – Noted that if at some point in time the owner wished to re-
16 develop into high-density housing they could. This legitimizes the use
17 that is there, which means he can expand the footprint of the storage
18 facility as a conforming use, but if in the future the best use became
19 high-density residential, the owner would be able to develop
20 accordingly.

21

22 Jenniges – The report also states that the Kingston sewage treatment
23 plant will provide service to the site and is scheduled for completion in
24 2005.

25

26 **Richard Bjarnson - Continued**

27

28 Discussion continued between staff and the Planning Commission
29 members regarding the acreage change to the Bjarnson application.

30

31 Rice – Clarified the change to 7.2 acres by stating that for the
32 commercial development, it is anticipated that all requirements and
33 conditions will address only development within the commercial
34 boundaries. There was some question as to whether septic and drain
35 fields could be skirted over the property line onto the residential
36 property because it is under the same ownership. He is not sure if
37 that issue has been clarified as yet due to the North Sound Bank
38 question of whether or not that will be acceptable in land use review

1 when they reach that point. It is however assumed that all
2 commercial development including mitigation for stormwater and on-
3 site septic will be contained within the commercially zoned area. The
4 acreage calculations associated with the boundaries that staff has
5 proposed, is 7.2. Rice is unsure how the Lindsey calculations were
6 obtained.

7

8 **Brown-Rice-Krueger**

9

10 Rice – Nothing has changed from the 2003 application information.
11 Staff has asked for additional information from the applicant to
12 support their position. An additional pre-application meeting was held
13 with the individuals involved and recent hearings and court decisions
14 were discussed. Staff suggested that the applicants consider these
15 decisions in preparation for discussion relative to UGA boundaries.
16 Rice is not aware of any additional information submitted to be used
17 for a modified recommendation.

18

19 Ahl – In staff reports it states that the joint planning process between
20 the City of Port Orchard and Kitsap County is underway.
21 Commissioner Ahl asked for a status report on this.

22

23 Rice – The two entities are currently working on an Interlocal
24 Agreement (ILA) that will commit the funding for 2004 Phase I of the
25 entire planning process. Phase I includes population analysis and
26 holding capacity broken down to the Transportation Analysis Zone
27 (TAZ) level. It includes the scoping and defining alternatives, public
28 workshops and gathering information and input on the alternative
29 UGA boundary proposals. It will be the existing conditions and it is
30 anticipated that by the end of the year 2004, there will be a working
31 draft, EIS and policy plan.

32

33 Ahl – Was told by Rice that it is a current expectation that the next
34 2005 revisions to the Kitsap County Comp Plan will include a revised
35 UGA boundary for the City of Port Orchard. Either it will include a
36 boundary change or land use changes within the existing boundary
37 as identified on the current Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.
38 Thinks people need some assurance that this will in fact, take place.

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

Rice – Department of Community Development Interim Director, Cindy Baker, told the Port Orchard City Council that Kitsap County is committed to making sure this effort goes through, based on budget and staffing. Essentially County staff is committed to completing Phase I of the process in this year’s budget. This amounts to approximately half of the work in a six-month period. The remainder will be completed in the 2005 CPA process to include public hearings, open houses on the draft SubArea Plan and EIS, similar to the process used for ULID #6 SubArea Plan. The process is approximately one month and one week behind schedule based on the timeline originally established between the previous Department of Community Development Director and the City.

Jenniges – When he asked if the UGA boundary for the City of Port Orchard has been extended since the Brown-Rice-Krueger application has the City’s endorsement based on an extension of the UGA, Rice responded this is part of the process for a boundary change. This does not imply that the four South Kitsap deferred site-specific applications will be included in the Port Orchard UGA. Only that the sites will be part of the planning process agreement between the County and the City. The City is on record expressing a desire within the UGA process, to connect McCormick Woods that would include these properties as part of the area.

A discussion continued between Commissioner Coppola and Rice regarding length of time it has taken to process the South Kitsap site-specific requests, when the first application was made and the history of the applications’ connection with the Port Orchard planning process.

Taylor – Sees this as similar to the Bjarnson application in that it has sensitive and critical areas on the site. He wondered why the applicant has not done a Boundary Line Adjustment, omitting the unusable land from the application.

Rice – Difficult to get an agreeable Boundary Line Adjustment between three property owners.

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

Laura Ditmer – Thought that last year the applicants talked about carving out areas that could be approved.

Rice – The conversation about scaling back similar to what Bjarnson has done, took place after they applied for the rezone. This would create a situation similar to that along the Bethel Corridor where the zoning split parcels. The acreage involved for this application is 29.07, 10.81 of which would be considered the developable area. Most likely, all development would be contained on the 10+ acres. Staff told the applicants if they scaled back the proposal, they might have a more favorable recommendation. Again, the Boundary Line Adjustment could not be obtained because two of the owner’s properties would then be contained in a total wetland area that would limit their potential.

Taylor – Asked that if the Planning Commission recommends approval of the total 29 acres, what assurance is there that the applicants will not go ahead and try to develop the sensitive areas. What will avoid them pouring concrete in wetlands.

Rice – There are a couple hurdles involved. First Blackjack Creek is an ESA designated stream requiring a Habitat Management Plan. In addition, this area is heavily encumbered because it is designated wetlands. The applicants have been asked on several occasions to provide staff with a wetlands report, with no response from a certified specialist.

Ahl – It is not inevitable that these sites will ever be approved for commercial development. If in fact the sites are part of the Port Orchard UGA, it will probably happen. If the Planning Commission as a group is somehow forging the inevitable, it does a disservice to what the Planning Commission, Kitsap County and the City of Port Orchard are trying to accomplish. It is possible that these South Kitsap parcels could be delayed forever. It depends on what transpires between the County and City with the SubArea planning process. Whether that makes good sense or not is another question.

1 **Blackjack Valley Associates**

2
3 Rice – This application has the same issues as the previous
4 application. It is still deferred depending on the Port Orchard
5 SubArea Planning process.

6
7 Rice – Relating back to the George’s Corner issue, there are two
8 proposals, Hanson and Fall that needs some clarification. Hanson
9 previously had commercial zoning of Business General back in the 80’s.
10 There was an old daycare center, a bait shop and another use on the site.
11 Currently it is residential with two rentals on the property, but adjacent to
12 the Kountry Korner parcel. Hanson is the person petitioning the
13 community to get his property included. The Fall property, represented by
14 Chuck Iromonger. This property has some commercial historic
15 significance. It has an Unclassified Use Permit. While the owner believes
16 this still applies, he has not acted on it for a number of years. It was for a
17 70+-slot RV Park. They will be arguing that the property and its approved
18 use should be included in the George’s Corner boundaries.

19
20 Chair Nevins – Asked if any thought has been given to squaring off the
21 corner relative to the Hanson site. Possibly a Boundary Line Adjustment
22 so Hanson could control what commercial activity takes place next to their
23 residential portion.

24
25 Rice – The potential, usable area is very limited because they have
26 already had to use part of the site as a reserve area for a drain field
27 because the existing drain field failed. An easement has been provided to
28 them for part of the drain field on an adjacent property. Based on the
29 footprints of the site and the proposed widening of Miller Bay Road, the
30 usable portion of the property would be small, if any.

31
32 **Robert Waters**

33
34 Jenniges – Asked for the logic behind changing from Rural Protection
35 to Highway Tourist Commercial. If the City of Port Orchard is hurting
36 for building areas, this looks like a perfect spot for homes.

37
38 Coppola – Does not think this would be the best spot for homes
39 because of the high volume of traffic.

40

1 **Sedgwick Joint Venture**

2

3 Jenniges – Asked if the Bethel Sedgwick highway study is completed.

4

5 Rice – There are revisions in the Bethel Corridor Development Plan
6 currently undergoing acquisition for a potential start date of next
7 summer for Phase I of a three phase improvement plan. This was
8 adopted in 1999. Because it is a State highway, it will become a
9 limited access highway, based on the State’s lack of funding for
10 improvements necessary.

11

12 Jenniges – Here again there is Highway Tourist Commercial right
13 next to neighborhood. The County should expect this to be a
14 controversial issue.

15

16 Rice – In last year’s process, there were no complaints.

17

18 Mahan – Does not recall hearing a single complaint in last year’s
19 process on any of the South Kitsap site-specific requests.

20

21 **OLD BUSINESS**

22

23 **1. Final draft of amendments to the Planning**
24 **Commission By-laws**

25

26 Chair Nevins - addressed two changes under Conduct of Business.
27 The changes were reflecting the application of the Appearance of
28 Fairness doctrine and the voting procedure. For the Appearance of
29 Fairness it reads, “The Planning Commission will apply the
30 appearance of fairness doctrine in matters concerning a specific
31 parcel or a small group of parcels including individual site specific
32 zoning or tax status change requests.” For the voting procedure
33 change it reads, “A simple majority of a quorum for the transaction of
34 business but for recommendations to the Board of County
35 Commissioners and to the Department of Community Development, it
36 will be the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total
37 members of the commission.” Those were the only two changes
38 discussed at the previous Planning Commission meeting.

1
2 No further discussion being heard, a **motion** was made by John Ahl
3 and seconded by Dean Jenniges that the *Kitsap County Planning*
4 *Commission Rules of Procedure* be approved and adopted. **The**
5 **vote: Yes-7; No-0. Motion carried.**

6
7 **2. Planning Commission Guidelines for Effective Public**
8 **Testimony**

9
10 Planning Commission members will note any changes and give to
11 Chair Nevins to make edits.

12
13 **3. Planning Commission Findings of Fact for SKIA Criteria**
14 **for Determination of Land Use Process**

15
16 Eric Baker –SKIA findings were distributed at the previous Planning
17 Commission meeting. He is present to answer any questions the
18 Planning Commission members might have. He referenced the three
19 separate areas that the Planning Commission wanted to make
20 available for Industrial Park zoning. Additionally, he understood there
21 was some confusion regarding the wording used to describe the
22 inclusion of the three additional areas. On the map, he showed
23 everything within the SKIA boundary. 1) Everything within the SKIA
24 boundary north of State Highway 3, including the triangular parcel
25 belonging to the Port of Bremerton; 2) Stretch of 1500 feet from
26 Highway 3; and 3) Indicates a radius. The Port's suggestion was to
27 take a point east where runways connect and draw a 4500-foot radius
28 around that to include a future additional runway. This was calculated
29 by using the north runway and connecting it with the center line of
30 Highway 3, thus creating a radius from that point down 6200 feet to
31 the exact same area that the Port requested for inclusion (the site for
32 future hanger).

33
34 Ahl – A radius describes a full circle. What is showing is a sector.

35
36 Baker – Taking the full radius, this only applies to SKIA, the line
37 continues through SKIA and into other areas that allow Business Park

1 zoning. He agreed to change the word radius to a narrative
2 description.

3

4 Discussion continued on how to best word the description for the
5 reader's clear understanding.

6

7 Ahl – Asked what areas within the Port of Bremerton properties would
8 not be exempt from Master Planning and Baker showed the Planning
9 Commission on the SKIA map that the southeastern portion of the
10 Port's properties would still need to Master Plan.

11

12 Baker – Asked for approval subject to a wording change on criteria 3
13 from radius to a more accurate description.

14

15 Ahl – Suggested wording to read, "A sector of a circle described
16 from a pt 6200 feet south of the intersection running westward to
17 the centerline of the runway with reference to bullet in findings."

18

19 No further discussion being heard, a **motion** was made by John
20 Ahl and seconded by Mark Flynn that the Planning Commission
21 recommend approval of the Planning Commission's Findings of
22 Fact for SKIA Criteria for Determination of Land Use Process, subject
23 to the wording change listed above. **The vote: Yes-6; No-0;**
24 **Abstained-1. Motion carried.**

25

26 Chair Nevins explained that he abstained because he feels it puts
27 Master Planning effort in jeopardy. He was in opposition to the SKIA
28 plan in general because the original allocation was predicated on an
29 increase of manufacturing base from 3% to 9% over the next 15-year
30 period. Thinks that to be a bit optimistic and visionary but not
31 generally supported by any statistics of which he is aware. Also, sees
32 a plan that will take a very long time to be fulfilled and expects other
33 property owners in this classification to ask for a justifiable reason to
34 also be exempt from master planning. Therefore, he is opposed to
35 designating so much land exempt from master planning.

36

37 Mark Flynn – Asked for typo change on line 4 of number 7.

38

1 **NEW BUSINESS**

2

3 Laura Ditmer – Introduced Betty Capehart a new Long Range
4 Planner III. Betty will be assigned to the Chico watershed planning
5 process and Community Planning with the Suquamish Plan.

6

7 **OTHER BUSINESS**

8

9 **11:50 AM - No other business being heard, a motion was made by**
10 **Monty Mahan and seconded by John Ahl that the meeting be**
11 **adjourned. The Vote: Yes-7; No-0. Motion carried.**

12

13 **Exhibit No. Description**

14

- 15 A. June 15, 2004 Agenda
- 16 B. Kitsap County Planning Commission Rules of Procedure
- 17 C. Planning Commission Guidelines for Effective Public Testimony
- 18 D. Legal Notice for June 15, 2004 Planning Commission meeting

19

20 **MINUTES approved this ____ day of _____, 2004.**

21

22

23

24

25 _____
Tom Nevins, Chair

26

27

28

29 _____
Planning Commission Secretary

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41