

# MINUTES

## KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION June 22, 2004

---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at  
7 the Eagle's Next Conference Center, 1195 Fairgrounds Rd, Bremerton,  
8 Washington 98311. Members **Present:** Tom Nevins, John Ahl, Monty  
9 Mahan, Deborah Flynn, John Taylor and Dean Jenniges. **Not Present:**  
10 Michael Gustavson, Lary Coppola and Mark Flynn Staff Present: JoAnn  
11 Vidinhar, Laura Ditmer, Jason Rice, Dave Greetham, Stephanie  
12 Pawlawski, Betty Capehart, Angie Silva, Greg Cioc, Travis Black and Holly  
13 Anderson, Secretary.

14  
15 A. Chair Nevins Called the Meeting to Order and made  
16 introductions

### 17 18 Old Business

19  
20 Stephanie Pawlawski, Department of Community Development staff,  
21 distributed responses to questions the Planning Commission asked at  
22 the previous work/study relative to George's Corner LAMIRD.  
23 Regarding the Bjarnson acreage total, the larger southern portion is  
24 7.38 acres and the staff proposes 7.04 acres. Also presented the  
25 1990 housing and population information vs. the same information for  
26 2004, for a five-mile radius around the intersection. Included as well  
27 are the notes from the George's Corner Boundary Advisory Group  
28 (BAG) meetings as requested.

### 29 30 B. WORK STUDY

- 31  
32 1. **Growth Management Act (GMA) Compliance**  
33 **The Washington State GMA (RCW 36.70A.130)**  
34 **requires Kitsap County to review, and if needed, revise**  
35 **the comprehensive plan and implementing**  
36 **development regulations to ensure compliance with**  
37 **the GMA.**  
38

1 JoAnn Vidinhar briefed the Planning Commission on Kitsap County's  
2 compliance review for the GMA. RCW 36.70A.130 requires Kitsap  
3 County to review, and if needed, revise the Comprehensive Plan and  
4 development regulations to insure compliance with the GMA before  
5 December 1, 2004. To assist local governments in evaluating if  
6 adopted plans and development regulations comply with the GMA,  
7 the Washington State Office of Community Development developed a  
8 checklists as a technical tools. Staff utilizes these checklists,  
9 included in the Planning Commission documents, and identified  
10 seven areas where review and analysis is needed. In addition to the  
11 seven areas, two additional items were requested by the public during  
12 the County's public participation process in March. The fact that  
13 these items are being reviewed and analyzed does not mean that the  
14 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan and development regulations are  
15 not in compliance with the GMA. The Act in Washington has been  
16 amended several times since its adoption in 1990. In addition to these  
17 amendments, the County further analyzed new laws, changed  
18 circumstances and current State Hearings Board's decisions in  
19 performing its compliance review. The County's review and analysis  
20 review is completed and is part of the record. Staff proposes  
21 revisions and amendments to five of the areas, with no action  
22 required for the remaining. These are all outlined in the staff report.

23

24 Dean Jenniges – Since the GMA allows, following analysis and  
25 review, UGAs to be extended, he asked if this has been done for Port  
26 Orchard, Central and North Kitsap.

27

28 Vidinhar – Those are still under review because the County's Comp  
29 Plan became validated in 1999, it has until as early as 2008 to  
30 complete the review the boundaries. She told Commissioner  
31 Jenniges that Invalidity was based on several issues not available to  
32 explain today.

33

34 Deborah Flynn – Asked if development regulations something that  
35 follows later or is it part of the GMA compliance process.

36

37 Vidinhar – This process will amend the Comp Plan. The development  
38 regulations such as the Critical Areas Ordinance, will be presented to

1 the Planning Commission later this year, before the December  
2 deadline. It is on a separate track but will be together as the Comp  
3 Plan amendment process.

4  
5 John Ahl – Noted a spelling error on page 6 of the staff report. The  
6 third paragraph under “Analysis of Siting of Essential Public  
7 Facilities.” He also asked about Policy 5.3 on page 7 of the staff  
8 report, regarding location of essential public facilities relative to urban  
9 centers. It discusses “. . .schools and libraries that generate  
10 substantial travel demand to be located in designated centers or if not  
11 feasible to do so, along or near major transportation corridors and  
12 public transportation routes.” He asked for further clarification on the  
13 issue of finding suitable land for schools that even without this type of  
14 constraint, is very difficult. He questioned if this is implemented,  
15 might make siting even more difficult in the future.

16  
17 Vidinhar – Intent is not to hinder siting of schools. The intent is to  
18 recognize the Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) designated  
19 centers for essential public facilities. Kitsap County designated  
20 centers include Manchester, Bremerton and Silverdale. Others such  
21 as Keyport are currently under review.

22  
23 Deb – Referenced policy wording in staff documents about locating  
24 schools where there is population concentrated but not necessarily in  
25 urban centers but in neighborhoods where there is rapid growth.  
26 Does the language mean that regional schools such as junior  
27 colleges should be Located in centers?

28  
29 Vidinhar – The way in which essential facilities are defined in the  
30 GMA, staff needs to look at both regional centers and population and  
31 needs of the school districts. Staff can review policy to make sure it  
32 does not hinder siting process once regulations are implemented.

33  
34 John Taylor – Is it correct that churches now only be located in  
35 Business General zones.

36

1 Vidinhar – Not true. Churches are allowed in Residential zones. That  
2 is not part of GMA compliance. Again, not looking to prohibit siting of  
3 church. Like schools, churches are allowed in residential areas.

4

5 Jenniges – Understands that schools use a demographic outlook on  
6 where growth occurs in certain areas and then attempt to purchase  
7 land in these areas. Is this restricted at all in the current Comp Plan?

8

9 Vidinhar – No, it is not.

10

11 Chair Nevins – On page 10, asked for definition of acronym TIP, and  
12 was told it stands for Transportation Improvement Project. Next on  
13 page 12, at bottom, it references ACR for AADT/C Ratio. Is capacity  
14 ratio a ratio in itself? Is it dividing the average annual daily traffic by a  
15 ratio? Vidinhar will get an answer for him.\*

16

17 D. Flynn – The policy referenced earlier is in “How Your Tax Dollars  
18 Subsidize Sprawl.”

19

20 Vidinhar – This is an analysis from a public comment forum.

21

22 D. Flynn – It goes on to say, “Encouraging high quality schools in  
23 existing communities will promote compact communities and  
24 discourage poorly managed sprawl.” Questions if this is counter to  
25 the policy language stating schools will be located in centers.

26

27 Ahl – Understands first hand the difficulty in siting schools. Asked  
28 that staff consider that finding suitable properties that meet  
29 demographic requirements for any new school in the future in Kitsap  
30 County is going to be very difficult. Also, page 12, item B, second  
31 paragraph discusses, “. . . reviewing Comprehensive Plan and  
32 development regulations” refers to the absence of required or  
33 potentially desired contents. Thinks that is what staff ultimately  
34 attempts to do in the policy language. He asks if staff also looks for  
35 unnecessary contents.

36

37 Vidinhar – Definitely.

38

1 Ahl – Page 14, Reasonable Measures. Understands these are  
2 included as potential items to be looked at in the future and are not in  
3 the Comp Plan regulations.

4  
5 Jenniges – Citizens will complain about where schools are sited.  
6 Requested no constrictions be placed on location of schools in the  
7 Comp Plan.

8  
9 **2. 2004 SITE SPECIFIC REQUESTS**

10  
11 • **Royal Valley LLC-George Minder Co.**

12  
13 Dave Greetham – Department of Community Development staff,  
14 explained why this application will not be considered in this year's  
15 process. The same amount of staff environmental review for adverse  
16 impacts is required for all applications before issuing a SEPA  
17 determination and forwarding to the decision makers. If there are  
18 likely to be environmental impacts on a proposal, then staff must  
19 require and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that accompanies  
20 the application through the decision-making process. The information  
21 is provided regarding what specific impacts are on the project and  
22 ways to mitigate those impacts. Because of the timing of preparing  
23 and EIS, this application cannot be included with the remaining 2004  
24 site-specific requests. The applicant has appealed staff's decision to  
25 require an EIS and the appeal hearing will be in July. The decision  
26 on this appeal will be either late July or early August. A copy of the  
27 appeal can be found in the staff reports. SEPA is not an implied  
28 denial but a tool to assist in the decision.

29  
30 Jenniges – In evaluating and classifying streams, are migratory  
31 patterns considered as well as water levels and number of fish.

32  
33 Greetham – They are classified based on the channel width and  
34 gradient. If there is a man-made blockage, it can be corrected, it is  
35 not downgraded. If blockage is natural such as a waterfall prohibiting  
36 fish from going upstream, the stream goes down in the rating system.

37

1 Jenniges – Had questions regarding salmon habitat in streams  
2 located on this site. Greetham will get Commissioner Jenniges this  
3 information on stream classification.

4

5 • **White-Lueck**

6

7 Jason Rice - Reviewed the application noting the property is in the  
8 northern portion of Kingston UGA. The parcel size is 19.14 acres  
9 comprised of two parcels. The current Comp Plan designation for  
10 these two parcels is Rural Residential, one home per five acres. Last  
11 year, the Kingston community went through a SubArea Plan and  
12 integrated EIS process. This property and others in the area are  
13 contained within a proposal identified as Alternative D for SEPA  
14 purposes. The applicant was not party to that process and is  
15 applying this year for a site-specific rezone. The application meets  
16 the criteria in the resolution for submittal. The request is for Urban  
17 Medium or Urban High Residential. It is located next to areas located  
18 as Urban Medium within the Kingston UGA and are currently served  
19 by sewer and water. These are available to be extended further north  
20 to the proposed site. There are some environmental constraints on  
21 the parcel. The applicants have prepared an initial report on some of  
22 the on-site wetlands and staff has performed an on-site inspection to  
23 verify accuracy of the wetlands. Some constraints would limit  
24 development on this property if it is approved and included in the  
25 UGA as proposed.

26

27 Jenniges – Asked about statement that there is a minor critical area  
28 on the extreme west portion of the subject property.

29

30 Rice - Staff asked for additional supplemental report to address this  
31 issue. A Wetland Report from Wildermood & Associates is attached  
32 in the application packet. Staff provided findings and analysis.  
33 Based on these findings, staff recommends denial and deferral since  
34 Kingston went through the SubArea Planning process last year and  
35 this area was considered for the additional population allocation for  
36 the interim 2017 period. Staff thought it would be more appropriate to  
37 wait for the 2025 populations numbers are available and until the  
38 revised Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) is completed to

1 determine if currently used methodology is appropriate. If there are  
2 any changes to that, it would be applied to the Kingston area and this  
3 application could receive a more favorable recommendation in next  
4 year's Comp Plan Amendment (CPA) process.

5

6 Ahl – When will the new population allocation be available?

7

8 Rice - Late July, early August, after this years deliberations.

9

10 Jenniges – Asked questions concerning wetlands on the site,  
11 proposal being for reasonably priced homes, distance from sewers,  
12 and square footage for average house, the housing dollar value and  
13 whether development proposed is considered high density. (Sewers  
14 are approximately 200 feet away).

15

16 Rice – Kingston contains a good mix of densities and development  
17 types. There are areas upwards near 10-12 homes per acre adjacent  
18 to the proposal. Apartments are coming into the town of Kingston.  
19 Relatively, this area is surrounded by single-family homes on larger  
20 parcels of land. The predominant zoning is Rural Residential, one  
21 home per five acres, except for existing grandfathered lots.

22

23 Chair Nevins - Aerial photos not quite up to date. Maps are from  
24 2001.

25

26 Rice – At this point, the applicant is trying to develop an  
27 understanding of what they are considering as it relates to the type of  
28 development to propose. Staff provides analysis on what potentially  
29 could occur based on environmental constraints, availability of  
30 infrastructure, etc. but not on cosmetic appearances of structures.  
31 Currently Planning Division of Department of Community  
32 Development would step into the picture at that point with permit  
33 approval. This application is not out of character, it is just outside  
34 process from last year. It is a timing-related issue. Process needs to  
35 be followed.

36

37 Rice – Told Commissioner Jenniges that citizens are made aware of  
38 the timeframe issue. Notification is given regarding requirements

1 established under the resolution process, what timeframe and  
2 financial requirements are and that the possibility that approval might  
3 not be recommended by staff. He said the Planning Commission will  
4 probably be receiving a letter from the Kingston Advisory Committee.  
5 A presentation was made for them the first Wednesday in June on  
6 properties in this years CPA process that are in their community.

7  
8 Greetham – Provided the initial analysis of the wetlands report on this  
9 application. Staff found less wetlands on this site than the  
10 consultant’s report makes it slightly more favorable for development  
11 that the initial report indicates. The applicant was provided an  
12 opportunity to submit an updated report.

13  
14 D. Flynn – Clarified that Kingston has just been allocated a certain  
15 amount of population to determine where the UGA boundaries are.  
16 There is another piece on the other side of Kingston that also wants  
17 to be included in the UGA. All of this needs to be looked at together,  
18 not parcel by parcel.

19  
20 Ahl – The piece referenced above is a large parcel to the south that  
21 should be looked at in conjunction with any others, such as White-  
22 Lueck. The key is revision to the UGA based on revised population  
23 allocations worked out by the cities and the County.

24  
25 Jenniges – Referenced a statement about Kitsap County currently  
26 reviewing its Land Capacity Analysis and that based on permit data, it  
27 is growing at a higher rate than anticipated. Thinks this is  
28 inconsistent with UGA intent unless the UGA itself is extended to  
29 encompass that growth.

30  
31 Rice – That is a general statement, not specific to this particular site-  
32 specific application. In response to D. Flynn’s comment, the other  
33 large parcel would be a type of competing interest situation.

34  
35 Jenniges – Thinks expansion of the UGA depends on current  
36 population demand, not necessarily because of competing interests.  
37 If no land is available, the situation is self-limiting.

1 Ahl –UGA boundaries are expanded not from current demand but  
2 from projected growth. In the Kingston UGA, the point is there is a  
3 large parcel of land looking at Urban Reserve designation that needs  
4 to be carefully considered in the event the population numbers  
5 indicates an expansion of the UGA is needed. Kingston went through  
6 a long deliberation process last year that fit the projection that was  
7 determined at that time.

8

9 Rice – Clarified that the County’s Transportation staff is present to  
10 answer any questions the Planning Commission members might on  
11 that element of the applications. He also noted that all site-specific  
12 applications zoning changes as well as land use proposals. The  
13 cover page will reflect that as well.

14

15 • **Global Investments-Kitsap Transit**

16

17 Rice - reviewed the application in combination with Kitsap Transit.  
18 The property is located within the Central Kitsap unincorporated UGA.  
19 The site is 11.74 acres in size. Current zoning and land use is Urban  
20 Restricted Residential, one home per five acres, depending on the  
21 presence of critical areas. The request for rezone and re-designation  
22 is to Highway Tourist Commercial. The actual parcel size for the  
23 rezone and land use change is two acres of the 11.74-acre parcel.  
24 Applicant has supplemented throughout the application references to  
25 a Transit Oriented Development (TOD). However, staff is  
26 recommending denial and deferral for two reasons. 1) Kitsap County  
27 does not have adequate policy language contained within its  
28 Transportation and Land Use section regarding TOD. 2) Specificity  
29 in development regulations needs to be considered that are  
30 associated with these types of developments, which the County  
31 currently does not have. Staff notes throughout report and findings  
32 that this is something the County would support if the above  
33 referenced elements in place before receiving this application. Staff  
34 also identified the transit portion of this development could move  
35 forward on the remaining acreage contained within the Urban  
36 Restricted portion of the property that is not being considered for a  
37 rezone, but the applicant wants to pursue the entire request. Again  
38 the proposal is for two acres that would be provided for at the

1 entrance of the TOD. It is recognized in the Transit Facility Plan as  
2 such and is one of the areas the applicant would look to for providing  
3 transit facilities for commuters in the Bremerton/Silverdale areas.  
4

5 Jenniges – Read from staff report, “Proposed amendment will not  
6 likely affect the level of service (LOS) of the transportation system of  
7 entire county.” In addition, regarding natural resources, “This site is  
8 very close in proximity upstream to a major salmon restoration project  
9 at Glud’s Pond.” He asked for comments from staff on these  
10 statements.  
11

12 Rice – Staff analyzes whether or not the County’s LOS would be  
13 impacted. On any project, staff prepares a determination on impacts  
14 of traffic generation on the current LOS for Kitsap County.  
15

16 Chair Nevins – LOS also has to do with traffic in and out of this  
17 particular site.  
18

19 Discussion continued about traffic impact and LOS criteria.  
20

21 Travis Black – Kitsap County Transportation staff, clarified that the  
22 LOS for the County is a countywide standard. There is no specific  
23 LOS for specific roadways. An accumulative look is taken at all the  
24 roads in the County. If this proposal goes forward, the LOS for the  
25 County would not be violated or exceeded. The statement read by  
26 Commissioner Jenniges does not address the benefits of a park and  
27 ride facility.  
28

29 John Taylor – Stated for the record that this location has been  
30 identified as a possible bridge site and ferry terminal to Bainbridge  
31 Island in the future.  
32

33 Black – in Kitsap Transit’s Transit Plan, the site has been identified as  
34 a location for approximately 100 spaces for the 2009 to 2020 as a  
35 park and ride facility in Kitsap Transit’s long range plan.  
36

1 Jenniges – Read from staff report on page 8, paragraph 8, and “The  
2 proposal will not materially affect adequacy of urban services.” This  
3 tells him, once again, the facility is not needed.

4

5 Chair Nevins – Explained criteria being read by Commissioner  
6 Jenniges to mean that this particular item does not materially effect it,  
7 therefore it is not a blocker, just something to be considered in staff’s  
8 analysis.

9

10 Rice – The statement says that the proposal will not adversely affect  
11 or affect the current availability and usage of the existing urban  
12 facilities. It will not create any adverse impact preventing staff from  
13 approving what is being proposed.

14

15 Ahl – Thinks this is the first time he has seen staff recommend denial  
16 based on absence of government development regulations. Seems  
17 odd since there are other park and ride facilities throughout the  
18 County.

19

20 Rice – Staff is recommending denial of the proposal that is a  
21 conversion of two acres from Urban Restricted to Highway Tourist  
22 Commercial. As indicated in the staff report, the proposal for a park  
23 and ride facility can go forward under the Conditional Use process as  
24 currently allowed in the Code for public facilities.

25

26 Monty Mahan – Questioned how long it would take to implement the  
27 needed development regulations mentioned above by Rice that are  
28 currently not in place.

29

30 Rice – During Kitsap Transit’s pre-application meeting, their  
31 representatives were anticipating developing some language for  
32 consideration. Staff has not received this to date. At this time staff is  
33 focused on GMA compliance and application. New policy language is  
34 not in Department of Community Development’s work plan for this  
35 year.

36

1 Mahan – Asked if this application was approved for the new zoning  
2 and land use designation, would the option then be available for any  
3 commercial development and was told that is correct.

4

5 Rice – The Transit Facility Plan does not have TOD language in the  
6 Plan yet. They do have designated areas where they would like to  
7 provide at least the element contained in the park and ride facility, not  
8 commercial or residential development.

9

10 D. Flynn – Asked what kind of development would a TOD allow as  
11 opposed to Highway Tourist Commercial.

12

13 Rice – This is where you get into defining based on the permitted use  
14 table.

15

16 D. Flynn – In the applicant's proposal they call it a TOD not  
17 commercial development. They are making a distinction between  
18 what they want and what would normally be permitted in Highway  
19 Tourist Commercial.

20

21 Taylor – In the future if Highway Tourist Commercial zoning is  
22 approved, it would move commercial development from the traffic  
23 signal at Fairgrounds Road to the traffic signal at Glud's pond.

24

25 Rice – During a discussion with Commissioner Jenniges about the  
26 size, shape and previous structures on the property, Rice said that  
27 Darryl Piercy from Kitsap Transit assumed there were two parcels  
28 because it was divided by Highway 303. However, according to the  
29 Assessor's records, it is still tied together under one Assessor  
30 account number.

31

32 • Lindsey

33

34 Rice reviewed the application stating the applicant is requesting 40  
35 acres currently adjacent to the Silverdale UGA, be rezoned and re-  
36 designated from Rural Residential to Urban Low Residential, five to  
37 nine homes per acre. Adjacent zoning is also zoned Urban Low  
38 Residential and contains existing urban types of densities and

1 development with infrastructure in the form of sewer and water. The  
2 applicant provided information as to why they believe this is an  
3 appropriate expansion of the UGA. Staff has provided findings that  
4 further show inconsistencies with future planning efforts scheduled to  
5 take place beginning next year. Staff is therefore recommending  
6 denial and deferral to the Silverdale SubArea planning process. The  
7 reasons are similar to those discussed with the White-Lueck  
8 application.

9

10 Rice – With regard to ingress and egress for the proposal, he is  
11 unsure if the applicant has identified the entrance and exit points at  
12 this time. This issue usually needs to be worked out with neighboring  
13 properties. In addition, some topography issues need to be worked  
14 out.

15

16 Ahl – Noticed applicant reduced the net acreage from his original  
17 proposal. Asked if this can be done without rezoning the entire tax  
18 parcel. Can it be singled out and identified as the new request.

19

20 Rice – Originally, staff came to the same conclusion as with the Royal  
21 Valley application that it may require an EIS if it went forward as 120  
22 acres. After discussion with the application, it was determined that  
23 the size and scale of the proposal would be reduced to 40 acres to  
24 avoid the EIS process.

25

26 Taylor – Can the Silverdale UGA be expanded?

27

28 Jason – With proper findings it is possible but recent case law is  
29 challenging this issue.

30

31 Rice – Told the Planning Commission that the aerial photos were  
32 taken in June 2001.

33

34 Rice – Told Commissioner Jenniges that the Emery Ridge  
35 development has sewer service. It runs up Newberry Hill Road to the  
36 Klahowya Middle School. The Health District would most likely  
37 require this proposal to connect.

38

1 Rice – Told Commissioner Mahan that densities in the developments  
2 to the north and west are almost four homes per acre for Emery  
3 Ridge. Proposal is similar to what is occurring in McCormick Woods.

4  
5 Taylor – There is industrial development adjacent to Newberry Hill.

6  
7 Rice – From the original proposal, it indicates the overall intent is to  
8 connect these parcels together and provide multiple access points but  
9 to serve development that would occur in this area. Future goals can  
10 be assumed as provision of interconnected road systems and  
11 infrastructure to support future development.

12  
13 Greg Cioc – Transportation Planner for the Department of Public  
14 Works, said the Newberry Hill railroad crossing is slated for a gate  
15 within next year or two. If the application were approved, the  
16 developer would have to provide some mitigation through SEPA.  
17 Sewer is available on Chico way. The issue will be capacity to pump  
18 it to the Central Kitsap plant. This is in the Capital Improvement  
19 Project for sewer group now.

20  
21 D. Flynn – Discussed with Cioc the County’s desire to create friendly,  
22 walkable communities. The subdivisions in and around this proposal  
23 look like separate accesses. Hoping for more policies in the Comp  
24 Plan to discourage isolation and encourage more connectivity.

25  
26 Cioc – The County does have policies that try encourage  
27 interconnection. He would strongly encourage walking paths  
28 especially since it is close to schools. There is a policy in the Comp  
29 Plan to strongly encourage, but no incentives are provided. KRCC’s  
30 Countywide Planning Policies are looking at the same thing.

31  
32 Laura Ditmer – When looking at the different SubArea Plans, ULID #6  
33 for example, staff can put policy in requiring pedestrian walkways and  
34 trails. However, countywide, there is no requirement. This will be  
35 looked at closely to implement connection on more of a community  
36 scale.

37

1 D. Flynn – Asked if the Com Plan has a policy requiring a  
2 development of 40 acres to leave some easements so that when the  
3 next development comes in there can be connectivity. Not talking  
4 about connectivity within one development. Talking about multiple  
5 developments connecting with each other. If not required up front,  
6 there could be a house in the way when the time comes for  
7 interconnecting with the next development.

8  
9 Chair Nevins – Commented that even when a connection area is pre-  
10 arranged, history shows that if you do not open it up right away,  
11 people will complain that their children play in that area and they do  
12 not want it opened.

13

14 D. Flynn – This is why stronger policies are needed, not just  
15 recommending or encouraging.

16

17 Cioc – Problems occur when asking a new development to connect  
18 with an existing development with no trails or walkways. It creates a  
19 path to nowhere.

20

21 Discussion:

22

23 Jenniges – Concerns about ingress/egress, who owns the adjacent  
24 property, a step process occurring with authorizing high residential  
25 and strain on road capacities.

26

27 • Lewis

28

29 Jason reviewed the application stating it is in the South Kitsap UGA  
30 adjacent to Staples at the Lund and Bethel intersection. The proposal  
31 is for a rezone and re-designation from Urban Low Residential to  
32 Highway Tourist Commercial within the Bethel Corridor Plan. Staff is  
33 recommending approval with support from the City of Port Orchard.  
34 The area has negligible impacts on population. It does provide for  
35 additional employment opportunities within the current UGA  
36 boundary. This is one of the goals established in the Comp Plan.

37

1 Taylor – Asked Rice to show site on the aerial map and identify other  
2 structures in area.

3

4 Rice – Told the Planning Commission that the old site is a leased  
5 facility next to Starbucks, available for another tenant once it is  
6 vacated.

7

8 Mahan – Discussed the commercial aspect of interconnections and  
9 how staff will provide for this to avoid having drives all along the  
10 corridor.

11

12 Rice – The applicant was asked meet design guidelines of the Bethel  
13 Corridor Plan by working with Staples to share access.

14

15 Mahan - Since Staples is a pre-existing development, they would not  
16 be required to share access if they do not want to. He asked if staff  
17 can plan for a future connection on the east boundary of this site.

18

19 Cioc – This can be done through the site planning process. Land use  
20 issues might include buffers being required between commercial and  
21 residential.

22

23 Dean – Assumes future access right of way will be considered as part  
24 of development approval.

25

26 Rice – Also asked applicant to look at utilizing three or four parcels  
27 and providing one access for all but the applicant has no interest at  
28 this time for expansion.

29

30 Mahan - Encouraged that as site development takes place, that  
31 some provision is made for internal access to the east.

32

33 Cioc – They can be required to do a right in, right out configuration.

34

35 Jason – Staff cannot assume that this entire area will be Highway  
36 Tourist Commercial because there are apartments as buffers  
37 between zonings.

38

1 Ahl – Asked if any development has occurred supporting the  
2 concepts of the Bethel Corridor study. Has any development  
3 occurred supporting the concepts.

4

5 Rice – Noted a new proposal under construction south of an old mini  
6 storage facility and the Chevron station and Fred Meyers.

7

8 Ahl – The original design was to not have a non-strip development  
9 appearance.

10

11 Cioc - Walmart agreed to continue with engineered zones and are  
12 building the access road that would conceivably be an extension of  
13 Kathy Avenue.

14

15 Rice - Upcoming discussion on another application will be discuss t  
16 further the issue of achieving the goals of the Bethel Corridor Plan.

17

18

19 • **Cara Land Co.- Flaherty**

20

21 Jason reviewed the application as being 20.0 acres in South Kitsap,  
22 currently zoned Urban Reserve and requesting zoning and re-  
23 designation of Business Park or Industrial. This has been under  
24 discussion for some time relative to trying to find means for Flaherty  
25 to expand his fabrication business. Currently he employs 40 people  
26 and wants to expand his business. The current operation is  
27 contained within the City of Port Orchard's Industrial Park. The  
28 proposal he presents attempts to extends outside of the City into the  
29 County's jurisdiction. The site is located in a designated joint  
30 planning area and if approved, he would annex into the City and  
31 continue the expansion and land use application process through the  
32 City. The City has voiced support for this application. Staff identified  
33 necessary findings to support this application in that it is creating jobs  
34 and employment opportunities. It is already served by sewer and  
35 water and already has access. They will probably negotiate  
36 additional access points within the business park for safety issues.  
37 One difference between this one and other similar requests is that  
38 this is an existing business, not speculative. In addition, with zoning

1 approval, they intend to expand to offer even more jobs and a positive  
2 impact on the economy.

3

4 Rice explained the statement requiring 969 square foot per employee  
5 is the standard for industrial space. It is a State requirement.

6

7 Chair Nevins - If this application goes forward to site planning, would  
8 staff look at the connectivity issue between this piece and the next  
9 one. Cook Road and Old Clifton could easily be connected.

10

11 Rice – Explained that this was discussed with the City’s Engineer and  
12 because this proposal already has access onto an internal access in  
13 the Business Park that accesses onto Old Clifton Road.

14

15 Pawlawski– Talked with owner of the Port Orchard Industrial Park  
16 and he supports including this property as part of the Industrial Park  
17 but mentioned that when he developed the Park, he was not allowed  
18 access off Cook Road. Access will be within industrial park which  
19 accesses onto old Clifton Road.

20

21 Black – The parcels do currently have access off Cook Road so it  
22 would not be a factor in this rezone to take away that access. Staff  
23 would encourage access off Industrial Park road. Cook Road is  
24 mostly residential and would change the character of that  
25 neighborhood.

26

27 Chair Nevins – Looking at treating both this application and the next  
28 one equal. Should require it to access off Old Clifton.

29

30

31 • **Binns**

32

33 Jason reviewed the proposal stating it is much the same as the Cara  
34 Land Co.-Flaherty proposal. This is for a parcel 7.5 acres in size,  
35 currently designated Urban Reserve and requesting Industrial. The  
36 property is within the JPA with the City of Port Orchard. It is subject  
37 to the SubArea Plan and integrated EIS process as is Flaherty.

38 Staff’s conclusions and findings are for denial and deferral and

1 inclusion in the joint planning process. The one element different  
2 from the Flaherty proposal is that this is not an immediate expansion  
3 of a business.

4  
5 Jenniges – Questioned why not zone all this area Industrial to  
6 encourage business to avoid a potential systematic application  
7 process. Thinks deferral and denial adds to the process.

8  
9 Rice – This is why staff is recommending deferral so this type of  
10 application goes through the SubArea planning process.

11  
12 Rice - Wherever the UGA boundaries are established there will be  
13 service, access, and environmental impacts in all areas on a site-by-  
14 site and accumulative basis.

15  
16 Chair Nevins – There are now 3,000 acres of expansion and  
17 industrial area justified on a three-fold increase in percentage of  
18 industrial type workers the County will have in the next 10 years.  
19 Understands staff's reluctance and Jenniges' concern over delay,  
20 there is the GMA that planning must comply with.

21  
22 Ahl – Thinks this will draw criticism at the public hearing not only for  
23 the different recommendations between Flaherty and Binns but from  
24 the 2003 deferred applicants.

25  
26 Discussion continued about the joint planning efforts between the  
27 County and the cities.

28  
29 • **Home Depot**

30  
31 Jason reviewed the application stating that the applicant is requesting  
32 extension of Commercial zoning and land use for an additional 2.17  
33 acres of two parcels 7 acre in size. They want to adjust the current  
34 commercial boundary to align with the northern parcel, currently  
35 zoned Commercial to create adequate size to accommodate future  
36 development. The 2.17 acres is currently Urban Medium Residential,  
37 10 to 18 homes per acre with a request to Highway Tourist  
38 Commercial. This would reduce the size of potential medium density

1 apartment type development to the remaining almost five acres. This  
2 would also result in and require an expansion to the Bethel Corridor  
3 Plan and related development requirements. The proposal would add  
4 new employment opportunities and displace some minor population  
5 numbers that could be accommodated in the future Port Orchard  
6 SubArea planning process.

7

8 Taylor – Asked for clarification of structures on the aerial photo.

9

10 Rice – The boundary running north south would be moved to the  
11 east.

12

13 Discussion continued regarding markings on the aerial photo and  
14 what they represent.

15

16 Rice – Commercial zoning by-sects the property with Commercial on  
17 the back portion and Residential on the front. The request would  
18 allow Commercial development on the front.

19

20 D. Flynn – Asked if this involved a Boundary Line Adjustment.

21

22 Rice – No. This takes two parcels already split by zoning and moving  
23 the zoning further east to expand the Commercial zoning and reduce  
24 the Urban Medium.

25

26 Taylor – Asked if Home Depot tried several years ago to locate a  
27 facility in South Kitsap.

28

29 Jason – Not sure but staff is recommending approval of this  
30 adjustment.

31

32 Chair Nevins – Department of Community Development provided the  
33 Planning Commission with a spreadsheet with room for notes on the  
34 side. He would like to proceed in the order on the spreadsheet at the  
35 June 29 public hearing beginning with George's Corner. At the July  
36 6 public hearing on Phase II, would also like to proceed in order  
37 shown on spreadsheet. He then read off the staff recommendations  
38 for Phase II. White-Lueck, denial/deferred; Global, denial/deferred;

1 Lindsey, denial/deferred; Lewis, approved; Cara Land, approved;  
2 Binns, denial/deferred; Home Depot, approved.

3

4 Rice – For the 2003 deferrals, recommendation is to maintain same  
5 position to defer to the Port Orchard planning process.

6

7 Jenniges declared for the record that he is a member of Mason  
8 County Farm Bureau.

9

10 **New Business**

11

12 **Other Business**

13

14 **(11:30 AM) No further business being heard, a motion was made by**  
15 **John Ahl and seconded by Dean Jenniges that the meeting be**  
16 **adjourned. The Vote: Yes-6; No-0. Motion carried.**

17

18 **Exhibit No. Description**

19

- 20 A. Planning Commission Agenda for June 22, 2004
- 21 B. Memorandum from Laura Ditmer regarding George's Corner
- 22 questions
- 23 C. BAG notes from April 14, 2004 meeting
- 24 D. 2004 GMA Compliance staff report
- 25 E. Legal notice for June 22, 2004 Planning Commission meeting

26

27 MINUTES approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2004.

28

29

30

31

32

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Nevins, Chair

33

34

35

36

\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Secretary