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

Old Business

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

B. WORK STUDY

1. Growth Management Act (GMA) Compliance
   The Washington State GMA (RCW 36.70A.130) requires Kitsap County to review, and if needed, revise the comprehensive plan and implementing development regulations to ensure compliance with the GMA.
JoAnn Vidinhar briefed the Planning Commission on Kitsap County’s compliance review for the GMA. RCW 36.70A.130 requires Kitsap County to review, and if needed, revise the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations to insure compliance with the GMA before December 1, 2004. To assist local governments in evaluating if adopted plans and development regulations comply with the GMA, the Washington State Office of Community Development developed a checklists as a technical tools. Staff utilize these checklists, included in the Planning Commission documents, and identified seven areas where review and analysis is needed. In addition to the seven areas, two additional items were requested by the public during the County’s public participation process in March. The fact that these items are being reviewed and analyzed does not mean that the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan and development regulations are not in compliance with the GMA. The Act in Washington has been amended several times since its adoption in 1990. In addition to these amendments, the County further analyzed new laws, changed circumstances and current State Hearings Board’s decisions in performing its compliance review. The County’s review and analysis review is completed and is part of the record. Staff proposes revisions and amendments to five of the areas, with no action required for the remaining. These are all outlined in the staff report.

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

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

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

Vidinhar – This process will amend the Comp Plan. The development regulations such as the Critical Areas Ordinance, will be presented to
the Planning Commission later this year, before the December
deadline. It is on a separate track but will be together as the Comp
Plan amendment process.

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

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

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

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

John Taylor – Is it correct that churches now only be located in Business General zones.
Vidinhar – Not true. Churches are allowed in Residential zones. That is not part of GMA compliance. Again, not looking to prohibit siting of church. Like schools, churches are allowed in residential areas.

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

Vidinhar – No, it is not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. 2004 SITE SPECIFIC REQUESTS

- Royal Valley LLC-George Minder Co.

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

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

Greetham – They are classified based on the channel width and gradient. If there is a man-made blockage, it can be corrected, it is not downgraded. If blockage is natural such as a waterfall prohibiting fish from going upstream, the stream goes down in the rating system.
Jenniges – Had questions regarding salmon habitat in streams located on this site. Greetham will get Commissioner Jenniges this information on stream classification.

- **White-Lueck**

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

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

Rice - Staff asked for additional supplemental report to address this issue. A Wetland Report from Wildermood & Associates is attached in the application packet. Staff provided findings and analysis. Based on these findings, staff recommends denial and deferral since Kingston went through the SubArea Planning process last year and this area was considered for the additional population allocation for the interim 2017 period. Staff thought it would be more appropriate to wait for the 2025 populations numbers are available and until the revised Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) is completed to
determine if currently used methodology is appropriate. If there are any changes to that, it would be applied to the Kingston area and this application could receive a more favorable recommendation in next year’s Comp Plan Amendment (CPA) process.

Ahl – When will the new population allocation be available?

Rice - Late July, early August, after this year's deliberations.

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

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

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

Rice – At this point, the applicant is trying to develop an understanding of what they are considering as it relates to the type of development to propose. Staff provides analysis on what potentially could occur based on environmental constraints, availability of infrastructure, etc. but not on cosmetic appearances of structures.

Currently Planning Division of Department of Community Development would step into the picture at that point with permit approval. This application is not out of character, it is just outside process from last year. It is a timing-related issue. Process needs to be followed.

Rice – Told Commissioner Jenniges that citizens are made aware of the timeframe issue. Notification is given regarding requirements
established under the resolution process, what timeframe and
financial requirements are and that the possibility that approval might
not be recommended by staff. He said the Planning Commission will
probably be receiving a letter from the Kingston Advisory Committee.
A presentation was made for them the first Wednesday in June on
properties in this years CPA process that are in their community.

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

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

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

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

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

Jenniges – Thinks expansion of the UGA depends on current
population demand, not necessarily because of competing interests.
If no land is available, the situation is self-limiting.
Ahl – UGA boundaries are expanded not from current demand but from projected growth. In the Kingston UGA, the point is there is a large parcel of land looking at Urban Reserve designation that needs to be carefully considered in the event the population numbers indicates an expansion of the UGA is needed. Kingston went through a long deliberation process last year that fit the projection that was determined at that time.

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

- **Global Investments-Kitsap Transit**

Rice - reviewed the application in combination with Kitsap Transit. The property is located within the Central Kitsap unincorporated UGA. The site is 11.74 acres in size. Current zoning and land use is Urban Restricted Residential, one home per five acres, depending on the presence of critical areas. The request for rezone and re-designation is to Highway Tourist Commercial. The actual parcel size for the rezone and land use change is two acres of the 11.74-acre parcel. Applicant has supplemented throughout the application references to a Transit Oriented Development (TOD). However, staff is recommending denial and deferral for two reasons. 1) Kitsap County does not have adequate policy language contained within its Transportation and Land Use section regarding TOD. 2) Specificity in development regulations needs to be considered that are associated with these types of developments, which the County currently does not have. Staff notes throughout report and findings that this is something the County would support if the above referenced elements in place before receiving this application. Staff also identified the transit portion of this development could move forward on the remaining acreage contained within the Urban Restricted portion of the property that is not being considered for a rezone, but the applicant wants to pursue the entire request. Again the proposal is for two acres that would be provided for at the
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entrance of the TOD. It is recognized in the Transit Facility Plan as such and is one of the areas the applicant would look to for providing transit facilities for commuters in the Bremerton/Silverdale areas.

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

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

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

Discussion continued about traffic impact and LOS criteria.

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

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

Black – in Kitsap Transit’s Transit Plan, the site has been identified as a location for approximately 100 spaces for the 2009 to 2020 as a park and ride facility in Kitsap Transit’s long range plan.
Jenniges – Read from staff report on page 8, paragraph 8, and “The proposal will not materially affect adequacy of urban services.” This tells him, once again, the facility is not needed.

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

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

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

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

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

Rice – During Kitsap Transit’s pre-application meeting, their representatives were anticipating developing some language for consideration. Staff has not received this to date. At this time staff is focused on GMA compliance and application. New policy language is not in Department of Community Development’s work plan for this year.
Mahan – Asked if this application was approved for the new zoning and land use designation, would the option then be available for any commercial development and was told that is correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Lindsey

Rice reviewed the application stating the applicant is requesting 40 acres currently adjacent to the Silverdale UGA, be rezoned and redesignated from Rural Residential to Urban Low Residential, five to nine homes per acre. Adjacent zoning is also zoned Urban Low Residential and contains existing urban types of densities and
development with infrastructure in the form of sewer and water. The applicant provided information as to why they believe this is an appropriate expansion of the UGA. Staff has provided findings that further show inconsistencies with future planning efforts scheduled to take place beginning next year. Staff is therefore recommending denial and deferral to the Silverdale SubArea planning process. The reasons are similar to those discussed with the White-Lueck application.

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

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

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

Taylor – Can the Silverdale UGA be expanded?

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

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

Rice – Told Commissioner Jenniges that the Emery Ridge development has sewer service. It runs up Newberry Hill Road to the Klahowya Middle School. The Health District would most likely require this proposal to connect.
Rice – Told Commissioner Mahan that densities in the developments to the north and west are almost four homes per acre for Emery Ridge. Proposal is similar to what is occurring in McCormick Woods.

Taylor – There is industrial development adjacent to Newberry Hill.

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

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

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

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

Laura Ditmer – When looking at the different SubArea Plans, ULID #6 for example, staff can put policy in requiring pedestrian walkways and trails. However, countywide, there is no requirement. This will be looked at closely to implement connection on more of a community scale.
D. Flynn – Asked if the Com Plan has a policy requiring a development of 40 acres to leave some easements so that when the next development comes in there can be connectivity. Not talking about connectivity within one development. Talking about multiple developments connecting with each other. If not required up front, there could be a house in the way when the time comes for interconnecting with the next development.

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

- Lewis

Jason reviewed the application stating it is in the South Kitsap UGA adjacent to Staples at the Lund and Bethel intersection. The proposal is for a rezone and re-designation from Urban Low Residential to Highway Tourist Commercial within the Bethel Corridor Plan. Staff is recommending approval with support from the City of Port Orchard. The area has negligible impacts on population. It does provide for additional employment opportunities within the current UGA boundary. This is one of the goals established in the Comp Plan.
Taylor – Asked Rice to show site on the aerial map and identify other structures in area.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jason – Staff cannot assume that this entire area will be Highway Tourist Commercial because there are apartments as buffers between zonings.
Ahl – Asked if any development has occurred supporting the concepts of the Bethel Corridor study. Has any development occurred supporting the concepts.

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

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

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

Rice - Upcoming discussion on another application will be discussing further the issue of achieving the goals of the Bethel Corridor Plan.

- **Cara Land Co.- Flaherty**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

• Binns

Jason reviewed the proposal stating it is much the same as the Cara
Land Co.-Flaherty proposal. This is for a parcel 7.5 acres in size,
currently designated Urban Reserve and requesting Industrial. The
property is within the JPA with the City of Port Orchard. It is subject
to the SubArea Plan and integrated EIS process as is Flaherty.
Staff’s conclusions and findings are for denial and deferral and
inclusion in the joint planning process. The one element different from the Flaherty proposal is that this is not an immediate expansion of a business.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Home Depot

Jason reviewed the application stating that the applicant is requesting extension of Commercial zoning and land use for an additional 2.17 acres of two parcels 7 acre in size. They want to adjust the current commercial boundary to align with the northern parcel, currently zoned Commercial to create adequate size to accommodate future development. The 2.17 acres is currently Urban Medium Residential, 10 to 18 homes per acre with a request to Highway Tourist Commercial. This would reduce the size of potential medium density
apartment type development to the remaining almost five acres. This would also result in and require an expansion to the Bethel Corridor Plan and related development requirements. The proposal would add new employment opportunities and displace some minor population numbers that could be accommodated in the future Port Orchard SubArea planning process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Nevins – Department of Community Development provided the Planning Commission with a spreadsheet with room for notes on the side. He would like to proceed in the order on the spreadsheet at the June 29 public hearing beginning with George’s Corner. At the July 6 public hearing on Phase II, would also like to proceed in order shown on spreadsheet. He then read off the staff recommendations for Phase II. White-Lueck, denial/deferred; Global, denial/deferred;
Lindsey, denial/deferred; Lewis, approved; Cara Land, approved; 
Binns, denial/deferred; Home Depot, approved.

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

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

**New Business**

**Other Business**

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