
A. Vice Chair Deborah Flynn called the meeting to Order and introduced the Planning Commission members present.

Minutes of October 11, 2005

A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by John Ahl that the October 22, 2005 minutes be approved. THE VOTE: Yes-8; No-0. Motion carried.

This is a public hearing to consider an update to the Suquamish Sub-area Plan.

- Vice Chair Flynn –Explained to the audience that the Planning Commission is a volunteer group of citizens appointed by the Board of County Commissioners and is holding a public hearing tonight on the Kingston and Suquamish Sub-area Plans. The Planning Commission’s job is to listen to oral testimony and possibly ask questions. Following this, the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners that will ultimately make the final decision. She also limited the testimony to 5 minutes per person based on the number of citizens wishing to speak.

Albert Williams – Suquamish Sub-area Plan was completed in 1999 because of some stormwater and transportation issues that were
mitigated via an emergency ordinance. This ordinance committed
staff to complete the Sub-area Plan. The Plan was completed in one
year with a requirement to review again within five years. The five-
year deadline ends in December of 2005. Since there was no
population allocation or expansion of the Urban Growth Area (UGA),
the Plan has nothing but textural changes in it. This is an update,
without current Assessor data, from 1999 to 2005 and however some
of the 1999 data is still contained in the language of the Plan.
However, wastewater, water usage and other items for public
infrastructure were updated as the upgrades became available.
Kingston is a UGA and was given a population allocation in 2004.
Based on the population allocation, the original Plan that was
completed in 2003 required that staff come back and review the Plan.
Based on the Updated Land Capacity Analysis, Kingston was
approximately 2,000 people short. Land use requests were reviewed.
The Arborwood proposal was Urban Reserve. Through the review
process, a preferred alternative was selected. This can be found in
the Plan.

Scott Diener, Community Planning Division Manager, added that in
April the Board of County Commissioners adopted Resolution 79-
2005 that identified a number of 2005 Comprehensive Plan docket
items. Two of those items were the Suquamish and Kingston Sub-
area Plans. It is important to note is that staff ran out of time this
year. Staff does feel that even with the shortage of time, both plans
appear to be solid. It is important to comply with the direction of
management and the Board to complete adoption of the Plans by
year end and be adopted as part of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan
Amendments. He noted that if there are any additional comments
beyond this evening’s hearing, these comments can be submitted to
the Board prior to its hearing on December 13, 2005 at the Kingston
Community Center.

- Dean Jenniges – Has many questions. Should he asked them
  now or wait until after the public testimony is heard. He was
  advised by Vice Chair Flynn that his questions should be asked
  following public comments.

- John Ahl – Asked when the Planning Commission was
  expected to deliberate and was told by Diener that it was
  expected the Planning Commission would deliberate tonight at
the close of public testimony. That both Plans were quite solid and should not be accompanied by too much deliberation. He also said it was unfair to the communities involved to carry these plans over to 2006. These documents are legislative tools that the citizens can use to garnish support for their projects. It is also anticipated that the Board will be taking the same stand on December 13, 2005. He noted that any disagreement expressed is relative to process and not the plans themselves.

- Jenniges – Can find nothing indicating the make-up of the members of the working groups and asked if the Tribes were represented. He assumed there were both tribal and non-tribal members.

- Frank Mahaffay – Expressed concern about enough time to deliberate and formulate a recommendation.

- Vice Chair Flynn opened the floor for public comment.

Bruce Goodrich – County staff and citizens did a wonderful job working through this process. The only problem is that they were a little rushed for time. He thanked various staff members for their assistance. One problem is that there is no overt community support that it is basically just the committee’s recommendations that are being brought forward tonight. The members of the Suquamish Tribe have been very helpful. One issue of concern is the traffic now being channeled through Suquamish coming from Hansville and Indianola. Because of this, a huge traffic increase has occurred. This is a subject the committee was unable to address because there were no counts available to use. He has however received some counts tonight from Greg Cioc. He would like to have some idea of where the community stands in terms of impact. Finally he felt the committee was a good one and is hoping the Plan will be a useful tool.

- Lary Coppola – Asked if the Suquamish Tribe was represented at every committee meeting.

Goodrich – They were there and were very helpful.
• Dean Jenniges – Noticed that transportation is addressed significantly throughout the Plan. Asked if Goodrich was still not satisfied.

Goodrich – There is some mitigating procedures mentioned but the Committee wants some historical data on the volume of traffic besides mitigating suggestions.

Cioc – Staff has a model of Suquamish and will run a model showing how the traffic works in downtown Suquamish. From there staff is looking at another option that includes one-way traffic.

• Jenniges – The Plan addresses traffic quite well.

Cioc – Through the Committee, much analysis was accomplished on mitigation measures. Believes Goodrich is asking staff to model downtown traffic flows, this can be done and will show how traffic passes through. This is a community that gets hit hard with traffic flow. Has promised this will be done by January.

• Jenniges – If the Planning Commission approve this Plan to go forward, the analysis continues on until completion.

Cioc – This is correct and it references a larger traffic study with State Highway 305.

• Jenniges – Wants to clarify the process on approval and the following activities.

Diener – Staff has been told by the Board of County Commissioners that minor changes can be addressed in the 2006 Plan process. The improvements may not be noted until the end of 2006.

• Jenniges – Just wants to make sure all concerns are addressed.

Diener – These Sub-area plans are fluid and dynamic and there will be opportunity for minor changes.

• Coppola – Asked Diener if the traffic concerns are not addressed then is not the Plan incomplete. If this is the case, why is this hearing being held?
Diener – Deferred to Cioc to determine if the information is complete. He summarized for Greg by stating staff has a good body of knowledge in the traffic issue, have costs identified for traffic improvements but the actual modeling of some of the downtown traffic volume has not been completed. Most of the information is there but it is not complete.

- Coppola – This must mean deliberations will be conducted on an incomplete plan.

Cioc – No. The mitigation measures that would come out of the modeling are in the plan. For instance, Public Works would like to model the one-way traffic flow that is in the plan. Everything in the plan came out of the community group discussions and he did not think any of the modeling to be done will change and make the plan incomplete at this time.

Goodrich – Agreed with Cioc’s statement that the committee is all in agreement. However, there was no data for the committee to review.

Gail Petranek – An employee of Suquamish Elementary as well as a volunteer for the safety patrol. Her number one concern was the lack of sidewalks for the students to use going to and from school. She presented letters written by students regarding their need for sidewalks. Specific concerns included: no sidewalks on Division, the main road in, or Park Street, a walkway created for the children to use on Geneva is usually filled with parked cars because there is no parking to speak of in Suquamish. This necessitates the school children to have to walk out into the street around the cars. School buses have to swing out into on-coming traffic in order to make a right-hand turn onto Park Street. Petranek is now stationed there to stop traffic to get the busses in and out of the school. Also in reverse, traffic has to be stopped at Geneva and Park so the busses can get out of the school area. This area is a 20-mph school zone yet cars go through there way too fast. The Suquamish Tribe is now ticketing at a frequent rate. Signs have been installed with the help of County staff. There is very low viability from Park to Geneva on the left side for traffic to exit. 37% of the school children at Suquamish ride a bus, the remainder walk to school or are driven to school. Traffic has increased due to many parents driving their child
or children to school because they do not feel the streets are safe. Petranek’s and the committee members’ goal is encourage the Safe Walk to School program through Washington State. Hopefully with Albert Williams and Greg Cioc’s help, some of the $74 million grant dollars can be accessed over the next 15 years. She believes by working together this can be accomplished.

- John Taylor – Asked what would be the optimum times to personally observe the traffic problems addressed by Petranek, and was told from 8:30-9:00 AM and again from 3:00-3:40 PM. Cioc and another County engineer have come and observed at these times.

- Jenniges – The Plan does address roads and shoulders, recommendations and transportation studies and establishes the fact that it is required relative to County rights-of-way. He is not sure of the solutions for these issues.

Petranek – A big problem in Suquamish is rights-of-way and utility poles that block the pathways and the ability to install sidewalks, pathways and bike paths.

- Jenniges – Noticed rights-of-ways when reading the plan and said that they are usually 40 feet wide on normally streets in small town areas and it also refers to utility poles, etc. blocking the rights-of-way.

Petranek – Recommended a new approach stating this is a safety issue because no one wants to give up their right-of-way. She believes this will happen partly because the community is working together to make Suquamish a safe place for the residents. She stated the plan satisfies all of her needs.

- Gustavson – Asked about chicanes or traffic slowing device. He asked if by installing these and making the lanes narrower, if this might not be more dangerous for the children.

Cioc – The problem has nothing to do with the chicanes but the need is to purchase more right-of-way and that the County has to maintain a safety buffer. The chicanes is just a possibility and not too popular with most people. The utility pole is an issue due to cost.
• Vice Chair – Asked that these kinds of conversations take place after the public hearing portion.

Joseph Petranek – A 6th grader and safety patrol at Suquamish Elementary asked for sidewalks to keep the students at his school safe. People don’t watch for the students, they just drive right through.

Eli Gordon – Most people stop but others drive right through. This is why sidewalks would be helpful so that students would be able to walk without fear of being hit by a car.

G. Petranek – Talked to the Suquamish police department yesterday and was told the Tribe has approved a blinking light on Geneva and Park. The police department is providing the funds for this light due to the safety issue. There are many out of state plates coming through the area and when she is out wearing her safety vest, these cars are not stopping or acknowledging the safety patrols assisting the students walking to and from school.

Niki Quester – With the Friends of Miller Bay and attended every meeting of the committee. She agreed with her fellow committee members that the transportation issue in Suquamish is very important. She also thought that preservation of the natural systems is even more important. Clean air and water is the basis for all life. The highest recommendation to come out of the Open Space Committee is the 200 acres off of Diamond Lane owned by the County known as Place of the Bear. She requested that the County continue to maintain ownership of this property and to place a conservation easement of these 200 acres. This land was acquired by the County in the 1930’s when the owners of the property could not pay their property tax. The land was put up for public auction, there were no bidders and the County has held onto it ever since. There are now people who want to purchase this property and she urged the County not to sell.

• Vice Chair Flynn – Asked Quester to identify the property on the map.
• John Ahl – Asked if the plan reference this property and she said it did.

• Jenniges – Asked if the Friends of Miller Bay sought out any grant funding to purchase this property. Suggested that would be the best way to keep it from developers.

Quester – As a member of both the Open Space Committee as well as the Friends of Miller Bay and it is the Open Space Committee that wants to keep it but feels they already own it through their county taxes.

Julia Smith – Trying to underline the plan and one of the reason participation at the meetings has been so low is because the faith in the County is low. The last plan, nothing was done. Felt this plan was pushed through and time was short. Still doesn’t understand what LAMIRDs are and what they get for development or if it has even been determined. This is definitely a work in progress. She wants a safe community with parks and safety. Always hearing Suquamish doesn’t have enough people.

• Jenniges – Asked Smith if she felt this document covers all issues, including LAMIRD.

Smith – Expressed concern over documents released dated November, 2005 and wants to be reassured that the Planning Commission has the most current document. More time would help but at the same time, Suquamish has many urgent issues needing to be addressed. Development inside the boundaries of a LAMIRD has not been determined. When asked if she believed it worthwhile for this plan to continue forward and is pleased to see the County and Tribe working together. As successes are experienced people will be more receptive.

• Gustavson – Had several observations to present. LAMIRDs are something fairly new, Manchester being one of them. He believes the success in Manchester is due mainly to a citizens’ group called the Manchester 42 and with that number of people it made an impression on the Board of County Commissioners. He encouraged the citizens of Suquamish to form an active
group to work together on their specific needs. Suquamish could benefit from a citizens’ council type of group.

- Coppola – Was a member of the Manchester 42.

Eli Gordon – Suquamish, wanted the Planning Commission to know there is a lot of energy in Suquamish. At least 100 residents showed up to express a desire for open spaces, more parks and noted that the plan contains innovative funding ideas. Also the plan provides a basis from which to work. She recommended that the Planning Commission approve the plan. She said that Place of the Bear is a goldmine and believes this type of property needs to be preserved for the future.

- Jenniges – Recommended the group reconvene and prioritize their wants and needs.

Gordon – The energy and desire is there and referenced existing facilities that are not adequate to provide the community with active and passive recreation areas. Much more is needed and the plan will facilitate that.

Tom Curley – Suquamish, at the last meeting consensus was reached to move this document forward for approval. They do not want it delayed until the end of 2006. Funding is needed but the document will allow for this to happen.

Kingston Sub-area Plan

Chair Flynn asked the Planning Commission members to save questions for staff until all those wishing to testify have had a chance to do so.

Brian Rotsten – Kingston, applied for zoning reclassification request for 10 acres west of and adjacent to the Kingston Meadows development, north of and adjacent to the Robinswood and Kingston Ridge apartments and south of and adjacent to the White-Luke property. The property is bound on two sides by the current UGA and on three sides by the Kingston Sub-area Committee’s proposed preferred alternative. He was asked to identify the parcel on the map provided. Both sewer and water are available to the ten acres and
the property is located within walking distance of both the Kingston downtown area and the Washington State Ferry terminal. A land use request for zoning change was submitted to be included in the UGA. The meeting was held on August 17, 2005. At that time there were no questions asked or any concern expressed. He was later told that his property was excluded due to tributary shown on the Critical Areas Ordinance map. He believes the Kingston Sub-area Committee erred in it decision since the Robinswood development is built across the tributary. The previous run-off no longer is a problem. Cluster development should allow for this property to be up-zoned. He listed reasons why he thought this property should be included in the Kingston Sub-area. This would provide up to 178 additional residences in the UGA.

- Coppola – Asked about grouping of the wetlands and about the affect of the new Critical Areas Ordinance if approved. He then asked Albert what category wetlands are on this property. Also he asked Albert the same question about passage of the Critical Areas Ordinance. All he is aware of is that there would be buffers along the creek on the property.

- Jenniges – Kingston Meadows also has the same creek running through it. He wanted to know the restrictions on that development.

- Mahaffay – Said the rationale used to deny this request makes no sense to him.

Suzanne Arness – Distributed copies of her presentation. She made a timely request in June to have her property included in the Kingston UGA. She is representing two parcels, hers that is 35 acres and A & A Tree Farms between her property and Pope’s Arborwood. Both are north of Arborwood. They are contiguous to the UGA on two sides. Clustering as Urban Cluster Residential would be better for the preservation of the landscape than Urban Restricted or Rural Residential. Arness added some clarifications subject to a possible appeal of the decision to exclude these properties. There are several laws and ordinance, Critical Areas Ordinance in particular, that would protect these properties. Sewer extensions and water hook-ups would be the burden of the purchaser. Including these parcels in the UGA would not create an added expense to the County rather having
public sewer and water available is an advantage to the County. The sensitivity of the properties creates a logical argument for placement in the UGA.

- Jenniges – Asked for specifics as to why the working group excluded her properties. He also asked how many homes could be placed on the property with clustering.

- Arness – It may be because of the slew located in the middle of her property. She has no plans at all at this point; the proposal was for future protection of the land. However, approximately 100 homes could be constructed by using the clustering method.

- Gustavson – He read from the Reasonable Measures relative to incentive such as home sewage treatment facilities that produce potable water, green roofs, net zero storm water.

Kent Berryman– Olympic Property Group (OPG) and a landscape architect, presented an exhibit for the Planning Commission’s review of the history of Arborwood that started out as 1,100 acres but eventually was determined that the land was too valuable and that timber was not its highest and best use. A park site of 431 acres was acquired by Kitsap County back in June. In 2003, the County placed an option on another 364 acres. This option is good until 2008. OPG has a vested application that was placed on hold to allow the Kingston Sub-area Plan process to be completed. The vesting allows for one dwelling unit per five acres. Consequently, the overall site density has been reduced from 1,100 down to 305 acre site.

Speaking to the request to change from Urban Low to Urban Cluster, he said it was to protect environmental restraints; steep slopes and wildlife corridor. A 104-acre greenway has been set aside for wildlife passage. OPG wants to cap it off at 765 units, just a little over five dwelling units per acre. UC has the same zoning density as UL but allows for other types of uses than UL. This zoning change seems appropriate based on 1993 goals and policies. What everyone seems to want is preservation of a quality life style and believes Arborwood’s presentation shows a good format for this.

- Mahaffay – Asked if the Kingston Community Council supported this and was told yes, in 1993 as part of the Urban
Reserve and part of the UGA but put on hold to complete the Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA).

- Ahl – Confirmed that Berryman was supportive of the Plan and not supporting change to the recommended plan.

- Jenniges – Questioned if OPG was actually seeking a zoning change rather than anything else.

Berryman – No, he was told that a zoning request should accompany a request to be included in the UGA based on the population allocation.

Steve Heacock – Kingston, co-chair of Kingston Citizen Advisory Committee (KCAC). Read into the record a letter addressed to the Board of County Commissioners regarding a statement by Cindy Baker, Department of Community Development Director, at a November 2, 2005 KCAC’s meetings. She stated that the County had submitted a proposed Kingston Sub-area Plan to the State and to the Planning Commission for recommendation. This was a surprise to all in attendance particularly the four committee members who had served on the sub-area planning work group. They had been told previously that they would have a copy of the plan made available to them for review two weeks before it was released to the public. KCAC were concerned about actions to be taken by the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners on the revised boundary for Kingston’s UGA. Of particular concern was the manner in which this plan was rushed through without review by the citizens of Kingston. Because of the above statement and following potential actions, the KCAC expressed its strong objection to the time line and that review of the Kingston Sub-area Plan is pushed back until after the first of 2006. While the Director stated that the County wished to complete work on this until 2005 in order to incorporate it into the 2005 Comprehensive Plan revisions. Baker gave no other justification for the above-stated actions. Heacock urged the Planning Commission not to rush their action on the Sub-area plan. The community does not have enough time to review something this significant and in conclusion, he requested the Planning Commission to remove the Kingston Sub-area Plan from the fast track it is currently on according to the Department of Community Development Director.
• Jenniges – Asked Heacock what parts of the plan he disagrees with.

Heacock – His concern is no with the plan it is with the process because the citizens of Kingston were only represented by a small number of people. Further, tonight is Kingston citizens’ first chance to voice any opinion. They were not excluded from the process but rather a number of different situations that caused the planning track to fail; for instance, change in County staffing creating a lack of continuity. There just wasn’t enough time to complete the plan in a timely manner.

• Mahaffay – Concerned about public participation and asked if Heacock did not agree with the proposal for expansion of the Kingston UGA. The majority of the group members understood they would be given ample time to review the plan before it even went to the public but this did not happen. The group wanted a chance to approve the plan prior to submittal to the Planning Commission.

Annie Humiston – Kingston, member of the Sub-area working group and the KCAC, gave a brief overview of the tasks the working group were given. One was to look at the community to determine if it was necessary to expand the UGA boundaries again since the Kingston Sub-area Plan was originally adopted. Given that the community was allocated an additional 3,135 bodies. Reasonable measures were reviewed, as were land use applications. Found that certain assumptions did not hold true. For instance, people were building more than one dwelling unit on a half acre waterfront lot; found that pieces of property in the Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) fell out without an explanation. For instance, why would a vacant parcel of land in downtown Kingston fall out of the equation for re-development? Since 1999, the group has been given 15 planners and three Department of Community Development Directors from the County. This is a serious problem at the County level. The current Department of Community Development Director told the citizens of Kingston there is no money for infrastructure but they needed to continue with their planning and the latest population allocation of 3,135 came from the community which is not true. This has been driven by large land owners. For just the current process, there have been three different planners since July. The work has been rushed,
no meeting summaries have been posted for reference and guidance at the next meeting and the group members have been asked to do work that she believes the County planners should have been doing. Since they only had to allocate for 3,135, not 6,000 bodies, all of the land requests to be included in the UGA are not needed. Humiston expressed concern that the planning group was told they would be able to see the rough draft prior to release to the State, something that did not happen. Also, the draft sent to the Planning Commission and the State is full of errors. Most of the drafts are fairly thick, except for the one left at the library for the public to view. That one has no maps. In summary, she said the draft is sloppy, incomplete and without an analysis of what each alternative will hold relative to the population number. If this plan is adopted as is she believes it will be a great disservice to the community and is not sure it will even hold up with the Growth Management Hearings Board. Albert Williams told the planning group that the reason Phase II is in the works is to get Arborwood included. She does not think a decision can be made on this incomplete document.

Pete DeBoer – Kingston, involved in many service organizations in town. As a group, the Kingston Stakeholders endorse the Kingston Sub-area Plan, Phase II, with Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative. He presented a document signed by some members of the Stakeholders group.

- Jenniges – Asked DeBoer his thoughts on Humiston’s testimony.

DeBoer – Worked on the plan for a long time and thinks it is a good one. There is never a perfect plan but Kingston needs to move forward with a plan in place.

Sonny Woodward – Kingston business owner and former resident, involved with many groups studying Kingston and its problems. He thinks Alternative 4, with the exception of the Arness property exclusion, is a very good plan. It satisfies many needs. He listed examples of activities that have taken place. In this time of flex for Kingston, the need is to stop studying the study and stop allowing a few people to manipulate the hard work that was put into this plan and micro-manage the town. The needs are many; parks, recreation facilities for the youth, completion of new high school and basically
move forward. He challenged the Planning Commission to move forward and work on Alternative 4.

Melissa Reynolds – Kingston, presented hand-out regarding .21 acre parcel on Kingston Loop Road. The applicant states that all properties within walking distance from the ferries should be zoned Urban Medium. All properties on Kingston Loop are currently zoned Urban Low and there are approximately 45 homes in the loop built around 1970. A well cared for neighborhood with an assortment of condos and apartments below the loop. There is no more land available in the Loop to develop therefore the applicant wants his single-family resident home rezone Urban Medium so that some time in the future he can demolish his house and build condos on the property. This will remove the neighborhood’s view plus be completely out of character with the surrounding homes. The loop needs to remain Urban Low. It would be short-sighted to include this parcel in the UGA.

• Gustavson – Asked if the previous plan shows that parcel as Urban Low or Urban Medium.

Reynolds – The entire loop is Urban Low. The neighbor’s name is Ralph Robinson.

Peter Brachvogel – Architect from Bainbridge Island, involved with the Stakeholders Group and with the planning and design process developed from a number of goals from the Phase II plan before the Planning Commission at this time. His firm was hired to develop the physical manifestation of what that plan might look like in terms of the development of the town. To do this, they developed two concentric rings side-by-side indicating seven minute walks that collide at the community center located where the street splits. The town is based on the two walking circumferences that would handle keeping the values as stated in the plan consistent throughout the development of the town as it grows. He asked Tom Waggoner to talk about how this group evolved.

Tom Waggoner – Kingston resident, first referenced a letter he presented from the Stakeholders Group and noting the long list of property owners’ names. Primarily these are properties along Main Street in Kingston and the discussion evolves around what the
owners see in the future for their property, what is their intent in the future for their property. There are approximately 20 property owners in the group that started out with six. This group has been a very positive step for Kingston. One thing they want to see happen is California Avenue extended through and completed. This street is in downtown Kingston. This would be a natural enhancement for traffic flow and to assist pedestrians at the same time. With his letter is a copy of a 1992 design study that references California Avenue.

Property owners engaged Brachvogel to focus on properties owned by the Stakeholders Group and at the same time, make downtown Kingston a healthy environment by enhancing the commercial area. Lastly speaking as a private citizen, he thinks the community owes Arborwood representatives a large thank you for the cooperative nature in which they downsized the development to meet the needs of the citizens and yet add numbers to the UGA. He also noted that this process has been going on for a very long time and if people wanted to attend tonight’s public hearing they could have.

Brachvogel spoke again about taking properties from members of the Stakeholders Group and knitting the code around them. The plan was to ultimately see how to effectively run both pedestrians and vehicles through the town safely.

- Ahl – Asked if this document was part of the Kingston Plan, Phase II and has it been presented the Kingston working group or County staff in any form and was told by Brachvogel, only to the Stakeholders Group. Ahl then asked if Brachvogel was proposing that the Kingston Sub-area plan be held up to include this plan and was told no, that the Stakeholders Group is endorsing the Kingston Sub-area plan and that this presentation is a follow-up.

- Gustavson – Asked if the Stakeholders group has had a chance to run the numbers on their plan. Brachvogel said they had run unit numbers and found they were in compliance but less so than the Sub-area plan before the Planning Commission tonight.

Brachvogel – A population study was not done, only for building mass of the mixed-use facilities.
• Coppola – Asked how many groups are involved with
  Kingston’s planning issues and was told three; Sub-Area work
  group, KCAC and the Stakeholders group.

Brachvogel – The Stakeholder Group is a private committee
comprised of property owners trying to accomplish things in
downtown Kingston. For instance, the California Avenue extension
is one project they want to get completed.

Dan Martin – Kingston, here to show his support for both the Sub-
area Plan and the Stakeholders work to make improvements to
downtown Kingston.

Dave Wetter – Kingston, a member of the Stakeholders Committee
and is very impressed with this committee’s commitment to both
growth and maintenance of a community. Consistent with that, he
also supports the Kingston Sub-area Plan, Alternative 4.

Betsy Cooper – Kingston, presented the Planning Commission with
photos commented that Draft 4 has serious inconsistencies and
omissions. Also, much of it is text lifted from the 2003 plan which
would be fine if that text presents analysis that supports the proposal
before the Planning Commission for 2,000 more people in Kingston.
Many of the sections used do not. Her basic comment was for the
Planning Commission members to take time, review the draft, and
see if the differences between each of the proposals are
understandable plus the ramifications for each of those alternatives.
The previous speaker from the Stakeholder Committee presented
new information to most Kingston residents who were unaware of the
progress the committee has made. She was also unaware that a
mixed-use development plan was done in Kingston. An interesting
part is that the ULCA, the underpinning for the entire plan, made a
number of assumptions and applied them to Kingston. In fact they
came up with no residential future density in Kingston and the
majority of the Kingston core generated no residential equivalent.
This forces the need to reach out and expand the UGA boundary.
That the ULCA analysis was skewed was a significant flaw in this
plan. Whether or not the draft Sub-area Plan should be held up and
not moved forward is another call. The pictures presented to the
Planning Commission members earlier are sites that a group
prepared a ground truthing exercise. These are sites that the County
states will not generate any development in Kingston. This, Cooper believes is not the case. The sites all have water view and are valuable parcels. She would also like to know how much population this will generate since the County says none. Another problem is the definition of the Arborwood project in each alternative is different. The zoning shows different from Urban Low to Urban Cluster. At the working group’s September meeting, the members were provided a new proposal for Arborwood. Not only were they proposing a new zoning designation, a development agreement with the County, a master planning process and defined the project as only residential, no commercial. These stipulations do not appear in the plan. There was some discussion of a development agreement but there were other components that would define the project and give some certainty to the residents of Kingston as to what was going to transpire in their community. This is another example why the document, draft 4, is potentially conflicting, incomplete and inaccurate in how it is presented. Not sure how the Planning Commission can even make a recommendation at this time. Finally, the Capital Facilities section, Chapter 8, describe fire equipment, EMS, law enforcement, public education, parks and water supplies, were all lifted from the 2003 plan. This can be fine if the analysis covers all the way to 2025 and covers the analysis for adding 2000 people. The analysis is not covered in the plan. To approve this would be to do so without any fiscal analysis. She suggested look back at the Stake holder’s plan that could work and be even better than the Arborwood project in total. Not sure why the County is in such a hurry. The basis for moving forward on this alternative is not complete. She showed the Planning Commission members a map showing potential development areas proposed by the County.

Robert Smiley – Kingston, also approves of the plan with the exception of the exclusion of the Arness property and the parcel on Lindvog as well as his property that he wants included in the UGA. He also re-submitted a copy of his re-class zoning request. He read portions of his letter, emphasizing the high points. His property is across the road from Kingston Junior High School where tonight’s meeting is being held. There is 5.2 acres in size and one behind it that is 10.25 acres. He sees an opportunity for performance based development or Urban Clustering development to meet the Kingston design studies. The properties are within walking distance of downtown Kingston. It is one and a half miles from downtown
shopping and the Washington State Ferries. The County just made major improvements to West Kingston Road with probably the anticipation of future growth. Sewer and water are currently available to the property. The back ten acres contains a Class II wetlands and has had a wetlands delineation prepared by Bob Wildermood. One of the major concerns of the working group was critical areas. There are several plans in place to protect the critical areas. These include the Critical Areas Ordinance and a development agreement with the County. He was in favor of inclusion of the Arness property stating they have been good stewards of the land. He addressed the types of developments that have taken place near schools. They all have residential housing nearby allowing the children to walk to school. The numbers are low for the UGA infill. As to environmental impact, he referenced Item 6, Reasonable Measures; sewer hook-up mitigates the impact. He closed by saying that his property meets all necessary needs and criteria to be included in the UGA.

David Kutz – Kingston, new to the process and reviewing the plan. He has reviewed it and thinks it is a very well thought out plan. He sees no reason to delay the recommendation on the plan and liked Alternative 4 with inclusion of some of the single properties described and presented tonight. He would not like to see the plan delay due to either over-analysis or just trying to keep everyone happy.

Walter Elliott – Kingston, a member of the working group and the KCAC as well as the subcommittee for parks, trails and open space. He specifically addressed Appendix L. This is the completion of a project passed to his sub-committee in the original plan. He urged the Planning Commission to consider sending this forward to the Board of County Commissioners, regardless of what is decided on the remainder of the plan since he believes is independent of the trails proposal. The trains plan is a broad plan that contains on and off road trails, recreation, schools and commuter type transportation. It is modeled after the Bainbridge Island’s non-motorized transportation plan. It has national recognition. There has been no objection voiced on this. It has been through an extensive public process and there is an opportunity cost to send this forward. One more year of delay is one more year of missed opportunity to get the trails project started. He used rights-of-way vacations as an example of property that could be held for future trail use. They are in the
process of planning for trails at various sites. He asked the Planning
Commission to consider allowing Appendix L to go forward with or
without the Kingston Sub-area Plan update.

- Vice Chair Flynn – Asked Elliott if the California extension
  consistent with the trails and open space. Needs shoulders for
  bikes and pedestrian.

Tom Coultas – Kingston, present tonight to give support for the
Kingston Sub-area Plan Update, Alternative 4 and submitted written
comment for the record detailing their support.

Cassy Quinn Peterson – Kingston, member of the working group.
Discussed Alternative 4 draft, also commented that the group did not
have a chance, as promised, to review the draft prior to public
release. The group worked very hard on this process. She has been
involved with the group since 1999. Being a member has helped
familiarize her with what the Kingston community stands for and
what they want to see happen to their town. Due diligence was given
to each individual property reclassification request. Alternative 4 as
presented and via a straw poll, was what the group agreed to bring
forward. There were serious concerns about each request that
Peterson described. Hope the Planning Commission receives a new
draft minus the errors and prepared in a more professional manner.

- Mahaffay – Relative to the rezone requests, he asked what
criterion was used in the group’s decision.

Peterson – The group looked at environmental concerns, at the total
number of housing units potentially possible on the sites, what it
would add to the goal number and the overall number.

- Mahaffay – He asked if they went to the lowest or highest
  number in that zone and was told the lowest.

Michael Kulish – Kingston, a member of the working group since
1999, shared concerns about the process. The members of the group
want to see the plan moved forward and the common thread was that
everyone was very interested in the future of Kingston. He said that
getting as close as the group did to reaching agreement speaks to
that dedication. His concerns however were the plan process, ULCA
and the Reasonable Measures. His committee was tasked with coming up with a new urban growth boundary that met the future population allocation. Unfortunately, his committee did not quite reach these goals, which is not reflected in the draft presented to the Planning Commission. The committee was told they would have a chance to review the draft plan prior to public release. He believed Williams made that promise in good faith but was not able to keep it. Kulish did not sign off on the plan. It was more than just a numbers game of picking lots on a map. This is unnecessary. What is needed is a plan that addresses the needs of the community. It doesn’t matter to him if every request on the map is included or whether the boundaries shrink. The goals need to be addressed but that was not done. This is due in part to the fact that the ULCA is partially flawed. It is horribly simplistic. He explained the process and criteria used to keep or eliminate properties. This is not a good process. Every property has a probability between 0 and 100 that it will or will not develop. This was not represented, rather only the low end was considered. This fact drove the group’s decision toward consideration of a boundary and not what the community should look like. Transportation, infrastructure or inclusion of public recreation and industrial areas (those things that drive a community) were left out of the analysis. Kingston is not just groups of houses. Another item he felt was left out of the process was any effective analysis of reasonable measures. It is unfair to ask the Planning Commission to make recommendations on an incomplete plan. He did not feel the group finished the task put before them and he has no interest in extending the process further. It is in everyone’s interest to attain certainty to allow the community to move forward. The Stakeholders group however showed the value of both certainty and a coordinated plan for all to work against. Kulish thinks it would be a disservice to move forward without clear resolution on many issues. For instance, the ULCA is not right and it would not be fair to stand back and say we are going to stand back and not deal with it. He does not recommend that. As representatives of the work group, he believes all members should be given the opportunity to actually sign off on the ULCA.

- Gustavson – He understands the frustration as the Planning Commission has to move forward when sometimes it doesn’t feel ready to do so. He asked if there are any fatal flaws if the plan moves forward as is.
Mahaffay – Concerned about defending a challenge. Further, a plan will never be implemented that pleases everyone.

Jenniges – The frustrations expressed about the ULCA is the same in every district. It is no more than a scientific wild guess process. However, there is a point in time when analysis has to end and the document moved forward.

Kulish – Believes there are employees on staff who could have produced a better document for a lot less money than was paid the consultant. This draft is elementary at best.

Robert J. Smiley – Kingston, He authored the Shoreline Master Program while working for Kitsap County and has supported the Planning Commission for years and was a member of the Housing Authority. Thinks with clarification of planning and zoning is needed for more comfort to the Kingston residents. State statutes require that the Comp Plan set forth a broad policy for the intended direction of growth and overall densities. The GMA encourages clustering which will be expanded as utilities and facilities are available; a time and money dependent factor. Limited by constraints of the terrenes and natural features that prevents building in certain areas and the environmental concerns must be additionally considered. The study plan is an elemental study when considering the maximum number of units and, in particular, parcels without considering all details. Therefore deriving numbers matched to acres to be eligible for inclusion in the UGAs he thinks is a game, if you will, or a planning tool. Citizens sometimes want to take this type of broad brush approach and drill down to more specifics. He thinks the wrong tool is being used. That when looking at acreage to build homes on, you factor in population and people per house, but cannot factor in other issues for instance while the land may be available it may not be developable. Additionally, while it might vacant and developable it might not be available. As to affordable housing, it is necessary to have a ready, available market for housing at various prices economical enough for lower income people to reside in, (a goal Kitsap County aspires to but has yet to achieve). To get down to that level, it requires accommodation of opportunities for growth and development plus multiple players to participate in providing housing at various markets. One weakness in Kingston is that the population
allocation is under the control of one developer yet there could be
other properties that could develop at a faster rate and be on the
market. He has no problem with including the additional properties
and that any issues can be resolved as the land use applications
move forward. Although he feels the same frustrations and
pressures relative to public involvement, it needs to be remembered
that the government is given the power to plan, not the citizens. The
public however is encouraged to provide input and participation.

Jon Rose – Olympic Resources, There are many groups to keep track
of in Kingston. This means there are many people who care about
the future of their community. He thinks the downtown effort is quite
remarkable. The process proposed in the Sub-area Draft 4 started
back in 1990 so it is difficult to hear people say there has not been
enough time given to it. His company has a had a chance to work
with staff and produce the current updated plan. In 1998 was not
allotted very much population with the understanding of getting it
passed and then revisit the issue of more people in the UGAs later.
In 1999, the Kingston Steering Committee process was started. He
went on to explain the options from no building to large
development. This was then studied based on a much larger UGA
than is presented tonight. The current UGA now being looked at in
EIS terms is a lesser included alternative. A much larger UGA was
studies 3-4 years ago. Alternative 4 today is much smaller. He
showed the map from 2002 that is literally the same today. Without
opening the Kingston Sub-area Plan up for review and update, there
was no way to use any alternative except B, the smaller expansion.
The Heritage Park was presented by Rose and in fact, already created
for the active recreation. As stated previously, the County has an
option to purchase the middle portion until 2008. If this doesn’t take
place, the lots will be zoned Rural Residential. Even without an
expanded UGA, Olympic Resources and been moving forward and
creating a vision. As to how this plan fit in the original plan, the
goals must be reviewed. The goals are made broad intentionally and
anyone can argue for or against them. In the Table of Contents,
Chapter 2, Major Concepts of a Sub-area, calls for accommodating an
appropriate share of urban growth. Additionally, preserve open
space and habitat areas; provide livable community, clustering and
urban design. Rose believed his development meets all of these
major concepts. These were also objective and qualitative goals that
were part of the working group’s process. Next he noted that
planning under the GMA is not an exact science. One can’t say for sure the exact number of homes or people occupying the homes. If one attempts to get too exacting in the GMA process, it is not reasonable. The important things to look for are thoughtful and reasonable planning for growth in the future. The reasonableness test is to ask the question, “Is this the best we can do?” The passage of the revised Kingston Sub-area Plan is just the beginning. There is still more EIS work, wetland studies, traffic reports. The citizens should take comfort in the amount of work that has been amassed over 14-15 years. Consistency for ULCA has been accomplished throughout the County. He noted the citizens still have another chance to comment before the Board of County Commissioners.

Alfredoquz Claro – Kingston, he attended the KCAG meetings and tried to understand the process. Wants to see this draft moved forward, make a decision and use this for a baseline and proceed with the plan. It is difficult to make decisions without good baseline and vision for the community. He and his wife do not want to see people priced out of the housing market. Claro wants to see the uniqueness of the County preserved and does not wish to see people forced out of the County because of high prices. People want to see a good plan.

• Vice Chair Flynn – Offered one more chance for people to speak. She asked that issues already addressed not be repeated.

Robert Smiley – Briefly commented that his property is not spotty and it is contiguous to the UGA. This is a stipulation KAP imposed on itself. Exclusion of this property would be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the UGA, GMA and the Kingston Sub-area Plan.

Annie Humiston – KAP has nothing to do with the Sub-area Plan it is the Sub-area Planning Committee that worked on individual property requests. She submitted all four drafts with corrections made. She would like to see the plan moved forward but not before all corrections are made, from grammar to analysis. It must be correct.

Tom Waggoner – Was president when the working group voted to adopt Draft 4 and thinks the vote was 8 for, 3 against.
Unidentified Person - The committee members need to remember this was a straw poll vote.

A motion was made by Michael Gustavson and seconded by Dean Jenniges that the public comment portion of the public hearing be closed. THE VOTE: Yes-8; No-0. Motion carried.

Vice-Chair said the public hearing is also closed to written comments. People can send comments to the Board of County Commissioners for its hearing.

- Vice Chair Flynn – Mentioned that the meeting had gone past the time scheduled and asked her co-commissioners what they would like to do. She reiterated that the Planning Commission was asked at the beginning of this public hearing to deliberate and make a recommendation tonight.

- Taylor – Asked that the Department of Community Development Director comment on how the Planning Commission is expected to complete this task is the timeframe requested.

Cindy Baker – Apologized for the rushed schedule. It was stated at the beginning of this year that both Suquamish and Kingston Sub-area Plan updates would be completed by the end of 2006. There is only one time each year that a Sub-area Plan can be opened up for review. If these are not completed before the end of 2005, both communities will have to wait another year until the end of 2006 for a plan to use to move forward with work to improve their quality of life. This information has been open to the public for a long time. The Board of County Commissioners will be holding its hearing on December 13, 2005. Baker said she needed their recommendation no later than December 3, 2005.

A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Michael Gustavson that the public hearing be continued to November 29, 2005 for deliberation and recommendation. THE VOTE: Yes-9; No-0. Motion carried.

10:35 PM - No further business being heard. A motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by John Taylor that the meeting be
adjourned. THE VOTE: For-8; Against-0. Motion carried unanimously the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED this ____day of _____________, 2005.

____________________________
Deborah Flynn, Vice Chair

__________________________
Holly Anderson Secretary

EXHIBITS:

A. Agenda for November 22, 2005 meeting
B. Letter dated November 22, 2005 from Suzanne Arness with duplicate and map
C. Sign-in sheet for Suquamish Sub-area Plan
D. Sign-in sheet for Kingston Sub-area Plan
E. Map of Arborwood with duplicate
F. Letter dated November 21, 2005 from Tom Waggoner
G. Photos submitted at public hearing November 22, 2005 by Betsy Cooper
H. Kingston Master Plan sketch
I. Kingston UGA/Arborwood – Planning Commission Hearing – November 22, 2006
J. Packet of letters in support of Suquamish Sub-area Plan from safety patrols in that area
K. Letter dated November 17, 2005 from Brian and Rhonda Rotsten, with attachments
L. Letter dated November 11, 2005 from Kingston Citizens Advisory Committee (KCAC)
M. Exhibit A – Proposed Arborwood UCR Zoning Articulations
N. Letter dated November 18, 2005 from the Kingston Stakeholders and signed by 11 members
O. Letter dated November 22, 2005 from Tom and Carri Coultas, with attachments
P. Zoning Request – Olympic Property Group’s Arborwood Project, Exhibit 2
Q. Email dated November 20, 2005 from Annie Humiston, et al, with written comments attached
R. Draft Kingston Sub-area Plan, library copy
S. Zoning Request – Smiley Property West Kingston Road
T. Legal notice for November 22, 2005 meeting