

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
November 22, 2005

The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Presidents Hall, 1195 Fairgrounds Rd, Bremerton, Washington 98311. Members Present: Deborah Flynn, Tom Nevins, John Ahl, Lary Coppola, Dean Jenniges, Frank Mahaffay, John Taylor and Mike Gustavson. Members not present: Monty Mahan. Staff Present: Greg Cioc, Cindy Baker, and Planning Commission Secretary Holly Anderson.

DRAFT
9:00 AM

- 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

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

19
20 Scott Diener, Community Planning Division Manager, added that in
21 April the Board of County Commissioners adopted Resolution 79-
22 2005 that identified a number of 2005 Comprehensive Plan docket
23 items. Two of those items were the Suquamish and Kingston Sub-
24 area Plans. It is important to note is that staff ran out of time this
25 year. Staff does feel that even with the shortage of time, both plans
26 appear to be solid. It is important to comply with the direction of
27 management and the Board to complete adoption of the Plans by
28 year end and be adopted as part of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan
29 Amendments. He noted that if there are any additional comments
30 beyond this evening's hearing, these comments can be submitted to
31 the Board prior to its hearing on December 13, 2005 at the Kingston
32 Community Center.

- 33
- 34 • Dean Jenniges – Has many questions. Should he asked them
35 now or wait until after the public testimony is heard. He was
36 advised by Vice Chair Flynn that his questions should be asked
37 following public comments.
 - 38
 - 39 • John Ahl – Asked when the Planning Commission was
40 expected to deliberate and was told by Diener that it was
41 expected the Planning Commission would deliberate tonight at

1 the close of public testimony. That both Plans were quite solid
2 and should not be accompanied by too much deliberation. He
3 also said it was unfair to the communities involved to carry
4 these plans over to 2006. These documents are legislative tools
5 that the citizens can use to garnish support for their projects. It
6 is also anticipated that the Board will be taking the same stand
7 on December 13, 2005. He noted that any disagreement
8 expressed is relative to process and not the plans themselves.

9

- 10 • Jenniges – Can find nothing indicating the make-up of the
11 members of the working groups and asked if the Tribes were
12 represented. He assumed there were both tribal and non-tribal
13 members.
- 14
- 15 • Frank Mahaffay – Expressed concern about enough time to
16 deliberate and formulate a recommendation.
- 17
- 18 • Vice Chair Flynn opened the floor for public comment.

19

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

35

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

38

39 **Goodrich – They were there and were very helpful.**

40

1 • **Dean Jenniges – Noticed that transportation is addressed**
2 **significantly throughout the Plan. Asked if Goodrich was still**
3 **not satisfied.**

4
5 **Goodrich – There is some mitigating procedures mentioned but the**
6 **Committee wants some historical data on the volume of traffic**
7 **besides mitigating suggestions.**

8

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

12

13 • **Jenniges – The Plan addresses traffic quite well.**

14

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

20

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

23

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

26

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

29

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

33

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

35

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

38

39 • **Coppola – Asked Diener if the traffic concerns are not**
40 **addressed then is not the Plan incomplete. If this is the case,**
41 **why is this hearing being held?**

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

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 busses 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

1 or children to school because they do not feel the streets are safe.
2 Petranek's and the committee members' goal is encourage the Safe
3 Walk to School program through Washington State. Hopefully with
4 Albert Williams and Greg Cioc's help, some of the \$74 million grant
5 dollars can be accessed over the next 15 years. She believes by
6 working together this can be accomplished.

- 7
- 8 • John Taylor – Asked what would be the optimum times to
9 personally observe the traffic problems addressed by Petranek,
10 and was told from 8:30-9:00 AM and again from 3:00-3:40 PM.
11 Cioc and another County engineer have come and observed at
12 these times.
 - 13
 - 14 • Jenniges – The Plan does address roads and shoulders,
15 recommendations and transportation studies and establishes
16 the fact that it is required relative to County rights-of-way. He is
17 not sure of the solutions for these issues.
 - 18

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

- 22
- 23 • Jenniges – Noticed rights-of-ways when reading the plan and
24 said that they are usually 40 feet wide on normally streets in
25 small town areas and it also refers to utility poles, etc. blocking
26 the rights-of-way.
 - 27

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

- 33
- 34 • Gustavson – Asked about chicanes or traffic slowing device.
35 He asked if by installing these and making the lanes narrower, if
36 this might not be more dangerous for the children.
 - 37

38 Cioc – The problem has nothing to do with the chicanes but the need
39 is to purchase more right-of-way and that the County has to maintain
40 a safety buffer. The chicanes is just a possibility and not too popular
41 with most people. The utility pole is an issue due to cost.

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

- 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.

1 • **John Ahl – Asked if the plan reference this property and she**
2 **said it did.**

3
4 • **Jenniges – Asked if the Friends of Miller Bay sought out any**
5 **grant funding to purchase this property. Suggested that would**
6 **be the best way to keep it from developers.**

7
8 **Quester – As a member of both the Open Space Committee as well as**
9 **the Friends of Miller Bay and it is the Open Space Committee that**
10 **wants to keep it but feels they already own it through their county**
11 **taxes.**

12
13 **Julia Smith – Trying to underline the plan and one of the reason**
14 **participation at the meetings has been so low is because the faith in**
15 **the County is low. The last plan, nothing was done. Felt this plan**
16 **was pushed through and time was short. Still doesn't understand**
17 **what LAMIRDs are and what they get for development or if it has**
18 **even been determined. This is definitely a work in progress. She**
19 **wants a safe community with parks and safety. Always hearing**
20 **Suquamish doesn't have enough people.**

21
22 • **Jenniges – Asked Smith if she felt this document covers all**
23 **issues, including LAMIRD.**

24
25 **Smith – Expressed concern over documents released dated**
26 **November, 2005 and wants to be reassured that the Planning**
27 **Commission has the most current document. More time would help**
28 **but at the same time, Suquamish has many urgent issues needing to**
29 **be addressed. Development inside the boundaries of a LAMIRD has**
30 **not been determined. When asked if she believed it worthwhile for**
31 **this plan to continue forward and is pleased to see the County and**
32 **Tribe working together. As successes are experienced people will be**
33 **more receptive.**

34
35 • **Gustavson – Had several observations to present. LAMIRDs**
36 **are something fairly new, Manchester being one of them. He**
37 **believes the success in Manchester is due mainly to a citizens'**
38 **group called the Manchester 42 and with that number of people**
39 **it made an impression on the Board of County Commissioners.**
40 **He encouraged the citizens of Suquamish to form an active**

1 group to work together on their specific needs. Suquamish
2 could benefit from a citizens' council type of group.

3

- 4 • Coppola – Was a member of the Manchester 42.

5

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

14

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

17

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

22

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

27

28 Kingston Sub-area Plan

29

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

33

34 Brian Rotsten – Kingston, applied for zoning reclassification request
35 for 10 acres west of and adjacent to the Kingston Meadows
36 development, north of and adjacent to the Robinswood and Kingston
37 Ridge apartments and south of and adjacent to the White-Luke
38 property. The property is bound on two sides by the current UGA
39 and on three sides by the Kingston Sub-area Committee's proposed
40 preferred alternative. He was asked to identify the parcel on the map
41 provided. Both sewer and water are available to the ten acres and

1 the property is located within walking distance of both the Kingston
2 downtown area and the Washington State Ferry terminal. A land use
3 request for zoning change was submitted to be included in the UGA.
4 The meeting was held on August 17, 2005. At that time there were no
5 questions asked or any concern expressed. He was later told that
6 his property was excluded due to tributary shown on the Critical
7 Areas Ordinance map. He believes the Kingston Sub-area Committee
8 erred in its decision since the Robinswood development is built
9 across the tributary. The previous run-off no longer is a problem.
10 Cluster development should allow for this property to be up-zoned.
11 He listed reasons why he thought this property should be included in
12 the Kingston Sub-area. This would provide up to 178 additional
13 residences in the UGA.

- 14
- 15 • Coppola – Asked about grouping of the wetlands and about the
16 affect of the new Critical Areas Ordinance if approved. He then
17 asked Albert what category wetlands are on this property. Also
18 he asked Albert the same question about passage of the Critical
19 Areas Ordinance. All he is aware of is that there would be
20 buffers along the creek on the property.
21
- 22 • Jenniges – Kingston Meadows also has the same creek running
23 through it. He wanted to know the restrictions on that
24 development.
25
- 26 • Mahaffay – Said the rationale used to deny this request makes
27 no sense to him.
28

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

1 public sewer and water available is an advantage to the County. The
2 sensitivity of the properties creates a logical argument for placement
3 in the UGA.

- 4
5 • Jenniges – Asked for specifics as to why the working group
6 excluded her properties. He also asked how many homes could
7 be placed on the property with clustering.

8
9 Arness – It may be because of the slew located in the middle of her
10 property. She has no plans at all at this point; the proposal was for
11 future protection of the land. However, approximately 100 homes
12 could be constructed by using the clustering method.

- 13
14 • Gustavson – He read from the Reasonable Measures relative to
15 incentive such as home sewage treatment facilities that
16 produce potable water, green roofs, net zero storm water.

17
18 Kent Berryman– Olympic Property Group (OPG) and a landscape
19 architect, presented an exhibit for the Planning Commission’s review
20 of the history of Arborwood that started out as 1,100 acres but
21 eventually was determined that the land was too valuable and that
22 timber was not its highest and best use. A park site of 431 acres was
23 acquired by Kitsap County back in June. In 2003, the County placed
24 an option on another 364 acres. This option is good until 2008. OPG
25 has a vested application that was placed on hold to allow the
26 Kingston Sub-area Plan process to be completed. The vesting allows
27 for one dwelling unit per five acres. Consequently, the overall site
28 density has been reduced from 1,100 down to 305 acre site.

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

- 38
39 • Mahaffay – Asked if the Kingston Community Council
40 supported this and was told yes, in 1993 as part of the Urban

1 **Reserve and part of the UGA but put on hold to complete the**
2 **Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA).**

- 3
- 4 • **Ahl – Confirmed that Berryman was supportive of the Plan and**
5 **not supporting change to the recommended plan.**
 - 6
 - 7 • **Jenniges – Questioned if OPG was actually seeking a zoning**
8 **change rather than anything else.**
 - 9

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

13

14 **Steve Heacock – Kingston, co-chair of Kingston Citizen Advisory**
15 **Committee (KCAC). Read into the record a letter addressed to the**
16 **Board of County Commissioners regarding a statement by Cindy**
17 **Baker, Department of Community Development Director, at a**
18 **November 2, 2005 KCAC’s meetings. She stated that the County had**
19 **submitted a proposed Kingston Sub-area Plan to the State and to the**
20 **Planning Commission for recommendation. This was a surprise to**
21 **all in attendance particularly the four committee members who had**
22 **served on the sub-area planning work group. They had been told**
23 **previously that they would have a copy of the plan made available to**
24 **them for review two weeks before it was released to the public.**
25 **KCAC were concerned about actions to be taken by the Planning**
26 **Commission and the Board of County Commissioners on the revised**
27 **boundary for Kingston’s UGA. Of particular concern was the manner**
28 **in which this plan was rushed through without review by the citizens**
29 **of Kingston. Because of the above statement and following potential**
30 **actions, the KCAC expressed its strong objection to the time line and**
31 **that review of the Kingston Sub-area Plan is pushed back until after**
32 **the first of 2006. While the Director stated that the County wished to**
33 **complete work on this until 2005 in order to incorporate it into the**
34 **2005 Comprehensive Plan revisions. Baker gave no other**
35 **justification for the above-stated actions. Heacock urged the**
36 **Planning Commission not to rush their action on the Sub-area plan.**
37 **The community does not have enough time to review something this**
38 **significant and in conclusion, he requested the Planning Commission**
39 **to remove the Kingston Sub-area Plan from the fast track it is**
40 **currently on according to the Department of Community**
41 **Development Director.**

- 1 • Jenniges – Asked Heacock what parts of the plan he disagrees
2 with.

3
4 Heacock – His concern is no with the plan it is with the process
5 because the citizens of Kingston were only represented by a small
6 number of people. Further, tonight is Kingston citizens' first chance
7 to voice any opinion. They were not excluded from the process but
8 rather a number of different situations that caused the planning track
9 fail; for instance, change in County staffing creating a lack of
10 continuity. There just wasn't enough time to complete the plan in a
11 timely manner.

- 12
13 • Mahaffay – Concerned about public participation and asked if
14 Heacock did not agree with the proposal for expansion of the
15 Kingston UGA. The majority of the group members understood
16 they would be given ample time to review the plan before it
17 even went to the public but this did not happen. The group
18 wanted a chance to approve the plan prior to submittal to the
19 Planning Commission.

20
21 Annie Humiston – Kingston, member of the Sub-area working group
22 and the KCAC, gave a brief overview of the tasks the working group
23 were given. One was to look at the community to determine if it was
24 necessary to expand the UGA boundaries again since the Kingston
25 Sub-area Plan was originally adopted. Given that the community was
26 allocated an additional 3,135 bodies. Reasonable measures were
27 reviewed, as were land use applications. Found that certain
28 assumptions did not hold true. For instance, people were building
29 more than one dwelling unit on a half acre waterfront lot; found that
30 pieces of property in the Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) fell
31 out without an explanation. For instance, why would a vacant parcel
32 of land in downtown Kingston fall out of the equation for re-
33 development? Since 1999, the group has been given 15 planners and
34 three Department of Community Development Directors from the
35 County. This is a serious problem at the County level. The current
36 Department of Community Development Director told the citizens of
37 Kingston there is no money for infrastructure but they needed to
38 continue with their planning and the latest population allocation of
39 3,135 came from the community which is not true. This has been
40 driven by large land owners. For just the current process, there have
41 been three different planners since July. The work has been rushed,

1 no meeting summaries have been posted for reference and guidance
2 at the next meeting and the group members have been asked to do
3 work that she believes the County planners should have been doing.
4 Since they only had to allocate for 3,135, not 6,000 bodies, all of the
5 land requests to be included in the UGA are not needed. Humiston
6 expressed concern that the planning group was told they would be
7 able to see the rough draft prior to release to the State, something
8 that did not happen. Also, the draft sent to the Planning Commission
9 and the State is full of errors. Most of the drafts are fairly thick,
10 except for the one left at the library for the public to view. That one
11 has no maps. In summary, she said the draft is sloppy, incomplete
12 and without an analysis of what each alternative will hold relative to
13 the population number. If this plan is adopted as is she believes it
14 will be a great disservice to the community and is not sure it will even
15 hold up with the Growth Management Hearings Board. Albert
16 Williams told the planning group that the reason Phase II is in the
17 works is to get Arborwood included. She does not think a decision
18 can be made on this incomplete document.

19
20 Pete DeBoer – Kingston, involved in many service organizations in
21 town. As a group, the Kingston Stakeholders endorse the Kingston
22 Sub-area Plan, Phase II, with Alternative 4 as the preferred
23 alternative. He presented a document signed by some members of
24 the Stakeholders group.

- 25
26 • Jenniges – Asked DeBoer his thoughts on Humiston’s
27 testimony.

28
29 DeBoer – Worked on the plan for a long time and thinks it is a good
30 one. There is never a perfect plan but Kingston needs to move
31 forward with a plan in place.

32
33 Sonny Woodward – Kingston business owner and former resident,
34 involved with many groups studying Kingston and its problems. He
35 thinks Alternative 4, with the exception of the Arness property
36 exclusion, is a very good plan. It satisfies many needs. He listed
37 examples of activities that have taken place. In this time of flex for
38 Kingston, the need is to stop studying the study and stop allowing a
39 few people to manipulate the hard work that was put into this plan
40 and micro-manage the town. The needs are many; parks, recreation
41 facilities for the youth, completion of new high school and basically

1 move forward. He challenged the Planning Commission to move
2 forward and work on Alternative 4.

3
4 **Melissa Reynolds – Kingston, presented hand-out regarding .21 acre**
5 **parcel on Kingston Loop Road. The applicant states that all**
6 **properties within walking distance from the ferries should be zoned**
7 **Urban Medium. All properties on Kingston Loop are currently zoned**
8 **Urban Low and there are approximately 45 homes in the loop built**
9 **around 1970. A well cared for neighborhood with an assortment of**
10 **condos and apartments below the loop. There is no more land**
11 **available in the Loop to develop therefore the applicant wants his**
12 **single-family resident home rezone Urban Medium so that some time**
13 **in the future he can demolish his house and build condos on the**
14 **property. This will remove the neighborhood's view plus be**
15 **completely out of character with the surrounding homes. The loop**
16 **needs to remain Urban Low. It would be short-sighted to include this**
17 **parcel in the UGA.**

- 18
19 • **Gustavson – Asked if the previous plan shows that parcel as**
20 **Urban Low or Urban Medium.**

21
22 **Reynolds – The entire loop is Urban Low. The neighbor's name is**
23 **Ralph Robinson.**

24
25 **Peter Brachvogel – Architect from Bainbridge Island, involved with**
26 **the Stakeholders Group and with the planning and design process**
27 **developed from a number of goals from the Phase II plan before the**
28 **Planning Commission at this time. His firm was hired to develop the**
29 **physical manifestation of what that plan might look like in terms of**
30 **the development of the town. To do this, they developed two**
31 **concentric rings side-by-side indicating seven minute walks that**
32 **collide at the community center located where the street splits. The**
33 **town is based on the two walking circumferences that would handle**
34 **keeping the values as stated in the plan consistent throughout the**
35 **development of the town as it grows. He asked Tom Waggoner to**
36 **talk about how this group evolved.**

37
38 **Tom Waggoner – Kingston resident, first referenced a letter he**
39 **presented from the Stakeholders Group and noting the long list of**
40 **property owners' names. Primarily these are properties along Main**
41 **Street in Kingston and the discussion evolves around what the**

1 owners see in the future for their property, what is their intent in the
2 future for their property. There are approximately 20 property owners
3 in the group that started out with six. This group has been a very
4 positive step for Kingston. One thing they want to see happen is
5 California Avenue extended through and completed. This street is in
6 downtown Kingston. This would be a natural enhancement for traffic
7 flow and to assist pedestrians at the same time. With his letter is a
8 copy of a 1992 design study that references California Avenue.
9 Property owners engaged Brachvogel to focus on properties owned
10 by the Stakeholders Group and at the same time, make downtown
11 Kingston a healthy environment by enhancing the commercial area.
12 Lastly speaking as a private citizen, he thinks the community owes
13 Arborwood representatives a large thank you for the cooperative
14 nature in which they downsized the development to meet the needs
15 of the citizens and yet add numbers to the UGA. He also noted that
16 this process has been going on for a very long time and if people
17 wanted to attend tonight's public hearing they could have.

18
19 Brachvogel spoke again about taking properties from members of the
20 Stakeholders Group and knitting the code around them. The plan
21 was to ultimately see how to effectively run both pedestrians and
22 vehicles through the town safely.

- 23
24 • Ahl – Asked if this document was part of the Kingston Plan,
25 Phase II and has it been presented the Kingston working group
26 or County staff in any form and was told by Brachvogel, only to
27 the Stakeholders Group. Ahl then asked if Brachvogel was
28 proposing that the Kingston Sub-area plan be held up to
29 include this plan and was told no, that the Stakeholders Group
30 is endorsing the Kingston Sub-area plan and that this
31 presentation is a follow-up.
32
33 • Gustavson – Asked if the Stakeholders group has had a chance
34 to run the numbers on their plan. Brachvogel said they had run
35 unit numbers and found they were in compliance but less so
36 than the Sub-area plan before the Planning Commission
37 tonight.

38
39 Brachvogel – A population study was not done, only for building
40 mass of the mixed-use facilities.

41

- 1 • **Coppola – Asked how many groups are involved with**
2 **Kingston’s planning issues and was told three; Sub-Area work**
3 **group, KCAC and the Stakeholders group.**

4
5 **Brachvogel – The Stakeholder Group is a private committee**
6 **comprised of property owners trying to accomplish things in**
7 **downtown Kingston. For instance, the California Avenue extension**
8 **is one project they want to get completed.**

9
10 **Dan Martin – Kingston, here to show his support for both the Sub-**
11 **area Plan and the Stakeholders work to make improvements to**
12 **downtown Kingston.**

13
14 **Dave Wetter – Kingston, a member of the Stakeholders Committee**
15 **and is very impressed with this committee’s commitment to both**
16 **growth and maintenance of a community. Consistent with that, he**
17 **also supports the Kingston Sub-area Plan, Alternative 4.**

18
19 **Betsy Cooper – Kingston, presented the Planning Commission with**
20 **photos commented that Draft 4 has serious inconsistencies and**
21 **omissions. Also, much of it is text lifted from the 2003 plan which**
22 **would be fine if that text presents analysis that supports the proposal**
23 **before the Planning Commission for 2,000 more people in Kingston.**
24 **Many of the sections used do not. Her basic comment was for the**
25 **Planning Commission members to take time, review the draft, and**
26 **see if the differences between each of the proposals are**
27 **understandable plus the ramifications for each of those alternatives.**
28 **The previous speaker from the Stakeholder Committee presented**
29 **new information to most Kingston residents who were unaware of the**
30 **progress the committee has made. She was also unaware that a**
31 **mixed-use development plan was done in Kingston. An interesting**
32 **part is that the ULCA, the underpinning for the entire plan, made a**
33 **number of assumptions and applied them to Kingston. In fact they**
34 **came up with no residential future density in Kingston and the**
35 **majority of the Kingston core generated no residential equivalent.**
36 **This forces the need to reach out and expand the UGA boundary.**
37 **That the ULCA analysis was skewed was a significant flaw in this**
38 **plan. Whether or not the draft Sub-area Plan should be held up and**
39 **not moved forward is another call. The pictures presented to the**
40 **Planning Commission members earlier are sites that a group**
41 **prepared a ground truthing exercise. These are sites that the County**

1 states will not generate any development in Kingston. This, Cooper
2 believes is not the case. The sites all have water view and are
3 valuable parcels. She would also like to know how much population
4 this will generate since the County says none. Another problem is
5 the definition of the Arborwood project in each alternative is
6 different. The zoning shows different from Urban Low to Urban
7 Cluster. At the working group's September meeting, the members
8 were provided a new proposal for Arborwood. Not only were they
9 proposing a new zoning designation, a development agreement with
10 the County, a master planning process and defined the project as
11 only residential, no commercial. These stipulations do not appear in
12 the plan. There was some discussion of a development agreement
13 but there were other components that would define the project and
14 give some certainty to the residents of Kingston as to what was
15 going to transpire in their community. This is another example why
16 the document, draft 4, is potentially conflicting, incomplete and
17 inaccurate in how it is presented. Not sure how the Planning
18 Commission can even make a recommendation at this time. Finally,
19 the Capital Facilities section, Chapter 8, describe fire equipment,
20 EMS, law enforcement, public education, parks and water supplies,
21 were all lifted from the 2003 plan. This can be fine if the analysis
22 covers all the way to 2025 and covers the analysis for adding 2000
23 people. The analysis is not covered in the plan. To approve this
24 would be to do so without any fiscal analysis. She suggested look
25 back at the Stake holder's plan that could work and be even better
26 than the Arborwood project in total. Not sure why the County is in
27 such a hurry. The basis for moving forward on this alternative is not
28 complete. She showed the Planning Commission members a map
29 showing potential development areas proposed by the County.

30
31 Robert Smiley – Kingston, also approves of the plan with the
32 exception of the exclusion of the Arness property and the parcel on
33 Lindvog as well as his property that he wants included in the UGA.
34 He also re-submitted a copy of his re-class zoning request. He read
35 portions of his letter, emphasizing the high points. His property is
36 across the road from Kingston Junior High School where tonight's
37 meeting is being held. There is 5.2 acres in size and one behind it
38 that is 10.25 acres. He sees an opportunity for performance based
39 development or Urban Clustering development to meet the Kingston
40 design studies. The properties are within walking distance of
41 downtown Kingston. It is one and a half miles from downtown

1 shopping and the Washington State Ferries. The County just made
2 major improvements to West Kingston Road with probably the
3 anticipation of future growth. Sewer and water are currently available
4 to the property. The back ten acres contains a Class II wetlands and
5 has had a wetlands delineation prepared by Bob Wildermood. One of
6 the major concerns of the working group was critical areas. There
7 are several plans in place to protect the critical areas. These include
8 the Critical Areas Ordinance and a development agreement with the
9 County. He was in favor of inclusion of the Arness property stating
10 they have been good stewards of the land. He addressed the types
11 of developments that have taken place near schools. They all have
12 residential housing nearby allowing the children to walk to school.
13 The numbers are low for the UGA infill. As to environmental impact,
14 he referenced Item 6, Reasonable Measures; sewer hook-up
15 mitigates the impact. He closed by saying that his property meets all
16 necessary needs and criteria to be included in the UGA.

17
18 David Kutz – Kingston, new to the process and reviewing the plan.
19 He has reviewed it and thinks it is a very well thought out plan. He
20 sees no reason to delay the recommendation on the plan and liked
21 Alternative 4 with inclusion of some of the single properties
22 described and presented tonight. He would not like to see the plan
23 delay due to either over-analysis or just trying to keep everyone
24 happy.

25
26 Walter Elliott – Kingston, a member of the working group and the
27 KCAC as well as the subcommittee for parks, trails and open space.
28 He specifically addressed Appendix L. This is the completion of a
29 project passed to his sub-committee in the original plan. He urged
30 the Planning Commission to consider sending this forward to the
31 Board of County Commissioners, regardless of what is decided on
32 the remainder of the plan since he believes is independent of the
33 trails proposal. The trains plan is a broad plan that contains on and
34 off road trails, recreation, schools and commuter type transportation.
35 It is modeled after the Bainbridge Island's non-motorized
36 transportation plan. It has national recognition. There has been no
37 objection voiced on this. It has been through an extensive public
38 process and there is an opportunity cost to send this forward. One
39 more year of delay is one more year of missed opportunity to get the
40 trails project started. He used rights-of-way vacations as an example
41 of property that could be held for future trail use. They are in the

1 process of planning for trails at various sites. He asked the Planning
2 Commission to consider allowing Appendix L to go forward with or
3 without the Kingston Sub-area Plan update.

- 4
- 5 • Vice Chair Flynn – Asked Elliott if the California extension
6 consistent with the trails and open space. Needs shoulders for
7 bikes and pedestrian.
- 8

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

12

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

- 25
- 26 • Mahaffay – Relative to the rezone requests, he asked what
27 criterion was used in the group's decision.
- 28

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

- 32
- 33 • Mahaffay – He asked if they went to the lowest or highest
34 number in that zone and was told the lowest.
- 35

36 Michael Kulish – Kingston, a member of the working group since
37 1999, shared concerns about the process. The members of the group
38 want to see the plan moved forward and the common thread was that
39 everyone was very interested in the future of Kingston. He said that
40 getting as close as the group did to reaching agreement speaks to
41 that dedication. His concerns however were the plan process, ULCA

1 and the Reasonable Measures. His committee was tasked with
2 coming up with a new urban growth boundary that met the future
3 population allocation. Unfortunately, his committee did not quite
4 reach these goals, which is not reflected in the draft presented to the
5 Planning Commission. The committee was told they would have a
6 chance to review the draft plan prior to public release. He believed
7 Williams made that promise in good faith but was not able to keep it.
8 Kulish did not sign off on the plan. It was more than just a numbers
9 game of picking lots on a map. This is unnecessary. What is needed
10 is a plan that addresses the needs of the community. It doesn't
11 matter to him if every request on the map is included or whether the
12 boundaries shrink. The goals need to be addressed but that was not
13 done. This is due in part to the fact that the ULCA is partially flawed.
14 It is horribly simplistic. He explained the process and criteria used to
15 keep or eliminate properties. This is not a good process. Every
16 property has a probability between 0 and 100 that it will or will not
17 develop. This was not represented, rather only the low end was
18 considered. This fact drove the group's decision toward
19 consideration of a boundary and not what the community should
20 look like. Transportation, infrastructure or inclusion of public
21 recreation and industrial areas (those things that drive a community)
22 were left out of the analysis. Kingston is not just groups of houses.
23 Another item he felt was left out of the process was any effective
24 analysis of reasonable measures. It is unfair to ask the Planning
25 Commission to make recommendations on an incomplete plan. He
26 did not feel the group finished the task put before them and he has
27 no interest in extending the process further. It is in everyone's
28 interest to attain certainty to allow the community to move forward.
29 The Stakeholders group however showed the value of both certainty
30 and a coordinated plan for all to work against. Kulish thinks it would
31 be a disservice to move forward without clear resolution on many
32 issues. For instance, the ULCA is not right and it would not be fair to
33 stand back and say we are going to stand back and not deal with it.
34 He does not recommend that. As representatives of the work group,
35 he believes all members should be given the opportunity to actually
36 sign off on the ULCA.

- 37
- 38 • Gustavson – He understands the frustration as the Planning
39 Commission has to move forward when sometimes it doesn't
40 feel ready to do so. He asked if there are any fatal flaws if the
41 plan moves forward as is.

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

- 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

1 allocation is under the control of one developer yet there could be
2 other properties that could develop at a faster rate and be on the
3 market. He has no problem with including the additional properties
4 and that any issues can be resolved as the land use applications
5 move forward. Although he feels the same frustrations and
6 pressures relative to public involvement, it needs to be remembered
7 that the government is given the power to plan, not the citizens. The
8 public however is encouraged to provide input and participation.

9
10 Jon Rose – Olympic Resources, There are many groups to keep track
11 of in Kingston. This means there are many people who care about
12 the future of their community. He thinks the downtown effort is quite
13 remarkable. The process proposed in the Sub-area Draft 4 started
14 back in 1990 so it is difficult to hear people say there has not been
15 enough time given to it. His company has a had a chance to work
16 with staff and produce the current updated plan. In 1998 was not
17 allotted very much population with the understanding of getting it
18 passed and then revisit the issue of more people in the UGAs later.
19 In 1999, the Kingston Steering Committee process was started. He
20 went on to explain the options from no building to large
21 development. This was then studied based on a much larger UGA
22 than is presented tonight. The current UGA now being looked at in
23 EIS terms is a lesser included alternative. A much larger UGA was
24 studies 3-4 years ago. Alternative 4 today is much smaller. He
25 showed the map from 2002 that is literally the same today. Without
26 opening the Kingston Sub-area Plan up for review and update, there
27 was no way to use any alternative except B, the smaller expansion.
28 The Heritage Park was presented by Rose and in fact, already created
29 for the active recreation. As stated previously, the County has an
30 option to purchase the middle portion until 2008. If this doesn't take
31 place, the lots will be zoned Rural Residential. Even without an
32 expanded UGA, Olympic Resources and been moving forward and
33 creating a vision. As to how this plan fit in the original plan, the
34 goals must be reviewed. The goals are made broad intentionally and
35 anyone can argue for or against them. In the Table of Contents,
36 Chapter 2, Major Concepts of a Sub-area, calls for accommodating an
37 appropriate share of urban growth. Additionally, preserve open
38 space and habitat areas; provide livable community, clustering and
39 urban design. Rose believed his development meets all of these
40 major concepts. These were also objective and qualitative goals that
41 were part of the working group's process. Next he noted that

1 **planning under the GMA is not an exact science. One can't say for**
2 **sure the exact number of homes or people occupying the homes. If**
3 **one attempts to get too exacting in the GMA process, it is not**
4 **reasonable. The important things to look for are thoughtful and**
5 **reasonable planning for growth in the future. The reasonableness**
6 **test is to ask the question, "Is this the best we can do?" The**
7 **passage of the revised Kingston Sub-area Plan is just the beginning.**
8 **There is still more EIS work, wetland studies, traffic reports. The**
9 **citizens should take comfort in the amount of work that has been**
10 **amassed over 14-15 years. Consistency for ULCA has been**
11 **accomplished throughout the County. He noted the citizens still**
12 **have another chance to comment before the Board of County**
13 **Commissioners.**

14
15 **Alfredoquz Claro – Kingston, he attended the KCAG meetings and**
16 **tried to understand the process. Wants to see this draft moved**
17 **forward, make a decision and use this for a baseline and proceed**
18 **with the plan. It is difficult to make decisions without good baseline**
19 **and vision for the community. He and his wife do not want to see**
20 **people priced out of the housing market. Claro wants to see the**
21 **uniqueness of the County preserved and does not wish to see people**
22 **forced out of the County because of high prices. People want to see**
23 **a good plan.**

- 24
25 • **Vice Chair Flynn – Offered one more chance for people to**
26 **speak. She asked that issues already addressed not be**
27 **repeated.**

28
29 **Robert Smiley – Briefly commented that his property is not spotty**
30 **and it is contiguous to the UGA. This is a stipulation KAP imposed**
31 **on itself. Exclusion of this property would be inconsistent with the**
32 **goals and policies of the UGA, GMA and the Kingston Sub-area Plan.**

33
34 **Annie Humiston – KAP has nothing to do with the Sub-area Plan it is**
35 **the Sub-area Planning Committee that worked on individual property**
36 **requests. She submitted all four drafts with corrections made. She**
37 **would like to see the plan moved forward but not before all**
38 **corrections are made, from grammar to analysis. It must be correct.**

39
40 **Tom Waggoner – Was president when the working group voted to**
41 **adopt Draft 4 and thinks the vote was 8 for, 3 against.**

1
2 **Unidentified Person - The committee members need to remember this**
3 **was a straw poll vote.**

4
5 **A motion was made by Michael Gustavson and seconded by Dean**
6 **Jenniges that the public comment portion of the public hearing be**
7 **closed. THE VOTE: Yes-8; No-0. Motion carried.**

8
9 **Vice-Chair said the public hearing is also closed to written**
10 **comments. People can send comments to the Board of County**
11 **Commissioners for its hearing.**

- 12
- 13 • **Vice Chair Flynn – Mentioned that the meeting had gone past**
14 **the time scheduled and asked her co-commissioners what they**
15 **would like to do. She reiterated that the Planning Commission**
16 **was asked at the beginning of this public hearing to deliberate**
17 **and make a recommendation tonight.**
 - 18
 - 19 • **Taylor – Asked that the Department of Community Development**
20 **Director comment on how the Planning Commission is**
21 **expected to complete this task is the timeframe requested.**

22

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

34

35 **A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Michael**
36 **Gustavson that the public hearing be continued to November 29,**
37 **2005 for deliberation and recommendation. THE VOTE: Yes-9; No-0.**
38 **Motion carried.**

39

40 **10:35 PM - No further business being heard. A motion was made by**
41 **Dean Jenniges and seconded by John Taylor that the meeting be**

1 adjourned. THE VOTE: For-8; Against-0. Motion carried
2 unanimously the meeting was adjourned.
3
4
5

6 APPROVED this ____ day of _____, 2005.
7
8
9

10 _____
11 Deborah Flynn, Vice Chair
12
13
14

15 _____
16 Holly Anderson Secretary
17

18 **EXHIBITS:**

- 19 **A. Agenda for November 22, 2005 meeting**
20 **B. Letter dated November 22, 2005 from Suzanne Arness with**
21 **duplicate and map**
22 **C. Sign-in sheet for Suquamish Sub-area Plan**
23 **D. Sign-in sheet for Kingston Sub-area Plan**
24 **E. Map of Arborwood with duplicate**
25 **F. Letter dated November 21, 2005 from Tom Waggoner**
26 **G. Photos submitted at public hearing November 22, 2005 by**
27 **Betsy Cooper**
28 **H. Kingston Master Plan sketch**
29 **I. Kingston UGA/Arborwood – Planning Commission Hearing –**
30 **November 22, 2006**
31 **J. Packet of letters in support of Suquamish Sub-area Plan from**
32 **safety patrols in that area**
33 **K. Letter dated November 17, 2005 from Brian and Rhonda**
34 **Rotsten, with attachments**
35 **L. Letter dated November 11, 2005 from Kingston Citizens**
36 **Advisory Committee (KCAC)**
37 **M. Exhibit A – Proposed Arborwood UCR Zoning Articulations**
38 **N. Letter dated November 18, 2005 from the Kingston**
39 **Stakeholders and signed by 11 members**
40 **O. Letter dated November 22, 2005 from Tom and Carri Coultas,**
41 **with attachments**

Kitsap County Planning Commission –November 22, 2005

- 1 **P. Zoning Request – Olympic Property Group’s Arborwood**
- 2 **Project, Exhibit 2**
- 3 **Q. Email dated November 20, 2005 from Annie Humiston, et al,**
- 4 **with written comments attached**
- 5 **R. Draft Kingston Sub-area Plan, library copy**
- 6 **S. Zoning Request – Smiley Property West Kingston Road**
- 7 **T. Legal notice for November 22, 2005 meeting**
- 8
- 9