

MINUTES

**KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
November 29, 2005**

The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Eagle's Nest Conference Center, 1195 Fairgrounds Rd, Bremerton, Washington 98311. Members Present: Deborah Flynn, Tom Nevins, John Ahl, Lary Coppola, John Taylor and Dean Jenniges, Not Present: Frank Mahaffay, Mike Gustavson and Monty Mahan. Staff Present: Scott Diener, Albert Williams, Angie Silva, Greg Cioc and Planning Commission Secretary Holly Anderson. Two citizens from the public were in attendance.

9:00 AM

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

PUBLIC HEARING DELIBERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE FOLLOWING SUBAREA PLANS:

Kingston Subarea Plan Update Includes Expansion of the Current Urban Growth Area (UGA)

- **Tom Nevins, Acting Chair – Believes consideration must be given to the citizens who took the time to show up and testify. He also expressed concern about the rush nature of this item.**

Scott Diener, Community Planning Manager – Thanked the Planning Commission members for being present and was prepared to review documents in large binders in their entirety. He referenced two issues. First, the two subarea plans being discussed today were the subjects of proposed docket items adopted by the Board of County Commissioners last April, Resolution No. 079-2005 which set a docket schedule. Reminded the Planning Commission that some of the documents are visionary as well as broad, policy guidance documents. Some of the more in-depth details can be accommodated during the 2006 ten-year Comprehensive Plan update. Diener responded to the question of why this plan was not

1 presented to the working group prior to submittal to the State.
2 Although the working group was told they could review the plan prior
3 to State submittal, however in November it was discovered that
4 Kitsap County had to initiate a 60-day review period that began
5 November 1, 2005. There just was no time to present it to the
6 working group first. If this deadline had not been met, the County
7 would have lost its eligibility for 2005. This was announced to the
8 working group at the KCAC meeting when they were told that they
9 would get the plan quickly. This was the early plan noted that was
10 available to the public at the library. Every attempt was made to
11 accommodate the working group's concerns. Staff also wishes there
12 was more time available but if the Plan is to be ready at the beginning
13 of 2006, then it has to move forward today from the Planning
14 Commission to the Board of County Commissioners. If this is
15 delayed, the citizens of Kingston and Suquamish will be looking at
16 another year's wait. He said at the last working group meeting on
17 November 16, there was general unanimous support for the Plan that
18 was reviewed page by page. The document before the Planning
19 Commission is this version. Diener noted that minor changes could
20 be made to the Plan in the '06 Comp Plan update process.

- 21
- 22 • Dean Jenniges – Asked what problems would be caused if the
- 23 Plan were not approved until next year.
- 24

25 Diener – Citizens of Kingston have been waiting for this plan to be
26 adopted for some time now and some most likely have development
27 projects waiting.

- 28
- 29 • John Ahl – Noted that the argument that this plan has been in
- 30 the making for 10-12 years is not accurate.
- 31

32 Diener – If not adopted this year, his concern is it will have to have
33 until December of 2006.

- 34
- 35
- 36 • Jenniges – His reference to rushing was directed more the
- 37 Critical Areas Ordinance process. As to the timelines for
- 38 Kingston, Arborwood and Applewood were presented in 1991
- 39 and the Urban Growth Area (UGA) process started in 1998,
- 40 indicating more than enough opportunities for citizens to weigh
- 41 in on this plan. Thinks the process has been in the works for a

1 significant length of time. Does not believe in studying
2 something forever.

- 3
- 4 • Lary Coppola – Asked if the lack of the working group’s
5 complaint that the plan was not presented to them first
6 something that can be appealed.

7

8 **Angie Sylva – Appeal of the plan would need to be based on the 13**
9 **goals of the Growth Management Act (GMA) or the Land Capacity**
10 **Analysis if the appellant determined that appeal of the plan did not**
11 **meet the goals.**

- 12
- 13 • Coppola – Did not want to be in the position of recommending
14 approval and having it come back on appeal.

15

16 **Diener – The last working group meeting was scheduled on**
17 **November 16, and were one person shy of a quorum. This shows**
18 **there was opportunity to review the plan. Also noted the he saw**
19 **support for the plan even from those who disapproved of the**
20 **process. Staff also wishes there was more time but in fact there is**
21 **not.**

- 22
- 23 • Jenniges – Hopefully there is no new information in the large
24 binders presented today. He referenced several documents
25 including a memo from Dave Greetham stating that no SEPA
26 review is required for the Kingston Subarea Plan. He read the
27 entire memo explaining why none was needed.

28

29 **Albert Williams – Explained the documents behind each tab in the**
30 **binder. These included comments from the public, comments on the**
31 **Updated Land Capacity Analysis with a response from staff and an**
32 **explanation of a LAMIRD. Suquamish Rural Village is a LAMIRD. He**
33 **noted he started this process in April and explained the loss of**
34 **historical knowledge due to staff change. He explained the history**
35 **told to him on the Updated Land Capacity Analysis for Kingston.**
36 **Population was given to Kingston in 2003, the working group did not**
37 **provide an alternative, and the group made no population**
38 **determination but settled on 640 through 2017. The Planning**
39 **Commission adopted the 640 with a caveat that when the next**
40 **population was determined, if the number went above the 640, the**
41 **plan would be reopened for population allocation. As part of the**

1 process in 2004, Kingston did go over a 3000 threshold. There was
2 some discussion in the working group that 640 should be subtracted
3 from the new number of 3,135 because the 640 were already
4 allocated in the beginning. However, the Board of County
5 Commissioners adopted the population allocation in total, taking the
6 current population and added 3,135 without consideration of the 640
7 in the 2003 plan. The Updated Land Capacity Analysis was to have
8 taken that into consideration. When the Updated Land Capacity
9 Analysis was prepared for 2003, a minimum and maximum was
10 looked at by acreage that the population could handle by acreage.
11 The new Updated Land Capacity Analysis goes to the minimum
12 density. All shown on map is based on minimum built density and
13 maximum was not considered. Therefore, when one deducts for
14 critical areas, buffers, etc. there is no maximum such as nine units
15 per acre to look at because it cannot be achieved according the
16 Kingston area developers.

- 17
- 18 • Ahl – Page 47 talks about the numbers. It states staff is looking
19 for a net increase of 2,060. He asked which of the four
20 alternatives would accommodate this number.

21

22 Williams – Alternative 4 accommodates it the best. It will
23 accommodate 5,449 at total build-out.

- 24
- 25 • Ahl – This is more than the projected growth.

26

27 Williams – Option 4 will accommodate 3,578 from the 2,135. 3,135 are
28 the total population allocation. Inside the current UGA, 1,075 are
29 allocated.

- 30
- 31 • Ahl – Asked if this discussion is about adding enough to the
32 UGA to accommodate 2,060. This is correct.

33

34 Williams – At full build-out, option 4 will accommodate 5,349 people.

- 35
- 36 • John Taylor – Wants to look at individual parcels not included
37 in the UGA but are requesting to be included. Unless action is
38 taken today, they will need to wait another five years.
 - 39
 - 40 • Tom Nevins – Alternative 4 includes more than enough space to
41 accommodate the highest projectives within a 20-year

1 timeframe. Thinks encouraging the Board of County
2 Commissioners to include additional properties beyond the
3 recommendations of the citizens' working group would open up
4 this up to an appealable action and not in the best interest of
5 any party. He cautioned against doing this as it may be working
6 against the major interest of the population allocation numbers
7 including the original number projected. He was very clear
8 about this stating that the population allocation is somewhat of
9 a mystery as to determination of numbers. This process
10 appears to be for accommodating a large property directly to
11 the south of the Kingston limits. He has no opposition to this
12 idea however by adding additional properties beyond the
13 above-stated capacity, he thinks the Planning– thinks to
14 encourage the Board of County Commissioners to include
15 additional lands beyond Commission is taking a risk. He is
16 willing to do it.

- 17
- 18 • Jenniges – Agreed with Nevins in that the Updated Land
19 Capacity Analysis is in fact a scientific guess, the citizens of
20 Kingston worked through it a produced what they thought to be
21 a futuristic outlook for the growth of Kingston. Because this is
22 reviewed every five years, if the growth has a greater impact in
23 the first five years, Kingston can then take a look at the other
24 parcels wanting inclusion. The working group has gone
25 through a major process to produce the plan and he has not
26 heard one complaint about the plan. The only complaints he's
27 heard have been about the process, not the plan. He is
28 satisfied with the current proposed UGA designations.

29

30 Vice Chair Deborah Flynn arrived and took charge of the meeting.

31

32 Williams – Reviewed the meeting to this point for Vice Chair Flynn.

- 33 • Jenniges – Asked if any of the new developments have
34 considered low income housing because what is proposed for
35 construction is definitely not low income. He asked Williams to
36 explain criteria for low income housing and also if the Kingston
37 Plan addresses this subject.

38

39 Williams – First noted that when Arborwood changed from Urban
40 Low to Urban Residential Cluster zoning, which allows multi-family
41 housing and they do proposed some multi-family housing. He said is

1 unable to state whether or not there will be affordable and low-
2 income housing. He can't speak to that until he sees the plan.

- 3
4 • Jenniges – He noted spots on the Kitsap County map where
5 affordable housing is being constructed. Here is an entire UGA
6 in Kingston adding a large parcel of residential zoning with no
7 identified affordable or low-income housing. He thinks there
8 should at least be a reference to it. Policies were written to
9 allow for affordable housing.

10
11 Williams – Said it was discussed in the same context with
12 Arborwood's inclusion once the zoning was changed. It was also
13 discussed along with the Urban Village Center (UVC) zoning that
14 allows mixed use zoning with commercial on the bottom and
15 residential on top. There was some discussion.

- 16
17 • Jenniges – Asked if this aspect of the plan could be challenged
18 in court.

19
20 Williams – Any group that goes forward and doesn't believe there is
21 enough low income or affordable housing may appeal. Affordable
22 housing is difficult to measure as many will say that the market
23 drives the price. He knows that once construction begins, the price
24 goes up. Unless there is a written agreement requiring a certain
25 amount of low income housing for so many market-driven houses, it
26 depends on what they can build it for or sell it for.

27
28 Discussion continued about low-income housing areas in the county
29 and the possible need for reference in the plan. It was felt that
30 defining low income and affordable.

31
32 Williams – Attempt was made to write policies for affordable housing,
33 the thought being that affordable housing is there and that it is the
34 market demand that will drive the prices.

- 35
36 • Taylor – Asked Williams to indicate on the map Arborwood's
37 location and noted that it is currently not inside the Kingston
38 UGA. Including it is part of Alternative 4.

39
40 Williams – Arborwood is in every alternative except Alternative 1, the
41 "No Action" alternative. He noted that in the packets Arborwood is

1 listed as UL instead of UCR. Originally, Pope Resources asked to be
2 UL then later requested a change to UCR. This zoning requires not
3 only open space and trails but requires multi-family housing as well.
4 Arborwood holds 962, requests to be capped at 765, which omits all
5 commercial elements and would be easier to add as an appendix at
6 the end.

- 7
- 8 • Nevins – Expressed concerns about this and referenced
9 objections of Betsy Cooper. He wondered how many of her
10 concerns have been satisfied.

11

12 Williams – Referenced the comment section, there were two on the
13 plan; one from Annie Humiston and Betsy Cooper. On November 16,
14 he sat with Humiston and discussed her concerns and made
15 attempts to change before submittal to the Planning Commission. He
16 didn't see Cooper's until the Planning Commission did. Also until
17 Arborwood said it would remove the commercial element from its
18 proposal, it was still valid and included from the 2003 plan. Once the
19 commercial portion was removed, he admits he should have taken it
20 out of the current plan. However he was given a deadline of Monday
21 to distribute documents, he missed removing the commercial
22 language. If the working group had been given a chance to review
23 the plan, it might have been caught. Only two basic comments were
24 received from two of the steering committees. One person who
25 spoke addressed the park plan.

- 26
- 27 • Nevins – Asked for clarification of the various groups.

28

29 Williams – Clarified group names: KCAC is the Kingston Citizens
30 Advisory Committee that does not deal with land use but rather the
31 city issues such as parks and transportation. KCAG, the Kingston
32 Citizen Advisory Group, they are also the steering committee or the
33 working group. Finally there is the stakeholder group that is working
34 on the downtown revitalization.

- 35
- 36 • Jenniges – Concerned about Cooper's complaint about the
37 Updated Land Capacity Analysis, in that she felt that some level
38 of minimum density should be assumed for all vacant and
39 under utilized properties in the UVC zoning.

40

1 **Williams – Originally the UVC was not counted in the Updated Land**
2 **Capacity Analysis. The binder tab “ULCA Comments”, the first one**
3 **from consultant Mark Personius and discussed the fact that the new**
4 **land capacity methodology did not notice that the urban growth**
5 **center in Kingston was to encourage mixed use development. The**
6 **response is the Updated Land Capacity Analysis is still going**
7 **through the public review process including review and comment by**
8 **Kitsap County staff , individual citizen working groups, the Planning**
9 **Commission, Board of County Commissioners and the Kitsap**
10 **Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC). The Department of**
11 **Community Development redefined redevelopment screening**
12 **material for underutilized parcels in Kingston’s UVC to address the**
13 **issue of failure of the initial residential underutilized land**
14 **redevelopment criteria. Kingston’s UGA is the only one where such a**
15 **situation exists. Under Alternative 1, the UVC carries residential**
16 **capacity. In other words, it did consider mixed use.**

- 17
18
 - **Vice Chair Flynn – Asked if there were any questions on the**

19 **transportation elements.**
20
21 **Greg Cioc, Public Works staff – Noted that in January 2006, an**
22 **implementation plan would be completed for Suquamish to Kingston,**
23 **the entire Miller Bay corridor. At that point, any project in these**
24 **communities will be prioritized and tracked. Funding will be sought**
25 **for what is basically a rural design study.**

- 26
27
 - **Jenniges – Clarified that his main reason for asking about the**

28 **transportation element was safety of the children and if there**
29 **was to be a school safety program included.**
30
31 **Cioc – Corey Johnson will be heading up a committee on school**
32 **safety programs. It is called a “Walk to School” program and will**
33 **take place in Suquamish as well. He and Williams then showed**
34 **proposed ingress/egress for the 7000 trips per day proposed for the**
35 **Arborwood development. A study will be conducted to determine if**
36 **West Kingston Road can handle the additional traffic. As White**
37 **Horse develops, traffic will need to go south to Indianola. He then**
38 **explained to Coppola how trips per unit per day are calculated.**

- 39
40
 - **Coppola – Thinks that ten trips per day per unit are a lot and**

41 **was told by Williams that these were 5 round trips.**

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

- Jenniges- Expressed concern about traffic on Miller Bay Road.
- Vice Chair Flynn - Deb – Asked about a proposed extension of California Street to Lindvog.

Cioc – Explained several options for re-routing the traffic. He also said he was surprised at the California option.

- Vice Chair Flynn – Feels that the Kingston Plan is not quite done.

Cioc – The stakeholder group has its own agenda on this issue and mentioned that one condition of the former plan was a circulation study that will be done.

A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that it supports the extension of California Street.

DISCUSSION:

- Taylor – Motions are based on input at the public hearing from citizens who live there.

Cioc – The Village Green concept is part of the design and takes up the middle section.

- Vice Chair Flynn – Likes the idea of the street extension but the stakeholders alone do not represent the entire community.

Williams – the working group did not discuss The California Street extension.

- Vice Chair Flynn – Asked about an Urban Design Standard that describes the architectural streetscape only. She asked if there was something to address this approved by the County.

Williams – The Design Study is from the 1992 Design Study from which the original Kingston Design Study was developed. He reviewed a document from Vice Chair Flynn that was the 1992 design

1 study and used it for the basis of a new plan. California Street was
2 not referenced in the new plan.

- 3
- 4 • Coppola – Asked if motion could be amended to include all four
5 alternatives.
 - 6
 - 7 • Nevins – Asked if the Planning Commission was going to move
8 forward on the Kingston Subarea Plan and expressed concern
9 at getting stuck on individual issues.

10

11 Diener – The original charge of the working group was to
12 accommodate the population allocation. It wasn't a focus of the
13 working group to concentrate on goals and policies but instead how
14 the subarea plan could accommodate additional population. The
15 amendment on the floor could certainly be passed on to the group.
16 Rather than an extension request, perhaps an analysis would be the
17 first thing looked at by the County.

18

19 John Taylor withdrew his original motion and made a new motion,
20 seconded by Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission
21 recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that it adopt
22 Alternative 4 of the Kingston Subarea Plan, to include California
23 Street. He felt the Subarea Plan should be approved first and then
24 specific issues, i.e., other properties wanting included, could be
25 looked at. He then expressed frustration that nothing was being
26 accomplished after an hour and a half in session.

- 27
- 28 • Jenniges – Thinks the Kingston Plan should be voted on first
29 before adding any other items to the motion.
 - 30
 - 31 • Taylor – Going for Alternative 4 because that seems to be what
32 the citizens of Kingston want.
 - 33
 - 34 • Jenniges – Going with why did Taylor request to look at
35 extension for add-on properties because that is not a part of
36 Alternative 4. If intending to do this, the motion must be for
37 another alternative that includes additional properties.
 - 38
 - 39 • Vice Chair Flynn – With a motion on the floor, she asked if there
40 was any discussion on it.
- 41

1 Cioc - Suggested a motion that the County conducts a downtown
2 circulation study. It was in the plan two years ago and it is already
3 modeled. Possibly could be done by February.

4
5 Taylor – amended his motion to remove the California Street
6 connection subject to a transportation study back before the
7 Planning Commission no later than March and Lary Coppola
8 seconded the motion.

9
10 **DISCUSSION:**

- 11
12 • Ahl – Thinks some good work done by the group. His problem
13 with the motion to approve is that the Planning Commission is
14 voting to approve an expansion of the UGA that accommodates
15 twice the net growth projected from the new Updated Land
16 Capacity Analysis. This may or may not be the case but thinks
17 it leaves the County somewhat vulnerable.

- 18
19 • Nevins – Recognizing that more population is being
20 accommodated than necessary and recognizing that the driver
21 is the accommodation of the Arborwood property, he asked the
22 question, why are reasonable measures being added to the
23 Robinson property and accommodating White-Luke property to
24 the north. Additionally, the Karl property with access
25 negotiable. Ahl is looking at the fact that more numbers are
26 being accommodated than the County's numbers require.

27
28 Williams – The current numbers for Kingston are 1,871. 640 can be
29 added to this and what the Board of County Commissioners did was
30 adopted 3,135 total including the 640.

- 31
32 • Vice Chair Flynn – was told there is a surplus of population with
33 Alternative 4. That surplus equals 248 people.

34
35 Williams – There is a base population in the Kingston UGA of 1,871.
36 The Board of County Commissioners then gives a population
37 allocation that is then added to the current population. That gives a
38 roughly 5,000 number. From this comes the Updated Land Capacity
39 Analysis that tells how many people the current UGA may have. This
40 is subtracted, along with the existing population away from that
41 number. This leaves a leftover number of 2,060. The current UGA

1 can handle all of the other growth except the 2,060. The properties
2 staff need to look at only need to accommodate 2,060 people.

- 3
- 4 • **Nevins – Asked how many people Alternative 4 can**
5 **accommodate and was told 3,078, or about 1,000 more people.**
6 **Next he asked how many people White-Luke would**
7 **accommodate and was told 190 units or 400 people, the**
8 **Robinson 2.5 people, the Clarol 2.5 and Arborwood 1,912. Total**
9 **additional properties would account for 2,227 more people.**

 - 10
 - 11 • **Jenniges – Believes the Planning Commission is nit picking at**
12 **analyses spent years doing on an assumption that the Updated**
13 **Land Capacity Analysis is correct. It is nothing but a scientific**
14 **wild guess in which they consider properties will or will not be**
15 **used. He sees no heartburn in enlarging this UGA if reduction**
16 **is then warranted in a couple years. He thinks the Planning**
17 **Commission is only saying that here is the UGA, if the growth**
18 **exceeds it, it will need expanding, if you don't fill it, what does it**
19 **hurt. Again, what does it hurt if the current Updated Land**
20 **Capacity Analysis is not filled in complete. Basically, the**
21 **Planning Commission is trying to take 15 years of study and**
22 **being concerned over a few additional homes. The fact is that**
23 **no one was against the plan, only some against the process.**

 - 24
 - 25 • **Nevins – There were some people who spoke out against the**
26 **Robinson property. It is a small little parcel and it seems to**
27 **make more sense to rezone that entire zone as Urban Medium.**

 - 28
 - 29 • **Coppola – Point of Order. This has nothing to do with the**
30 **motion on the floor.**

 - 31
 - 32 • **Vice-Chair Flynn – The motion on the floor is to approve the**
33 **Kingston Subarea Plan, Alternative 4.**

 - 34
 - 35 • **Nevins – Believes the Robinson property is part of Alternative 4.**
36 **Need to take a holistic approach rather than look at a .21**
37
 - 38 • **Coppola – Agrees with Nevins.**

 - 39
 - 40 • **Taylor - It is already in the UGA. The issue is that it was Urban**
41 **Low and wants to go to Urban Medium.**

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

- Jenniges – If someone wants to make a friendly amendment that the Robinson property stay at Urban Low that is not a problem. However, to set aside the entire UGA for .21 acres, he strongly disagrees.

Motion Reiterated: A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of County Commissioners approve the Kingston Subarea Plan, Alternative 4, with the Robinson zoning remaining at Urban Low.

THE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT: Yes -6; No-0.

- Taylor – Does not want to forego the ability to address the other smaller parcels’ requests.
- Ahl – Thought the Planning Commission should move forward with the vote and the Suquamish Plan.
- Coppola – Withdrew his second to the vote.
- Jenniges – Seconded the vote. He explained that the citizens working group has already considered all of the other parcels in their recommendation and these can be reviewed again in five years. The Planning Commission has already been hung up on the reality of the Updated Land Capacity Analysis yet now we are talking adding more numbers to the Land Capacity thus making it even larger. Will never get anything done by adding to the land capacity usage by adding more parcels.
- Vice Chair Flynn – It can either be done now or after voting on Alternative 4. Let’s vote on something. Seems it would be more appropriate to do it first. Need 5 votes to pass a motion.

Williams – Part of the packet presented today does discuss the site-specific amendment process for 2006. There is a possibility that any property owner not considered at this time, does have an opportunity in 2006 to do so.

- Coppola – If this plan is not passed, these property owners will have nothing to come forward to. Correct?

1 **Williams – Agreed.**

- 2
- 3 • **Vice Chair Flynn – After reviewing this document, she thinks**
- 4 **this was the most difficult part of the committee’s work. After**
- 5 **reading it, though some decisions she might have made**
- 6 **differently but in the end, feels she should support what the**
- 7 **committee recommended. She will not be voting to add**
- 8 **additional properties.**
- 9
- 10 • **Jenniges – Williams just alleviated any concern for these**
- 11 **properties coming back. Believes the Board will pass this. The**
- 12 **Planning Commission will be doing the committee a disservice.**
- 13
- 14 • **Taylor – Does not believe the motion on the floor will not pass,**
- 15 **he withdrew his motion. There is a handicap because three**
- 16 **members are absent. The Planning Commission is obligated to**
- 17 **honor the citizens of Kingston’s request.**
- 18
- 19 • **Jenniges – Believes Taylor is misreading this. There are**
- 20 **several families wanting included in the UGA, but the committee**
- 21 **did not recommend inclusion. If the Planning Commission**
- 22 **recommends approval to the Kingston Plan, they can still come**
- 23 **back and request a rezone next year. Understands they are not**
- 24 **shut out.**
- 25
- 26 • **Coppola – Feels much like Ahl that this has been studied to**
- 27 **death for the past 15 years, the Planning Commission has a**
- 28 **responsibility to the people in Kingston to pass this plan. They**
- 29 **made it very clear that Alternative 4 is what they want. The**
- 30 **problem is that if we don’t get five votes today, it is defeated.**
- 31
- 32 • **Jenniges – He will vote for it. Asked Coppola if he was.**
- 33
- 34 • **Ahl – Would not be on board if the Planning Commission**
- 35 **members continue to tinker with it.**
- 36

37 **A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded Lary Coppola that**

38 **the Planning Commission recommends to the Board of County**

39 **Commissioners approval of the Kingston Subarea Plan, alternative 4.**

40

1 THE VOTE ON THE KINGSTON SUBAREA PLAN, ALTERNATIVE 4:
2 Yes-6; No-0. Motion carried.

3
4 A motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by Lary
5 Coppola that the Planning Commission recommends to the Board of
6 County Commissioners approval of the Kingston Subarea Plan with
7 Alternative 4. THE VOTE: Yes-6; No-0. Motion carried.

- 8
9 • Taylor – His problem with the issue of land capacity is that the
10 medium price of homes is \$280,000. Recent homes built in
11 Silverdale are on the market today for \$600,000+. It is the
12 supply and demand. We are pricing people out of the market
13 and we need more supply.

14
15 Suquamish Subarea Plan Update

16
17 A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by John Taylor
18 that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the
19 Suquamish Subarea Plan Update.

20
21 **DISCUSSION:**

- 22
23 • Ahl – Page 18, talks about a study scheduled for completion in
24 2000. Need to clean up the errors. Also, top of page 21, Impact
25 Mitigation Fees, states traffic . . . should be adopted by 2003. . .”
26 Needs to be edited. Lastly, starting on page 41, a questionnaire
27 with suggestions, etc. Asked if this is part of the Plan.

28
29 Williams – This is part of the Safe Street Plan. If not included in the
30 Plan, it will not get funded.

- 31
32 • Nevins – Page 15, Regulations for Large Lot Subdivision
33 ordinance from 1981, asked if there was a more recent iteration
34 to put in here. Next, top of page 16, minimum size lot is ½ acre.

35
36 Williams – The land use section of this plan wasn't changed. The
37 only changes are the Transportation/Capital Facilities/Pedestrian
38 Walkways.

39

1 • **Nevins – Page 15, Regulations for Non-conforming lots, he**
2 **thought he read mandatory lot configuration. Asked if it is**
3 **legal.**

4
5 **Williams – It is in RCW 57 and can be found more in urban areas than**
6 **rural.**

7
8 • **Coppola – Said it is in the Manchester Plan.**

9
10 • **Jenniges – Page 13, Lot Requirements, is it with or without**
11 **sewers?**

12
13 **Williams – Suquamish is mostly sewerred. He referenced the**
14 **Suquamish Sewer Treatment Plant.**

15
16 • **Jenniges – Asked for the purpose of the Mosquito Fleet Trail**
17 **being 57 miles long. Also what is the cost and who pays for it?**
18 **Lastly page 22, another potential funding source is through the**
19 **Bureau of Indian Affairs. He asked how much funding has been**
20 **used for children safety.**

21
22 • **Taylor – At the public hearing in Kingston, school safety issues**
23 **were very dominant in the testimony. Who pays for and helps**
24 **the children.**

25
26 **Williams – Both the County and the Tribe. He explained studies**
27 **accomplished to date and what is being done at this time to protect**
28 **the children.**

29
30 • **Ahl – In approving this subarea plan today it means the**
31 **Planning Commission recognizes the problem.**

32
33 • **Nevins – The process itself brought people together to work on**
34 **a common solution.**

35
36 • **Jenniges – Asked about the on-going process after plan is in**
37 **place.**

38
39 **Williams – These plans will not go on the shelf and be forgotten.**
40

1 THE VOTE: Yes-6; No-0. Motion carried.

2
3 COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:

- 4
5 1. Program to monitor effectiveness of the plans
6 2. Annual Report back to Planning Commission on Plan
7 progress
8 3. Secret is for the community to be involved in an organized
9 way
10 4. Manchester 42 has grown into Manchester Community
11 Council
12 5. Discovered this morning it appears his (John Taylor's) term
13 ends December 2005. He would like it known that he wants
14 to be re-appointed.
15
16

17 11:15 AM - No further business being heard, a motion was made by
18 Dean Jenniges and seconded by Tom Nevins that the meeting be
19 adjourned. THE VOTE: For-6; Against-0. Motion carried
20 unanimously.
21

22
23 APPROVED this ____ day of _____, 2005.
24
25
26
27

28 _____
29 Deborah Flynn, Vice Chair
30

31 _____
32 Holly Anderson, Secretary
33

34 EXHIBITS:

- 35
36 A. November 29, 2005 Planning Commission Agenda
37 B. Email from Walt Elliott dated November 28, 2005
38
39
40
41

Kitsap County Planning Commission – November 29, 2005

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7