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

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

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

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

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

- Jenniges – His reference to rushing was directed more the Critical Areas Ordinance process. As to the timelines for Kingston, Arborwood and Applewood were presented in 1991 and the Urban Growth Area (UGA) process started in 1998, indicating more than enough opportunities for citizens to weigh in on this plan. Thinks the process has been in the works for a
significant length of time. Does not believe in studying something forever.

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

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

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

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

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

Albert Williams – Explained the documents behind each tab in the binder. These included comments from the public, comments on the Updated Land Capacity Analysis with a response from staff and an explanation of a LAMIRD. Suquamish Rural Village is a LAMIRD. He noted he started this process in April and explained the loss of historical knowledge due to staff change. He explained the history told to him on the Updated Land Capacity Analysis for Kingston. Population was given to Kingston in 2003, the working group did not provide an alternative, and the group made no population determination but settled on 640 through 2017. The Planning Commission adopted the 640 with a caveat that when the next population was determined, if the number went above the 640, the plan would be reopened for population allocation. As part of the
process in 2004, Kingston did go over a 3000 threshold. There was some discussion in the working group that 640 should be subtracted from the new number of 3,135 because the 640 were already allocated in the beginning. However, the Board of County Commissioners adopted the population allocation in total, taking the current population and added 3,135 without consideration of the 640 in the 2003 plan. The Updated Land Capacity Analysis was to have taken that into consideration. When the Updated Land Capacity Analysis was prepared for 2003, a minimum and maximum was looked at by acreage that the population could handle by acreage. The new Updated Land Capacity Analysis goes to the minimum density. All shown on map is based on minimum built density and maximum was not considered. Therefore, when one deducts for critical areas, buffers, etc. there is no maximum such as nine units per acre to look at because it cannot be achieved according the Kingston area developers.

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

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

- Ahl – This is more than the projected growth.

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

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

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

- John Taylor – Wants to look at individual parcels not included in the UGA but are requesting to be included. Unless action is taken today, they will need to wait another five years.

- Tom Nevins – Alternative 4 includes more than enough space to accommodate the highest projectives within a 20-year
timeframe. Thinks encouraging the Board of County Commissioners to include additional properties beyond the recommendations of the citizens’ working group would open up this up to an appealable action and not in the best interest of any party. He cautioned against doing this as it may be working against the major interest of the population allocation numbers including the original number projected. He was very clear about this stating that the population allocation is somewhat of a mystery as to determination of numbers. This process appears to be for accommodating a large property directly to the south of the Kingston limits. He has no opposition to this idea however by adding additional properties beyond the above-stated capacity, he thinks the Planning– thinks to encourage the Board of County Commissioners to include additional lands beyond Commission is taking a risk. He is willing to do it.

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

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

Williams – Reviewed the meeting to this point for Vice Chair Flynn.
- Jenniges – Asked if any of the new developments have considered low income housing because what is proposed for construction is definitely not low income. He asked Williams to explain criteria for low income housing and also if the Kingston Plan addresses this subject.

Williams – First noted that when Arborwood changed from Urban Low to Urban Residential Cluster zoning, which allows multi-family housing and they do proposed some multi-family housing. He said is
unable to state whether or not there will be affordable and low-income housing. He can’t speak to that until he sees the plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Williams – Arborwood is in every alternative except Alternative 1, the “No Action” alternative. He noted that in the packets Arborwood is
listed as UL instead of UCR. Originally, Pope Resources asked to be UL then later requested a change to UCR. This zoning requires not only open space and trails but requires multi-family housing as well. Arborwood holds 962, requests to be capped at 765, which omits all commercial elements and would be easier to add as an appendix at the end.

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

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

- Nevins – Asked for clarification of the various groups.

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

- Jenniges – Concerned about Cooper's complaint about the Updated Land Capacity Analysis, in that she felt that some level of minimum density should be assumed for all vacant and under utilized properties in the UVC zoning.
Williams – Originally the UVC was not counted in the Updated Land Capacity Analysis. The binder tab “ULCA Comments”, the first one from consultant Mark Personius and discussed the fact that the new land capacity methodology did not notice that the urban growth center in Kingston was to encourage mixed use development. The response is the Updated Land Capacity Analysis is still going through the public review process including review and comment by Kitsap County staff, individual citizen working groups, the Planning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC). The Department of Community Development redefined redevelopment screening material for underutilized parcels in Kingston’s UVC to address the issue of failure of the initial residential underutilized land redevelopment criteria. Kingston’s UGA is the only one where such a situation exists. Under Alternative 1, the UVC carries residential capacity. In other words, it did consider mixed use.

- Vice Chair Flynn – Asked if there were any questions on the transportation elements.

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

- Jenniges – Clarified that his main reason for asking about the transportation element was safety of the children and if there was to be a school safety program included.

Cioc – Corey Johnson will be heading up a committee on school safety programs. It is called a “Walk to School” program and will take place in Suquamish as well. He and Williams then showed proposed ingress/egress for the 7000 trips per day proposed for the Arborwood development. A study will be conducted to determine if West Kingston Road can handle the additional traffic. As White Horse develops, traffic will need to go south to Indianola. He then explained to Coppola how trips per unit per day are calculated.

- Coppola – Thinks that ten trips per day per unit are a lot and was told by Williams that these were 5 round trips.
• 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
study and used it for the basis of a new plan. California Street was not referenced in the new plan.

• Coppola – Asked if motion could be amended to include all four alternatives.

• Nevins – Asked if the Planning Commission was going to move forward on the Kingston Subarea Plan and expressed concern at getting stuck on individual issues.

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

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

• Jenniges – Thinks the Kingston Plan should be voted on first before adding any other items to the motion.

• Taylor –Going for Alternative 4 because that seems to be what the citizens of Kingston want.

• Jenniges – Going with why did Taylor request to look at extension for add-on properties because that is not a part of Alternative 4. If intending to do this, the motion must be for another alternative that includes additional properties.

• Vice Chair Flynn – With a motion on the floor, she asked if there was any discussion on it.
Cioc - Suggested a motion that the County conducts a downtown circulation study. It was in the plan two years ago and it is already modeled. Possibly could be done by February.

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

DISCUSSION:

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

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

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

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

Williams – There is a base population in the Kingston UGA of 1,871. The Board of County Commissioners then gives a population allocation that is then added to the current population. That gives a roughly 5,000 number. From this comes the Updated Land Capacity Analysis that tells how many people the current UGA may have. This is subtracted, along with the existing population away from that number. This leaves a leftover number of 2,060. The current UGA
can handle all of the other growth except the 2,060. The properties staff need to look at only need to accommodate 2,060 people.

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

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

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

- Coppola – Point of Order. This has nothing to do with the motion on the floor.

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

- Nevins – Believes the Robinson property is part of Alternative 4. Need to take a holistic approach rather than look at a .21

- Coppola – Agrees with Nevins.

- Taylor - It is already in the UGA. The issue is that it was Urban Low and wants to go to Urban Medium.
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?
Williams – Agreed.

- Vice Chair Flynn – After reviewing this document, she thinks this was the most difficult part of the committee’s work. After reading it, though some decisions she might have made differently but in the end, feels she should support what the committee recommended. She will not be voting to add additional properties.

- Jenniges – Williams just alleviated any concern for these properties coming back. Believes the Board will pass this. The Planning Commission will be doing the committee a disservice.

- Taylor – Does not believe the motion on the floor will not pass, he withdrew his motion. There is a handicap because three members are absent. The Planning Commission is obligated to honor the citizens of Kingston’s request.

- Jenniges – Believes Taylor is misreading this. There are several families wanting included in the UGA, but the committee did not recommend inclusion. If the Planning Commission recommends approval to the Kingston Plan, they can still come back and request a rezone next year. Understands they are not shut out.

- Coppola – Feels much like Ahl that this has been studied to death for the past 15 years, the Planning Commission has a responsibility to the people in Kingston to pass this plan. They made it very clear that Alternative 4 is what they want. The problem is that if we don’t get five votes today, it is defeated.

- Jenniges – He will vote for it. Asked Coppola if he was.

- Ahl – Would not be on board if the Planning Commission members continue to tinker with it.

A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission recommends to the Board of County Commissioners approval of the Kingston Subarea Plan, alternative 4.
THE VOTE ON THE KINGSTON SUBAREA PLAN, ALTERNATIVE 4:
Yes-6; No-0. Motion carried.

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

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

Suquamish Subarea Plan Update

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

DISCUSSION:

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

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

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

Williams – The land use section of this plan wasn’t changed. The only changes are the Transportation/Capital Facilities/Pedestrian Walkways.
Nevins – Page 15, Regulations for Non-conforming lots, he thought he read mandatory lot configuration. Asked if it is legal.

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

Coppola – Said it is in the Manchester Plan.

Jenniges – Page 13, Lot Requirements, is it with or without sewers?

Williams – Suquamish is mostly sewer. He referenced the Suquamish Sewer Treatment Plant.

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

Taylor – At the public hearing in Kingston, school safety issues were very dominant in the testimony. Who pays for and helps the children.

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

Ahl – In approving this subarea plan today it means the Planning Commission recognizes the problem.

Nevins – The process itself brought people together to work on a common solution.

Jenniges – Asked about the on-going process after plan is in place.

Williams – These plans will not go on the shelf and be forgotten.
THE VOTE: Yes-6; No-0. Motion carried.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:

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

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

APPROVED this ____day of _____________, 2005.

____________________________
Deborah Flynn, Vice Chair

____________________________
Holly Anderson, Secretary

EXHIBITS:

A. November 29, 2005 Planning Commission Agenda
B. Email from Walt Elliott dated November 28, 2005