

M I N U T E S

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

January 10, 2006

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: John Ahl, Tom Nevins, Deb Flynn, Dean Jenniges, Brian Bekeny, John Taylor, Lary Coppola, Mike Gustavson and Monty Mahan. Staff Present: Scott Diener, James Weaver, Greg Cioc, Rick Fackler, Cindy Baker, Holly Anderson and Acting Planning Commission Secretary Brynan Pierce. Ten members from the public were in attendance.

9:00 AM

A. Chair Monty Mahan called the meeting to Order and introduced the Planning Commission members present.

9:05 A.M.

Approval of Minutes

B. November 29, 2005 Minutes

A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Dean Jenniges that the Planning Commission minutes of November 29, 2005 be approved. THE VOTE: Yes-9 No-0 Abstained-1. Motion carried.

C. Election of 2006 office

- **Dean Jenniges-Noticed John Taylor's term had expired and asked if had been reappointed.**

Holly Anderson- Stated that the Board of County Commissioners passed a resolution reappointing him for a full term.

- 1 • John Taylor made a MOTION to appoint Deb Flynn as 2006
2 Planning Commission Chair. Mike Gustavson seconded. The
3 VOTE: Yes-8 No-1. Motion Carried.

- 4
5 • Tom Nevins-made a MOTION to appoint John Taylor as 2006
6 Planning Commission Vice Chair. Monty Mahan seconded. The
7 VOTE: Yes-9 No-0. Motion carried unanimously.

8
9 **D. Work/Study Session**

10
11 James Weaver, Senior Planner, introduced the consultant team from
12 AHBL starting with Michael Katterman, AICP, Associate Principal;
13 Senior Planner; Gwen Rousseau, Planner; and Brad Medrud, AICP,
14 Planner. Denise Lathrop, AICP, a consultant from Adolfson, Inc. was
15 also introduced.

- 16
17 • Deb Flynn-Asked for clarification regarding the acronym AICP.

18
19 Weaver-Defined AICP as American Institute of Certified Planners.
20 Weaver then gave a brief overview of the binders the Planning
21 Commissioners received containing the Port Orchard/South Kitsap
22 draft Sub-Area Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

- 23
24 • Jenniges-Asked for the timeline process of the plan.

25
26 Weaver-Explained phase I consisted of *visioning, data collection and*
27 *Citizens Advisory Group*. Phase II consisted of *open house and EIS*
28 *scoping meeting, analysis of alternatives, draft sub-area plan and*
29 *DEIS and public meetings on draft sub-area plans and EIS*. And
30 phase III will include *the final sub-area plan and EIS as well as a*
31 *public hearing on the final plan/EIS and adoption*. James also
32 informed the Planning Commission 118 comments were submitted
33 which will be available by disk in the next few weeks and the Port
34 Orchard City Council accepted the draft the previous night. Weaver
35 described the project schedule in detail and indicated the proposed
36 timeline for a deliberation and recommendation from the Planning
37 Commission, how a Final Sub-Area Plan / Final EIS would be
38 produced from that recommendation, and that the scheduled
39 proposed a March 2006 completion date for that document.
40

- 1 • **Jenniges-Asked if an inter-local agreement has been accepted**
2 **between the City of Port Orchard and Kitsap County.**

3
4 **Weaver- Stated that it had been accepted and approved by the Port**
5 **Orchard City Council on September 26, 2004. Public comment ends**
6 **on January 20, 2006 and there will be a joint public hearing with the**
7 **Port Orchard Planning Commission as well as the Kitsap County**
8 **Planning Commission.**

- 9
10 • **Taylor-Asked for justification on where the City Planning**
11 **Commission will be sitting.**

12
13 **Weaver-Informed Taylor they will be sitting up front. Weaver then**
14 **explained the Planning Commissions tasks for the draft including a**
15 ***review of the draft plan/IES; considering public comments on the***
16 ***draft plan/EIS and Land Use reclassification requests; providing***
17 ***direction for preferred alternative and making a recommendation to***
18 ***the Board and City Council.***

19
20 **Scott Diener-Asked the Planning Commission if Rick Fackler from the**
21 **Parks department would be allowed to make his presentation on**
22 **Open Space first due to a prior engagement.**

- 23
24 • **Chair Flynn-Asked the consultant team from AHBL if that would**
25 **be a problem and it was not.**

26
27 **Fackler-Informed the Planning Commission members the Open**
28 **Space plan has been updated for grant funding for the past 30 years**
29 **and under state law, the plan must be updated every six years. Now**
30 **the Parks Open Space Plan is now an element to the Comprehensive**
31 **Plan. A survey is being conducted as an initial step to the public**
32 **process. There will be meetings coordinated with agencies to learn**
33 **what open space is needed. There is an emphasis to work with non-**
34 **profit and state agencies. There was a recent meeting with the**
35 **directors from Bremerton, Poulsbo and Bainbridge Island to discuss**
36 **meeting requirements. The Open Space Plan updated in 2000**
37 **approved recreational needs. Kitsap County is far behind other**
38 **counties with recreational facilities and Kitsap County is working**
39 **with four other counties on Urban Growth Areas. In the last six years**
40 **the County has acquired acres for open space. One of the goals was**
41 **to have fewer large parks in the county and that goal has been met**

1 since 2000. The Board of County Commissioners met with the Parks
2 Board and decided they would like to develop more facilities mostly
3 for waterfront access. The next steps are to continue with meetings.
4 The Planning Commission can be involved as much as they would
5 like.

- 6
- 7 • Jenniges-Asked Fackler if there has been any cost to ratio done
8 because he sees trails that are not being utilized and mentioned
9 the Seabeck Marina had been shut down and doesn't
10 understand why the Commissioners are looking at more
11 waterfront access.

12

13 **Fackler- Stated Golf Courses and Bowling Alleys are profitable where
14 wetlands are not, but they are great for the community.**

- 15
- 16 • Jenniges- Notices people walking on sidewalks and highways
17 instead of on trails and wants to know what the cost to usage
18 ratio is for transportation as well, because people are tired of
19 giving their money away.

20

21 **Fackler- Had taken a survey and walking for pleasure was the top on
22 the list. There are not a lot of trails and the County knows that is a
23 demand.**

- 24
- 25 • Chair Flynn- Noted usage is not the only value of trails but
26 economic value as well.

27

28 **Fackler- Answered Jenniges cost to usage ratio by stating that Kitsap
29 County is probably beyond the scope of availability.**

- 30
- 31 • Taylor- Feels this issue is important and may be brought up at
32 another time in a comprehensive manner.

- 33
- 34 • Mahan- Asked what percent of money from tax will be used.

35

36 **Fackler- Out of 29 million dollars, 1/3-1/2 is local money.**

- 37
- 38 • Mahan- Asked who the primary decision makers are.

39

40 **Fackler- The Parks Board and the Board of County Commissioners
41 are the primary decision makers.**

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

- Taylor-Asked Fackler if he could have an answer about cost to usage ratios at the February 14, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

Fackler- Stated he would get what he is able to.

- Chair Flynn-Told Fackler this question needs to be answered to avoid it coming up again.

Michael Katterman, AHBL-Reinitiated the Port Orchard/South Kitsap draft Sub-Area Plan and Environmental Impact Statement presentation by giving an overview of the planning efforts. Next, Katterman described the Major Objectives including *accommodate an appropriate share of urban growth; preserve open spaces and habitat areas; provide employment opportunities in proximity to housing and provide adequate public facilities and services.* Next was the Plan Elements including *land use, housing, environmental protection, transportation, capital facilities, economic development and implementation.* Following Plan Elements was the Key Concept: *Centers which will preserve rural, open space and natural areas; foster a sense of place and boost economic activity; enhance safe and convenient access; diversify housing opportunities; promote healthy communities; and facilitate efficient provisions of public services and facilities.* Next was Center Elements including *compact mixed-use core; walkable and safe environment; public gathering spaces; and connection to public transit.* After the Center Elements was Potential Centers including *neighborhood (Mile Hill at Village, Lund at Jackson, Jackson at Salmonberry and Bethel at Salmonberry) and community (Bethel at Sedgwick, Bethel at Lund and Mile Hill at Jackson).* Next was Expansion Areas including *north along Baby Doll Road, east along Mile Hill and Sedgwick Roads, south to Bielmeier or Spring Creek Road, west along the Sidney Corridor, west of Glenwood Road, west along Berry Lake and Anderson Hill Roads, west along Cook and Old Clifton Roads.* Next was a brief overview of the four alternatives. Following were the Alternatives Key Similarities such as *residential expansion primarily Urban Low residential; commercial expansion along major arterials (Bethel Road, Mile Hill Drive and Sidney Road); and industrial expansion adjacent to existing industrial.* Next were the Alternatives Key Differences including *accommodate different amounts of*

1 ***population growth; alternatives 2&3 distribute residential growth in***
2 ***different locations; and alternative 4 only alternative that changes***
3 ***land use designations within existing UGA.***

- 4
- 5 • Nevins-The Comprehensive Plan has a few things to say about
6 industrial expansion and SKIA needs to be considered.
 - 7
 - 8 • Jenniges-Asked when questions could be asked because he
9 found some mistakes in the plan.
 - 10
 - 11 • Chair Flynn-Stated questions could be asked after the
12 presentation was done.
 - 13

14 **Michael Katterman handed the presentation over to Denise Lathrop,**
15 **AICP, Senior Planner.**

16

17 **Lathrop-Informed the Planning Commission that County staff will be**
18 **at the City of Port Orchard this evening to take any public testimony**
19 **due to an error of publication time. Lathrop spoke about the EIS**
20 **being broken up into two parts. The first Natural Environment**
21 **explaining *larger UGA=greater potential for impacts including more***
22 ***impervious surface area; larger habitat area coverage/fragmentation;***
23 ***more vehicle miles traveled (VMT); more energy/fuel consumption;***
24 ***and mitigation through regulations and design.*** Next under Natural
25 **Environment is Earth and *effects from increased densities including***
26 ***erosion of soils/decreased slope stability; alteration of***
27 ***topography/drainage patterns; and impacts similar for alternatives 2,***
28 ***3, &4.*** Next was Water Resources including an ***increase in impervious***
29 ***surfaces and runoff; decreased groundwater recharge; diminished***
30 ***flood storage capacity; alternatives 3 & 4 greater potential to affect***
31 ***Blackjack and Salmonberry Creeks; and implementing ecology's***
32 ***2005 stormwater manual BMP's provide further mitigation.*** Next was
33 **Fish/Plants/Animals explaining *removal & displacement of habitat;***
34 ***fragmentation of wildlife corridors; potential impacts similar for all***
35 ***alternatives; alternative 2-most class I salmon habitat, watersheds &***
36 ***streams; and alternative 4-most lakes <20 acres in size.*** Following
37 **Fish/Plants/ and Animals is Energy explaining *more energy***
38 ***consumed annually; more vehicle miles traveled = more fuel***
39 ***consumption; impacts similar for all alternatives; and mitigation***
40 ***strategies.*** Following Natural Environment with all of its categories is
41 **Built Environment with *approximately 9,700 more people in UGA;***

1 *intensification of land uses; increase in housing units; increases in*
2 *noise & reduced air quality; and increased demand for public*
3 *services and utilities. Next is Land Use with alternatives 2,3, & 4-*
4 *increase in UGA size; alternative 1-insufficient population capacity;*
5 *alternatives 2 &3-sufficient population capacity at maximum*
6 *densities; alternative 4-51% more capacity than population*
7 *allocation; and alternatives 2,3, & 4-land use compatibility. Next is*
8 *Housing and housing will increase; alternative 1-insufficient housing*
9 *capacity; alternatives 2&3-sufficient capacity at maximum densities;*
10 *alternative 4-excess housing capacity; and alternatives 1-4 lack*
11 *housing diversity (4 most diverse). Following Housing is*
12 *Environmental Health that will increase in ambient noise levels;*
13 *alternatives 2, 3, & 4-Air quality effects from increased VMT; and*
14 *mitigation strategies. Next is Transportation with no significant*
15 *differences in traffic generation; reduced intersection LOS; increased*
16 *in delays at principal arterials; and reduced LOS on adjacent rural*
17 *roads. Next is Public Services & Utilities including demand for fire &*
18 *police personnel; increased capital and operating costs; increased*
19 *enrollment(1,942 students); demand for 132 AC parks/open*
20 *space/trails; demand for water (1 MGD) & storage capacity; 0.7 MGD*
21 *wastewater generated; and 63,000 LBS solid waste/day generated.*
22 *Next are the Land Use Reclassification Requests that incorporated as*
23 *a public participation component of Sub-Area Plan at direction Kitsap*
24 *County Board of Commissioners; opportunity fro property owners t*
25 *request specific land use designations; citizen advisory group*
26 *reviewed land use reclassification requests; citizen advisory group*
27 *reviewed requests at the June 9, 2005 meeting; citizen advisory*
28 *group voted to recommend forwarding to Kitsap County Planning*
29 *Commission with criteria t be developed by Kitsap County staff; and*
30 *Kitsap County staff and consultants developed criteria listed in*
31 *appendix A.*

32
33 **Weaver-Explained to the Planning Commissioners the Land Use**
34 **Reclassification request process has been added as a component by**
35 **the Board of County Commissioners. This process allows property**
36 **owners to submit requests as to what their property should be**
37 **classified as. The CAG voted unanimously to forward the Land Use**
38 **Reclassification Requests directly to the Planning Commission.**

- 39
40
 - **Jenniges-Asked what were the four criteria to determine who**
- 41 **would be reclassified.**

1
2 **Weaver-Listed the prerequisites. 1. Was the request received within**
3 **the May 31, 2005 deadline date? 2. Does the request fall within the**
4 **study area identified by the CAG? 3. Does the request fall within on**
5 **of the four land use alternatives identified in the scoping report? 4. Is**
6 **the request consistent with one of the four land use alternatives**
7 **identifies in the scoping report?**

8 **The Planning Commissioners reviewed the Land Use Reclassification**
9 **request review criteria and the criteria matrix.**

- 10
11
 - **Jenniges-Asked James to define *commercial*.**

12
13 **Weaver-Said the definition indentified in the Draft Sub-Area plan was**
14 **identical as in the Kitsap County Code under the Commercial Use**
15 **Table. Weaver noted that under the provisions of Kitsap County**
16 **Code, mixed use of residential and commercial were allowed in all**
17 **commercial land use designations.**

- 18
19
 - **Jenniges-Stated when looking at the maps there is nothing**
20 **open near McCormick Woods.**

21
22 **Weaver-Requested Lary Coppola, as the Chair of the Citizen Advisory**
23 **Group, if he would speak on behalf of the CAG recommendations.**

- 24
25
26
 - **Coppola-Explained the CAG voted not to include any area west**
27 **of McCormick Woods.**
 - **Chair Flynn-Told the Planning Commissioners this was the time**
29 **to ask any questions.**
 - **Ahl-Asked for clarification on which alternative the Citizen**
31 **Advisory Group preferred.**

32
33
34
35 **Weaver-The Citizen Advisory Group recommended Alternative 2.**

- 36
37
 - **Nevins-Asked if the reasonable measures were adopted by the**
38 **KRCC.**

39
40 **Weaver-Yes, and extensive analysis of the existing Kitsap County**
41 **adopted reasonable measures and the 46 reasonable measures**

1 suggested by the KRCC were addressed in the current Reasonable
2 Measures Appendix and in Chapters 3 and 6 of the Draft Sub-Area
3 Plan.

- 4
- 5 • Gustavson-Asked under which CAO was the plan drafted.
- 6

7 Weaver-This plan was drafted under the previous 1998 CAO because
8 the second draft was still undecided at the time of publishing. Every
9 area in the plan that needs to be addressed has been identified and
10 will be addressed to comply with the newly adopted CAO in the final
11 document.

- 12
- 13 • Gustavson-Stated the properties that are under developable
14 need to be taken out so the citizens know what is buildable or
15 not.
- 16

17 Weaver - The Updated Land Capacity Analysis in Chapter 3 and 6
18 provided the results of the amount of land in each category that were
19 impacted by the CAO and the resulting developable land due to those
20 impacts. Additional analysis of the “preferred Alternative” including
21 the adopted 2005 CAO was proposed to be completed in the Final
22 Sub-Area Plan.

23

24 Cindy Baker-Informed the Planning Commissioners the Kingston and
25 Suquamish Plans also had the same issues and in those plans it was
26 negotiable and this is done through the ULCA.

27

28 Gustavson made a MOTION to have an overlay of the CAO to show
29 what is buildable or not before the first public hearing. Taylor
30 seconded.

31

32 Discussion

- 33
- 34 • Mahan-Asked Gustavson if he was interested in a parcel level.
35 Mahan is concerned with the county delineating where the lines
36 are drawn.
- 37

38 Baker-Explained that the County’s GIS is used when estimating
39 capacity.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – January 25, 2005

- 1 • **Gustavson-Asked that all of the changes that need to be made**
2 **do so as soon as possible so the public will have a correct**
3 **version of the draft that the CAO is supported by.**

4
5 **THE VOTE: Yes-5 NO-0 Abstained-3. Motion carried.**

- 6
7 • **Taylor-Asked what the target date is of the final plan**

8
9 **Weaver-The project schedule is for a Final Plan to be provided in late**
10 **March 2006.**

- 11
12 • **Taylor-Asked Joanne Long-Woods, City of Port Orchard, what**
13 **the City of Port Orchard’s anticipation of the boundary line will**
14 **be.**

15
16 **Joanne Long-Woods-The City planned to exercise and expansion of**
17 **Mile Hill Drive which did not project a great amount of revenue. The**
18 **City is in the process of building a new well and the City’s goal is to**
19 **include more commercial corridor. There are a lot of developers who**
20 **want to re-develop on Sidney/Sedgwick. There has been a high**
21 **demand for mixed use in that area. The City is also having work**
22 **sessions to discuss more residential area downtown Port Orchard.**

- 23
24 • **Taylor-Asked if Urban Medium and Urban High have a major**
25 **impact.**

26
27 **Long-Woods-The concerns would be trying to serve that level of**
28 **impact. Kitsap County allows mixed use but the City does not.**

- 29
30 • **Ahl-Asked if the City is going to expand its city limits.**

31
32 **Long-Woods-The City is looking to build a corridor to McCormick**
33 **Woods and there is intent for the City to discuss expansion.**

- 34
35 • **Jenniges-Has comments he will submit in writing at a later time.**

- 36
37 • **Chair Flynn-Noted there are still quite a few comments and**
38 **asked if there will be a work/study session.**

39

1 **Weaver- Stated that would be possible and would be scheduled at the**
2 **boards direction.**

- 3
4 • **Mahan- Noticed some of the areas are Urban Reserve study area**
5 **and questioned if the zoning does not change what will happen**
6 **to the rural lands.**

7
8 **Weaver- Stated the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update would**
9 **address the areas not proposed to be included with the Port Orchard**
10 **/ South Kitsap Urban Growth Area and that the areas would**
11 **remain urban reserve until the 10-Year update is complete.**

- 12
13 • **Gustavson- Motioned to begin the February 14, 2006 Planning**
14 **Commission meeting with a work/study session. Taylor**
15 **seconded. THE VOTE: Yes-9 No-0**

16
17 **Baker- Informed the Planning Commission the zoning code is being**
18 **updated. Also, the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan is being updated**
19 **with Jones and Stokes and AHBL as the consultants.**

20
21 **No further business being heard, a motion was made by Monty**
22 **Mahan and second by John Taylor that the meeting be adjourned.**
23 **Motion carried.**

24
25 **D. Old Business**

26
27 **None**

28
29 **E. New Business**

30
31 **None**

32
33 **F. Other Business**

34
35 **None**

36
37 **10:45 AM - No further business being heard, a motion was made by**
38 **John Taylor and second by John Ahl that the meeting be adjourned.**
39 **Motion carried.**

40

41

Kitsap County Planning Commission –January 25, 2005

1 Exhibit No.	Description
2	
3 A. January 10, 2006 Agenda	
4 B. Legal public notice for the January 10, 2006 Planning	
5 Commission work study session	
6 C. PowerPoint Presentation of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Draft	
7 Sub-Area Plan and EIS	
8	

9 MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2005.

**10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20**

Deborah Flynn, Chair

Brynan Pierce, Acting Planning Commission Secretary