

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Work/Study Session

February 14, 2006

1
2
3
4
5
6 The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated
7 date at the Kitsap County Fairgrounds, Eagle's Nest Conference
8 Center, 1195 Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA 98311. Members
9 Present: John Ahl, Tom Nevins, Dean Jenniges, Brian Bekeny, John
10 Taylor, Lary Coppola, Mike Gustavson, Monty Mahan and Chair, Deb
11 Flynn. Staff Present: Scott Diener, James Weaver, and Planning
12 Commission Secretary, Brynan Pierce.

13
14 9:00 AM

15
16 A. Chair Deb Flynn called the meeting to Order and
17 introduced the Planning Commission members present.

18
19 9:05 AM

20 Approval of Minutes

21
22 B. October 25, 2005 Minutes

23
24 A motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by Lary Coppola
25 that the Planning Commission minutes of October 25, 2005 be
26 approved. THE VOTE: Yes-6 No-0 Abstained-2. Motion carried.

27
28 October 31, 2005 Minutes

29
30 A motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by John Ahl that
31 the Planning Commission minutes of October 31, 2005 be approved.
32 THE VOTE: Yes-7 No-0 Abstained-1. Motion carried.

33
34 November 1, 2005 Minutes

35
36 A motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by John Taylor
37 that the Planning Commission minutes of November 1, 2005 be
38 approved.
39

- Mike Gustavson- Stated for the record, the letter signed by 5 Planning Commissioners regarding the CAO was never submitted to the Board of County Commissioners.

THE VOTE: Yes-4 No-0 Abstained-4: Approved with four because Frank Mahaffay has been replaced.

November 22, 2005 Minutes

A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by Dean Jenniges that the minutes of the November 22, 2005 Planning Commission meeting be approved. THE VOTE: Yes-6 No-0 Abstained-2. Motion Carried.

- Chair Flynn-Noted for the record Brian Bekeny is now in attendance.

C. Work/Study Session

James Weaver, Kitsap County Senior Planner-Introduced the team who will be giving a brief presentation on the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan/EIS: Michael Katterman, Denise Lathrop, and Joanne Long-Woods. Weaver explained the purpose of the work/study session is for the Planning Commission to deliberate for a recommendation of an alternative to the Board of County Commissioners. Weaver passed out public testimony received within the extended public comment period ending on February 6, 2006. The comments are broken into agency comments and public comments. There will be a discussion from Joanne Long-Woods regarding the Port Orchard Planning Commissions recommendation, which is included in the packet before the Commission.

Denise Lathrop-Gave a brief overview of the comments. There were a number of comments from the tribes that wanted additional culture resources included into the Sub-Area plan and EIS. There were comments regarding reasonable measures and how they were applied to the study area. There were a number of comments regarding natural resources including how the newly adopted CAO will affect land capacity and critical areas. There were comments from the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, the City of Bremerton and the City of Port Orchard asking to extend the

1 **comment period. The City of Bremerton and the City of Port Orchard**
2 **were concerned about maintaining the city identities and looking into**
3 **urban separators and coordination between jurisdictions. There were**
4 **a number of land use reclassification request submitted as well as**
5 **comments regarding individuals properties being rezoned. There**
6 **were comments regarding the size of the Urban Growth Area and**
7 **affordable housing, where a larger UGA may provide more affordable**
8 **housing opposed to a smaller UGA. There were also CAO issues**
9 **concerning buffers and land capacity.**

10
11 **Michael Katterman-Discussed a question and answer list the**
12 **Planning Commissioners had at the previous Planning Commission**
13 **meeting as well as a brief power point presentation that were both**
14 **submitted for the record. Katterman also briefly reminded the**
15 **Planning Commissioners of the four alternatives.**

16
17 **Joanne Long-Woods-Thanked the Kitsap County Planning**
18 **Commissioners for allowing the City of Port Orchard Planning**
19 **Commissioners to join them at the Public Hearing; they enjoyed the**
20 **opportunity to listen to citizens comments. The Port Orchard**
21 **Planning Commission held a discussion on January 30, 2006 to**
22 **consider any additional testimony and make a recommendation. The**
23 **preferred alternative that was agreed upon was Alternative two with**
24 **some modifications. The Planning Commission chose alternative two**
25 **to honor the Citizens Advisory Group's recommendation and their**
26 **hard work over the past two years. The modifications included:**

27
28 **1. Include the Berry Lake Area Southwest of Old Clifton Road and**
29 **west of State Route 16;**

30
31 **2. Include a triangular area of approximately 5-6 parcels southwest of**
32 **the above referenced area, south of Old Clifton Road, and adjacent to**
33 **the McCormick Wood UGA;**

34
35 **3. Designate the zoning in the above two areas as Urban Low**
36 **Residential (5-9 DU/AC) except in the case where there area critical**
37 **area restraints on the property. On the parcels containing more than**
38 **>50% critical areas, those parcels should be designated Urban**
39 **Restricted (1-5 DU/AC). On parcels containing <50% critical area,**
40 **those parcels should be designated the Urban Low Residential (5-9**
41 **DU/AC);**

1 **4. Add a section of land from SE Sedgwick Road, East of Phillips Rd.**
2 **up to and including Aiken Road SE, and north to Creek View Drive**
3 **and adjacent to the existing Urban Low Residential Area.**

- 4
- 5 • **Mahan-Asked Long-Woods whose analysis the Kitsap County**
6 **Planning Commission should use to decide if areas are 50%**
7 **impacted.**

8

9 **Long-Woods- It is based on Kitsap County's GIS.**

- 10
- 11 • **Mike Gustavson-Feels there needs to be more than a GIS map**
12 **to determine what is impacted.**

13

14 **Long-Woods-The City of Port Orchard applied for a grant to do a site**
15 **specific wetland inventory within the city and a certain area around**
16 **the city. It does not include the study area. After the site specific**
17 **wetland evaluation, we will have a transparency map that will be**
18 **available to the public and other agencies.**

- 19
- 20 • **John Ahl-Asked if the Port Orchard Planning Commission**
21 **considered any off set deductions in the UGA.**

22

23 **Long-Woods-Stated that was the one thing not discussed; if you add**
24 **in some areas, should you subtract in other areas.**

25

26 **Weaver-Part of the purpose of this meeting is to request a**
27 **recommendation of a preferred alternative. Previous plans have**
28 **relied upon staff recommendations and they presented those**
29 **recommendations to this Commission. It was the desire from the**
30 **CAG and the community that the Planning Commission be forwarded**
31 **the opportunity to choose a preferred alternative on behalf of the**
32 **CAG and community. Part of the basis of the decisions of the**
33 **preferred alternative is that it would achieve the goals of the plan,**
34 **balance the growth and expansion to reflect pubic input received and**
35 **minimize the impacts to the natural and built environments. The**
36 **proposed commercial expansions are identified in all of the**
37 **alternatives.**

- 38
- 39 • **Jenniges-Looking at all of the maps, the dark lines on the maps**
40 **are the Urban Growth Area and there are no changes.**

41

1 **Weaver-The dark lines show the study area and that remains the**
2 **same.**

- 3
4 • **Jenniges-There were many people concerned about the mixed**
5 **industrial to residential zoning out on Old Clifton Road.**

6
7 **Weaver-Alternatives two and three have the industrial-residential**
8 **north of Old Clifton road only.**

- 9
10 • **Jenniges-Drove out to Old Clifton and saw very high-end homes**
11 **out there.**

12
13 **Weaver-South of Old Clifton there are many existing homes that were**
14 **recently constructed.**

- 15
16 • **Jenniges-Asked if everyone out there is satisfied with the**
17 **growth.**

18
19 **Weaver-Stated, probably not. No alternative proposed would meet**
20 **everyone's desires. Specifically Alternative four was the largest area**
21 **and incorporated a number of the land use reclassification requests.**
22 **For many of the Land Use Reclassification Requests, there were**
23 **many parcels with same owners. To be able to analyze the requests**
24 **fully, alternative four included the most of them that fell within the**
25 **EIS study area.**

- 26
27 • **Jenniges- Felt during the public hearing, there were a lot of**
28 **people who wanted to add into the growth area, especially Ron**
29 **Wiley and Arnie Norm. With the Wiley property being**
30 **established for the past 20 years, Jenniges questioned why it**
31 **was not considered in the process.**

32
33 **Weaver-That group of parcels were included in the Land Use**
34 **Reclassification Requests for all the parcels south of Highway 16.**
35 **There are a number of them that may have been operating under a**
36 **grandfather use. In discussions with Karcher Creek Sewer District**
37 **representatives, the length and cost of the extension that would**
38 **provide sewer across the highway was examined. There were about**
39 **including the four parcels and that did not seem feasible financially**
40 **given the few parcels involved that would be required to bear that**

1 **cost as well as limiting future expansions that may already be**
2 **available under the existing Land Use Designation.**

- 3
4 • **Jenniges-Wiley and Norm were just looking at expansion for**
5 **industrial.**

6
7 **Weaver-Typically, under GMA regulations, that would require sewer**
8 **and urban amenities.**

- 9
10 • **Gustavson-When we do developments like this don't we often**
11 **leave the sewer connect to the developer?**

12
13 **Weaver-The financial obligation is typically dependent upon the**
14 **developer unless if there is a latecomer's agreement for existing**
15 **infrastructure.**

- 16
17 • **Gustavson-There should be a rectangle of commercial area**
18 **highway accessible near the Sidney/Sedgwick interchange.**

19
20 **Weaver-Asked if the commercially designated parcels along Sidney**
21 **and Sedgwick were sufficient to meet this.**

- 22
23 • **Gustavson-Does not see available buildable parcels like Gig**
24 **Harbor has.**

25
26 **Weaver-Unlike The Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan is**
27 **responsible for looking at a 20 year plan for accommodating growth**
28 **in the Port Orchard / South Kitsap area. , Joanne Long-Woods would**
29 **like to speak about commercial development within the City of Port**
30 **Orchard.**

31
32 **Long-Woods-There is a group of property owners interested in doing**
33 **big box development at the Sidney/Sedgwick interchange that have**
34 **previously looked at building in Gig Harbor.**

- 35
36
37 • **Coppola-Understands the developers are not being spoken to**
38 **because of mitigation issues.**

39
40 **Long-Woods-The last proposal Port Orchard was given has two big**
41 **boxes and one is on a wetland. There is another developer interested**

1 in lower intensive retail surrounded by high rise condos. It is almost
2 like a neighborhood commercial center surrounded by residential
3 use. That is something that can be more easily mitigated.

- 4
- 5 • **Gustavson-Feels South Kitsap desperately needs to not zone**
6 **ourselves out of future use.**
- 7
- 8 • **Coppola-Agrees with Gustavson. Kitsap County loses millions**
9 **of dollars in sales tax revenue to Gig Harbor. As long as the**
10 **opportunity to shop locally isn't here, we are not going to. It**
11 **also impacts out county in a negative way.**
- 12

13 **Long-Woods-Will pass that information along. Long-Woods has**
14 **worked with big box developers and knows that there is a range of**
15 **sizes to work with from 250,000 square feet to 50,000 square feet.**

- 16
- 17 • **Chair Flynn-It seems the alternatives have enough commercial**
18 **land.**
- 19

20 **Weaver-They do, all of the alternatives show adequate commercial**
21 **capacity based on the existing trends identified by the ULCA. The**
22 **existing trends show the out migration of jobs and commercial**
23 **activity to regional centers. The out migration was a concern.**

- 24
- 25 • **Jenniges- Has friends that don't go into Port Orchard because**
26 **there is nowhere to shop. Jenniges sees highway tourist along**
27 **all of the main roads.**
- 28

29 **Weaver-Highway tourist commercial has been identified as the most**
30 **flexible county designation that allows both housing and retail use**
31 **along the corridors. The ten-year Update to the Kitsap County**
32 **Comprehensive Plan has the ability to analyze the county-wide areas**
33 **and identify if those areas need more infrastructure or growth.**
34 **Weaver asked the Planning Commissioners if they had a solution or**
35 **recommendations to this identified shortage of commercial land use**
36 **designations.**

- 37
- 38 • **Mahan-Asked if alternative two was recommended and adopted,**
39 **when the City of Port Orchard would legally own the properties.**
- 40

1 **Weaver-Replied regarding the planning process, that once a**
2 **recommendation of a “preferred alternative” comes from this**
3 **planning commission, an analysis is provided of the recommended**
4 **“preferred alternative” is performed and received comments are**
5 **responded to in the Final document. This Final Sub-Area Plan/Final**
6 **EIS is delivered to the City in satisfaction of the approved inter-local**
7 **agreement. Upon adoption by the Board of County Commissioners, it**
8 **would result in zoning changes taking place immediately upon**
9 **notification, but are pending a 60 day appeal period. The annexation**
10 **of any parcels would be an entirely separate process with**
11 **independent requirements to begin.**

- 12
- 13 • **Mahan-Asked what the level of service G and H in the**
14 **appendices was correct.**
- 15

16 **Weaver-Replied that the G and H levels of service were used for**
17 **modeling purposes in Appendix D of the Draft Sub-Area Plan. The**
18 **levels of service allows public works to prioritize what transportation**
19 **needs are first and how improvements may be allocated.**

- 20
- 21 • **Jenniges-One of the major fallacies are assuming all of the**
22 **industrial areas need sewer. A lot of the industrial areas just**
23 **need to accommodate 30-50 people.**
- 24

25 **Weaver-Where manufacturing goes on, water usage may be a factor.**
26 **Sewer may be required for those to operate at their full capacity for**
27 **highest and best use.**

- 28
- 29 • **Jenniges- Asked if there are alternatives for industrial type**
30 **septic systems that could be augmented for growth. If someone**
31 **goes to get a permit will they be denied because they don't**
32 **have sewer?**
- 33

34 **Weaver-Deferred the question to Eric Baker, Land Use Planning**
35 **Manager.**

36

37 **Eric Baker-It is all use dependent. The health district plays a huge**
38 **role in exactly what types of uses are allowed and what types are not.**
39 **There are alternatives systems such as a significant industrial**
40 **separating system. They are very expensive and we don't want to**
41 **make large scale improvements in the interim because it may make it**

1 harder in the future. In regards to permitting, the systems do restrict
2 the types of systems that can be used on the property.

- 3
- 4 • Jenniges-We have had this conversation before. Why doesn't
5 the County invest in some kind of infrastructure here? It seems
6 to be the main desire. The county hasn't taken the lead to build
7 the infrastructure.

8

9 Baker-That is part of the Sub-Area plans. Beyond putting the color on
10 the map, it's getting the actual lines to be capable of accommodating
11 growth. Through the 10-year update, we will be taking a proactive
12 role with trying to determine commercial/industrial uses. The capital
13 facilities element is always the devil in these types of projects.

- 14
- 15 • Taylor-There is an article in this morning's paper about Pierce
16 County receiving money from the state to build a hospital that
17 has been blocked by infrastructure. Maybe Public Works should
18 read that article.
 - 19
 - 20 • Tom Nevins-Commented on staff and the Citizens Advisory
21 Group's hard work and feels it is not the Planning
22 Commissioner's role to make a recommendation.

23

24 A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by Dean Jenniges
25 that alternative two be selected as the preferred alternative with
26 modifications.

- 27
- 28 • Mahan-Stated his father owns property on the corner of Berry
29 Lake and Sedgwick that has not been discussed between the
30 two of them, but if anybody feels Monty Mahan should recuse
31 himself, he is willing to entertain their thoughts.
 - 32
 - 33 • Jenniges-Does not feel that is necessary because the
34 recommendations are coming from a variety of groups, not just
35 one.
 - 36
 - 37 • Coppola-Informed the Planning Commission that he was Chair
38 of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Citizen's Advisory Group and
39 would be willing to recuse himself if anyone felt it appropriate.
- 40

- 1 • **Gustavson- Stated he was a member on the CAG.**
- 2
- 3 • **Ahl- Stated that the audience is allowed to weigh in on the**
- 4 **decision as well.**
- 5
- 6 • **Chair Flynn- Stated that she listened to the public hearing,**
- 7 **however, coming in today, she did not see the comments in**
- 8 **front of her.**
- 9

10 **Weaver- Staff received the last comment yesterday. Anything**
11 **received before the 24th of January was scanned to the CD each**
12 **Planning Commissioner received.**

- 13
- 14 • **Coppola- Extended a personal invitation to the Suquamish Tribe**
- 15 **to participate in the process three times with out a response.**
- 16 **Coppola also invited the Chairman of the Tribe to the Economic**
- 17 **Development Council meetings and Tribal Chairman stated that**
- 18 **they wanted to be on a Government to Government basis.**
- 19 **Coppola said that was fine, because the County is also doing**
- 20 **that with the City of Port Orchard, but we would welcome their**
- 21 **participation. The Tribal Chairman stated that is a manpower**
- 22 **issue and it is cheaper for the tribe to appeal on the back end of**
- 23 **the process then to participate in the process. Coppola pointed**
- 24 **out that it may cost Kitsap County a lot of money to have an**
- 25 **appeal and the tribal Chairman shrugged his shoulders stating,**
- 26 **that's the way it goes.**
- 27
- 28 • **Gustavson- Asked if it is appropriate for the Planning**
- 29 **Commission to consider and vote on the motion on the table,**
- 30 **then make amendments, or to vote on the motion with**
- 31 **amendments.**
- 32
- 33 • **Ahl- Would prefer to air ideas before voting on a motion**
- 34 **because there may be some people who don't want to change**
- 35 **the motion, then vote on the package.**
- 36
- 37 • **Gustavson- The City of Port Orchard voted on the alternative,**
- 38 **and then voted on any additional modifications.**
- 39

Kitsap County Planning Commission –February 14, 2006

- 1 • **Ahl-Is not willing to tinker with the plan too much, two years of**
2 **hard work was put into the plan and he supports the Citizens**
3 **Advisory Group’s preferred alternative.**
4
- 5 • **Gustavson-We are going to look at parcel by parcel from the**
6 **citizen’s testimony at the public hearing.**
7
- 8 • **Ahl-Feels the reclassification requests should be a separate**
9 **issue until we know what we are recommending as an Urban**
10 **Growth Area.**
11
- 12 • **Nevins-Suggests changes one by one to the individual land use**
13 **reclassification requests.**
14
- 15 • **Coppola-Appreciates the attitude John Ahl has and thanks him**
16 **on behalf of the CAG.**
17
- 18 • **Chair Flynn-Realized during the break there is a lot of**
19 **information she has not reviewed and does not feel comfortable**
20 **deliberating or voting on the issue but will be happy to stay and**
21 **chair the meeting.**
22
- 23 • **Taylor-Asked Chair Flynn if she does not want to move forward**
24 **with the motion.**
25
- 26 • **Chair Flynn-Stated she is one person of nine who will not be**
27 **voting but will still run the meeting.**
28
- 29 • **Taylor-Thinks it is fine to continue with the meeting to have it**
30 **off the Planning Commission’s table.**
31
- 32 • **Nevins-Asked staff if there is anything in the packet that has not**
33 **been presented before.**
34

35 **Weaver-Before you are comments from individuals, a large set of**
36 **three documents submitted by Jerry Harless, in addition to**
37 **comments relating to specific properties. The comment period was**
38 **extended to February 6, 2006 and those received are new to the**
39 **Planning Commission. Staff just finished compiling all of them to**
40 **present to you.**

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

- **Nevins-Asked if the Planning Commission needs additional time to read the new comments.**
- **Mahan-Read the comments during the presentation and is ready to proceed.**
- **Jenniges-To move the process ahead, Jenniges recommends the Planning Commission look at the alternative currently on the table as a generic plan. Any changes to the plan should be site specific due to the fact that during the public hearing there were a lot of citizens asking to be included. If it is done any other way, it will be a convoluted process.**

Weaver-The City of Port Orchard had a hard time getting their arms around the same subject. The City voted on the alternative as an individual item then proceeded to the individual components that each member wanted to address, and then voted on those separately. He asked if there is still a motion on the table and if the Commissioners are still deliberating on that.

- **Taylor-Asked that the motion be read back.**
- **Nevins-We could do the modifications either way.**

A friendly amendment was made by Dean Jenniges to Tom Nevins' motion that the Planning Commission accept alternative two without amendments and the amendments be presented as separate proposals.

- **Nevins-Stated he cannot accept that, but would prefer to talk about individual modifications without any motion to accept any alternative.**
- **Taylor-Feels there are sufficient agreement to work on the amendments prior to voting on the alternative.**
- **Nevins-The modifications in concern are the plans approach and the work order to meet certain conditions. The top problem is the lack of looking outside the box in industrial area.**

1
2 **A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by Mike**
3 **Gustavson that new industrial area be eliminated.**

- 4
5 • **Coppola-SKIA is 2100 acres. To say that we will have 9,000 jobs**
6 **by 2017 is a fallacy based on the County’s track record. The**
7 **proposed expansion of the existing industrial area is to**
8 **accommodate businesses that are already there, but have no**
9 **room to expand.**
- 10
11 • **Gustavson-Agrees with Lary.**
- 12
13 • **Coppola-Feels very strongly that the extension in alternative**
14 **four to Long Lake, be included in alternative two due to the fact**
15 **that sewer is strongly needed in that area.**
- 16
17 • **Mahan-The two different areas are two different kinds of**
18 **industrial and there is room for the existing businesses and**
19 **SKIA.**
- 20
21 • **Jenniges-Asked for clarification on what is being modified.**

22
23 **Weaver-My understand of the present motion is that we would be**
24 **removing all industrial area.**

- 25
26 • **Chair Flynn-Asked what the zoning would be if industrial was**
27 **removed.**

28
29 **Weaver-Stated it would remain Urban Reserve.**

- 30
31 • **Nevins-Justification would be that Kitsap County has sufficient**
32 **industrial areas zoned.**

33
34 **Weaver-Indicated on the map where the industrial areas in alternative**
35 **two were.**

- 36
37 • **Gustavson-Noted that there are businesses that just want to**
38 **expand rather than relocate their entire business.**
- 39

- 1 • Nevins-There have been goals set during SKIA that have not
2 been achieved. Industrial area has been added without activity.

- 3
4 • Coppola-Asked James Weaver how many acres total is
5 industrial.

6
7 **Weaver-This is a joint sub-area plan specifically identifying local
8 level goals and policies. In the population and development
9 allocation report, it goes into extensive detail about the impacts of
10 SKIA. That is the reason for the low allocations identified early on.
11 The City of Port Orchard has invested interest in existing businesses
12 to keep them on a local level land not outsource to other areas of the
13 County. The industrial acres total 43 acres in alternative 2, 19 of
14 those acres are developable based upon the CAO maps.**

- 15
16 • **Coppola-The corporate campus has been in litigation for the
17 past 2 years. To try to include that in the mix does not work
18 because we don't know what is going on.**

- 19
20 • **Jenniges-Without any changes to alternative two, making
21 comments about industrial area that should or shouldn't be
22 there is overcome by events.**

23
24 **The VOTE to the amended motion: Yes-1 No-7 Abstained-1
25 Amendment failed.**

- 26
27 • **Gustavson-Recommends that the Planning Commission
28 addresses the modifications from the City of Port Orchard.
29 Gustavson showed the Planning Commissioners critical areas
30 on a map showing them where it is possible to build or not.
31 Gustavson is disappointed that he did not see that map, unless
32 he missed it.**

33
34 **Weaver-The map was provided in your packets at the January 24,
35 2006 hearing, as well as additional information provided in table
36 format on buildable property.**

- 37
38 • **Gustavson-Dick Brown stated that the major commercial issue
39 was left on the table for the Planning Commission.**

40

1 Weaver-Clarified that Dick Brown, when asked this question, stated
2 in the Jan 24th Hearing that alternative two was the only alternative
3 that would be accepted by the state.

- 4
- 5 • Gustavson-By the time we take away all of the impacted soil
6 here will not be actual building permitable acreage.
- 7

8 Weaver-There may be a difference between what the state identifies
9 as buildable land and the economic disparity of accommodating the
10 buildable land.

11

12 A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by Monty
13 Mahan that the Planning Commission review and discuss the
14 recommendations made by the City of Port Orchard to alternative
15 two.

16 The VOTE: Yes-8 No-0 Abstained-1
17 Motion carries.

18

19 A motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by Lary Coppola
20 that the Kitsap County Planning Commission adopt recommended
21 changes one and two from the City of Port Orchard's Planning
22 Commission.

- 23
- 24 • Nevins-Feels an area of Urban Low should be taken off of the
25 area north of Baby Doll Road. Nevins would have to vote
26 against the motion if some areas were not removed.
- 27
- 28 • Gustavson-The number of parcels that would be added are
29 significantly less because of the Critical Areas Ordinance.
- 30
- 31 • Mahan-Does not see a strong case of capacity without
32 removing an area.
- 33
- 34 • Brian Bekeny-Asked what the unit of measure is and if an area
35 is subtracted, what is added.
- 36

37 Weaver-Approximately 290 acres would be added in this proposal.

- 38
- 39 • Nevins-If you are going to add, we might as well recommend
40 alternative four.
- 41

- 1 • Jenniges-Agrees with Tom Nevins. If the Planning Commission
2 makes a lot of changes, things get complicated. It is important
3 to get the alternative through the process without changes.
4 Jenniges would vote on alternative two without changes.

5
6 **THE VOTE: Yes-0 No-8 Abstained-1**

7 **Motion failed.**

- 8
9 • Mahan-Recommendation three has to do with alternatives one
10 and two which will not change because we voted not to include
11 changes one and two.

12
13 A motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by Tom Nevins
14 that recommendation four from the Port Orchard Planning
15 Commission be included.

- 16
17 • Mahan-Asked if any of the parcel owners attended the public
18 hearing and ask to be included.

19
20 Weaver-To his recollection, no, most of the property owners were
21 further south.

- 22
23 • Mahan-Asked if it was the City of Port Orchard's Planning
24 Commission that saw this area as valuable.

25
26 Long-Woods-Yes, and there wasn't any specific reasoning as to why.

- 27
28
29 • Gustavson-Asked if the Phillips road area is currently served by
30 sewer.

31
32 Weaver-Not currently, but Karcher Creek has the capacity to extend
33 to Bielmeier road.

34
35 **The VOTE: Yes-3 No-3 Abstained-3**

36 **Motion failed.**

- 37
38 • Mahan-Felt Don Ryan's request to change the North side of
39 Sedgwick road to commercial was reasonable for his business
40 and future growth.

1 A motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by John Taylor to
2 change the zoning on the North side of Sedgwick to commercial.

- 3
- 4 • Gustavson-Drives that road and feels the road is very high
5 traffic with minimal visibility. Having left hand turns on the road
6 seems very dangerous. Gustavson suggests having a dual left
7 hand turn lane with a stop light.
 - 8
 - 9 • Taylor-The governing agency will make the decision on how
10 many turn pockets, roads and everything else.
 - 11
 - 12 • Ahl-Asked if this was discussed during the Citizens Advisory
13 Group meetings.
 - 14
 - 15 • Coppola-It wasn't discussed at all.
 - 16

17 Weaver-Reflected why this proposal was not discussed in the 2004
18 CAG meetings. At that time there was no gas tax. Sedgwick road was
19 not proposed to be improved until 2012 or 2017. In this planning
20 process, the CAG determined it would seem adding more commercial
21 on a two lane road would be detrimental. Since that time, the gas tax
22 was passed and Sedgwick Road moved up immediately to the top of
23 the list for State improvements.

- 24
- 25 • Ahl-Feels that traffic problems alone would cause him to vote
26 no.
 - 27
 - 28 • Jenniges-It is a terrible hill to have traffic backed up on
29 Sedgwick.
 - 30
 - 31 • Mahan-Because of the hills, we are likely to be looking at a
32 concrete median and access through Ramsey road.
 - 33

34 Weaver-Mr. Ryan's proposal included aggregation of four lots with
35 access at Bethel.

- 36
- 37 • Gustavson-If we are going to put in freeway accessible big
38 building lots in, where are they going to go?
 - 39

40 The VOTE: Yes-3 No-5 Abstained-1

1 Motion failed.

2
3 A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Monty Mahan
4 to remove the access to Long Lake in alternative four and put it in
5 alternative two, to extend sewer to the area.

- 6
7 • Mahan-Asked if the lots are built out or not.

8
9 Weaver- They are suburban level residential subdivisions and the
10 extension includes the park.

- 11
12 • Ahl-Asked if including the yellow area would provide sewer
13 around the whole lake.

14
15 Weaver-It would allow the pump station to be on the current land and
16 the line extensions would be available on an emergency basis
17 without converting to urban densities.

- 18
19 • Mahan-The pump stations would be the expensive part.

20
21 Long-Woods-It is the opinion of the council and the Planning
22 Commission that UGA not be extended out to the Long Lake area.

- 23
24 • Bekeny-Before someone said alternative four would be shot
25 down. Will adding this area put alternative two in jeopardy?

- 26
27 • Nevins-Generally supports adding sewer, but feels this does
28 not seem totally honest.

- 29
30 • Ahl-Does not feel that designating this area in the UGA will
31 promise a pump station. There is an issue, but the County could
32 say it is not their problem.

33
34 The VOTE: Yes-5 No-3 Absatined-1
35 Motion carries.

- 36
37 • Gustavson-Asked if the Planning Commission should address
38 the individual parcel requests here.

39

1 **Weaver-There is a possibility to include all of them currently in**
2 **alternative two. Or recommend delegating that to the Board of**
3 **County Commissioners.**

4
5 **A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by John**
6 **Taylor that the Land Use Reclassification requests be included as**
7 **requested in mass that are in alternative two.**

- 8
9 • **Nevins-Would add if they are unchanged from the zoning that**
10 **has been presented so far.**
11
12 • **Ahl-Those parcels that are consistent with the criteria identified**
13 **in the plan that is ultimately adopted by the Commissioners, will**
14 **get their requests. Those that are not consistent should be**
15 **reviewed and acted upon individually.**

16
17 **Weaver-There is also the chance to do so during the 10-year**
18 **Comprehensive Plan Update.**

- 19
20 • **Coppola-Too many people worked too hard to change it now.**
21 **The individual requests should be moved to the Board.**
22
23 • **Bekeny-Agrees because the Planning Commission just voted**
24 **against Monty’s motion which included one of the property**
25 **owners’ reclassification requests.**
26
27 • **Ahl-Everyone is saying the same thing in different ways.**

28
29 **The VOTE: Yes-0 No-8 Absatined-1**
30 **Motion failed.**

- 31 • **Jenniges-For clarification, the only change to alternative two is**
32 **the addition of the Long Lake access.**

33
34 **Discussions were held by the Planning Commission with failed**
35 **zoning change amendments South of Sedgwick, West of Bethel and**
36 **North East of Highway 16, currently identified as Urban Low in**
37 **alternative two with the previous motion withdrawn.**

38
39 **A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by Mike**
40 **Gustavson to incorporate within the current Urban Growth boundary**

1 the Urban medium and Urban High from alternative four to alternative
2 two.

- 3
- 4 • Mahan-Asked if Urban Cluster would also be included and
5 suggests an amendment that any residential zones from
6 alternative four not take away from commercial zone from
7 alternative two.

8

9 **The VOTE: Yes-4 No-4 Abstained-1**
10 **Motion failed.**

11

12 **The VOTE to the original motion: Yes-8 No-0 Abstained-1**

- 13
- 14 • Taylor-Asked staff why there has not been a joint meeting with
15 the Planning Commission and the Board of County
16 Commissioner's that has been requested by the Planning
17 Commission, Taylor noted that the Planning Commission
18 requested a traffic analysis report for North Kitsap, due in
19 March, has not been provided, and asked who the Director of
20 DCD is.

21

22 **Diener-Jim Bolger is remaining Assistant Director and there is no**
23 **Interim Director. Chris Gears has assumed the responsibilities of**
24 **DCD Director.**

25

26

27 **D. 12:30 PM Meeting adjourned with no further business.**

28

29

30 **Exhibit No.**

Description

- 31
- 32 **A. February 14, 2006 Agenda**
 - 33 **B. Legal public notice for the February 14, 2006 Planning**
34 **Commission work study session**
 - 35 **C. Questions and Answers for the Planning Commissioners'**
36 **submitted by Michael Katterman**
 - 37 **D. Port Orchard/South Kitsap Power Point Presentation by Michael**
38 **Katterman**
 - 39 **E. January 24, 2006 Minutes**
 - 40 **F. Meeting agenda from Michael Katterman**
 - 41 **G. City of Port Orchard notice of decision**

H. Newspaper articles referencing Consolidated Housing

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15

MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2006.

Deborah Flynn, Chair

Brynan Pierce, Planning Commission Secretary