

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Work/Study Session

September 5, 2006

**** Please note: Audio recording not available for these minutes ****

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap
9 County Administration Building, Commissioner's Chambers located at 619 Division
10 Street Port Orchard, Washington 98366. Members present: John Taylor, Mike
11 Gustavson, Monty Mahan, Tom Nevins, Dean Jenniges, Deb Flynn, John Ahl. Also
12 Greg Cioc, Jim Bolger, Angie Silva, James Weaver, and Planning Commission
13 Secretary Brynan Pierce.

14
15 Meeting called to order with introductions

16
17 Approval of minutes: June 27, 06 minutes

18 A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Dean Jenniges.

19 MG: pg 153 line 25 doesn't make sense re comments by DJ. DJ: happy with what was
20 stated

21 The vote: 6 for; abstained 1 (MM)

22 Minutes approved

23 **Please note: The adopted minutes cannot be located and will be re-adopted on**
24 **11-28-06**

25 *****

26
27 Jim Bolger: Planning Commissioners should all have the three volumes of the draft
28 comprehensive plan. Baker is not present. Will look at volume one and some
29 changes. There are three volumes, and this is an integrated document. Volume One
30 will be the main doc.

31 Under Vol One is the reference to the presentation. All of the sub-area plans are
32 included. Also is a chapter of implementation and 6-year capital facilities plan.

33
34 Bolger noted in Vol II: Environmental impact statement:

35 Updated land capacity analysis/UGA sizing

36 Existing environmental conditions

37 Environmental impacts of impacts 1, 2, and 3

38 Reasonable measures review

39 Capital facilities plan for alternative 2; and

40
41 Vol 3 is proposed regulations:

42 Mixed use zone

43 Consolidated land use table

44 Rural wooded incentive program

45 Transfer of development rights

46 Park zone

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

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
42
43
44
45
46
47

Angie Silva: The hearings board decision on the reductions are providing sewer being too far away from development. The hearings board noted there was no connection and we are deducting lands and they identified this.

Ahl: Asked if the net affect would be if subtracted those parcels, does that give the opportunity to expand and accommodate the area for the same people?

Silva: Things are different for all UGAs.

Bolger: We counted for the capacity. In terms of the 10-year update we tried to accommodate. We have explored the idea of 4 dwelling units per acre.

Specifically, note chapters for:

- Land Use Chapter
- UGA sizing land capacity
- Vacant and underutilized land
- Critical areas deduction
- Right of way and public facilities deductions
- Sewer reduction removed per CPSGMHB

We are a little shy in Kingston alt 2.

County-wide we are 2500 people under capacity. JB went over the new population and capacity from the alternatives maps in the presentation.

Bolger: County is looking to having the city of Bremerton annex into something. East Bremerton, WA is below in capacity for the new population. West Bremerton UGA is similar.

Jenniges: Talked to members of the city council and wants clarification of the red line. Questioned why the Illahee area is not incorporated.

Bolger: We are making an assumption that the areas will eventually annex.

Gustavson: In Nov, will rezone to one residence per lot. Bremerton has downzoned across the board.

Bolger: They feel that they can accommodate.

Taylor: Bremerton's final adoption was in December, now you can't get a permit for duplexes.

Bolger: Stated that they are proposing mixed use in some of their centers.

Chair Flynn: Has not Bremerton made a commitment to take the remainder of growth?

Bolger: Yes

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

1 Bolger: In Gorst, we have exceeded population over capacity. This is just looking at
2 alternative 2,
3 McCormick Woods is pretty close. Port Orchard is exceeding capacity by 800 people.
4

5 Mahan: There is new population just for the new areas in the existing cities.
6

7 James Weaver: that is for the unincorporated areas.
8

9 Mahan: Is there anywhere to see how they are doing in their current boundaries.
10 Could their be capacity to take?
11

12 Weaver: There was an analysis for population and it was part of the subarea plan and
13 part of what was incorporated in the plan. Alternative 1 is the existing UGA and it
14 discusses the other two.
15

16 Gustavson: how far off the target are we for the whole county, including the
17 incorporated areas?
18

19 Weaver: See volume II.
20

21 Bolger: Ideally we would have done our buildable lands report, but that is due in 2007.
22 The cities are included in the buildable lands report.
23

24 Bolger: Also in the land use chapter is some of the comprehensive land use
25 designations. With in the comprehensive land use map we have land use designations
26 that mirror the zoning changes. If we consolidate the comp plan designations, it will be
27 easier. We have a low-density residential, medium/high residential and low-intensity
28 commercial and high-intensity commercial. These will include the mixed use
29 designation.
30

31 Nevins: How do you deal with land capacity when you combine them?
32

33 Bolger: We will still work off the zoning map.
34

35 Chair Flynn: The comp plan will change but the zoning will not.
36

37 Bolger: That is correct. Reasonable measures, upzoning in a lot of the commercial
38 areas--we are looking at increased structure heights, you may see than in Silverdale.
39

40 Jenniges: Explain minimum densities
41

42 Bolger: With the pre-planning, you can come in with an acre lot. You only want to build
43 one home. The county currently allows you to separate that one acre and save the
44 other four building areas without platting, leaving the other areas empty. We are doing
45 away with preplanning.
46

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

1 Weeaver: The provision only applies to the home. It is the sub-division of the parcel at
2 issue. When the sub-division is done it allows the other 5 lots on the parcel. Currently
3 that is one of the provisions to be removed.

4

5 Chair Flynn: Let's say you have an acre, you can't sub-divide into lots.

6

7 Jenniges: Will I be taxed at highest and best use?

8

9 Weaver: Jim Avery could go into discussion on this.

10

11 Gustavson: On increased structure heights, why are you not looking at it county wide?

12

13 Silva: We are looking at it for up to 60ft.

14

15 Bolger: We are looking at SEPA exemptions for infill. We are looking at specific
16 guidelines and it should be an incentive for development. As well, we are reviewing:

17 Alternative sewer provision strategies/new treatments for areas.

18 UGA Association/UGAMAs

19 Population banking/redistribution

20 Annexation Plans and when annexation takes place for development
21 regulations.

22 Revenue sharing associated with annexations

23 IMPRA designation, as an urban holding area, and future development
24 agreement (master plan, EIS and capital facilities plan).

25

26 The brown area is the designated IMPRA area with business centers and SKIA. With
27 this zoning if there is no proposal, the land would revert back to what it was in the 1998
28 Comp Plan.

29

30 Jenniges: received 4 phone calls about the walkway into the Gorst mudflats and asked
31 it is park zoning.

32

33 Bolger: Parks has funds for maintenance. A lot of that work has been done by the
34 County.

35

36 Jenniges: Where will they park?

37

38 Bolger: There is an area by Eglands Garden. There is some countywide of discussion
39 of historic preservation and low impact development as well as polices for regional
40 stormwater facilities.

41

42 Gustavson: How does that site by site work with McCormick Woods?

43

44 Bolger: When each person comes in for a building permit, we know how much capacity
45 there is. Rural/Resource Chapter includes LAMIRDs, Forest and mineral resource
46 industrial needs of North Kitsap. We are showing the same policies with proposed
47 changes in Vol I.

48

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

1 Taylor: Asked James to clarify the chapter and pages.

2

3 Weaver: These are the same policies adopted in 2003.

4

5 Chair Flynn: Asked if they were part of an appeal that the county lost.

6

7 Bolger: The development regulations were not developed.

8

9 Weaver: At this time we included policies that are consistent.

10

11 Chair Flynn: Asked if the policies are part of alternative 2 or 3.

12

13 Weaver: They are currently part of alternative 3.

14

15 Chair Flynn: Asked if there is old stuff included in alternative 2.

16

17 Weaver: The incentive program and development regulations are part of alternative 3.

18 The policies reflect a baseline of 1-20, the incentive program is on top. The baseline is
19 rural wooded, 1 per 20 acres.

20

21 Jenniges: Asked if there is a 5000 acre pilot what does that mean?

22

23 Weaver: All this applies to interim rural wooded forest lands. A pilot project is the first
24 portion of the incentive program, and it was brought together by stakeholders, property
25 owners, etc. Essentially 5000 acres would be the first phase. There is a density bonus
26 for open space and long term forestry. If 75% is in the wooded reserve, and the
27 remaining 23% in cluster, the second alternative is 3 per 20 having 50% in wooded
28 reserve and 25% in permanent. Alt 3 is 4 per 20, with 25% in reserve and 50% in open
29 space and 25% in homes.

30

31 Chair Flynn: What he is referring to is the development regulations.

32

33 Weaver: There are future provisions for a shoreline incentive program. It was not
34 included because this is a pilot program. Re the monitoring of program, there are a
35 number of things needed to be monitored on a 2-year cycle. In any time they are
36 approved, another 5000 acre phase could be released with public involvement. This is
37 in chapter 5.

38

39 Ahl: Asked if someone has looked at the capacity.

40

41 Weaver: Rural lands aren't specifically part of the 10-yr; focus is urban lands, to meet
42 those targets.

43

44 Ahl: The non-urban is supposed to accommodate a certain amount of growth and how
45 does this work into accommodating the capacity?

46

47 Weaver: The urban lands have a capacity requirement; it is assumed that there will be
48 excess capacity.

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

1 Capacity in the rural areas is not monitored.

2

3 Bolger: Capacity in the rural areas is not monitored, and that is why we went with a
4 limited pilot and it is adapted management.

5

6 Gustavson: it is exactly what you are short on the expansion.

7

8 Weaver: That is why the phases are released. With the requirements in this, we would
9 meet them.

10

11 Nevins: Has anyone looked at a potential application and what it would look like?

12

13 Weaver: There are fixed buffers between clusters so it preserves rural cluster. They are
14 not urban development. There is not a lot specific size.

15

16 Mahan: thought he saw some shoreline regulations.

17

18 Weaver: There are not any here. The regulations for 2.5 acres have not been included.
19 There is a provision to allow that in future.

20

21 Mahan: So, shoreline properties would be the same.

22

23 Chair Flynn: There will be policies in the future discussion.

24

25 Gustavson: You could get 1 house per acre on 20 acres.

26

27 Weaver: Yes, there is preservation for shorelines.

28

29 Taylor: Asked how this relates to the 40 ft wide lots that appear to be rural. There
30 seems to be a contradiction to what is coming from the ground to what is being read.

31

32 Weaver: Those lots have been grandfathered. This is an entirely different project. It
33 focuses on rural clustered homes and is intended not to convey that approach or look.

34

35 Taylor: So what we are doing today is to preserve what was done 100 years ago.

36

37 Weaver: Rather, hoping to preserve ability to develop and encourage big lots to
38 preserve the area.

39

40 **BREAK**

41

42 Bolger: Transfer of development rights is next: Rural Areas are Sending sites and
43 Urban Areas are Receiving sites. The mechanism for triggering this is site specific
44 during a comprehensive plan. Essentially there is a formula. Under current regulations,
45 for example, to go higher would be 1 credit. This would result in rural lands to be tied
46 up for 40 years. No further development would be allowed. Essentially as a 'time,' 40
47 years was a compromise. If we update the comp plan and the UGAs grow with any

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

1 TDRs, the next 40-years go by and the TDR certificated would expire. It would not hold
2 that parcel forever.

3
4 Chair Flynn: Asked if models from other areas were looked at.

5
6 Weaver: There are models. The county provides to funding mechanisms. Currently
7 they hold about 50,000 credits. Free market would determine.

8
9 Gustavson: Asked what is a credit?

10
11 Weaver: Eg, a credit is to sell to an urban developer, to bump to the new zone with the
12 credit.

13
14 Gustavson: If you own a parcel in the rural area and you have no use for the 2nd acre
15 and get credit for the 2nd acre.

16
17 Weaver: No

18
19 Gustavson: If you have a 9 acre parcel can you split the parcel?

20
21 Mahan: Asked if he sold a development credit and decided he wants to buy a credit.

22
23 Weaver: You cannot use a credit in a rural area.

24
25 Mahan: Are you talking about selling between the cities and counties.

26
27 Weaver: Between UGAs and rural areas.

28
29 Mahan: Asked if this is a high or medium priority.

30
31 Weaver: Is not sure where it falls.

32
33 Mahan: Asked if anyone is interested in this yet.

34
35 Weaver: It has been discussed.

36
37 Mahan: With the site specifics you created the demand. Has doubts that any city will
38 want to do this.

39
40 Weaver: There may be certain projects.

41
42 Mahan: Setting it at 40 years is a good idea. The price will be on how useful it is to the
43 buyer.

44
45 Gustavson: What is the expected price of a credit?

46
47 Weaver: Does not know—market driven.

48

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

1 Nevins: Would say to talk to a realtor.

2

3 Gustavson: It has to be small enough to be of interest to a developer and high enough
4 for a seller.

5

6 Weaver: It ties to consolidating lots in the rural area.

7

8 Taylor: It is probably per housing unit.

9

10 Nevins: The supply of people who want to sell their development rights would set the
11 price.

12

13 Jenniges: People in Seattle lost a lot. King County had 277,000 jobs in the last 4 years.
14 The rest of the people moved into different cities.

15

16 Mahan: Is there any thought to make the tax value to the development lost.

17

18 Weaver: There has been thought.

19

20 Chair Flynn: If someone took their property and had the development right into a
21 certificate to sell, in 40 years the land didn't develop, they would have the opportunity
22 to build a second house.

23

24 Weaver: In 40 years they could sub-divide the lot.

25

26 Bolger: Thanked everyone, there is an upcoming meeting on Thursday at Given's
27 Community center. We have tonight, at the Silverdale fire station, the PSRC 20-20+20
28 update. Angie is currently making a matrix to assist with review.

29

30 Gustavson: Asked if there are going to be more changes.

31

32 Silva: Likely.

33

34 Ahl: PC informally proceeded to the idea of putting the extra land in alternative 3. This
35 would help shed light in the need for infrastructure. Asked if there is a dollar figure for
36 the infrastructure.

37

38 Bolger: That would be in the master plan.

39

40 Gustavson: Remember when we spoke about this, the developer would provide the
41 infrastructure.

42

43 Ahl: This additional land has been generalized into the racetrack, and questioned from
44 a planning prospective, what requirements are there for this land?

45

46 Bolger: This is a holding provision.

47

48 Ahl: It is an extra that has not been rationalized.

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

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
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

Bolger: It is a potential project that we don't want to close on.

Nevins: We have 3 hearings and significant stuff to deal with. If a single landholder, they could hold the land on their own. And if they ever make a real proposal. We are going to waste a lot of time on the racetrack. Would like to recommend the IMPRA is removed from the 10-year update.

Jenniges: Naturally I am against that, everyone outlines it as a NASCAR racetrack. I look at it as an opportunity to build an economic structure of what is needed if they want to go ahead with the racetrack. It could be an equestrian ring, a fair, baseball fields, motorcycle track, a motor home park, and could be grown. This should be part of the comprehensive plans .When you look at Manchester, he was a forward thinker.

Bolger: This is already part of the DEIS and is already up for public comment. Even if the board said take it out, it is already on the streets for comment.

Gustavson: EDC presentation showed this as a catalyst. This could absorb a lot of discussion time. It may be we want to set aside a portion of time for ISC.

Bolger: That was a discussion, but did not go through because people want to comment

Taylor: Understands what Tom is saying and tends to agree, but Jims comments are that it is too late. The unfortunate part of public meetings is when someone has an issue then the meeting tends to be circled around that.

Chair Flynn: Hopes the IMPRA doesn't take over the hearings.

Nevins: We will be able to hear it twice. When we actually get a proposal, we will do the same thing. This is just the hearing for the holding area.

Chair Flynn: There will be other track hearings. Hopefully the board will help people focus on the area.

Ahl: We still must recommend that we accept the alternative before us.

Bolger: Greg Cioc wanted to make sure that everyone read the summary of revenue short falls. Table 3.2-249 in volume II. \$373 million for capacity and total revenue is \$90 million.

Gustavson: The presentation said GMA is a massive unfunded mandated.

Jenniges: What happened to the 6 cents per gallon?

Greg Cioc: This is for county roads. Look at the mitigation. That is the critical part of transportation.

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

1 Gustavson: Asked for the numbers for transportation in a presentation.

2

3 Cioc: Does not know but will ask.

4

5 Jenniges: On public transportation, we have not gotten the cost per rider ship.

6

7 Gutsavson: Only 3% of people use it.

8

9 Bolger: You should find the numbers in the appendix.

10

11 Chair Flynn: If we do nothing, that would have costs as well. No matter, we need to fix
12 county roads. The level of service goes down with sub-urban sprawl.

13

14 Nevins: All things are under pressure and things will only get worse.

15

16

17 **Departmental updates:**

18

19 Bolger: CAO remanded back to the county to address current exemption for small
20 isolated wetlands and the 35 ft buffers, not being based on BAS. We have until
21 02/23/07.

22

23 Gustavson: Attended the hearing and noted his observations.

24

25

26 New manager for NR, Patty Charnas. The first review of DCD directors occurred and
27 we had a number of applicants. Next step will probably take weeks to a month.

28

29 Chair Flynn: In the past, the PC has been involved with interviews.

30

31 Bolger: thinks there may be something along the lines.

32

33

34 Ahl: asked about the Departmental audit study.

35

36 Bolger: We have implemented some of the recommendations. 5 positions were
37 approved including clerical positions. There is a position that takes the
38 recommendations into the plan for than implementation. DCD is the first to go through
39 this and other department reviews will follow. We are also looking to reflect our budget
40 for stronger customer service. We are looking at like a call center.

41

42

43 Chair Flynn: Meeting next Tuesday: There is going to be discussion on the 3 volumes.
44 There is a meeting scheduled on the 26th, are we still having those meetings?

45

46 Jenniges: Asked for an updated calendar.

47

48 Bolger: Will email a new calendar.

Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 5, 2006

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

Ahl: Asked if the hearings are joint.

Bolger: The Oct 6th hearing is

Meeting adjourned. At 11:30AM motion to adjourn.

EXHIBITS

- A. June 27th , 2006 Planning Commission Minutes
- B. September 5, 2003 Legal Notice
- C. September 5, 2006 Agenda
- D. Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Vol 1

MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____2006.

Deborah Flynn, Chair

Christina Lindner, Planning Commission Secretary