The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County Administration Building, Commissioner’s Chambers located at 619 Division Street Port Orchard, Washington 98366. Members present: John Taylor, Mike Gustavson, Monty Mahan, Tom Nevins, Dean Jenniges, Deb Flynn, John Ahl, and Lary Coppola. Staff present: Eric Baker, Angie Silva, James Weaver, Linda Bentley, Katrina Knutson, Jim Rogers, and Planning Commission Secretary Brynan Pierce.

The meeting was called to order with introductions.

Chair Flynn: Read from a memorandum sent to the Long Range Planning Staff and the Planning Commission members suggesting a procedure to use the time for deliberations in the most effective manner.

Dean Jenniges: Asked what the legal status is of those who wish to be removed from the urban growth area (UGA).

Eric Baker: Informed him it would be up to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to change the zoning.

Jenniges: Was referring to specific areas.

Baker: Informed him that is a big ticket item that is expected to be addressed later in deliberations.

Jenniges: Asked what happens to those who wish to maintain their current zoning.

Baker: Informed him that goes back to how we treat the open period and if we take in the additional changes. Staff’s recommendation would be to take in everything from the appropriate periods, then look at the requests that came in later and look at the larger purpose. Staff is concerned that including those that want to be in or not, would go against the citizen advisory group’s recommendation.

Monty Mahan: Stated that chair Flynn has laid out a good procedure and moved to recommend alternative 2 goals and polices with the understanding that the Planning Commission will be recommending changes.

Tom Nevins seconded.

Mike Gustavson: Stated the County-wide planning policies are part of GMA adopted by ordinance, and volume I of the draft plan is not written in accordance and has left important things out. Gustavson feels volume I is in violation of GMA and it was written without any justification.
Baker: Stated that staff welcomes discussion on any of the issues the Planning Commission may have. Baker also stated that the comprehensive plan does not have to be identical to the County-wide planning policies, but it needs to be consistent.

Nevins: Has not seen the recent decision about the Kingston appeal and would like to see something about the county’s perception on how the county should expand the UGA.

Baker: Informed him there is an appendix in the EIS that discusses Kingston.

Gustavson: Feels there are major segments to discuss and wants to know how to ensure enough time to look at each of them.

Chair Flynn: Suggested the Planning Commission start with the most controversial issues, and informed them members there is opportunity for minority reports.

Jenniges: Is here to represent the people who submitted concerns. At the July 10th public hearing there were a lot of issues and changes from Bill Palmer and Jenniges would like to know if any of them were incorporated into the draft plan.

Baker: Informed him Mr. Palmer’s testimony was read at great length by at least three staff members.

Chair Flynn: Stated that it seems all testimony was taken into consideration.

Jenniges: Also has a concern about Ron Ross’ testimony.

Baker: Stated that some of the concerns from Ron Ross are relate to what is in the code.

John Taylor: Asked Monty Mahan to explain the affects of the motion on the floor.

Mahan: Stated that because there is a motion on the floor, the Planning Commission can discuss different aspects of the 10-Year update and amend the motion as agreed by the Commission.

Chair Flynn: Would like to start with the UGAs beginning with Kingston.

Gustavson: Asked if the site specifics are on the maps shown.

Chair Flynn: Stated the Planning Commission needs to recommend the UGAs, and then discuss the site specifics.

Gustavson: Noticed two black sections on the Kingston map and asked why they were black.

Baker: Informed him that area is Urban High and the color is actually dark brown.

Taylor: Asked Baker to run through the high priority issues again.
Baker: Industrial Multi-Purpose Recreational Area (IMPRA), NASCAR, the inclusion or exclusion of Royal Valley and Barker Creek, 4 or 5 dwelling units per acre and the properties that are in or out of the UGA.

John Ahl: Was moved by Jean Sherrard’s testimony where he stated that the rug was basically taken out from under him.

Baker: Stated he was referring to where mini storages are prohibited.

A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Dean Jenniges that urban high be modified to include storage units as a conditional use.

Taylor: Stated for the record, that Jean Sherrard is his client.

The vote:
All in favor: 8
Motion carried unanimously.

Baker: Informed the Planning Commission that there will be a change to the “Use column”.

Gustavson: Stated that there is no allowance for residential in mixed use.

Baker: Stated that it is allowed at 10-30 dwelling units per acre which prohibits types of housing. Detached is hard to accommodate. This is a reasonable measure which is to maximize the housing stock. If you allow for single family detached, you get to lower density. You will sit on 10 dwelling units per acre.

Gustavson: Recommends accessory dwelling units, accessory living units, bed and breakfast house, single family attached housing, caretaker dwellings, and detached housing as administrative conditional uses.

Baker: Stated staff would support attached dwelling units, and that is the only one because the idea of mixed use is for intensity. If a significant number of mechanisms are provided, it is no longer intensified.

Jenniges: Stated based on that logic, Ilahee must be included in the UGA.

Baker: Stated that Ilahee being in or out of the UGA has nothing to do with the intensity. We are looking for a variety of housing units.

Jenniges: Said that if you say the UGAs have been established to increase density, then it seems counter productive to say we are going to do it here, but not there.

Baker: Informed him that not all of the UGAs are appropriate to maximize density. It was created as a reasonable measure for higher density construction. If you can do 10 dwelling units per acre, they are very small.
Chair Flynn: Commented that GMA calls for a variety of housing units and they shouldn’t all run together.

Baker: Stated that mixed use commercial is not required, single family detached housing looks like it will be the highest and best use.

Gustavson: Stated that if allowing the other dwelling units, we would be providing an adequate variety of housing.

Ahl: Stated that most of the plan is providing for single detached.

A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by John Taylor to allow accessory dwelling units, accessory living units, bed and breakfast house; single family attached housing, caretaker dwellings, and detached housing as administrative conditional uses.

Jenniges: Feels anyone building homes in the construction business will maximize their best use.

Nevins: Is inclined to vote against it because we don’t need to throw out too many more issues were the line is not drawn.

The vote:
All in favor: 3
Opposed: 5
Motion Failed.

Kingston UGA

Baker: Summarized the Kingston appeal under Appendix J of Volume II. The Hearings Board decision outlined four legal issues, one being the sewer reduction factor as part of the Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA). Secondly, the Hearings Board also indicated the Capital Facilities plan was lacking in inventory and demonstrating how sewer service would be provided to the UGA. The Hearings Board also the mixed the discussion of sewer reductions as it relates to ULCA and capital facilities planning. They felt the two components didn’t coordinate very well together.

Chair Flynn: Asked if the UGA has been amended to take those things out.

Baker: Stated there was a change from 5 dwelling units per acre to 4, and with the change of removing the sewer reduction out of ULCA and doing a complete capital facilities analysis.

Gustavson: Stated that infrastructure provision s includes sidewalks and such and asked if we are required to show this in the 20-year plan.

Baker: Said there is a clear distinction in the hearings board decision between transportation and sewer. Transportation is easier to plan for within 20-years and funding is heavily related to grants, road tax and impacts fees from the County. We are not talking about additional roads, but
improving them. Stormwater and sewer are harder to plan for and conveyance systems are primarily paid for by the developer. The County offers oversight and capacity for treatment of wastewater.

Gustavson: Asked how much of a plan is needed.

Baker: Stated that we need to provide capacity for our plants and we need to embrace sewer strategy. It is the staff and prosecutor’s decision that we don’t need to show every pump or lift station. We have developers that are changing plat approvals to maximize their ability. Sewer lines come from a different angle, and what you are recommending would be useful to the development community.

Gustavson: Stated that people will not be able to afford to pay back fees.

Baker: Stated that staff has acknowledged the difficulty and has taken alternative systems, rather than the traditional pipe to bay philosophy. By trying to coordinate overall sewer plan, it would not necessarily be useable for the private or public sector.

Jenniges: Stated that the Planning Commission has had these discussions before, Jenniges attended that Kingston meeting and in most cases the citizens agreed alternative 2 was what they wanted

A motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by Mike Gustavson to approve the Kingston Urban Growth Area as defined and recommended by staff.

Lary Coppola: Asked if the state has bought off on this.

Baker: Informed him they are embracing it in Washington State.

Coppola: Asked how it will hold up in an appeal.

Baker: Stated that it is an alternate system that has been approved by local and state groups, and feels there is not anything in the update for an appeal.

Chair Flynn: Asked if there is any difference between alternatives 1, 2, and 3.

Baker: Stated the only difference is in alt 3, where there are 5 dwelling units per acre, and alternative 2 is at 4.

Jenniges: Stated the topography in this county makes it almost impossible to go to 5 dwelling units per acre without a specific sewer system. Jenniges asked if the hearings board complained about this.

Baker: The hearings board said 4 dwelling units per acre are urban for Kitsap County. We went with 5. A number of citizen’s group’s have pushed for 3, but they are not compliant with GMA.

Jenniges: Asked Baker if he believes alternative systems will work.
Nevins: Stated that in the neighborhoods he sees, very few people have been developing at 4 dwelling units per acre on raw ground. Nevins does not think 4 dwelling units per acre will happen if it is at all possible, it will be developed at 6 dwelling units per acre with sewer.

Ahl: Stated that we are dealing with a range, and if it makes cost sense to have a pipe, that what will happen, and the market will determine the range.

Brian Bekeny: Asked if there are enough contractors that will agree to this.

Baker: Stated the contractors will have to ramp up on this. Over the course of the next 10-years contractors will be savvy and developers will be pushing this before the people arrive.

Bekeny: Asked if the Health Department has agreed with this.

Baker: Said they have.

Taylor: Noticed the map showing is dated May 2006, but when he looks at the proposed consolidated map, it is a little different.

Baker: Stated the Comprehensive Plan map and zoning map look almost identical, this will let the individuals request a rezone. If an individual is in Urban Restricted, they can change from 1-5-dwelling units per acre to 5-9.

The vote:
All in favor: 9
Motion carried unanimously.

Coppola: Doesn’t want to see the county go through an appeal on a technicality.

A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by John Taylor to incorporate the language, “planning horizon” into, whatever system is approved for sewer. JT: seconded

The vote:
All in favor: 9
The motion carried unanimously.

Poulsbo UGA

Baker: Stated that staff recommends Poulsbo, Alternative 2.

A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by Dean Jenniges to accept staff’s recommendation.

Nevins: Asked if the capacity was figured at 4 dwelling units per acre.

Baker: Stated that the County has an inter-local agreement with the City of Poulsbo, of 4-5 dwelling units per acre with 4 being the minimum and 5 being high.
Ahl: Stated that the only public testimony for Poulsbo was Johnson Creek and asked his fellow Planning Commissioners if they have any thoughts.

Gustavson: Stated because there is an inter-local agreement, Poulsbo’s rules for development will apply.

Baker: Stated as long as it is part of the county’s UGA, the county’s CAO will apply.

Chair Flynn: Asked where Johnson Creek is located.

Baker: Explained that is already in the UGA.

Coppola: Said some people asked to be removed from the UGA and GMA supports this.

Baker: GMA indicates we need to provide for long term forestry and the Johnson Creek area would not meet this criteria.

Ahl: Said that it is important to understand this is an already approved UGA.

Baker: Stated the county is trying to be cognizant to the City of Poulsbo.

Taylor: Asked if John Johnson’s property is in or out of the UGA.

Baker: Said the John Johnson property is out, but is asking to be included. It is staff’s recommendation to include and protect the property because of the few critical areas on the property.

Chair Flynn: Asked is staff has been out to the Johnson property.

Baker: Said they have.

The vote:

All in favor: 7
Opposed: 1
Abstained: 1
Motion carried.

Taylor: Stated for the record, Poulsbo is having a difficult time accepting growth in the UGA. There are 545 homes going in on Noll Road and Poulsbo Place is rapidly growing. We need to be careful of aquifer recharge areas and that is why he abstained from the motion.

Silverdale UGA

Baker: Stated that alternative 2 is largely what the citizen advisory group (CAG) recommended. One area removes the Barker Creek corridor. Staff does not have a recommendation on that. There is a request for urban low zoning, which used to be industrial on Dickey Road. Staff has a concern we are recommending urban density surrounded by industrial. Staff recommends converting the property back to industrial.
Ahl: Asked if that was a recommendation from the CAG?

Baker: Said yes and staff disagrees.

Jenniges: Asked how removing it will it impact the overall commercial or industrial area.

Baker: Informed him that it will not impact commercial, but it will allow for designating more industrial because we have a deficit of industrial.

Jenniges: Asked what it will do to the population.

Baker: Stated that it will drop the population.

Taylor: Stated the piece of property on Dickey Road is owned by his client. His reasoning is the property is sloped and is goes to a plateau top and is ideal view residential property. When he looks at it as the highest and best use, he sees it as urban low.

Gustavson: Is fearful that this is ideal view property and we should look at the property owner’s use.

Bekeny: Asked Baker who this would cause problems for.

Baker: Indicated it would be the future property owner, because of high traffic and noise, outdoor storage, etc.

Coppola: Asked where in relation to the property the power lines are.

Taylor: Stated they run through residential.

Coppola: Feels that because there is a situation of the power lines, maybe a business park would be more appropriate.

Jenniges: Said designating it at either one is a toss up.

Gustavson: Said there are moderate geo-hazards on the property.

Baker: Stated on similar note, staff’s recommendation by Schold farm, is to be consistent with surrounding properties as urban restricted

A motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded to accept staff recommendation on Silverdale, Alternative 2 with revisions to Dickey Road.

The vote:
All in favor: 6
Opposed: 2
Abstained: 1
Motion carried.
A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded to accept staff recommendation to convert the property east of Schold Farm from urban low to urban restricted.

Baker: Informed the Planning Commission that the property is currently zoned at Rural Protection.

Jenniges: Asked what the intent was for the CACs recommendation.

Angie Silva: Stated the CAC recommended preferred zoning for all land use reclassification requests (LURR) the applicant did apply for urban low zoning and the CAC agreed.

The vote:
All in favor: 8
Opposed: 1
Motion carried.

Baker: Explained in alternative 2, the Barker Creek corridor is out. Staff does not have a recommendation on this, but by leaving it out you create a de facto value.

Gustavson: Asked for clarification on the property.

Baker: Informed him it is around the Island Lake area. The CAC acknowledged the Barker Creek area as a boundary. Baker explained the Barker Creek corridor is split between 2 UGAs.

Gustavson: Asked if there is any hope that the county can manage the critical areas better than the City could.

Baker: Explained it comes down to critical area protection, not which jurisdiction could do the better job.

Jenniges: Feels by excluding it would be like an alley way.

Mahan: Stated that Pierce County has implemented rural separators just fine, it creates a lone between this area and another.

Ahl: Shares staff’s diligence on this. Once it is included it is there forever. Ahl’s inclination would be to leave it out.

A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by John Taylor to have Barker Creek remain rural rather than in the UGA.

Gustavson: Feels the exclusion should to all of the way to Island Lake.

Baker: Informed him that area is not included anyway.

Jenniges: Asked what the Silverdale CAC recommended.
Baker: Said in the first meeting, Barker creek was voted to be excluded. The next meeting they voted to include it. Staff looks at it as a split.

Bekeny: Asked why this is an issue if it is not in the UGA.

Baker: Alternative 2 shows it outside the UGA. You would be recommending a change from inside today to outside when this is adopted.

Bekeny: Asked if Barker Creek is in alternative 1.

Baker: Said yes.

Chair Flynn: Likes the idea of keeping it rural. She would vote to make it outside for now. It could possibly come up in future plans.

Gustavson: Stated we are talking about an urban separator, and we already have it in. Gustavson would vote to have Barker Creek as the boundary.

Jenniges: Asked where the utilities are in the area.

Baker: Said they run on Waaga Way and on Fairgrounds Road.

Jenniges: Stated that the CAO was passed with a 200 ft buffer. It has sewers and is already urban. Jenniges feels by voting it out, it goes against why the Planning Commission voted on the CAO in the first place.

Coppola: Likes the idea of a separator.

Mahan: Feels by leaving it in the UGA, it may seem the Planning Commission is in favor of infill for future development.

Taylor: Said the sewer lines are not close enough to make it economically developable. In 10 to 30 years, as Bremerton moves north, we should protect it forever and the Chums of Barker Creek have been a long standing group. Taylor will vote in favor of the motion.

The vote:
All in favor: 6
Opposed: 3
Motion carried.

A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by John Taylor to have this mirror Central Kitsap’s UGA.

The vote:
All in favor: 7
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 2
Motion carried.
Central Kitsap UGA:

Baker: Informed the Planning Commission that staff has some revisions to the Central Kitsap UGA, alternative 2. One is Royal Valley and the Minder property. Staff recommends alternative 2 with the removal of Royal Valley and Minder Road. Additionally mixed use was proposed in the Ilahoe area, some is constrained by critical areas and staff would alter the zone to urban restricted to be consistent.

Chair Flynn: Asked how it came to be mixed use in the first place.

Baker: Explained that it was a staff recommendation, and after looking closer there area critical areas, it doesn’t make sense and it is an error on staff’s part. Staff would like it to be Highway tourist commercial. This would be a change to the comp plan and the other would be a rezone from mixed use to Highway tourist commercial.

Ahl: Feels Bremerton is playing their cards very closely and asked how they read this.

Baker: Stated that Bremerton would prefer the county stick with alternative 1. Staff doesn’t have the option to do that. There is a certain amount of population that cannot be calculated. We are doing a small amount to meet our requirements.

A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by Mike Gustavson to accept staff’s recommendation to exclude Royal Valley from the UGA.

Gustavson: Asked what that will do to the population.

Baker: Said we are already short on population. The City of Bremerton has no desire to go North of Waaga Way. Putting Urban Restricted is problematic because it is to address critical areas running through properties. It has very little capacity.

Gustavson: Said for Bremerton to come in, Bremerton belongs to the KRCC, for them to object is very inappropriate. Also, talking to the Ross’ privately, they don’t plan on developing their 140 acres, and there is already sewer. Gustavson tends to favor it as rural to make the options available to the Ross’ and the County.

Baker: Is confused about Gustavson’s conversation with the Ross’s

Chair Flynn: Will vote for the motion, because she feels it is not the time to put it in.

Gustavson: Feels if the neighbors were concerned about their views, they should offer to purchase the Ross’ property.

Ahl: Agrees with Mike’s comment. He feels it is unfair to the people, on the other hand in view of Bremerton, part of the testimony was the hearings examiner and how that should never be developed. Ahl was surprised about Gustavson’s conversation with Ross as well, because he was
under the impression they wanted urban reserve. Sooner or later, as urban areas expanded, they have to be absorbed.

**Mahan:** Said he will vote for the motion.

**Jenniges:** Feels it should be in the UGA because we are short property as it is. The Ross’ have owned the land for 50 years, and it is not detrimental to have it in the UGA.

**Coppola:** Feels as Silverdale and Bremerton grow together; we will need a new hospital spot. There won’t be a piece of property big enough to accommodate a hospital. We shouldn’t have any more road blocks.

**Ahl:** Asked if this is part of Silverdale’s UGA as well.

**Baker:** Informed him this would be part of the Central Kitsap and Bremerton UGA.

**Ahl:** Feels the property should be left out because there is no desire to develop at this point.

**Mahan:** Stated there is nothing stopping the UGA from turning into a City.

**The vote:**

*All in favor: 5*

*Opposed: 4*

**Motion Carried.**

**Mahan:** Urged the citizen’s groups to preserve the area permanently.

**Lunch Break: 11:35-12:15**

**Monty Mahan has left for the day.**

A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by Lary Coppola to approve staff’s recommendation with revisions on Central Kitsap’s alternative 2

**The vote:**

*All in favor: 8*

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Baker:** The Planning Commission voted on Barker Creek, and there is the philosophy of banking. There would be an urban growth management agreement.

**Ahl:** Stated that Baker specifically talks about discussions with Bremerton, and asked if it is possible that KRCC may want to reallocate.

**Baker:** Stated between now and the 10-year update, we will have to bank it.
Ahl: Stated that Bremerton does not seem to be welcoming things and Ahl would expand
the discussion to not just state Bremerton.

Baker: Said under the goals and policies this is discussed.

_A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Mike Gustavson to use the concept of banking
the excess population for Central Kitsap as such times as UGAMA can be discussed as well as
discussions with other entities._

_The vote:_
_All in favor: 8_
_The motion carried unanimously._

_South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) UGA_

Baker: The department supports alternative 2 with no additional uses. This would be a full public
process and a master plan application will be approved and those would be approved
concurrently by the BOCC for a full public process. Baker explained the idea of IMPRA is for
one time use only so we have the flexibility to not have to go back through the comprehensive
planning

_A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Dean Jenniges to accept staff’s
recommendation of alternative 2 for the SKIA UGA._

Nevins: Stated he will vote against the motion because the one time big time is not very
clear, because we don’t know the deal and the present deal has not been accepted by the
Commissioners. It will be something different. Nevins’ preference is to wait for the something
different because he feels there is no point in holding an area.

Gustavson: Would like to leaves this decision up to people further down the road,
because if the legislature wants to vote for this, they will.

Jenniges: Does not understand why someone would not be open to looking at the
property. Companies are looking to come into the area, and the area needs to be open. It could
be a multi-use facility and Jenniges feels if he were a company looking to go somewhere; at least
here we would have the potential zoning rather than starting from scratch.

Baker: Stated the Board of County Commissioners have the ability to say what the uses would be,
what regulations there would be, and the zoning does not allow this right now.

Gustavson: Asked if we would have to remove industrial area from somewhere else.

Baker: Said there would be an additional 300 acres added to make up for the acres swallowed up.

Gustavson: Asked if this would come off Belfair’s sewer system?

Baker: Stated that is an option. They are trying to figure out what their sewer system is.
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**Gustavson:** Has heard that there will only be port-a-potties at the NASCAR track, and asked Baker if he has heard of this.

**Baker:** Stated that he has not heard of that.

**Chair Flynn:** Would have to vote against the motion because she feels we don’t need this area to move forward.

**Nevins:** Stated that the questions indication of where this project is is nowhere. It is not a proposal. This has not gone forward and it should be set aside until there is something a little more firm. Presently, it is not close enough and we could do it in a year.

**Ahl:** Stated that he sees this is an individual site request on steroids, and there are huge inconsistencies in the plan with the methodology. We have crafted every part of the plan with other aspects. This doesn’t fulfill any of the need other than the racetrack. This is the most vulnerable part of the plan. Regardless of intentions, it will be viewed and used by various things by a county endorsement. Ahl feels it will be wide open for some sort of appeal.

**Nevins:** Stated that the planning is not in place and we expect someone else to bring in the capital facilities.

**Bekeny:** Stated that we kind of renamed this with IMPRA and these stories have been across the county. The same situation happened with Disney World when a small town didn’t want to hold the area, so they went to Orlando. Bekeny feels this is an opportunity we should keep open.

**Taylor:** Asked if by approving this holding are, will it be perceived as being a vote in favor of the racetrack.

**Baker:** Said that it could be perceived as not closing the door, you are opening it. There is a Clark County case where a holding area was used for industrial use and fell through.

**Taylor:** Asked if Clark County develop the area.

**Baker:** Said they tried to deal with the timeline of when businesses could come in.

**Jenniges:** Believes there is no harm done to hold it. He would like to let someone study this, because if it goes through or not, time will tell. To close the door, is the wrong approach.

**The vote:**

*All in favor:* 5

*Opposed:* 2

*Abstained:* 1

**East Bremerton UGA**
Baker: Stated that staff is recommending alternative 2. Kitsap County tried to provide opportunities for mixed use on Sheridan and Perry, and Sylvan and Perry, Staff recommends as appears with population banking to be discussed in 2007. Part of Ilahee is in the East Bremerton UGA, but mostly in Central Kitsap UGA.

Ahl: Asked how close we are to accommodating the desires of the Ilahee Community Group.

Baker: Stated that in their most recent testimony, they have 4 areas of concerns. Staff can’t find a necessary growth management means for 3 of the areas, but we have taken 75% of their zoning requests and incorporated them into alternative 2.

A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by John Taylor to accept alternative 2 for East Bremerton with population banking.

The vote:
All in favor: 8
Motion carried unanimously.

Taylor: Asked if we have anything to do with the Traycton watershed.

Baker: Stated not at this time.

West Bremerton UGA

Baker: Stated that staff has provided mixed use centers near Crazy Eric’s. All of Rocky Point has been included and some Urban Medium.

Bekeny: Stated that everyone in the Rocky Point area has spent $15,000.00 on septic tanks.

Flynn: Stated that the County provided a map with some annexation areas but it did not include Gorst.

Baker: Said the County has been speaking with Bremerton and they are supportive of moving down towards Gorst. They have had a change in philosophy.

Gustavson: Stated that is also true with the Kitsap Lake area.

Baker: What you see here is the boundary that is consistent with the City’s wishes.

Gorst UGA:

Baker: Stated that Alternative 2 can only house 10 of the 73 people projected to move into Gorst. Staff recommends alt 2 with

Jenniges: Asked if there has been Gorst input about what is going on.

Baker: Said that he has spoken with 10-20 Gorst residents throughout the process.
Gustavson: Stated that one person commented he had a business for 50 years, and asked if that will change.

Baker: Stated that if it is residential, he is non-conforming.

Jenniges: Asked what the dark line around Division Street is associated with.

Baker: Stated there are currently non-conforming lots. Said Alternative 3 blows by our 73 person population allocation. The individuals are not looking for urban development.

Beken: Asked what happens in Gorst if the racetrack goes in.

Baker: Said if the track goes in, the southern end could change.

A motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by Brian Beken to accept staffs recommendation of alternative 2 with additions.

The vote:
All in favor: 8
Motion carried unanimously.

McCormick Woods/ULID#6 UGA

Baker: Stated there have been three requests to be included in Alternative 3. This is an existing ULID with the appropriate number for sewer. There has also been master planning for zoning. Staff recommends Alternative 2.

Beken: Stated that one property owner said there is already sewer on Fiegly Road.

Baker: Said without bringing sewer in a much larger area, it will be a larger problem.

Ahl: Asked if there are site requests.

Baker: Said yes.

Beken: Asked why the Planning Commission accepted them in Alternative 3 and not in Alternative 2.

Baker: Said that we wanted to complete environmental review on them to allow further discussion later in the process.

Port Orchard UGA

Baker: Stated Alternative 2 was recommended by the Planning Commission in June and by the CAG. Staff has reviewed this area and it includes the change from 5-4 dwelling units on all urban lands. We are looking at Alternative 2 with three changes to the boundary. We are looking at
about 700 individuals to accommodate for. 25% of the land was for population. Staff recommends the remaining population be distributed to centers.

**Jenniges:** Asked how that is accomplished.

**Baker:** Explained it will be accomplished with mixed use. Baker also indicated that we are 200 acres over, because South Kitsap took a big chunk of commercial land. We are looking at the connection out towards Manchester. If we included Howe Farm, we would be able to connect to sewer.

**Chair Flynn:** Asked what Howe Farm will be zoned.

**Baker:** Said it would be zoned parks.

**Jenniges:** Said if we eliminate Highway tourist commercial on Mile Hill, and you look around Manchester, they all have to move in towards Port Orchard to drive. Jenniges feels we should leave it and reduce Sidney Road.

**Baker:** Said the County-wide planning policies have some inconsistencies and they talk negatively about strict commercial. The city of Port Orchard has recommended removal of the area on Mile Hill.

**Ahl:** Said we have testimony about the area near Collins Road that was not included in the CAG recommendation and asked Baker to comment on that.

**James Weaver:** Said there were mailings to all property owners in the parcel owner for the study area and these requests came at the tail end of the process.

**Bekeny:** Asked why the area on Mile Hill was removed previously.

**Weaver:** Said the discussions have been more recent. It was included in the first place for improvements.

**Gustavson:** Asked what the benefit of incorporating the Manchester LAMIRD is.

**Weaver:** Deferred the question to Eric Baker.

**Baker:** Said that making the connection later is more appropriate. They are so close to Southworth and Port Orchard.

**Gustavson:** Asked if Southworth would be considered a UGA.

**Baker:** Said he wouldn’t be surprised.

**Coppola:** Informed the Commissioner’s that the idea of connecting the commercial corridor with Manchester was because Manchester has sewer and water. It was easier to go around Beach Drive towards the city. Most of the land is being used as commercial.
Jenniges: Understands what Lary is saying, but the uproar of the 40ft lots seems like they do not want to spend money mobbing sewers.

Gustavson: Asked if sewer runs to Nebraska.

Baker: Does not believe sewer extends that far. The removal of additional agricultural acreage near Sidney, has an additional 90 acres requesting to be removed. We are getting close to our acreage with the removal of certain areas.

A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by Mike Gustavson to extend the southern UGA boundary to include the Spring Creek industrial park.

Nevins: Stated that the Port Orchard City Council passed a motion that the residential area south of Beilmeir be removed. PO is saying they don’t want to go that far south and the County should listen to the City. We need to stop and listen. There is a residential extension to Long Lake that the City wanted to remove.

Baker: Stated that none of our existing alternatives include Spring Creek.

Bekeny: Stated that this area is a commercial area, and when we heard this reclassification before, we all voted against going south.

Jenniges: Said because of the pollution problems, we added that to ensure the city will look at it. Jenniges is against expanding the UGA boundary more south because he does not see a cost benefit to expanding.

Coppola: Stated that the area around Long Lake was considered so sewer could be expanded for future options. As far as the city, they want that area for McCormick Woods.

Gustavson: Thinks we should extend urban low south of Mullenix.

Ahl: Stated that staff has proposed a way to solve this problem and prefer staffs recommendation.

Baker: Said the idea of going down to Mullinex cannot be accommodated in our timeline.

The Vote:
All in favor: 2
Opposed: 6
Motion failed.

A motion was made by John Ah and seconded by Lary Coppola to continue the deliberation until tomorrow.

The vote:
All in favor: 8
Motion carried unanimously.

EXHIBITS
A. September 26th 2006 Legal Notice
B. September 26th Agenda
C. Department recommendations for the preferred alternative

MINUTES approved this _______ day of _______2006.

________________________________________
Deborah Flynn, Chair

_________________________________________
Christina Lindner, Planning Commission Secretary