Kitsap County Planning Commission –September 27 2006

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Deliberation

September 27, 2006

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, Tom Nevins, Dean Jenniges, Deb Flynn, John Ahl, and Lary Coppola. Staff present: Eric Baker, Angie Silva, James Weaver and Planning Commission Secretary Brynan Pierce.

9:00AM

Meeting Called to Order

A. 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Deliberations

- John Taylor: Informed staff and the Planning Commission that Chair Flynn would arrive around 10:00AM.

Eric Baker: Started the presentation where it was left off yesterday at the Port Orchard Urban Growth Area (UGA).

- Gustavson: Asked for clarification on which day next week is continued for deliberation.

Baker: Informed everyone that the Planning Commission will meet on Tuesday, October 3, 2006 to continue deliberation from 9:00AM-2:00PM with a lunch break.

Baker: Stated that we talked about the Manchester connector, the agricultural area, and the request for removal, and what to do with the remaining 600 people. Staff recommends the 600 people be located in the centers. It is a reasonable measure and it would be consistent with the Sub-Area Plan.

- Gustavson: Asked what affordable is, because he feels it is subsidized housing.

A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Tom Nevins to accept staff’s recommendation of Alternative 2 with the revision to distribute remaining population to the “centers” designated by the Sub-Area Plan.

The Vote:

All in favor: 5
Opposed 1
Motion carried.

A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by Dean Jenniges to accept staff’s recommendation of Alternative 2 to remove neighborhood commercial extension on Mile Hill Drive and pull back to the existing UGA boundary.
• Dean Jenniges: Feels that the continuity was lost in Manchester and it will create a bigger speed way on Mile Hill. Jenniges also feels the removal of 200 acres on Sidney will be better served there because there are many wetlands.

Baker: Stated the removal in Manchester accommodates 90 acres of a 200 surplus.

• Jenniges: Asked what the Manchester citizens are supposed to do for shopping.

Baker: Stated their shopping needs can be fulfilled by going to the Southpark grocery complex.

The vote:
All in favor: 2
Opposed: 3
Abstained: 1
Motion failed by lack of majority votes.

Baker: Stated that staff’s recommendation on the Port Orchard UGA also included the removal of additional agricultural properties near the corner of Glenwood and Sidney from the UGA (per request).

• Lary Coppola: Asked what the zoning is on the road recently completed into McCormick Woods.

Baker: Informed him the proposed zoning is Urban Low (UL)

• Coppola: Asked for clarification as to if there is proposed commercial in the area or not.

Baker: Stated that there is a current roadway to Glenwood and there is a strip of commercial in the area, but the connector road is through ULID #6 and there is only UL proposed there.

• Taylor: Asked if the owners of the property are in support.

Baker: Said yes, they have little interest in highway tourist commercial.

• Ahl: Asked if the City has weighed in on this.

James Weaver: Stated that the Silvernail horse property is to be removed as a park for part of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan Process. There was a continuing agreement to use it as a horse farm.

A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Tom Nevins to accept staff’s recommendation.

The vote:
All in favor: 7
Motion carried unanimously.
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- Nevins: Stated that the Port Orchard City Council recommended not to have the connection to Long Lake.

- Jenniges: Commented that this discussion has happened before, and Jenniges understands that people are reluctant to extend, but Long Lake is dying and sewer should be extended out there.

- Nevins: Is in support of wetlands, but feels the City of Port Orchard will not support the request for sewer out there.

A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by John Ahl to remove the area around Sidney road.

The vote:
All in favor: 1
Opposed: 5
Motion failed.

- Gustavson: Asked how much population is dedicated to the anvil.

Baker: Stated approximately 800-1,000 individuals.

- Gustavson: Commented that some of the City Council members are wild about Port Orchard extending out to McCormick Woods.

Baker: Stated that on page 9 of the table provided yesterday, the idea of 4-9 dwelling units per acre was voted upon. Also there was a lot of testimony on the rural wooded incentive program.

- Jenniges: Said that John Rose would attempt to use the Rural Wooded Incentive Program because it was there.

Baker: Said the Rural Wooded Incentive Program will be a difficult program. When you do one of the developments, 6 unit increments are not useful.

- Gustavson: Said you can sell a 20 acre parcel to a homeowner and put a well on it. With our failure to act, we are forcing the landowner to sell it.

Baker: Said that staff gave it the best effort to achieve middle ground. Additionally the timing is a little awkward. This program with all of its benefits could have an opposite affect. Staff would like to defer this to 2007 and 2008.

- Ahl: Said that the Rural Wooded Incentive Program is a great idea, but if nobody uses it, there is no time to re-craft it to satisfy both sides.

A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by Dean Jenniges to defer the rural wooded incentive program to 2007 and 2008.
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Baker: Said that there is a desire to recapture and there was a benefit for boutique forestry. The landowners have been working to have a density bonus in these areas for a % exchange for open space being left behind. The shoreline area is of great importance and the land owners would like to achieve that (1 per acre). There is concern of rural development as a whole. It affects wild life corridors. They are looking for less of that in the future.

- Coppola: Asked before it was down zoned if it was 1 unit per acre.

Baker: Said it was 1-2 units per acre.

The vote:
All in favor: 7
Motion carried.

- Gustavson: Asked for clarification on the year it will be looked at.


Chair Flynn arrived.

A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by Dean Jenniges to remove 2007 from the previous motion.

The vote:
All in favor: 6
Opposed: 0
Abstained: 1
Motion carried

- Taylor: Said he was in the business in the 1990’s when the down zoning took place and the properties have been waiting for zoning that they can use.

- Coppola: Feels there is disagreement between environmentalists and property owners on the Rural Wooden topic.

Transfer Development Rights:

Baker: Indicated that the Transfer Development Rights (TDRs) is another program that indicates property owners in the rural areas can sell their development rights to property owners in the urban area. There is not any banking for this. The development right would be a requirement for any site specific or a rezone.

- Jenniges: Asked if Ron Ross was against this.

Baker: Said that Ron Ross believed nobody would utilize this. Site specific is 2700.00 and there are concerns because there is an unknown value on the TDRs. When this sorts out there may be something form the 2,000-10,000 dollar range. It is a reasonable measure. We support a change to the language. Staff recommends the removal of height increases.
Nevins: Said he is in favor of the TDRs because it allows people in rural areas that are willing to wait 40 years for development, to get something.

- Coppola: Asked if a person was unable to develop, what would happen to the taxation.

Baker: Said there may be a reduction.

- Chair Flynn: Supports this program and having something like this is a start. Why not give it a try.

- Nevins: Was concerned about the 40 year reversal, but changed his mind because it would hopefully have people maintaining their rural property.

- Gustavson: Asked how many properties are available to utilize the TDR program?

Baker: Stated that it depends on the underlying zoning.

- Coppola: Asked if you can purchase another TDR from someone to make your area rural.

Baker: Stated you can’t sell rural to rural.

- Coppola: Feels the TDR should be a free market commodity.

Baker: Stated that on the rural to rural, the language could be altered without injuring the programs.

- Chair Flynn: Does not think that is a good idea because it would cease to be a reasonable measure.

A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by Larry Coppola to approve the TDR program with the amendment to be able to sell rural to rural.

- Chair Flynn: Feels this complicates things because you will have to see if the development rights are coming off.

- Coppola: Said you could then go rural to rural and rural to urban.

Baker: Stated this may not be allowed.

The vote:

All in favor: 7

Motion carried unanimously.

Parking Situation
Taylor: Thanked Jim Bolger for coming to the meeting and giving an update on the parking permit status.

Jim Bolger: Stated that he has not seen the permit.

Taylor: Said that it allows parking on Dwight and Austin Streets only.

Bolger: Said when we went to Admin services, we gave them the general schedule and informed them that it varies, but that may not have been conveyed to the City of Port Orchard.

Gustavson: Feels the Planning Commission should also have passes for official BOCC meetings.

Chair Flynn: Agrees the streets are too limited.

Jenniges: Said he would be happy to get a ticket if the county takes care of it.

Bolger: Said he will take the schedule to Ben Holland again.

Mixed Use Zone

Baker: The discussion about the mixed use zone, we have seen testimony for density from 10 dwelling units per acre to 4 dwelling units per acre. Staff supports the 10 as providing for additional housing types. 10 dwelling units per acre is a driving mechanism.

Jenniges: Asked what will happen if the acre will not sustain.

Baker: Stated that mixed use allows heights up to 60 ft. with other allowances, we have provided many mechanisms.

Jenniges: Asked if the land is in an essential area, will a 4 story building be built. Jenniges recommends more flexibility.

Baker: Said that this allows for commercial as well.

Taylor: Asked if it is required to build 10 dwelling units per acre or 4-10.

Baker: Said 10-30, but the public has requested 4-10.

A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by Mike Gustavson to endorse staff’s recommendation for mixed use at 10 dwelling units per acre.

Chair Flynn: Is in support of this and is excited for mixed use. She has indicated that there are already proposals in Kingston and it will make Kingston a more vibrant community.

The vote:
All in favor: 5
Opposed: 2
Motion Carried.

Urban Restricted Zone

Baker: Said that most densities look at high and low. If you have a 20 acre parcel and 15 acres are encumberd by critical areas, the urban restricted zone is based upon the land itself, not the number. Kitsap County has been looking at it as low number net, high number gross. Staff recommends clarifying this.

A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by John Taylor to accept staff's recommendation.

The vote:
All in favor: 7
Motion carried unanimously.

- Gustavson: Stated the each chapter of volume I raises concerns and it will take a significant amount of time and discussion. We cannot complete our deliberation until everything is gone through.

- Nevins: Recommended changing Poulsbo’s acronym to an abbreviation.

Volume I Discussion

- Gustavson: Asked to define the quality of life.

Baker: Said that it means a lot of things to different people, and it may have been written for a reason.

- Gustavson: Feels if it cannot be defined, it should be left out.

- Jenniges: Stated that he ah[s heard of permits being under review for 1.5 months and has asked if the County will prioritize them.

Baker: Stated that sometimes complicated permits come before easy permits, and the easy ones get backed up.

- Coppola: Asked if it would be easier to just call the permit counter rather than coming in.

Baker: Stated that email is more traceable and Baker will take the comments to Jeff Rowe-Hornbaker.

- Gustavson: Stated that if the CPP’s are not being achieved, the reasonable measures need to be jacked up.
Baker: There is a list of reasonable measures, some of them vary to things incentive based. If you say you will do X in your plan and you cannot achieve X, you need to take appropriate measures to be in compliance.

A motion was made by Tom Nevins and seconded by Lary Coppola to continue deliberations on Tuesday, October 3rd.

The vote:
All in favor: 7
Motion carried unanimously.
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Deborah Flynn, Chair

Christina Lindner, Planning Commission Secretary