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, WA 98366. Members present:
Chair John Taylor, Lary Coppola, Fred Depee, Michael Gustavson, Tom
Nevins, Linda Paralez, Lou Foritano and Dean Jenniges. Staff present: Eric
Baker, Angie Silva, Linda Bentley, Scott Diener, Larry Keeton, and Planning
Commission Secretary Christina Lindner.

9:09 AM
A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

9:10 AM
B. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Coppola and seconded by
Commissioner Jenniges to approve the minutes of February 27, 2007.
The VOTE:
Unanimous
Motion carries

A motion was made by Vice Chair Coppola and seconded by Commissioner
Jenniges to accept the resignation of Brian Bekeny effective March 13,
2007 with appreciation for his service.
The VOTE:
Unanimous
Motion carries

9:11 AM
C. Review of March 13, 2007 training and procedures.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nevins and seconded by
Commissioner Paralez to adopt the parliamentary procedures document as
a guideline for meetings and procedures with some flexibility and discretion as needed.

The VOTE:
Yes: 6
No: 2
Motion carries.

Nevins: Recommends reading the document once a month as a refresher.

Discussions held regarding the desire to adopt the document as a resource or to incorporate them into the bylaws.

Foritano: Agrees with the adoption, but recommends it be kept to a couple of pages.

Chair Taylor wishes to adopt the pamphlet as a guideline.

Scott Diener: Following the training on March 13, staff looked at the bylaws and decided it would be good to update them in order to improve staff and Planning Commission efficiency.

Foritano: Which issues would you like to correct?

Diener: We have tossed around the idea of bringing an ex-officio member to the Planning Commission. They can assist with points of order and make motions, but cannot vote.

Several Planning Commission members express disapproval of this idea.

Nevins: Expresses interest in seeing the plan on paper and submits a document to staff regarding his thoughts on roles, responsibilities, and procedures.

Chair Taylor: I think the document alone will help our meetings move efficiently. An ex-officio member is not necessary.

Commissioners Paralez, Coppola, and Foritano indicate that they would like to see the proposal before it is voted against.

Gustavson: The County Commissioners should determine if we are performing efficiently or if we should be replaced. I do not believe it is appropriate for an ex-officio member to make motions.
Chair Taylor establishes that the consensus is for staff to prepare a proposal to update the Planning Commission bylaws.

Gustavson: Recommends considering Pierce County’s model of bylaws.

9:24 AM

D. Public Hearing to consider testimony on proposed amendments to Kitsap County Code Title 17 (Zoning Ordinance), related to Chapter 17.381: Allowed Uses.

Eric Baker gives a brief update on the 10-Year Update and the Title 17 code changes. He then describes the documents before the Planning Commission.

Gustavson: How does the term “Fast Track” relate to Code Revisions?

Baker: There are two different code development projects right now. The “Fast Track” code amendment issues are more serious and require your attention now rather than later. Phase II Code Development will be brought to you at the end of the year. It is a much more comprehensive change to County code. We wanted to make the differentiation between the two projects. We could change “Fast Track” to a term that is less contentious.

Coppola: Some items have numbers attached and levels of review.

Baker: The number of rooms determines the required level of the review. Each of these numbers references a footnote.

Gustavson: Will we be looking at the other issues in this document in the fall?

Baker: Yes. Other issues such as agricultural regulations will be discussed at length in the fall. The regulations you see in this document are the same as those in 1998.

Coppola: Will there be a separate public hearing on the agricultural changes?

Baker: Staff will not be proposing changes to the agricultural regulations, but discussions can take place in October.

Depee: Requests an explanation of acronyms.
Baker: Explains the acronyms:
1. UCR – Urban Cluster Residential (located in Kingston and McCormick Woods)
2. UR – Urban Restricted (environmentally sensitive zone; 1-5 dwelling units per acre)
3. UL – Urban Low (standard Single Family Residential zone, 4-9 DU/acre)
4. UM - Urban Medium (apartments, condos, 10-18 DU/acre)
5. UH – Urban High (most intensive residential zone, 19-30 DU/acre)

Depee: Are manufactured homes permitted under zonings other than UCR?

Baker: Under UR and UL, you find the term “ACUP”. We are proposing to change it to “P” for permitted. This would imply that a person could apply for a mobile home permit then go about their business. For manufactured homes in UCR and UM zones it was written correctly in the code, thus no changes are necessary. And it is prohibited in UH because it is not possible to get Manufactured Homes at 19 DU/acre.

Coppola: What is the difference between mobile homes and manufactured homes?

Baker: Mobile homes are constructed prior to 1976. Anything constructed after 1976 is considered a manufactured home. They have different certifications and requirements with the State.

Depee: Clarifies that building codes play an important role as well.

Jenniges: Footnotes are identified in this document that were very controversial, ranging from the junk car proposal to the businesses proposal. Why are there footnotes when these were supposed to be strictly code changes?

Baker: We added the footnotes for reference. They are a compilation of approved items from the Board of County Commissioners with input from the Planning Commission. We are only making changes today that are necessary to remove obvious errors. We are not proposing changes to anything else, but as we approach Phase II Code Development at the end of the year I expect concerns will surface.

Jenniges: If we adopt these changes, will we adopt the footnotes as well?

Baker: They are in current code today. The Planning Commission read and approved them at the end of last year. This is not new text. We will be addressing these issues during Phase II Code Development.
Chair Taylor opens the Public Hearing portion of the Proposed Amendments to Kitsap County Code Title 17.

Ron Ross: It is complex trying to follow the footnotes. There are many zones that are now being broken into finite categories. If a bed and breakfast is permitted in UCR but not UL, where is the continuity? I would like to see a limit on the expansion of this complex system.

Chair Taylor closes the Public Hearing portion of the Proposed Amendments to Kitsap County Code Title 17.

Fred Depee: Asks for a definition of Urban Cluster Residential.

Baker: The zone was created in the Kingston sub-area plan and only applies in the McCormick Urban Village and Kingston area. It is a variety of zones including commercial uses, zero lot line development, and higher density cluster developments.

Gustavson: Seattle allows manufactured homes to be stacked, which doubles the density. It prompts the question, "why would it not be allowed in urban high?"

Baker: We can look at the code to see if it is allowable. We can also find out if 19 dwelling units per acre is achievable. Would you want to have stacked Manufactured Housing?

Nevins: Expresses interest in the justification of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in the urban restricted zones being reduced from an Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP) to a straight permit.

Baker: While it is an environmentally sensitive zone, it is still within the Urban Growth Area. We are not trying to push development, but it is in an area near mass transit services. Accessory Dwelling Units are a form of affordable housing which mass transit serves. Allowing the development of ADUs as permitted is a Reasonable Measure. Environmental protections are still in place.

Nevins: Is it possible that a permit would not be issued to a sensitive piece of land even if it were in the urban area?

Baker: If there were a proposed structure within a critical areas buffer or drain field, etc. Asking for a variance, however, could create an issue.
Jenniges: Requests a notation explaining the footnotes.

Chair Taylor: Is a written comment deadline established?

Baker: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission make a decision today.

10:55 AM

E. Deliberations and recommendation on proposed amendments to Kitsap County Code Title 17 (Zoning Ordinance), related to Chapter 17.381: Allowed Uses.

A motion was made by Commissioner Jenniges and seconded by Vice Chair Coppola to approve the current recommended code changes for Fast Track Code Revisions.

The VOTE:
Yes: Unanimous
Motion carries.

Discussions held regarding home businesses and conditional use permits.

Break 11:03 AM

11:15 AM

F. Continuation of February 27 Public Hearing: Silverdale Draft Downtown Design Guidelines.

Linda Bentley gives a brief update regarding the Silverdale Design Guidelines, the new district alternatives, and requests draft approval.

Jenniges: Asks why the Clear Creek Corridor does not run from Silverdale Way to Old Town along the same road.

Paralez: Compliments the timeliness and hard work put into responding to Planning Commission comments.

Chair Taylor opens Public Hearing Portion of the Silverdale Draft Downtown Design Guidelines.

Lawrence Greaves: I would like to see Paragraph 3.4.3 on page 21, subsection H, deleted from the guidelines. Commercial Street is a platted street in Old Town and is an acknowledged wetland area.
Mike Walton: There has been an attempt to keep the identity of specific neighborhoods of the Silverdale area, which is why there were originally as many recognized districts. Since our last meeting, one of our primary issues was that the waterfront district did not cover the waterfront. There was a lot of confusion over nomenclature, not intent. The waterfront is not homogeneous; our intent was not to treat it as such. It is not representative of what Silverdale is or might be. We removed that designation all together. The Clear Creek Corridor was extended to the waterfront in order to include the estuary and the creek corridor itself. The upper portion of the east area is Hospital property and will look like a campus whether we have guidelines that say it or not. Through our simplification discussions, central and east basically wound up with the same guidelines. For the sake of simplicity, have central and east colored the same. This indicates they are following the same guidelines rather than two separate areas. The intent is the same: to recognize and address the dissimilarities and satisfy the Planning Commission’s request. We could not make it all one district. The guidelines are good for the concept of an urban village of what Silverdale may look like 20 or 30 years from now. I feel like the guidelines have done a very good job of reaching that goal.

Depee: Asks if the hospital will build a campus at a future date and references a situation in which Port Orchard bought property for a future campus but never followed through. Suggests that the hospital could change its course.

Walton: We simplified this area to the Bucklin Hill Center, more commercially aligned guidelines, but it allows the hospital to do a campus design.

Gustavson: The east side of Silverdale Way, which you have included in the Clear Creek Corridor, looks exactly like the west side. What is the rational for coloring that green?

Walton: Other than drawing any arbitrary lines, the Clear Creek Corridor in the greenway runs down here (points to map), but to cover the development that may face toward the corridor, it was extended all the way to Silverdale Way. It could possibly be extended down, but because of the Bucklin Hill Center/Silverdale Campus area, it was decided to keep it within the Bucklin Hill guidelines rather than extend the Clear Creek Corridor to the Silverdale Way line.

Depee: The corridor is already established commercial and fully developed.

Walton: It is developed commercial, but it could be redeveloped. We would like the redevelopment to follow the guidelines.
Ron Ross: I believe this process is staff driven. Page 21, paragraph J states that sidewalks are to be provided if possible. When I choose to develop five or ten years from now and need to put in a road, do I need to put a sidewalk on both sides or not? Who makes this determination? The ten zones in Silverdale are confusing. Multi-family should be excluded from the design districts, but the hospital property does not need to be eliminated. We do not need restrictions on school zones. I suggest combining regional commercial (east and central) to achieve the lowest number of districts possible and combining Old Town with West Hills.

Depee: Asks Mr. Ross why he feels the property around the hospital should be excluded.

Ross: Topographical reasons. Much of the property around the hospital is owned by the hospital. Anything we could logically exclude would be my preference.

Gustavson: Could you make one district out of East, Central and Clear Creek Corridor?

Ross: The Critical Areas Ordinance protects the corridor. I do not see the need for urban design guidelines. Are the guidelines enforceable if they say things like “where possible”?

Dave Peterson: This plan is staff written, not staff driven. Public has had much input and now it is staff’s part to put it into writing. In the beginning we looked at what we thought were seven natural neighborhoods. I am not against any amount of districts except one; I am opposed to Old Town being brought into west. The space to the west of Old Town should be included with Old Town. I would encourage you to keep the basic idea of what we are trying to do. Please leave Old Town as its own unique area and not require businesses along the water to be on the first floor. It would be a much better use to have it all residential. The people will add to the success.

Depee: This process started two years ago. How can you say that there was public input when only three people attended the last community meeting?

Peterson: The Central Kitsap Community Council has kept the study active. There were many stops and starts.

Gustavson: Is there a theme for Silverdale?
**Peterson:** It was mentioned at one of our meetings, but there is no catchy theme that can be put into words.

**Mary Earl:** I agree with Dave Peterson in extending Old Town to the west. I would include the south part of Central into the Old Town area. I disagree with Ron Ross in combining the Old Town and west districts because of the topography in the area. They are two different neighborhoods.

**Jenniges:** The area currently called east, topographically, is more difficult to develop, except along Randall Way. Once you cross Silverdale Way heading west, you’re not in Old Town anymore. I would not like to see Old Town extended any further.

**Walton:** *Explains the working group process to the Planning Commission.*

**Gary Johnson:** Concerning the extension of Old Town northward, the area proposed contains two hotels and a strip mall and is very different in character from Old Town. I do not believe it belongs in Old Town.

**Chair Taylor closes the Public Hearing Portion of the Silverdale Draft Downtown Design Guidelines.**

**Foritano:** What are your thoughts? Are you moved to consider any further changes?

**Bentley:** The area to the north of Old Town was originally included in Old Town. During open houses and meetings, there was comment that the hotel area should be removed from Old Town based on development. They wanted to retain the charm and they wanted lower height requirements.

**Foritano:** Is the issue the enhancement of Old Town? Doing something to attract people to Old Town would keep the businesses viable. Why not attract traffic from what’s being built in the west?

**Bentley:** This is a design guideline only. This is not an Economic Development plan. We are thinking about the viability of Silverdale, but it is my understanding that the Old Town community wishes to retain its charm. The zoning is Neighborhood Commercial, which indicates that the businesses are there to serve the residents. Lastly, we can remove the reference to Commercial Street as suggested by the Port.

**Gustavson:** This seems to be another way to add more costs to the developers. I have not heard a theme or any reason for doing this. I would vote that we disband and drop this issue.
Gustavson leaves 11:22 AM

**Discussions held regarding text changes.**

**Jenniges:** Requests Larry Greave’s opinion of the guidelines.

**Greaves:** I have mixed emotions. The primary concern in Silverdale is to make the area pedestrian friendly. It would not hurt my feelings if this plan were not adopted.

**Nevins:** What rational led to exclusion of properties bordering Clear Creek on the east side from the Clear Creek Corridor area?

**Bentley:** The eastern portion of the Clear Creek Corridor was never discussed in my tenure.

A motion was made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by Vice Chair Coppola to combine the Central, Clear Creek, and East districts as one district, west as a second district, and Old Town as a third district.

The VOTE:

Yes: 4
No: 3

Motion fails

**Depee:** Would like to see simplicity in the plan.

**Paralez:** The guidelines are for appearance only. They are not related to critical areas. Without the guidelines you lose orientation, size, and height of buildings, things the citizens care about along the corridor. I do not agree with changing the Clear Creek Corridor standards, but I would support Central and East becoming one design standard.

**Nevins:** The citizens want the corridor to be an asset to their community. I think we ought to keep Clear Creek separate.

**Coppola:** I have mixed emotions. Silverdale Way and Blaine Avenue are heavily developed. I do not think we should impose design standards on a building that someday may not even see the creek. What matter would it be if we turned Safeway around? The creek is protected by the Critical Areas Ordinance so it would be 150 feet before anybody could develop anything anyway. I support two or three design districts and trust the Critical Areas Ordinance to protect the creek.
Jenniges: Central Kitsap is unique in that it has been able to develop itself through the current guidelines to the satisfaction of most of the citizens.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Coppola and seconded by Commissioner Jenniges to postpone the motion until a nine member Planning Commission is present.

The VOTE:
Yes: 2
No: 5
Motion fails

A motion was made by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by Commissioner Foritano to combine the central and east districts into one design standard and leave the other districts as presented by staff.

The VOTE:
Yes: 5
No: 1
Abstain: 1
Motion carries

G. Department Update

Larry Keeton gives the Planning Commission a brief update regarding the Community Development “SURGE” process.

A motion was made by Commissioner Paralez to adjourn the meeting.

The VOTE:
Unanimous
Motion carries

Meeting adjourned 12:05 PM.

EXHIBITS
A. Silverdale Draft Design Guidelines Staff Memo to the Planning Commission
B. Draft Development Checklist – Silverdale Design Guidelines
C. Proposed Amendments to Residential Uses in Title 17, Consolidated Use Table, Staff Report
Kitsap County Planning Commission – March 27, 2007

D. Code Development Fast Track Code Revisions
E. Silverdale Design Guidelines Public Testimony – Ron Ross
F. Silverdale Design Guidelines Public Testimony – David Peterson

MINUTES approved this _______ day of _______ 2007.

________________________________________
John Taylor, Chair

________________________________________
Christina Lindner, Planning Commission Secretary