

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

MINUTES
KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers
Work Study/Public Hearing
July 10, 2007, 9:00 AM

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

These minutes are intended to provide a summary of the meeting flow and content and should not be relied upon for specific statements from individuals at the meeting.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

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: Lary Coppola, Tom Nevins, Michael Gustavson, Linda Paralez, Fred Depee, Lou Foritano, and Chair John Taylor. Staff present: Eric Baker, Scott Diener, Angie Silva, Patty Charnas, and acting Planning Commission Secretary/ Associate Planner, Katrina N. Knutson.

31
32
33
34
35

9:05 AM

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

9:06 AM

B. Work-Study: Shoreline Program Update – Patty Charnas

Patty Charnas gives an update on the Shoreline Management Program and recent activities being undertaken related to the program.

John Taylor: Can DCD provide the Planning Commission with copies of WAC 173.26 (RCW 90.58)?

Charnas: Yes, staff can make copies.

Commissioner Paralez requests that the presentation be e-mailed to the Planning Commission.

Gustavson: The House Bill states that not all shorelines are critical. The Growth Management Act is applied where the Shoreline Management Act does not apply. The SMA only applies to areas that are not designated as critical. Does the SMA not apply now? Larry Keeton suggested that the current study would not be used to address the buffer issue. I understood Jim Bolger to say that Kitsap County would take a conservative approach and designate it all critical. It concerns me that I have received two

1 opposite answers. What are we doing differently in Puget Sound? Are we
2 mis-focusing the point? We are spending a lot of money looking at the
3 wrong problem.
4

5 **Charnas:** Many answers relate to policy. Some questions cannot be answered
6 by a technical exercise. I will be happy to work with individual commissioners on
7 any questions that may arise.
8

00:24:16

9
10 **Paralez:** Regarding the scope of this assessment, can you speak to
11 policy issues that drove the design of the scope of the project? Is it
12 aligned with other State assessments?
13

14 **Charnas:** Yes, it is aligned with other State assessments.
15

16 **Taylor:** I am concerned about the citizens and property owners being
17 visited in December.
18

19 **Charnas:** This will not be a static process whereby we collect information and
20 shut the door. It will be an on going project with DCD.
21

22 **Taylor:** Why is the assessment done in the summer?
23

24 **Charnas:** Low tides are available in the summer months. We also have
25 summer interns available to help.
26

27 **Depee:** The group started at the Pierce County line. Where are they
28 now?
29

30 **Charnas:** North of Tracyton. I am very pleased with the progress. Susan
31 Donahue is the project manager.
32

33 **Depee:** Is a pictorial being taken?
34

35 **Charnas:** Yes. It is a reproducible protocol that includes a GPS unit and
36 photographs.
37

38 **Gustavson:** Are any maps available of kelp beds from the 50's and 60's?
39

40 **Charnas:** I am not sure.
41

00:30:45

42
43 **9:35AM**

44 **C. Eric Baker-Phase II development process, review and discussion on**
45 **subdivision and performance based development**
46

1 **Baker gives a brief overview of the purpose and intent of the project.**

2
3 **Commissioner Gustavson requests a definition of “Performance Based**
4 **Development”.**

5
6 **Baker:** The State RCW and Washington Administrative Code establish a
7 process for subdividing land, called a plat. Straight platting works well on flat, dry
8 land. If looking to accommodate density, straight platting creates a series of
9 problems when faced with odd, topographical features like Critical Areas,
10 streams, and wetlands.

11
12 **Foritano:** Would a real life example be the Olympic resources concept?
13 There are maximum densities and a maximum return of the geography.

14
15 **Baker:** The proposal in Port Gamble is an example of rural clustering, a rural
16 performance based development. Clustering is very similar in that the
17 development is moved into one small area to be preserved.

18
19 **Foritano:** Is Poulsbo the urban version of this?

20
21 **Baker:** An urban version would be Kingston Meadows and Madeline Woods.
22 These are performance based developments.

23
24 **Baker continues presentation by discussing density.**

25 **00:45:25**

26
27 **Gustavson:** When variances are issued into Critical Areas, are they
28 actually critical?

29
30 **Baker:** Of course. Critical Areas are determined by Title 19.

31
32 **Gustavson:** We see information from the Hearing Examiner and wonder
33 how critical an area was to begin with.

34
35 **Baker:** The only place in the CAO that allows for a reduction in protection is the
36 Reasonable Use exception.

37
38 **Baker continues presentation by discussing minimum lot sizes and**
39 **building setbacks.**

40 **00:53:56**

41
42 **Coppola:** I believe “Tot Lots” attract crime in their current configuration.

43
44 **Gustavson:** I doubt we are the leader in this concept. How has it worked
45 elsewhere?

1 **Baker:** Some of this comes from planning principles and some comes from
2 other Puget Sound jurisdictions. These amenities have been located in many
3 other portions of the country. I think somebody could make an argument that it is
4 strongly encouraged by the Growth Management Act but there is no mandate
5 coming from the State stating “you shall have mandatory recreational
6 opportunities”.

7
8 **Gustavson:** Several years ago we were excited about the McCormick
9 West proposal with likely 1200 kids in a very small area.

10
11 **Baker:** We have active recreational amenities in small pockets throughout the
12 development.

13
14 **Depee:** Are the formulas for densities randomly chosen?

15
16 **Baker:** No. They are based on other jurisdictions and Hearing Examiner
17 decisions.

18
19 **Depee:** The example of 60 per square feet does not matter because
20 anything over 30 will have 260 per lot. What difference would it make if
21 there were 10, 20 or 30 lots more?

22 **00:59:30**

23
24 **Baker:** An active recreational amenity is required at 30 lots. They are required
25 for every 20 lots thereafter. Once it is required, the 260 square feet kicks in.

26
27 **Depee:** Regarding backyards, if the lot was 60x100, does this formula
28 reduce the number of footage needed for the recreation area?

29
30 **Baker:** The numbers seen here are the ones being seen today based on a
31 60/80 foot lot. They are deemed appropriate based on other jurisdictions and
32 Hearing Examiner decisions.

33
34 ***Baker continues presentation by discussing street ownership and***
35 ***development.***

36
37 **Depee:** Some revisions to road standards would reduce the widths but
38 still be able to dedicate publicly?

39
40 **Baker:** Yes.

41
42 **Paralez:** Are the fire departments involved?

43
44 **Baker:** The fire districts have been heavily involved in the design of road
45 standards.

46

1 **Gustavson:** *Asks about parking multiple cars on a driveway.*

2

3 **Baker:** The minimum road width most developers use is 28 feet. We will be
4 looking at a set aside parking area. 28 feet is the logical outcome of the road
5 standard change.

6

7 **Depee:** Will it be possible to back out on to a public road?

8

9 **Baker:** That is addressed in the draft road standards.

10

11 **Coppola:** I do not believe the parking scenario is applicable in the real
12 world. I do not think there will be enough room for a fire truck to get
13 through. Parking on one side of the street is unrealistic because people
14 will want to park their car on the side they live on.

15

16 ***Conversations held regarding parking.***

17

01:12:15

18

19 **Break: 10:18am**

20

01:31:31

21

22 ***Baker continues presentation by discussing landscaping and lighting,***
23 ***straight platting, and performance based development.***

24

25 **Paralez:** Are there trade-offs for low impact development?

26

27 **Baker:** At this point, low impact development is not attached to performance
28 based developments. Those are strongly encouraged to provide flexibility, not
29 necessarily in lot dimensions, but in stormwater controls which are managed by
30 Title 12, not Title 17. The LID components adopted at the end of last year were
31 meant to be options, not requirements.

32

33 **Paralez:** So low impact development tactics and strategies are elements
34 of performance based development? Those strategies are being
35 encouraged as a means of performance based development?

36

37 **Baker:** Yes.

38

39 **Chair Taylor:** The City of DuPont mandates that garages be built on the
40 back of the house. I encourage Planning Commission members to drive
41 through DuPont.

42

43 ***Baker continues presentation by discussing common Open Space and***
44 ***recreational Open Space.***

45

Kitsap County Planning Commission –July 10, 2007

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19

MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2007.

John Taylor, Chair

Christina Lindner, Planning Commission Secretary