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:
Dean Jenniges, Lary Coppola, Jim Sommerhauser, Tom Nevins, Fred
Depee, Lou Foritano, and Chair John Taylor. Staff present: Eric Baker,
Scott Diener, Angie Silva, James Weaver, Katrina Knutson, Phillip Fletcher,
Jim Bolger, and Planning Commission Secretary Christina Lindner.

9:11 AM
A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

9:12 AM
B. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Nevins and seconded by
Commissioner Foritano to approve the minutes of June 26, 2007.
The VOTE:
Unanimous
Motion carries

A motion was made by Commissioner Nevins and seconded by
Commissioner Foritano to approve the minutes of July 10, 2007.
The VOTE:
Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstained: 1
Motion carries

9:13 AM
C. Work-Study: Review and Discussion on Phase II Code Development
   Process – Eric Baker

Eric Baker: A draft code will be arriving August 15. Expect a document at that
time.
Depee: Will we be receiving an overview presentation of the draft code?

Baker: Yes.

Chair Taylor: Will there be an executive summary?

Baker: Yes.

9:18 AM

D. Work-Study: Keyport Community Plan Introduction and Overview – James Weaver

James Weaver gives an overview of the process and history of the Keyport Community Plan. He discusses LAMIRDS, shoreline designations and zoning, gives brief overviews to each chapter of the plan, and reads the Keyport Vision Statement.

Jenniges: Why is the public hearing held in Port Orchard?

Weaver: The previous discussions with the Planning Commission Chair and the DCD staff indicated that locating Public Hearings in the Commissioners Chambers was the most efficient process for audio/visual presentations, for availability of staff, and for scheduling for the available facilities.

Chair Taylor: We discussed this issue thoroughly. We have two major Public Hearings at the same time on August 14th and I would like to view the coordinated hearings as an experiment. We are not setting anything in concrete.

Foritano: View blockage – pitting neighbor against neighbor - is not specific to Keyport and the Critical Areas Ordinance did not help. As a general request I would like to discuss view blockage issues throughout the county.

Jenniges: Dogfish Bay is shallow and surrounded by Critical Areas; I have reservations with the outlook that we can develop the aquatic end of that for Keyport. Keyport was previously a torpedo station. The economic downfall is that marine activities will be limited. And I do not believe condos fit in Keyport or that the gate will be open to the museum.

Weaver: The Keyport community plan proposes to maintain Dogfish Bay pretty much the way it is utilized now. Most marine activity was proposed to occur with the Port of Keyport expansion. The discussion of the pedestrian gate to the
museum does not access anything controlled. It only accesses the museum parking lot which is open to the public. The Naval base will not be accessible at any time through this pedestrian gate. The pedestrian gate is the only gate being discussed.

**Depee:** Are the citizens living in the south end of Dogfish Bay interested in being part of the Keyport community?

**Weaver:** They were sent postcards but only three residents were in attendance. We made every effort we could to involve them. We had eight public meetings, newspaper articles, and mailings. We received little interest from the citizens South of Dogfish Bay.

**Coppola:** Since nothing will be included on the other side of the causeway, why is the causeway included in the boundaries?

**Weaver:** It is included because it is such an integral element. It would allow for significant funding and transportation requests to be included from community, given the limited pedestrian access across the causeway.

*Chair Taylor clarifies that eight public meetings have been held prior to August 14, 2007.*

**Weaver:** Correct. Each meeting is downloadable on our website at [http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/community_plan/subareas/keyport](http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/community_plan/subareas/keyport)

**Sommerhauser:** Is there any comment from the community about having the Public Hearing here?

**Weaver:** That location decision was recently made by DCD and I have not had an opportunity to collect any opinions regarding the location. I can e-mail you any comments I receive before the next meeting.

**E. Work-Study: Manchester Design Guidelines – Phillip Fletcher**

*Phillip Fletcher introduces Carillu Thompson, who gives a brief overview of the history of the Manchester Plan. Carillu discusses the goals and objectives of the design standards.*
Jenniges: What are design standards? Are they aesthetic? Are they technical? What do design standards include?

Thompson: Design standards include site development, SEPA designations, aesthetics, elevations, placement on the property, landscaping, conductivity between properties for pedestrian passage, etc...

Jenniges: Does anybody on the committee have a planning background?

Thompson: We have a contractor on the committee and the standards have been reviewed by two land use attorneys.

Carol Leininger gives a brief overview of the process and schedule of the Design Standards.

Fletcher continues the presentation by discussing public comment regarding view blockage and height limitations and the similarities between the Manchester Guidelines and Kingston Guidelines. Fletcher states the Planning Commission should be expecting a staff report shortly and suggests the commission discuss the timeline’s reasonability.

Coppola: I am finding items within the guidelines that directly conflict. For example, it says we should emulate the Bethel Corridor Plan and in another place it says all parking shall be in front. Has anybody checked for these inconsistencies?

Fletcher: I will address issues in the staff report. I will make note of all comments of internal inconsistencies.

Depee requests a copy of the 40 page document.

Fletcher: We received 60 pages from two people at the last minute. They will be addressed.

Jenniges reads a selection of public comments and expresses concerns. He asks for the comments to be addressed in the staff report.

Jenniges: Do they want to become a bedroom community like Seattle? What about parking?

Fletcher: Several people have brought up the parking issue. It is a problem in small downtown communities.
Jenniges recommends expansion of the Port for tourism purposes.

Sommerhauser: Is there any policy in the county that one community design standard should follow another? Or are they completely unique communities? Each community is making input on the character of their community. For the technical portion it may be helpful or it may be superfluous.

Fletcher: There is no rule against it. Manchester used Kingston as a model; same topics and format. In some areas identical language was used and in some areas they did not use them as a model. They logically looked at something that has worked and disassembled it to fit their needs.

Sommerhauser: Do we have any expression either by the Commissioners or approval with the 10-Year Update of building heights and views that gives us anything to look at related to where the current thinking in the County is? Does it vary community to community?

Fletcher: Yes, it does vary. To my knowledge, there are two documents that reflect official opinions – the Director’s Interpretation which led to the Commissioners 8-page ordinance establishing the interim ordinance. We can get legal opinion as to whether it is advisory or binding.

Jenniges: The only view aspect I remember was related to shoreline views and setbacks. But I do not remember ever dealing with commercial or city views.

Chair Taylor: What percentage of citizens were opposed and what percentage was supportive?

Fletcher: 60% represented the conservative group. This may not be statistically important.

Nevins: I recall that there was a specific height limitation of 28 feet. Taller buildings were to be placed down slope and shorter buildings were to be placed upslope.

Chair Taylor defers the question of Director’s Interpretation to Larry Keeton.

Larry Keeton: A height of 35 feet is stated in the goals. The Interpretation said it should be two stories based on historical character of the city. It has been appealed and the Commissioners passed the Interim Zoning. Silverdale has a higher height restriction. Each community has the ability to adjust its height.
Sommerhauser: Planning seems to grant large reliance on maintaining community character. Is that an item that stands on appeal?

Keeton: Character cannot be the overriding function. Legal will need to be involved. Hearings Board decisions frequently look at character.

**Discussions held regarding the definition and interpretation of community character.**

Jenniges: William Palmer needs to answer his own questions. Who made up this Design Group? Without a planner in the group it is difficult to arrive at a workable product.

Fletcher: I will address that in my staff report.

Chair Taylor: Requests the average number of people in attendance at the community meetings and the number of community meetings that have taken place.

Coppola: The original community plan was completed almost ten years ago. The character of the community has changed a great deal. We have some comments from people who may not have been around during the first plan.

Sommerhauser: It would be helpful to have a survey completed similar to Keyport to track shifts in attendance and opinions.

Fletcher: The forums from which the public comments were solicited were all in different settings. I will work with co-chairs to see what we come up with. The 40/60 figure is not statistically significant.

Chair Taylor: Requests that the cut-off date for public comment be listed on the agenda. Also asks for an executive summary.

Foritano: It is always helpful for contentious public hearings to be preceded by a summary of the planners. For example best practices regarding design standards, visibility issues, etc. It will preclude endless, redundant comments.

Nevins: It would be appropriate to say that our role is to determine what the person testifying is saying and only ask question to clarify what the testifier is trying to say. Our goal is not to argue with them.

Sommerhauser: It would be helpful to cut comment off five or six days before deliberations in order to have plenty of time to read through the comments. Does the Manchester timeline apply to Keyport as well?
Fletcher: I believe our time frames are different because I am working with a definite deadline.

Coppola: The planner that worked on the original plan is still with DCD. Would it be possible to have that person present?

Jenniges: It would be helpful, in the Executive Summary, to address the shift in attendance and attitudes from older residents to newer residents. What was the Manchester character other than 'small town'?

Sommerhauser: Can you tell us within ½ a mile of this area what the age of ownership is? For example, 50% of the homes have been owned by the same people for 30 years, etc...

Depee: Residency does not apply because we are focusing on the current process.

Sommerhauser withdraws request.

Chair Taylor requests a presentation regarding sewer connectivity and a formal introduction to the new County Commissioner.

Sommerhauser: Are there any Manchester meetings tonight?

Baker: There is a Manchester Community Council Meeting at the library at 6:30.

Bolger gives a brief update on the large on-site sewage system remand.

Depee: Is it not considered as much of a threat now?

Bolger: I think the recommendations from the Planning Commission, Stakeholders, and the public testimony has something to do with it.

Sommerhauser: Was this body ever briefed about the possible avenue through the Department of Health?
Bolger: No. I do not know if the Commissioners in their role with the Board of Health will make that motion. We have only briefed them on it.

Coppola: Is a lawsuit pending over this?  

Bolger: To my knowledge there is no pending litigation with the County.

Nevins: Several citizens have approached me regarding their concern with code enforcement on the weekends or after business hours. What steps are being taken?

Bolger: Certainly the citizen can call 911. DCD will investigate an issue as soon as we receive the message and sometimes on weekends.

Chair Taylor requests a short report on Code Enforcement processes.

Jenniges: I do not believe it is the responsibility of the police department to enforce codes that the County institutes.

Bolger: They prioritize the calls.

Depee: I usually recommend they call Eric Baker at home.

A motion was made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by Commissioner Nevins to adjourn the meeting.

The VOTE:

Unanimous

Motion carries

Meeting adjourned 11:55 AM

EXHIBITS

A. Interim Zoning Regulations Ordinance
B. Design Standards
C. Public Comment from William Palmer
D. Manchester Zoning Map

MINUTES approved this _______ day of ________2007.
John Taylor, Chair

Christina Lindner, Planning Commission Secretary