

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

MINUTES
KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers
Work Study/Public Hearing
August 14, 2007, 6:30 PM

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

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.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

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, Mike Gustavson, and Chair John Taylor. Staff present: Scott Diener, James Weaver, Katrina Knutson, Phillip Fletcher, Jim Bolger, and Mary Seals.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

6: 33 PM

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

6:35 PM

B. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Nevins and seconded by Commissioner Foritano to approve the minutes of July 24, 2007.

The VOTE:

Yes: 6

Abstained: 1

Motion carries

6:36 PM

C. Public Hearing: Keyport Community Plan, James Weaver, Planner, DCD

James Weaver gives an overview of the process and history of the Keyport Community Plan. He has collected all written and emailed testimony and has submitted it to the Commissioners today. He will continue to collect all comments until August 17, 2007 and will submit those to the Planning Commissioners prior to the August 28, 2007 Planning Commission meeting. He went over the chapters in the plan.

James Weaver: Opens Public Testimony

1 countywide. Broad and uniform view protection language cannot be applied to
2 Keyport because it is a tiny community existing of tiny lots. Because of Keyport's
3 tiny size and topography view protection restrictions will undermine private
4 property rights. I support the Keyport Community Plan as it was written on July
5 18, 2007 with no changes to the view protection language.

6
7 **Sommerhauser:** Requests zoning map available for people to point to
8 their lots.

9
10 **Gary Kohler:** I'd like to thank the county for updating plan and James Weaver.
11 We support the plan in that it corrects the 5 acre minimum lot size that reflected
12 no lot in Keyport for over the last several years. It provides the opportunity to
13 extend sewers to those areas where septic tanks have failed or may fail in the
14 future, thereby protecting or improving the quality of Liberty Bay. One issue that
15 we have a slight issue with is increasing the density to two units. We feel that's
16 better than 5 acres, one lot for 5. We feel that 2.5 units per acre is more reflective
17 of the existing community. It would allow us 3 lots rather than 2, and each of the
18 lots would be 17,000sf, which is larger than most of the lots in Keyport. We feel
19 the existing utilities also support the higher density which would not conflict with
20 the GMA because the area is surrounded by water with not potential to expand.
21 Existing codes provide more than enough view protection. On some properties a
22 tall thin house may provide a better view corridor than a lower wider rambler
23 which would block the total view.

24
25 **Len Marklund:** One good point that I see in the local plan is the provision to
26 have sewers. I have a septic system. The proposal to allow sewers to be
27 developed is something that would be very beneficial. It would improve the
28 utilization of my land and I would feel good about the improvement of the ecology
29 of the bay. I understand that there is an Appendix F which was proposed for
30 height restrictions and as I understand the plan does not include that. I would
31 certainly support the plan not including that appendix for the 28' height
32 limitations.

33
34 **6:54:10**

35
36 **Jenniges:** How wide is your lot?

37
38 **Len Markland:** 50'

39
40 **Shirl Golden:** I wish to speak on the issue of storm water drainage. The
41 intersection of State Highway 308 and Washington Avenue is in the vicinity of
42 high water table in the winter during the rainy season. As a historical indicative
43 of this continuing problem, we have three drainage ditches that serve the impact
44 of the low area that this is located. The reason that I bring this up at this time is it
45 has been zoned commercial. I would ask that some language be included that
46 would have developers cognizant of the water table in the winter. And make

1 arrangements so that this can be alleviated, mitigated. We would not want this
2 water to be shunted off to residential homes.

3
4 **Jenniges:** Could you point to where we're talking about with the
5 drainage?
6

7 **Shirl Golden:** It's along Poulsbo Road that we have had standing water. The
8 office building has had an improvement to the parking area that has helped with
9 that standing area at that point. The restaurant that is on the corner has also
10 done the same thing. We have expressed in one of our meetings a situation
11 where development may cause the people behind that development to receive
12 the run off of what normally goes into that lot. So it's a matter of each person
13 developing and improving their particular lot that sends this water elsewhere.
14

15 **Yvonne Posten:** During the plans that the county has done they've down zoned
16 us and done just about everything that could be done to keep us down. Right
17 now we are trying to get Keyport back to where it was which was a business
18 general property. What I want to find out is the definition of 'mixed use'. The
19 designation that they've given it, they're only allowed to have buildings or
20 improvements with apartments at the top and businesses at the bottom. That I
21 understand is going to be a little difficult. I would like to see a commercial area
22 come in because there have waited a long time and have lost their designation
23 throughout this whole area. They were all down zoned.
24

25 **Depee:** You want the commercial back because that's the way it used to
26 be or you think it would be conducive to the growth?
27

28 **Yvonne Posten:** I think when county did their plan years ago they took from
29 Keyport and gave to other areas because they had to have more growth. It would
30 be nice if they gave back what they took.
31

32 **7:00:55**

33
34 **Gene Warden:** My wife and I sent a letter in on August 6th and have gone on
35 record opposing appendix F to the plan. We agree with the rest of the plan and
36 support it. As far as this view protection ordinance and limiting it; and this is
37 urban, this is Seattle, this is Tacoma, this is where you have a rapidly growing
38 area that they're raising the density in, where a view protection is appropriate. It
39 is not appropriate for a small village like Keyport. Height here of 35', just a quick
40 look at it, that's what it's been historically. So, I'm very much opposed to any
41 reduction of that. If it should be reduced then the people that benefit from that
42 reduction should pay for that with increased property taxes or some other
43 method.
44

45 **Milt Meeds:** I'm the incoming president of the Community Club and
46 Commissioner of the Port of Keyport. I've been working on this plan for the last

1 couple of years and James has helped us finish it. I fully endorse the plan as it
2 stands, but I do have a couple of recommendations. There is some confusion
3 about the definition of the commercial district. The plan does have some verbiage
4 about commercial and mixed use. Some people take that to mean that new
5 development or a remodel has to include residential or mixed use. I'd like some
6 words in the plan to specify that that is not the case. As far as the height
7 restrictions goes, I like the way the plan is now where we do not have a view
8 protection ordinance. We don't have anything specifically stating about the height
9 restriction, though. I'd like some verbiage in there to say that we are endorsing
10 the county plan as it stands now. Emphasizing the current plan, because if it
11 changes we may want to come back and address it. Right now the plan itself
12 doesn't have any actual verbiage that says the people's desire is to endorse the
13 plan. As a board commissioner we do fully endorse everything in the plan and
14 our goals are to help the economic development of the town and to provide
15 waterfront facilities and whatnot to the community. We are in full agreement with
16 that.

17
18 **Lou Foritano:** As a Community Club President even though you cannot
19 endorse any protection of Appendix F, I presume you are familiar with the
20 argument for it, no one has argued for it? Who argued for it and what was
21 the rationale?
22

23 **Milt Meads:** The lady coming up that behind me shortly, I'm sure she'll discuss
24 that
25

26 **Lou Foritano:** What was the position of the Community Club in terms of
27 view protection?
28

29 **Milt Meads:** The club itself, we voted to have no view protection. There was a
30 lot of discussion both ways and that's how it ended up, but it was a very lightly
31 attended meeting.
32

33 **Linda Sullivan-Dudzic:** We were the ones with our neighbors who submitted
34 two petitions. I thank everyone that participated and Mr. Weaver. In February
35 when we attended a meeting and looked at the questions and answers it was
36 said, will we ever talk about view or height protection? And the answer was that
37 we will discuss that. I want to go on record that we never asked for a 28'
38 limitation. I asked Mr. Weaver what the process is; he said that I should write
39 letters, possibly a petition, so that I can have a voice. And then he said the only
40 other language is in Manchester, which is 28'. None of us in the petition wanted
41 to limit the waterfront owners. Nobody that I know of wanted 28'. What we did
42 want was the opportunity to draft language that was unique to Keyport that would
43 be specifically applied to all, and would not just default to the county ordinances.
44 We want it in 20 years, if its 35, if its 30, if it's 32, that people will participate,
45 they'd say "that's what we want" and it would be specific language. I just want to
46 state some facts. There are 540 people in Keyport. Less than 10% wrote the plan

1 and that is great because we can't get people to participate. I've asked people to
2 come to meetings and they've lost hope that they have a voice or are able to
3 participate in the democratic process. Less than 10% wonderful people did the
4 plan and usually there were 35-40 people at the meeting. And well intended
5 people in May, there were 16 people there. They looked at the Manchester
6 language; I would have voted it down too. But we never had that opportunity. And
7 so we ended up with a vote 12 to 15 and decided to default to the county. We
8 really like the plan, but would like more participation in the process of height or
9 view specifically and not defaulting to the county. And whatever it, is we'll live
10 with it.

11
12 **7:09:30**
13

14 **Thomas Sherry:** I like the plan as I understand it. I particularly like one notion in
15 Appendix G. The idea of building that seems to keep the character of the
16 neighborhood and the community. The idea of the single family residence is
17 strong. I think regarding the heights, I like the current county code. I think that
18 makes sense. To me it's a question of enforcement. I had a neighbor recently do
19 a remodel on a single family residence and it's very questionable about whether
20 he is actually within codes. To me, I like the plans, but I think enforcement is an
21 issue as well. And to know how to have a voice as a citizen who is busy, self
22 employed etc. is a question that I would see. We're in a position where we get a
23 lot of run off from up the streets. I haven't noticed in the plan specifically how
24 storm water is going to be handled? Is it going to be handled by county or
25 otherwise? I have concerns about water that comes right down and it goes
26 directly out into the bay which is to me is an environmental question. I support
27 the notion of the sewers, extending the sewer. I like the idea of having that more
28 accessible to other community members for the preservation of our community in
29 its current state. I would love to see the preservation of open spaces in the plan.
30 Particularly in this yellow section. Right now the character is very open and to
31 maintain that I think is a great thing.

32
33 **Paul Berg:** I'd like to thank James Weaver and his staff for extremely
34 professional job in putting this together. I think the concept has come together
35 smoothly. I'd like to voice opposition to any further discussions of a view corridor
36 height restriction below 35' county limit. Keyport is a unique community. For the
37 majority of people are waterfront owners. The topography is fairly flat. In that
38 sense, a restricted height to 28' or 30' will do little or nothing to improve the view
39 of people who are 3 or 4 lots back from the water. With the changes in the
40 property lot sizes for the people to potentially subdivide, that will bring an
41 opportunity in our community for approximately 8 or 9 more homes. Still being a
42 pretty wide open community. If you look at the lots that have the potential to be
43 subdivided with this program the lot sizes that they would subdivide into are still
44 very large lot sizes. With those lot sizes the people who are 4, or 5, 600 feet back
45 from the water will still have a view of the water.
46

1 **JW:** Actually, it's part of the policies and goals in the sustainability chapter,
2 chapter 8. It was highlighted pretty heavily that that could be a way to reduce the
3 cost of storm water mitigation, while still accommodating the goals.
4

5 **Gustavson:** Did it come up during the discussions so people are aware of
6 potential benefits?
7

8 **JW:** It did, we actually had a number of Public Works employees attend meetings
9 and give presentations on various elements, including sewer and storm water
10 issues.
11

12 **Chair Taylor:** Any one else to speak for Keyport?
13

14 **7:19:38**
15

16 **Break 7:19 – 7:34 PM**
17

18 **7:34:21**
19

20 **Chair Taylor resumes the public hearing.**
21

22 **7:36 PM**
23

24 **D. Public Hearing: Manchester Community Plan, Scott Diener,**
25 **Community Planning Manager, DCD**
26

27 ***Scott Diener gave an overview of the process and history of the***
28 ***Manchester Design Standards. He then introduced the co-chairs of the***
29 ***Manchester Standards Committee. He then gave an overview of the***
30 ***character of the Manchester Design Standards and reviewed the key issues***
31 ***in the staff report. He reviewed the height limitations issue on page 9 of***
32 ***staff report. He discussed the parking issue, building setbacks, and***
33 ***miscellaneous issues. He discussed the next steps in the staff report.***
34

35 **Jenniges:** Is this presentation going to include the Hearing Examiner's
36 decision on the height issue?
37

38 **SD:** I had not planned on discussing that.
39

40 **Jenniges:** OK
41

42 **7:45:50**
43

44 **Foritano:** Thanks to Phillip for what I thought was an excellent report. In
45 terms of your professional experience on the key issue of height and
46 views about height, is it as simple as, if you've got a waterfront lot you

1 want minimal restrictions, you want to stand up for your property rights. If
2 you don't you're looking to get a peek-a-boo at the expense of somebody
3 who is on the waterfront? There is no recommendation in here; it really
4 says it's up to the community. I gather we are going to hear maybe a
5 mixed view coming up. Can you guide us in terms of a reference center?
6 Is it beyond self interest?
7

8 **Scott Diener:** I would be hesitant to answer that because any answer I have
9 wouldn't be a good answer. Staff prefers to look at it as something that perhaps
10 is guided by more of what the community wants to work out. And is guided by the
11 character that the community is trying to establish, clarify which is as much a
12 question about what is the character of the existing Manchester. Staff has always
13 said with respect to the height issue, how could you argue that the
14 preponderance of a one story building translates into a character perpetuation by
15 three story building. I don't want to speak for the community nor for the
16 developers.
17

18 **Jenniges:** Doesn't Hearing Board Examiners decision on these height
19 restrictions have a significant impact on what's going to happen in Manchester?
20

21 **SD:** With respect to development that's slated, or I will say, development that is
22 vested the answer is yes. With respect to future development the answer is no. I
23 should say that both the remand of the Colchester commons and the denial of
24 the director's interpretation, both those are subject to appeal and the appeal
25 periods for both those have not expired, so we could see that those are
26 elements.
27

28 **Sommerhauser:** I've driven the area twice. I'm interested if staff could tell
29 me, there are at least three buildings there that I question what their
30 heights are. Can staff send me an email on the height on the three tallest
31 buildings in the area?
32

33 **Chari Taylor:** Well try to get you that information.
34

35 **7:50:00**
36

37 **Carrilu Thompson (Co-Chair):** The testimony that I'd like to give to you today is
38 a bit of the history of our committee. As you read in the staff report there were
39 some people who feel that it was not an open process and I would like to dispute
40 those. The Downtown Standard, the subcommittee was established as a regular
41 subcommittee for the Manchester Community Council. And the MCC was
42 formed as a conduit to the county for community to implement and update the
43 Manchester Plan. And it was our understanding at the time, that the needed to
44 be a part of and attached any plan update. We have since learned otherwise. But
45 our plan was originally scheduled, our update for 2006 and has been postponed
46 to 2007. Progress and meeting dates were reported at every monthly meeting of

1 the MCC and the MCC executive board meeting. All minutes from each of those
2 meetings were posted on the Manchester website. And all Standard Committee
3 meetings were held at the Manchester library and open to anyone wishing to
4 attend. We advertised meeting dates in our minutes which were on the website
5 and also if anyone checked the library calendar they would have known that the
6 meetings were being held there. We did not keep subcommittee meeting
7 minutes, nor did we need to vote, since the committee reached consensus at
8 each meeting on the points that we were discussing. And the resulting language
9 and progress was posted on the website and reported to the MCC regular
10 meetings, so we felt that that was our documentation. Our committee was
11 comprised of a mixture of interested residents that included a contractor and
12 current Manchester business owners. Those who could not attend were sent
13 update emails and often sent comment back via email which we incorporated in
14 the next meeting. The number of meetings, including open houses, is part of your
15 staff report. It also includes and unprecedented invitation sent to every land
16 owner in Manchester and the Manchester plan area to voice their preference to
17 heightened stories in the commercial district. We were excited that we got about
18 a 12% return for that. We also made provisions for people at those open houses
19 who were renting to also vote their preference. And included at every open house
20 was a comment sheet for individuals to fill out and you have a summary of those
21 comments. There are many individuals present here to testify, but I also want to
22 include for you're consideration the many residents who have written letters, sent
23 emails, made phone calls, attended open houses, signed a petition and they felt
24 that they contributed very strongly to the process. But when asked one more time
25 'could you please state it again' they said 'when is someone listen to us?' I
26 would like their voice to be part of the record and you have some of those, we're
27 going to double check to make sure you have all of them. We have consulted
28 with the county staff, we have consulted with two land use attorneys in a
29 continuing effort to fine tune the language of our document. The original that you
30 were handed are really our basic first draft and since then it has been fine tuned
31 to make sure that our language is consistent, that our language is binding and
32 also that we have addressed all of the issues that need to be addressed when
33 you are dealing with .

34
35 7:55:50
36

37 **Coppola:** You said there were not minutes taken of the subcommittee
38 meeting?

39
40 **Carrilu Thompson:** No
41

42 **Coppola:** And that you just reached a consensus? Is that a consensus of
43 everybody or just the people that attended?
44

45 **Carrilu Thompson:** A consensus of the people in the subcommittee and then we
46 make the report to...

1
2 **Coppola:** What I don't understand is if you had a subcommittee meeting
3 and you reached a consensus of the entire committee, how could you reach a
4 consensus of the entire committee that the entire committee didn't attend?

5
6 **Carrilu Thompson:** I'm sorry, of the people present, we reached a consensus.

7
8 **Coppola:** So, it's just the people that showed up made the decision?

9
10 **Carrilu Thompson:** Yes.

11
12 **Coppola:** You said there were invitations to the open house?

13
14 **Carrilu Thompson:** Yes

15
16 **Coppola:** I personally own two homes in Manchester and I never received
17 one.

18
19 **Carrilu Thompson:** Well then I would talk to your county assessor, because that
20 is where the county got the mailing list. It was a post card. I have the list; I'll have
21 to check it.

22
23 **Coppola:** I believe that you do.

24
25 **Chair Taylor:** Moving right along, Dean,

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
7:57:23

29 **Jenniges:** You mention that you're looking and clarifying the Design
30 Standards and everything. Have you seen the letter from Mr. Palmer and
31 Mr. Vancil on their concerns of the language within the?

32
33 **Carrilu Thompson:** Yes.

34
35 **Jenniges:** And you're trying to clarify that for them?

36
37 **Carrilu Thompson:** Absolutely, and for the document itself.

38
39 **Jenniges:** That's what I meant, for the document itself.

40
41 **Carrilu Thompson:** Yes, in fact the side by side comparison that you have, that
42 Phillip put together is and excellent coalescence of the comments that we've
43 received, that we have taken into consideration in terms of what we need to
44 address to fine tune the language.

1 committee members wanted 28' limitations, but were erroneously told that we
2 had put 35' as that was the county's norm at the time. Now is the time, we
3 understand, where these errors can be corrected. Therefore, this committee
4 recommends two stories and 28' height limitations. The Design Standards for the
5 commercial are of Manchester. We plan and look forward to having businesses
6 in our commercial zone that will serve the many residents of Manchester.

7
8 **Sommerhauser:** 'The committee recommends....' was that a consensus,
9 a vote of the committee?

10
11 **Carole Leiniger:** Of the committee, yes.

12
13 **Sommerhauser:** And it was a consensus?

14
15 **Carole Leiniger:** Yes. Actually, I don't think there was, there was one dissenting
16 vote and everybody on the committee voted.

17
18 **Sommerhauser:** How many in the committee?

19
20 **Carole Leiniger:** 15

21
22 **Sommerhauser:** Scott are there minutes from the meetings of the
23 committee that are in our packets?

24
25 **Scott Diener:** Can you clarify which committee you are talking about?

26
27 **Sommerhauser:** These two ladies have just said that there were 15
28 people and it was a unanimous vote except for one. We're looking for paperwork.

29
30 **Scott Diener:** Okay, I'll see if we can provide that.

31
32 **8:03:22**

33
34 **Carole Leiniger:** We can get that to you.

35
36 **Sommerhauser:** Okay. Scott. Along that line, when you were saying that
37 minutes were not taken by the subcommittee, but that there was feedback
38 that was posted on the full committee website. Is that what I understand?

39
40 **Carrilu Thompson:** On the Manchester Community Council website.

41
42 **Sommerhauser:** Okay. Can we get copies of those posts, because they
43 are the best record of those that we appear to have available to us.

44
45 **SD:** Staff will meet with representative of the Design Standards Subcommittee
46 and the Manchester Community Council and see what records we can get.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Sommerhauser: Thank you, I appreciate that. It seems to be that the computer has a lot of information in it that we are missing.

Toni McBride: I feel it's my obligation as a resident of the village of Manchester to voice my opinion on the upcoming growth. I was raised in Edmonds in the early 60's and left for many years to return in 1992 and was stunned at the growth. Traffic, condos, extremely long ferry lines, many new businesses and property values out of sight. What do Edmonds and Manchester have in common? We are both located on a hill with breathtaking views and that's about all. Edmonds has a large mixed use area surrounding a downtown core. Nothing has changed on Main Street in Edmonds since the 1950's. You still see the same bakeries, movie theaters, Dr. Offices, restaurants, gift shops, taverns, etc. Only the owners have changed through the years, but the town is booming. The people enjoy the beach, watch the sunsets, and take a ferry ride. They have a large waterfront area and have waterfront parks. People come from all over to enjoy the area. Manchester has a postage stamp park with a very busy boat ramp, one stop sign, a left turn up the hill, and one block and now you are in the residential portion of our village. Once the 35' condos are erected we will see nothing of our waterfront. If you want to go to the beach you'll have no place to park, let alone not place to sit, to say nothing of trying to park your truck or boat trailer. With what the developers are planning for the area, I want to know where they plan to put everyone. We are being told that if you do not allow three stories mixed use to be built, we cannot make enough money to develop the area. We have asked them to present us with numbers to support their claim. Thus so far, no one has spoken up. The developers have also said they want to be part of the community, maybe even live in one of their condos. I'd love to, what a beautiful view they will have. I was told by one of the developers I should really not support the 28', because I would make a lot more on my investment if I go with the 35'. I'm hoping that the commissioners and the developers will take a thoughtful look at the Manchester Design Standards. If we act too quickly our beautiful area will be just another spot on the road. I'd like to see a beautiful spot on the road. Many long hours have been spent on the Manchester trying to consider the good for all, not just for a few.

Sommerhauser: Could you point to your property?

8:07:45

Peter Clarke: I am a retired architect and listened in all four western states, and I've worked in planning, in design, in construction for most of that time. The changes in vision to the 10 year comprehensive plan update are too restrictive, too detailed, and are out of scope for a community the size of Manchester. The underlying concerns as presented by a small minority of local citizens of preservation of view and minimizing the population growth. While these are legitimate concerns, the attack on proposed commercial projects by these same

1 pressure groups appears to have rallied around the protection of Manchester's
2 old restaurant, called the Man' Family Inn. The project directly across Colchester
3 Drive called The Commons has been proposed as a mixed use, three story
4 commercial residential building. It has now been validated twice by the Hearing
5 Examiner and protest tactics delayed the project for over a year. Litigation is
6 being considered which might result in more delay. Time is money; soon one of
7 these bureaucratic delays will cost the taxpayers dearly in legal fees and
8 damages. It is true that the project would block the view of the water as enjoyed
9 for many years by the restaurants out door dining deck looking across the sight
10 of the commons. However, it's also obvious a two story building there would also
11 have the same effect. There appears to be an effort simply to delay the
12 inevitable. However, the county is mandated to move forward provisions of the
13 comprehensive plan update in the context of the Growth Management Plan. This
14 is especially relevant in the context of DCD's notorious assistance to two dentists
15 in bending the rules governing height limits; the result being a 4 story residence.
16 Where were the protesters then during a few neighbors costly legal battle to force
17 the DCD to do its job? One might be skeptical of the agencies ability and/or
18 willingness to enforce the terms of this now much enlarged and very detailed
19 comprehensive plan proposal. Why the current administration of the Kitsap DCD
20 has responded so hastily to the demands of a small pressure group? Why was it
21 necessary to declare an emergency, when the existing Manchester Village Plan
22 had been in effect for 4 years? This shows us how the police power can be used
23 to steamroller over thoughtful objections. I understand that some 180 citizens
24 signed the petition to take The Commons project to the Hearing Examiner. This
25 represents 3% of the villages' 6100 residents.

26
27 **Chair Taylor:** Can you summarize?
28

29 **Peter Clarke:** Yes, Manchester conservatives seem to be trying to bring forward
30 a 19th century concept of the rural village. Unchecked land values will be making
31 that impossible. Neither of the contested projects would have penciled out at two
32 stories. I believe that in my own experience.
33

34 **Chair Taylor:** Can you submit your written comments; we'd like to read
35 the whole thing?
36

37 **Ron Rada:** Currently the chair of the Manchester Community Council. I am one
38 of the original members of the Manchester Community Planning Group that
39 implement the current Manchester Plan of 2002. It was our intent back then to
40 get a 2 story mixed use development into the plan, this is so stated. But the 2
41 story did not transfer over into the code. We misunderstood the fact that one of
42 the policies and goals of that plan indicated we needed a design standard. But
43 we misunderstood; we didn't know that we could do that as a separate issue.
44 We thought that we needed to do that as a part of the revision process every 5
45 years. So when we started the revision process early this year we found out that
46 that could be a separate issue; fast tracked, if you will. So we've gone ahead and

1 separated the plan revision with the downtown design standard. We would hope
2 that you would address that issue; it has been a contentious issue. But it came to
3 the forefront last year when several developments came out of the blue. And
4 suddenly we had a lot of development downtown. We know that we failed to
5 basically write those design standards in a timely manner and it's coming back to
6 haunt us now. So, we would hope that you would take a serious look at those
7 and approve them as written for the 28', 2 stories, which was the majority vote of
8 our community. And I think that the Design Standard committee did a very very
9 good job in trying to get the word out to all of our community and we had a fairly
10 decent participation at all of their venues.

11
12 **Sommerhauser:** Do you keep minutes at your meetings?

13
14 **Ron Rada:** At the MCC meetings we do. Not at the subcommittee...

15
16 **Sommerhauser:** Would it be possible to reproduce the minutes from the
17 meeting where you thought you voted for or stated that you wanted 2 story/28'?

18
19 **Ron Rada:** Absolutely and I can also give you a copy of the letter that we sent to
20 Commissioner Angel back in October of '06 stating the desire of the community
21 and was signed by the current chair, Ron Robinson at that time. If you would like
22 to have me submit this.

23
24 **Sommerhauser:** Submit both of those so we can get them in the record.

25
26 **Ron Rada:** I will get that meeting minutes to you.
27 Submitted documents to Planning Commission Secretary.

28
29 8:16:20
30

31 **Debra Trudeau:** As you know, Manchester is a LAMRID and as such it may
32 allow for limited areas for more intensive rural development including necessary
33 public facilities and services. The opening paragraph for RCW 36.78.010, he
34 quotes the RCW. Throughout the discussions by the potential developers in
35 Manchester we've heard comparisons Old Town Tacoma, Queen Anne, and
36 Bellevue; all urban areas. Yet never once have we heard discussion about the
37 potential future businesses or what types of commercial ventures that they plan
38 for any of these developments. When pressed, one developer commented that
39 he could go two full years of commercial empty space and that the residential
40 condo units themselves were the main part of the buildings that were going to
41 make the money for them. Not the commercial lease spaces. When further
42 pressed, he said that he might consider asking for a rezone of that area to a
43 residential. The point is the GMA requires in that sub area a plan for a LAMIRD
44 that there be commercial zone in that particular part of Manchester. So what
45 happens when that all becomes residential? I want a preservation of that
46 commercial. And contrary to Mr. Clarke, I too consulted an architect who does

1 business in the Bay Area, Seattle, and Tacoma. And the only mixed used condos
2 that are any economic feasibility for any developer are those that exceed 5
3 stories. So even a 3 story, 35', mixed use condo is of no economic value.

4
5 **8:19:03**
6

7 **J.B. Bartel:** I was a member of the original 42 group that started meeting 10
8 years ago. When the meeting was first formed, Manchester Community Council
9 meeting, we formed subcommittees of areas of interest in the preservations of
10 the Manchester and the character of Manchester. The subcommittee groups
11 would then come back to our monthly meeting, which meets the 4th Tuesday of
12 each month at 6:30pm and again you're all invited to attend that. They were
13 voted on then my members that were attending MCC. We were green, naive,
14 innocent people putting this together and we found out some things that we
15 should have been informed about, but we weren't before. And that's the height
16 restriction. We found out through an unpleasant experience about a building
17 height that occurred and we learned from that that we need to take some action
18 to remedy that for the people who were concerned about 28' building heights;
19 which I am in favor of. Having had dinner last week at the Manchester Inn, sitting
20 outside, of course there is no building across the street from it now. At 28' I will
21 still see some blue sky and I will have some view area on the side lots. Touring
22 downtown Bremerton with our brick and mortar we have now with the high rise.
23 There is more shade than sun. I do not want to see that to downtown Colchester
24 where the Manchester Inn is right now. So 2 story vs. 3 story is a substantial
25 difference. It will impact the view that is a lovely drive. I want to keep the
26 character of Manchester, of the joy we have. I'm not opposed to development, in
27 an organized manner, but to enhance the majority of the people; and not to be a
28 dollar investment for investors.

29
30 **Depee:** Can I ask a couple of questions? The height restriction is coming
31 up and I'd like to go to a couple of other issues real quickly. The
32 architectural design standard; has that been discussed quite heavily? And
33 I'll give you an example, is that they have put in here, including the type of
34 material that is used, etc on the design standard? Is that the consensus of
35 the group?
36

37 **J.B. Bartel:** Yes
38

39 **Depee:** The Manchester Inn would not qualify under these.
40

41 **J.B. Bartel:** Those are grandfathered in. What we hope to do, though, by seeing
42 other buildings, to enhance the existing structures that are there. Like you see
43 going on in downtown Bremerton. Once one building starts, the enhancement to
44 keep the flow and interpretation of the village that we want it just takes one to
45 start it. And that's been encouraging for our business owners to do that, to
46 participate in enhancing what we have.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Depee: I mean, it's got the type of windows, the type of siding, the architectural style, roofing, non reflective, you've gone quite heavy. This is the point that I'm going to try to bring to you. That is exactly what occurred when they did the Bethel Corridor Plan. And it's been sitting as practically a dead zone for 10 years because it's economically infeasible for many people to build on it because of the type of that are put on. I'll maybe talk to you later about this.

J.B. Bartel: I'd like to turn that over to our co-chairs to respond to that question.

Jenniges: Fred, all of those questions that you just asked her are in...

Depee: I know and that's why I'm...

Jenniges: And she said that they would address those when their design standards are done.

Depee: Well, that's my point, is whether they should even be in there or not.

8:24:46

Gro Kleitsch: It is stated that the purpose of the design standard is to maintain the small town charm and quaintness of Manchester. But Manchester is not quaint right now. We do need design standards, but we need to encourage investment and not to prevent investment. The design standards state a preference for pitched roofs and gables with a 28' height limit. But with commercial 10' high ceilings and the construction requirements complying financially realistic structure is virtually impossible. I strongly encourage the standard of 35' height limit. The design standard prohibits flat roofs, but virtually all existing commercial buildings in Manchester now have flat roofs. Flat roofs would be consistent with the character of the existing area. The design standard states that condo underground parking must be available 24-7. What condo owner would want the tavern crown in their parking garage at 2am? This is totally unacceptable. By the way, the tavern has 4 parking spots. The tavern doesn't want development or they want to be able to use the garage that the condo's built. The design standard states that if an underground garage is not completely underground, it will count as the first floor. That would be the next floor would be the commercial and that there would be no floor for condo development. Many lots are in dips, like the two lots next to the post office, and some lots are in steep slopes, like the lot directly behind the restaurant. These lots could have like a daylight basement/garage entry into them, but if they had that, that would count as the first floor. And then they would only be allowed to go one up. I think this is just a clever attempt to making development there unfeasible. The design standards want roofs that go east and west, but most of Manchester's

1 commercial lots are long and narrow and go north and south. So, complying with
2 this standard makes it virtually impossible, it also makes it pretty funny looking. I
3 believe that a few sincere people are adamant about preventing growth in
4 Manchester and they've worked hard on this plan. I wonder if they haven't filled
5 the standard with unrealistically restrictive codes in an attempt to make it seem
6 like a compromise if you accept just a few of their core desires. I believe that the
7 Kitsap Counties' current standard can guide our growth in Manchester just fine.
8

9 **Joe Kleitsch:** When the port of Manchester wanted to expand *Palmaroid Park*
10 in making a modern boat launch facility the opposition was very strong and
11 almost stopped the project. Then the trees and the brush came down it opened a
12 world class view. The project has been a success and greatly enhanced this little
13 seaside community. People opposed to any growth and improvements have
14 become more vocal in recent years. Stop the Narrows Bridge, stop NASCAR,
15 stop all Port Orchard commercial development, and stop all commercial
16 development in Manchester. I am happy that one project has started. I feel it will
17 be a very positive influence on our community. The MCC has not welcomed this
18 new expansion; in fact they are trying very hard to stop growth. It is cleverly
19 demonstrated by the 22 page design standard plans. Try reading the standard
20 and see if you would want to invest here. Small business investors will not even
21 attempt to come here with these requirements. The business district is very small
22 and quite narrow with limited parking. To make the business district work the
23 MCC should be cooperating with investors in finding a way to make things work
24 out. The business district has remained essentially unchanged in over 30 years.
25 Two years ago, when houses were selling like hot cakes and the land value
26 skyrocketed, investors looked at building mixed use commercial on the ground
27 floor and two stories of condos. They anticipated that selling the condos would
28 help compensate for the possibility of vacant commercial space and expensive
29 underground parking. Now the housing market has cooled off and house sales
30 have virtually stopped. It is evident to me that the MCC is overreacting by
31 suggesting countless new regulations that I feel will stop all commercial
32 development for a long long time. I feel that the current Kitsap County standard
33 will work just fine. The new MCC design standard should not be passed as
34 written. Hopefully, by next year the MCC will be a little more business friendly
35 when they see how the market place has cooled down and the condo
36 development has not happened like they figured it would. I feel like if all these
37 regulations are passed that Kitsap County will have to hire more employees to
38 regulate all the commercial and residential challenges, rules and regulations that
39 are being passed.
40

41 **Chair Taylor:** Do you have copies that you can turn in?
42

43 **Joe:** Yes
44
45
46

8:32:08

1 **Vivian Henderson for Dee Murray:** Dee Murray had to leave, so she asked me
2 to deliver her testimony for her. She believes that the proposed height limit of 25'
3 and limited of 2 story buildings is unfair to property owners. She supports the 35'
4 limit and protecting the property rights of the people that bought this property
5 believing that they could use it in a different way and now that's being changes. I
6 agree with her, I'd like to say something about views. I live up on the hill and look
7 down at Long Lake; at least I used to look down at Long Lake. Well the trees
8 grew up and I didn't have a view of the lake anymore. I don't feel like people own
9 the view.

10
11 **Mattie Walters:** I support the Manchester Design Standard. The Manchester
12 community has shown repeatedly that it supports the two story mixed use
13 designation in its commercial zone. The mixed use concept was to promote small
14 commercial businesses, not be bootstrapped into 3 and 4 story residential
15 condominiums in a commercial zone is at the core of our rural village. Parking, in
16 the village, historically has been overly stressed by the port boat launch facilities.
17 Vehicles, many with their attached boat trailers park in residential areas
18 whenever the port parking lot is full. More 3 story mixed use structures would
19 create an even greater parking and traffic problem resulting in dangerous
20 conditions of congestion in steep hills and narrow roadways. I don't know where
21 additional parking could be accommodated in the tiny commercial zone. The
22 proposed 2 story building with the 28' height limit will help protect the residential
23 views of those who live in the Manchester view protection overlay. It is important
24 to note that the 2 story 28' limit reflects the preference of the majority of the
25 residents of Manchester. It should also be noted that the original intent of the
26 Manchester community was to have 2 story mixed used development. This new
27 plan reflects the intent of the original plan for the village. And view protection and
28 open space can also be enhanced by adopting the setback requirements that are
29 included in the new standard. The setbacks are necessary to maintain the
30 LAMIRD designation that's included in the Growth Management Plan.
31 Implementation of the Manchester Design Standard which provides a
32 reasonable guideline for creating a reasonable downtown commercial core that
33 will ultimately work for the common good and the greater goals of all the
34 residents of the rural village. Rural communities have been encouraged to be
35 involved in the shaping of development that enhances each of its unique rural
36 environments. The Manchester Plan is asking for nothing more or less than the
37 right to direct it's own future in keeping with it's village designation, the view
38 protection overlay zone and the Growth Management Plan.

39
40 **8:37:19**

41
42 **Ken Wocher:** If the 35' view designation stays our view that we worked so hard
43 for will be completely gone. We highly oppose the height of 35'. Part of the
44 Hearing Examiners' review was to ensure that the buildings are harmonious with
45 the community, but it seems they are failing to remember that the community is

1 not just buildings and houses; it's also the people who live in the community. If
2 there is opposition to that, I don't see how that is harmonious.

3
4 **Lyle Burbidge:** I'm speaking tonight about parking. I've been involved in the
5 efforts of the Designs Standards committee, I've been to the MCC meetings,
6 everyone. The current situation in Manchester residents and those visiting the
7 commercial zone are required to share perpendicular parking spaces in the
8 existing commercial core area. On any given day, all the parking spaces on both
9 side of Colchester Street are often filled to the brim. If it happens to be a day
10 during fishing season, the port parking, library parking and all the side streets up
11 to 2nd street can be filled with trucks and boat trailers parallel parked,
12 compounding the parking problem. There are two projects now coming into the
13 commercial zone, because they are more than 4 dwellings the 1.5 parking
14 spaces per unit standard has been allowed. There are more projects in the
15 works. If this standard is allowed to be applied it the parking problem will only be
16 exacerbated even with the so called underground parking. There will not be
17 enough parking in Manchester. The Manchester Downtown Design Standard
18 calls for 2 parking spaces per unit in multi-family units regardless of number of
19 units. This is necessary because of the already strained parking situation
20 described above, and for public safety. Underground parking must always be
21 accessible to the public or feasible on street parking should be provided. Parking
22 areas should be designed and situated so that they do not intur the goal of a
23 providing a pedestrian friendly downtown and by making it easier, safer, and
24 comfortable to walk between businesses. The projected development now is the
25 setbacks are right on the street. It's wall to wall buildings. The county staff
26 findings regarding parking said that the staff believed that the lack of parking if
27 afflicting the Manchester view corridor and zone now. They know it. This finding
28 alone support the design standard requirement for 2 spaces per unit in multi-
29 family dwellings.

30
31 **8:42:02**

32
33 **Denise Burbidge:** As a group of involved community members we have learned
34 that design standards are written to maintain and improve the character of the
35 community. In addition, they're intended to address scale and design issues by
36 establishing standards that are consistent with community character. Through
37 many lengthy meetings, that the community has been involved in, and we have
38 been encouraged to share our input in this process. During these meetings we
39 established a more specific definition of the character of Manchester. However, it
40 continues to maintain that spirit of vision that was stated in the original plan.
41 Quotes RCW 36.70a.70. Currently, there is a very small area of commercial
42 development in downtown Manchester, with all existing commercial buildings, but
43 one, being 1 story in height. The surrounding area is residential with a height limit
44 of 28'. Our topography in Manchester is different and unique; our commercial
45 core is contiguous to our residential area. 35' building in the commercial core will
46 impact view especially on Spring Street, which is part of the commercial core.

1 Quotes RCW 35.70A.30. Remembering our community's close proximity to the
2 Puget Sound. We had several open house venues where community members
3 were invited to state their preferences of the height of new development of
4 buildings in the commercial downtown are of the Manchester village. The results
5 of these preference surveys clearly reflect a desire for growth as it is also stated
6 in the Manchester Design Plan and design standard. It also demonstrates the
7 desire to maintain rural village character. You've already heard that 64% of
8 community that participated in the preference survey stated 2 stories or lower is
9 what they would like to see in the commercial zone.

10
11 8:47:26
12

13 **Ryan Vancil:** I'm a Land Use attorney. I was asked to review the design
14 standards on behalf of some citizens who have worked diligently to draft the
15 design standards. My primary focus of practice is Land Use.

16
17 **Sommerhauser:** Do I understand that you represent a group as such?
18

19 **Ryan Vancil:** That's a good question; because I did not come tonight on their
20 behalf. They asked me to review the design standards, tonight I've come on my
21 own to speak after having the opportunity to review the . I have worked with a
22 number of municipalities on similar design standards and so I wanted to give you
23 my insight on that in the context of these. Most large cities in Washington State
24 have a design standards review program; generally focusing on new commercial
25 and multi-family development. And quite a few smaller communities have
26 adopted similar guidelines, particularly those with an inherent historic or natural
27 character. Specifically, Washington courts have upheld municipalities' right to
28 govern land use through design standards and have directly commented on what
29 is expected of legitimately legal design standard. I will submit a full letter to you
30 before I go. Aesthetic concerns are a valid basis for zoning decisions and
31 counties may enact zoning ordinances to preserve aesthetics. That has been
32 held up in courts across the county, not just here in Washington State. Whenever
33 a community adopts such standards they can and must be drafted to give clear
34 guidance to all parties concerned. Applicants must have an understanding of
35 what is expected from new construction. Detail is encouraged. In this case, the
36 standards before you satisfy the Washington criteria for design standards. The
37 intent of the design standard is clear, they use language that is common or
38 commonly used in land use codes and they're specific enough that an applicant
39 will know from the start what is required of them. Specifically, there is not
40 legitimate legal reason to question the recommended height restrictions. Many
41 communities have adopted these, their economic benefit; Port Townsend, La
42 Connor, Poulsbo, Sumner, to name a few. With a view like the one in
43 Manchester, there is not going to be a deterrent to development, in fact, this
44 going to be a opportunity to focus the development in such a way that it makes
45 the community more desirable to come to. I have never seen a community
46 effectively stop growth with design standards. But I have seen them enhance

1 themselves economically by adopting standards that people can adequately
2 review. I'd like to touch briefly on the size of the small group; every public
3 process is represented by a small group. That's always the case and I don't think
4 it should be held up against these folks in this case. What you'll see in the
5 opponents is a similarly small group, in fact, they're smaller. So you should be
6 looking at the fact that you're in a small community, it's going to be a small group
7 of folks, and look also that the process is wide open. It's still on going, the record
8 is open. It can't be said that anybody has been shut out of it. I'd like to ask just
9 two items for your consideration, in looking at these that you might consider
10 adding since we've got more time. That's maybe a definition section, if there are
11 some words that are unclear or come to your attention that don't work for you.
12 And add graphics that display examples of design standards where you have that
13 opportunity.

14
15 **Jenniges:** We have a copy of your comments on the Manchester Design
16 Standards. You and Mr. Palmer have done an excellent job. So, if the
17 MCC takes a good hard look with the county and incorporates this, then
18 maybe it would work.

19
20 **Ryan Vancil:** I remain open to them to let me know if there are any further
21 questions to clarify those.

22
23 **Sommerhauser:** Is it your understanding both as somebody that's delved
24 in this arcane process a lot and also as an attorney, that it is the right of
25 the community to write design standards that impact negatively commercial
26 development. If they want to do that, they could do that.

27
28 **Ryan Vancil:** Yes, absolutely. As I mentioned I will be submitting a letter to you
29 that expands a bit further and analyzes the case log from Washington State that
30 does give communities that right. I would point out, though, that it's always an
31 assumption that it's going to be a negative impact. And in these cases, I see a lot
32 of the time the design standards do not negatively impact the community. But in
33 fact, that's an issue that you have to deal with, sometimes you make it so
34 desirable that those properties become overly valuable and you tax people out.
35 But if you want to go that direction you can do it.

36
37 **Chair Taylor:** Is there anyone else who desires to make some testimony?

38
39 **8:52:51**

40
41 **Bill Palmer:** I'm also the project planner on 4 projects in Manchester that are
42 mixed use. Two of those projects are on Colchester Drive and one of them is on
43 Spring Street. And the third faces Main Street and is about ready to start the
44 construction phase.

45
46 **JT:** You are representing a group of more than 3?

1
2 **Bill Palmer:** Yes I am. But, I am also representing myself. Apparently a decision
3 is made to take a little harder look at the guidelines maybe refine the, I hope. I
4 find them to be very problematic. Like Mr. Vancil, I have worked in quite a
5 number of jurisdictions with design standards. I have to say that these are the
6 worst proposed design standards that I've encountered. I've dealt with the City of
7 Seattle and Winter Park, Co and...

8
9 **Sommerhauser:** By worst, can you quantify for me by what do you
10 mean? They're so detailed they're bad?

11
12 **Bill Palmer:** No, they're not bad because of the detail, per say. They're bad
13 because of the language that's used and in some cases it's impossible to
14 determine what the intended result is supposed to be if you tried to implement
15 the standards. I highlighted 14 problems in my memorandum that went to you
16 back in July. I also spent a lot of time offering commentary about individual
17 design standards. I've supplemented that only with some questions and some
18 comments on the balance of design standards. But if I'd had more time, you'd
19 probably had a tone approaching 30-40 pages.

20
21 **Jenniges:** This is 25.

22
23 **Bill Palmer:** I realize that, it's gotten out of hand. But I'm concerned about a
24 couple of issues having to do with the height. If you look at Spring Street, and I
25 encourage you that have not been to Manchester to take a visit before you take
26 action on the design standards. I want you stand on the west side of Spring
27 Street and I want you to tell me if somebody built a 1 story building, whether the
28 houses on the west side of Spring Street would be impacted. If a 2 story building
29 of 28' were built, would they be impacted and how. And what's the difference to
30 those people on the west side of Spring Street. I think that you'll find that no
31 matter what is built on the east side of Spring Street it's going to severely impact
32 their views even if it's a 1 story structure. While you're in Manchester I'd like you
33 also to take a look at what's known as the Foxfire building. It is ostensibly a 2
34 story, but the first story is quite high, the second story is quite high above 1st
35 story and I think you'll find it's close to 30' to 32' in height. If you look behind it
36 you'll see a hillside and the building is still below the hill. If they built to 35' the
37 likelihood of them impacting the properties to the west, whether it's the
38 commercial properties that immediately abut them or the home across 3rd street
39 on the west side of Spring Street. I don't think your going to find that there's
40 going to be a great impact for that particular piece of property. If your looking at
41 properties that haven't developed, post office site here, these two sites can build
42 to 35'. The anchors project which in here can build to 35' and there's another
43 project in here that can build to 35'. So the only ones that are restricted to 2 story
44 and 28' would be those on the west side of Colchester and these two sites right
45 here. Realistically is it fair? So when you're looking at those kinds of design
46 issues I think it needs a hard look at the realities of Manchester. You're only

1 dealing with a commercial area of about 8 acres in total, some of which is already
2 committed for development. Now, whether it develops tomorrow or in the next
3 couple of years that remains to be seen. I am here to tell you that there is an
4 economic impact of trying to implement guidelines like this. I respect Mr. Depee's
5 comments regarding the Bethel Corridor and the limitations to those design
6 guidelines that they've had on development in that corridor. Believe me that there
7 are some significant issues. And incidentally, some of the Bethel Corridor
8 guidelines are incorporated here either in total or by reference. By reference I
9 mean they've used them as a model for some of the guidelines that are in here.
10 And some of the guidelines are meant to apply to a much larger area than this
11 small commercial area in Manchester. By the way, you've heard some testimony
12 tonight that the GMA is pertinent to the type of development that occurs in
13 Manchester. The issue of what's appropriate was decided in line with the GMA in
14 2002 when the county adopted the Manchester Community Plan. You do not
15 have the option of looking back to the GMA when you have a plan adopted in
16 concert with that act. It's what the plan says and it's what the zoning allows. With
17 regard to the parking issue that Mr. Burbage addressed. I happen to agree with
18 him. All four of the projects that I am associated with have a residential
19 component of 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit and they meet the commercial
20 standard of 1 space for 450sf. Interesting standard, because, the normal
21 standard in the rest of the county is 1 space per 300sf of commercial area. So
22 you have a relaxed parking standard that was adopted in the code. If you were to
23 tighten something up I would support using the countywide standard as opposed
24 to that relaxed standard. While you're on the subject of parking maybe you ought
25 to get the Public Works together with DCD and resolve whether or not you can
26 have on street parking. So I think there are some other issues that are involved
27 that the planning commission and the county are well advised to do it right. And
28 send the design standards through the code development review committee
29 that's reviewing the other stuff that's going in the zoning ordinance.

30
31 **Chair Taylor:** Is there anyone else?

32
33 **Robin Williams:** It's more than a place to build condominiums. It seems that
34 what I hear over and over is that the people of Manchester felt like they were
35 misled when they wrote the original plan. I'd like somebody to answer that
36 question.

37
38 **9:04:05**

39
40 **Bill Bellman:** I think it's sad that the 42 people feel they were misled. I think
41 that's something that shouldn't have happened if it did happen, but that is what
42 happened. But I don't think that's a reason to take people who invested their
43 money for development in downtown Manchester based on a county code that
44 said 35', 3 stories and punish them because what the sub area plan people felt
45 was inappropriate and what they were told was wrong in 2002. I do think that it's
46 a discouraging thing for some people having their views taken away. In the same

1 token, I think that people have property right that bought that did it based on a
2 county code so they could have 35', 3 stories. I think they should be allowed to
3 do that.

4
5 **Chair Taylor:** Is there anyone else? Thank you.
6

7
8 **9:06 PM**

9 **Chair Taylor closes**

10
11 **Scott Diener:** We are still taking public comments. I just wanted to reiterate and
12 ask a couple questions. I am Concerned about making the August 28 deadline
13 for the draft set of design standards.

14
15 **Chair Taylor:** Could I offer this suggestion? There have been a lot of
16 requests for addition information that is floating around in computers;
17 some of us have not driven the site yet. Could we put Manchester off until
18 September and take care of Keyport on August 28? It's unreasonable to
19 try to get this done in two weeks.
20

21 **Scott Diener:** The deliberation has actually been noticed, so we'll just have to
22 open and notice that we've extended it to September 11.
23

24 **Chair Taylor:** I fully support that.
25

26 **Jenniges:** My real concern is from the professional aspect that Mr. Vancil
27 and Mr. Palmer took the time to evaluate those design standards and
28 have really, in my opinion, there are a lot of weaknesses in it, so that
29 those weaknesses get clarified.
30

31 **Scott Diener:** That's staffs intention. I had a question for Commissioner
32 Gustavson.
33

34 **Gustavson:** I've got one for you too. I didn't understand from the public's
35 perspective, when public testimony would be terminated for the Planning
36 Commission.
37

38 **Scott Diener:** We had discussed at the prior Planning Commission meeting that
39 written public testimony would be terminated, I believe last week.
40

41 **Gustavson:** I just wanted to make sure we're all on the same page with
42 that. We asked for more stuff from people tonight.
43

44 **Scott Diener:** Yes and I believe that's relevant to the...
45
46

1 **Gustavson:** When could that continue to come in? We should establish a
2 date for the public so they have some guidelines when they need to print
3 this stuff off their computer and submit it to staff.
4

5 **Scott Diener:** That's information you requested, so we can do that. Mr.
6 Gustafson, You asked for a lot count of lots that would be impacted. I wanted to
7 point out that there are many ways to impact lots, there's traffic, property value
8 are you asking for impacted for full build out. What about partial view impacts,
9 what setbacks we would be using for those view impacts? That's a conversation
10 that I think, perhaps, we need to take offline. Just asking for an account of lots
11 are impacted by itself if very consuming question and I think regardless of what
12 you're asking us to do it's going to take a lot of time.
13

14 **Gustavson:** I really appreciate the fact that you are a professional and
15 you have thought this through better than I. I was merely looking at the view thing
16 and Mr. Palmer pointed out some of those issues.
17

18 **Scott Diener:** Let's take this off line because there's a partial view impact as
19 well.
20

21 **Depee:** Scott tonight was just design standards and height only for the
22 public hearing? Or was it the whole program? For example, aggregation we won't
23 be looked at?
24

25 **Scott Diener:** No, that will be part of the plan update.
26

27 **Depee:** But not public hearing on it?
28

29 **Scott Diener:** Not that it's been scheduled yet.
30

31 **Depee:** But there will be one on the other issues?
32

33 **Scott Diener:** There will be public hearing on that and other issues as well.
34

35 **Sommerhauser:** Staff, could we get single or maybe 2 wide angle photos
36 of Spring Street as described by Mr. Palmer with an overlay at 28' and 35' to
37 show me what that looks like.
38

39 **Jenniges:** That really resolve Mike's question also.
40

41 **Scott Diener:** We can do that, be careful of the presumptions you make, you
42 might be assuming that that means a consistent topography in that area, which
43 may not be.
44

45 **Jenniges:** I'll accept any explanation that you want to attach, but it would
46 help me.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Burbage: Offers his pictures.

Jenniges: That would be very beneficial. Based on that input I would suggest to my fellow members that we keep the written record on this open for at least 2 weeks.

Gustavson: I agree.

Chair Taylor: So, additional information up to the 28th of August? Okay.

Scott Diener: If that's the will of the commission. So at this time we are looking at September 11th some additional guidance for deliberation on September 25th.

Chair Taylor: Right.

Sommerhauser: I think we can give a little bit of direction to DCD now on option 2. I'm ready to do that.

Jenniges: I'm not. I want to see that standard with the incorporation of the professional opinions.

Sommerhauser: That's what I thought option 2 was.

Jenniges: Oh, okay.

Sommerhauser: That's the way I understand option 2. I think we're ready to say that it's got a lot of community input, but it needs a lot of professional help with that input. I'm more than willing to say to staff go do that reassembly.

Chair Taylor: I think they've got that message already. Are you done?

Scott Diener: Yes I am

Chair Taylor: Express appreciation for members of the public for conduct and respect for each other.

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

The VOTE:

Yes: 7

Abstained: 0

Motion carries

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

9:17 PM

EXHIBITS

- A. Keyport Community Plan: Public Comments
- B. Draft Manchester Design Standards
- C. Public Comment from William Palmer on Design Standards
- D. Manchester Design Standards Staff Report
- E: Attachment 3: Manchester Design Standards
- F: Public Comment from Mattie Walters on Design Standards
- G: Public Comment from Lyle Burbidge on Design Standards
- H: Public Comment from Ryan Vancil on Design Standards
- I: Public Comment from Toni McBride on Design Stanards
- J: Public Comment from Joe Keitsch on Design Standards
- K: Public Comment from Ron Robinson on Design Standards

MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2007.

John Taylor, Chair

Mary Seals