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.

6:30 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
Chair Taylor: Gives guidelines for presenting including a 3 minute time frame for speakers. If representing a group of 3 or more people, you are given 10 minutes.

6:41:33

David Evans: I would like to voice my opinion of view restriction languages, language that I would be opposed to. And I see now that this has been taken out of the draft proposal. I’ve just become aware of that tonight and so it may be somewhat of a mute point. I just wanted to go on record that we are against that language. The 35’ height limit that the rest of the county, other than Manchester, is observing. I just wanted to go on record as being against the height limitation of 28’.

Rich Culley: I’d like to voice my opinion about some things that have been going on in the community. We are pleased that county has decided to do a LAMRID for our community. In the past our septic system has backed up to our home three times. The LAMRID process began and in order to collect more data from homeowners an online survey was offered for all to participate. Multi meetings were started with Jim Weaver, voting on issued was established by Mr. Weaver as a fair and just way to settle volatile issues. The May 22, 2007 meeting was primarily about view protection. The height limit of 28’ was proposed for waterfront homes. It was voted on and defeated by a consensus of the people that were at the meeting. We were told at the meeting that the view protection issue would not be part of the plan. Sometime after the meeting, someone left a petition at my residence requesting that a view protection ordinance be put in the plan. The petitioners wanted both height and position restrictions for all future construction and vegetation. The language in the petition is very disturbing to any waterfront homeowner who has open lots. I can’t believe that this transpired. Somehow, selected neighbors are going to be held hostage over sewer costs and take away their rights. This petition infers that sewer costs are being looked at over these view protection ordinances. My wife and I want to remodel/rebuild our home someday and utilize the 35’ standard for our home. We will not compromise with any group who wishes to place any height restrictions on any new home or restrict placement of any new home on properties and heights of vegetation on properties.

6:46:08

Jenniges: Requests location of Mr. Culley’s home.

Arthur (Rick) Kennedy: I attended LAMRID meetings with James Weaver. I want to take this opportunity to thank James Weaver. The Keyport Community Plan as it was written on July 18, 2007 is fair because it is consistent with existing Kitsap County building work codes which are uniformly applied.
countywide. Broad and uniform view protection language cannot be applied to Keyport because it is a tiny community existing of tiny lots. Because of Keyport’s tiny size and topography view protection restrictions will undermine private property rights. I support the Keyport Community Plan as it was written on July 18, 2007 with no changes to the view protection language.

Sommerhauser: Requests zoning map available for people to point to their lots.

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

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

Jenniges: How wide is your lot?

Len Markland: 50’

Shirl Golden: I wish to speak on the issue of storm water drainage. The intersection of State Highway 308 and Washington Avenue is in the vicinity of high water table in the winter during the rainy season. As a historical indicative of this continuing problem, we have three drainage ditches that serve the impact of the low area that this is located. The reason that I bring this up at this time is it has been zoned commercial. I would ask that some language be included that would have developers cognizant of the water table in the winter. And make
arrangements so that this can be alleviated, mitigated. We would not want this
to be shunted off to residential homes.

**Jenniges:** Could you point to where we’re talking about with the
drainage?

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

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

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

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

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

**Milt Meeds:** I’m the incoming president of the Community Club and
Commissioner of the Port of Keyport. I’ve been working on this plan for the last
couple of years and James has helped us finish it. I fully endorse the plan as it stands, but I do have a couple of recommendations. There is some confusion about the definition of the commercial district. The plan does have some verbiage about commercial and mixed use. Some people take that to mean that new development or a remodel has to include residential or mixed use. I’d like some words in the plan to specify that that is not the case. As far as the height restrictions goes, I like the way the plan is now where we do not have a view protection ordinance. We don’t have anything specifically stating about the height restriction, though. I’d like some verbiage in there to say that we are endorsing the county plan as it stands now. Emphasizing the current plan, because if it changes we may want to come back and address it. Right now the plan itself doesn’t have any actual verbiage that says the people’s desire is to endorse the plan. As a board commissioner we do fully endorse everything in the plan and our goals are to help the economic development of the town and to provide waterfront facilities and whatnot to the community. We are in full agreement with that.

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

Milt Meads: The lady coming up that behind me shortly, I’m sure she’ll discuss that

Lou Foritano: What was the position of the Community Club in terms of view protection?

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

Linda Sullivan-Dudzic: We were the ones with our neighbors who submitted two petitions. I thank everyone that participated and Mr. Weaver. In February when we attended a meeting and looked at the questions and answers it was said, will we ever talk about view or height protection? And the answer was that we will discuss that. I want to go on record that we never asked for a 28’ limitation. I asked Mr. Weaver what the process is; he said that I should write letters, possibly a petition, so that I can have a voice. And then he said the only other language is in Manchester, which is 28’. None of us in the petition wanted to limit the waterfront owners. Nobody that I know of wanted 28’. What we did want was the opportunity to draft language that was unique to Keyport that would be specifically applied to all, and would not just default to the county ordinances. We want it in 20 years, if its 35, if its 30, if it’s 32, that people will participate, they’d say “that’s what we want” and it would be specific language. I just want to state some facts. There are 540 people in Keyport. Less than 10% wrote the plan
and that is great because we can’t get people to participate. I’ve asked people to come to meetings and they’ve lost hope that they have a voice or are able to participate in the democratic process. Less than 10% wonderful people did the plan and usually there were 35-40 people at the meeting. And well intended people in May, there were 16 people there. They looked at the Manchester language; I would have voted it down too. But we never had that opportunity. And so we ended up with a vote 12 to 15 and decided to default to the county. We really like the plan, but would like more participation in the process of height or view specifically and not defaulting to the county. And whatever it is, we’ll live with it.

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

Paul Berg: I’d like to thank James Weaver and his staff for extremely professional job in putting this together. I think the concept has come together smoothly. I’d like to voice opposition to any further discussions of a view corridor height restriction below 35’ county limit. Keyport is a unique community. For the majority of people are waterfront owners. The topography is fairly flat. In that sense, a restricted height to 28’ or 30’ will do little or nothing to improve the view of people who are 3 or 4 lots back from the water. With the changes in the property lot sizes for the people to potentially subdivide, that will bring an opportunity in our community for approximately 8 or 9 more homes. Still being a pretty wide open community. If you look at the lots that have the potential to be subdivided with this program the lot sizes that they would subdivide into are still very large lot sizes. With those lot sizes the people who are 4, or 5, 600 feet back from the water will still have a view of the water.
Chair Taylor: Asks if there is anyone else that would like to testify. No response.

James Weaver: Note in the plan, it is somewhat buried in the development code in Appendix B, but it does address the storm water issue quite heavily; similar to Manchester, in that it raises the county’s rural threshold for a Site Development Activity Permit, which triggers additional storm water review. There is a heightened level of review for Keyport development that was addressed in the storm water issue. Staff felt that would be the most appropriate measure to take.

Jenniges: What is the cost to the people that plan to develop with the storm water management? Are they aware of the additional cost that’s placed here?

James Weaver: Traditionally, with Kitsap County, they’re required to maintain storm water flows that were predevelopment, so that it is consistent and not exacerbating the existing problem. Once storm water is in the public right of way then it is the county’s responsibility to address the storm water. Most of the storm water improvements actually have been in state highway 308, which is state authority, so they would have the authority for any storm water improvements along that corridor. So, it’s a split responsibility among the jurisdictions and the individual property owners.

Jenniges: Am I actually hearing correctly that people concur with the heights within 35 foot or the new examiner hearing boards’ authorization of height allocation? It seems to me that in every other community it’s a major issue in which they want lower heights. Was anybody opposed?

James Weaver: There’s 57 comment letters in your packets. There’s a summary index that indicates which ones are supporting height restrictions and which ones are opposed to height restrictions. The majority in that index do show the majorities opposition to any height restrictions.

Coppola: Acknowledges the amount of praise James Weaver has received from the citizens of Keyport as well as the great job he’s done since he’s been here.

Gustavson: During the community meetings was there any discussion or appreciation of the positive impact that could come from using low impact development and green roofs to mitigate storm water by as much as 75%?
JW: Actually, it’s part of the policies and goals in the sustainability chapter, chapter 8. It was highlighted pretty heavily that that could be a way to reduce the cost of storm water mitigation, while still accommodating the goals.

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

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

Chair Taylor: Any one else to speak for Keyport?

Break 7:19 – 7:34 PM

Chair Taylor resumes the public hearing.

D. Public Hearing: Manchester Community Plan, Scott Diener, Community Planning Manager, DCD

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

Jenniges: Is this presentation going to include the Hearing Examiner’s decision on the height issue?

SD: I had not planned on discussing that.

Jenniges: OK

Foritano: Thanks to Phillip for what I thought was an excellent report. In terms of your professional experience on the key issue of height and views about height, is it as simple as, if you’ve got a waterfront lot you
want minimal restrictions, you want to stand up for your property rights. If you don’t you’re looking to get a peek-a-boo at the expense of somebody who is on the waterfront? There is no recommendation in here; it really says it’s up to the community. I gather we are going to hear maybe a mixed view coming up. Can you guide us in terms of a reference center? Is it beyond self interest?

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

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

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

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

Chari Taylor: Well try to get you that information.

Carrilu Thompson (Co-Chair): The testimony that I’d like to give to you today is a bit of the history of our committee. As you read in the staff report there were some people who feel that it was not an open process and I would like to dispute those. The Downtown Standard, the subcommittee was established as a regular subcommittee for the Manchester Community Council. And the MCC was formed as a conduit to the county for community to implement and update the Manchester Plan. And it was our understanding at the time, that the needed to be a part of and attached any plan update. We have since learned otherwise. But our plan was originally scheduled, our update for 2006 and has been postponed to 2007. Progress and meeting dates were reported at every monthly meeting of
the MCC and the MCC executive board meeting. All minutes from each of those meetings were posted on the Manchester website. And all Standard Committee meetings were held at the Manchester library and open to anyone wishing to attend. We advertised meeting dates in our minutes which were on the website and also if anyone checked the library calendar they would have known that the meetings were being held there. We did not keep subcommittee meeting minutes, nor did we need to vote, since the committee reached consensus at each meeting on the points that we were discussing. And the resulting language and progress was posted on the website and reported to the MCC regular meetings, so we felt that that was our documentation. Our committee was comprised of a mixture of interested residents that included a contractor and current Manchester business owners. Those who could not attend were sent update emails and often sent comment back via email which we incorporated in the next meeting. The number of meetings, including open houses, is part of your staff report. It also includes and unprecedented invitation sent to every land owner in Manchester and the Manchester plan area to voice their preference to heightened stories in the commercial district. We were excited that we got about a 12% return for that. We also made provisions for people at those open houses who were renting to also vote their preference. And included at every open house was a comment sheet for individuals to fill out and you have a summary of those comments. There are many individuals present here to testify, but I also want to include for you’re consideration the many residents who have written letters, sent emails, made phone calls, attended open houses, signed a petition and they felt that they contributed very strongly to the process. But when asked one more time ‘could you please state it again’ they said ‘when is someone listen to us?’ I would like their voice to be part of the record and you have some of those, we’re going to double check to make sure you have all of them. We have consulted with the county staff, we have consulted with two land use attorneys in a continuing effort to fine tune the language of our document. The original that you were handed are really our basic first draft and since then it has been fine tuned to make sure that our language is consistent, that our language is binding and also that we have addressed all of the issues that need to be addressed when you are dealing with .

7:55:50

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

Carrilu Thompson: No

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

Carrilu Thompson: A consensus of the people in the subcommittee and then we make the report to...
Coppola: What I don’t understand is if you had a subcommittee meeting and you reached a consensus of the entire committee, how could you reach a consensus of the entire committee that the entire committee didn’t attend?

Carrilu Thompson: I’m sorry, of the people present, we reached a consensus.

Coppola: So, it’s just the people that showed up made the decision?

Carrilu Thompson: Yes.

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

Carrilu Thompson: Yes

Coppola: I personally own two homes in Manchester and I never received one.

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

Coppola: I believe that you do.

Chair Taylor: Moving right along, Dean,

7:57:23

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

Carrilu Thompson: Yes.

Jenniges: And you’re trying to clarify that for them?

Carrilu Thompson: Absolutely, and for the document itself.

Jenniges: That’s what I meant, for the document itself.

Carrilu Thompson: Yes, in fact the side by side comparison that you have, that Phillip put together is and excellent coalescence of the comments that we’ve received, that we have taken into consideration in terms of what we need to address to fine tune the language.
Jenniges: I’ve seen the side by side comparison and concerns, but I haven’t seen the incorporation into the Design Standards. But that’s forthcoming, you’re telling us?

Carrilu Thompson: Yes. That’s part of working with the county to finalize the language for the August 28th work study.

Gustavson: In reading the document it came to my attention we are talking about 4 acres of commercial property. I’m hoping that someone tonight in the public will talk about that, will quantify the number of potentially adversely affected parcels by the difference in height of 28’ or 35’. How many lots are actually impacted? And I’d like to know what that number is.

Carrilu Thompson: Could you clarify, please, if you mean residential lots, commercial lots? It’s unusual area, in that you have residents, residential community on the water and then about a block and a half starts the commercial property and then residential property.

Gustavson: I used to live in Manchester; I’ve walked it many times. But I’d like to know how many lots; the flat lots obviously would be impacted because there are already houses in front of them. But the question I’d like to have come forward, if someone could speak to that, I’d like to know what those answers are. I’d like to know if we even have a problem to solve.

Carrilu Thompson: I do believe we do, because of the nature of Manchester and the hill that it is, and the fact that you have...

Gustavson: My point is, it may be an emotional issue, but I’d like to know what the quantified answer is. They can speak to that.

7:59:53

Carrilu Thompson: You know, I understand that, and I think that we do need to count the properties, including residential for you tonight. I don’t know if we can get that to you tonight.

Chair Taylor: I think that is a matter for staff to address and bring back to us on the 28th.

Carole Leiniger (Co-Chair): I’m just going to address the height issue as from the standpoint of this committee. In the original plan we stated we encouraged two stories, this was language that was suggested to us and was to accommodate a community center with an apartment for a caretaker. The two stories, however, never made it into code. The majority of the original 42
committee members wanted 28’ limitations, but were erroneously told that we
had put 35’ as that was the county’s norm at the time. Now is the time, we
understand, where these errors can be corrected. Therefore, this committee
recommends two stories and 28’ height limitations. The Design Standards for the
commercial are of Manchester. We plan and look forward to having businesses
in our commercial zone that will serve the many residents of Manchester.

Sommerhauser: ‘The committee recommends....’ was that a consensus,
a vote of the committee?

Carole Leiniger: Of the committee, yes.

Sommerhauser: And it was a consensus?

Carole Leiniger: Yes. Actually, I don’t think there was, there was one dissenting
vote and everybody on the committee voted.

Sommerhauser: How many in the committee?

Carole Leiniger: 15

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

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

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

Scott Diener: Okay, I’ll see if we can provide that.

Carole Leiniger: We can get that to you.

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

Carrilu Thompson: On the Manchester Community Council website.

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

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

Chair Taylor: Can you summarize?

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

Chair Taylor: Can you submit your written comments; we’d like to read the whole thing?

Ron Rada: Currently the chair of the Manchester Community Council. I am one of the original members of the Manchester Community Planning Group that implement the current Manchester Plan of 2002. It was our intent back then to get a 2 story mixed use development into the plan, this is so stated. But the 2 story did not transfer over into the code. We misunderstood the fact that one of the policies and goals of that plan indicated we needed a design standard. But we misunderstood; we didn’t know that we could do that as a separate issue. We thought that we needed to do that as a part of the revision process every 5 years. So when we started the revision process early this year we found out that that could be a separate issue; fast tracked, if you will. So we’ve gone ahead and
separated the plan revision with the downtown design standard. We would hope that you would address that issue; it has been a contentious issue. But it came to the forefront last year when several developments came out of the blue. And suddenly we had a lot of development downtown. We know that we failed to basically write those design standards in a timely manner and it’s coming back to haunt us now. So, we would hope that you would take a serious look at those and approve them as written for the 28’, 2 stories, which was the majority vote of our community. And I think that the Design Standard committee did a very very good job in trying to get the word out to all of our community and we had a fairly decent participation at all of their venues.

Sommerhauser: Do you keep minutes at your meetings?

Ron Rada: At the MCC meetings we do. Not at the subcommittee…

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

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

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

Ron Rada: I will get that meeting minutes to you.

Submitted documents to Planning Commission Secretary.

Debra Trudeau: As you know, Manchester is a LAMRID and as such it may allow for limited areas for more intensive rural development including necessary public facilities and services. The opening paragraph for RCW 36.78.010, he quotes the RCW. Throughout the discussions by the potential developers in Manchester we’ve heard comparisons Old Town Tacoma, Queen Anne, and Bellevue; all urban areas. Yet never once have we heard discussion about the potential future businesses or what types of commercial ventures that they plan for any of these developments. When pressed, one developer commented that he could go two full years of commercial empty space and that the residential condo units themselves were the main part of the buildings that were going to make the money for them. Not the commercial lease spaces. When further pressed, he said that he might consider asking for a rezone of that area to a residential. The point is the GMA requires in that sub area a plan for a LAMIRD that there be commercial zone in that particular part of Manchester. So what happens when that all becomes residential? I want a preservation of that commercial. And contrary to Mr. Clarke, I too consulted an architect who does
business in the Bay Area, Seattle, and Tacoma. And the only mixed use condos that are any economic feasibility for any developer are those that exceed 5 stories. So even a 3 story, 35’, mixed use condo is of no economic value.

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

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

J.B. Bartel: Yes

Depee: The Manchester Inn would not qualify under these.

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

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

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

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

Joe: Yes

8:32:08
Vivian Henderson for Dee Murray: Dee Murray had to leave, so she asked me to deliver her testimony for her. She believes that the proposed height limit of 25' and limited of 2 story buildings is unfair to property owners. She supports the 35' limit and protecting the property rights of the people that bought this property believing that they could use it in a different way and now that’s being changes. I agree with her, I’d like to say something about views. I live up on the hill and look down at Long Lake; at least I used to look down at Long Lake. Well the trees grew up and I didn’t have a view of the lake anymore. I don’t feel like people own the view.

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

Ken Wocher: If the 35’ view designation stays our view that we worked so hard for will be completely gone. We highly oppose the height of 35’. Part of the Hearing Examiners’ review was to ensure that the buildings are harmonious with the community, but it seems they are failing to remember that the community is
not just buildings and houses; it's also the people who live in the community. If there is opposition to that, I don't see how that is harmonious.

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

Denise Burbidge: As a group of involved community members we have learned that design standards are written to maintain and improve the character of the community. In addition, they're intended to address scale and design issues by establishing standards that are consistent with community character. Through many lengthy meetings, that the community has been involved in, and we have been encouraged to share our input in this process. During these meetings we established a more specific definition of the character of Manchester. However, it continues to maintain that spirit of vision that was stated in the original plan. Quotes RCW 36.70a.70. Currently, there is a very small area of commercial development in downtown Manchester, with all existing commercial buildings, but one, being 1 story in height. The surrounding area is residential with a height limit of 28’. Our topography in Manchester is different and unique; our commercial core is contiguous to our residential area. 35’ building in the commercial core will impact view especially on Spring Street, which is part of the commercial core.
Quotes RCW 35.70A.30. Remembering our community’s close proximity to the Puget Sound. We had several open house venues where community members were invited to state their preferences of the height of new development of buildings in the commercial downtown area of the Manchester village. The results of these preference surveys clearly reflect a desire for growth as it is also stated in the Manchester Design Plan and design standard. It also demonstrates the desire to maintain rural village character. You’ve already heard that 64% of community that participated in the preference survey stated 2 stories or lower is what they would like to see in the commercial zone.

8:47:26

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

Sommerhauser: Do I understand that you represent a group as such?

Ryan Vancil: That’s a good question; because I did not come tonight on their behalf. They asked me to review the design standards, tonight I’ve come on my own to speak after having the opportunity to review the . I have worked with a number of municipalities on similar design standards and so I wanted to give you my insight on that in the context of these. Most large cities in Washington State have a design standards review program; generally focusing on new commercial and multi-family development. And quite a few smaller communities have adopted similar guidelines, particularly those with an inherent historic or natural character. Specifically, Washington courts have upheld municipalities’ right to govern land use through design standards and have directly commented on what is expected of legitimately legal design standard. I will submit a full letter to you before I go. Aesthetic concerns are a valid basis for zoning decisions and counties may enact zoning ordinances to preserve aesthetics. That has been held up in courts across the county, not just here in Washington State. Whenever a community adopts such standards they can and must be drafted to give clear guidance to all parties concerned. Applicants must have an understanding of what is expected from new construction. Detail is encouraged. In this case, the standards before you satisfy the Washington criteria for design standards. The intent of the design standard is clear, they use language that is common or commonly used in land use codes and they’re specific enough that an applicant will know from the start what is required of them. Specifically, there is not legitimate legal reason to question the recommended height restrictions. Many communities have adopted these, their economic benefit; Port Townsend, La Connor, Poulsbo, Sumner, to name a few. With a view like the one in Manchester, there is not going to be a deterrent to development, in fact, this going to be an opportunity to focus the development in such a way that it makes the community more desirable to come to. I have never seen a community effectively stop growth with design standards. But I have seen them enhance
themselves economically by adopting standards that people can adequately
review. I’d like to touch briefly on the size of the small group; every public
process is represented by a small group. That’s always the case and I don’t think
it should be held up against these folks in this case. What you’ll see in the
opponents is a similarly small group, in fact, they’re smaller. So you should be
looking at the fact that you’re in a small community, it’s going to be a small group
of folks, and look also that the process is wide open. It’s still on going, the record
is open. It can’t be said that anybody has been shut out of it. I’d like to ask just
two items for you consideration, in looking at these that you might consider
adding since we’ve got more time. That’s maybe a definition section, if there are
some words that are unclear or come to you attention that don’t work for you.
And add graphics that display examples of design standards where you have that
opportunity.

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

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

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

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

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

8:52:51

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

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

Sommerhauser: By worst, can you quantify for me by what do you mean? They’re so detailed they’re bad?

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

Jenniges: This is 25.

Bill Palmer: I realize that, it’s gotten out of hand. But I’m concerned about a couple of issues having to do with the height. If you look at Spring Street, and I encourage you that have not been to Manchester to take a visit before you take action on the design standards. I want you stand on the west side of Spring Street and I want you to tell me if somebody built a 1 story building, whether the houses on the west side of Spring Street would be impacted. If a 2 story building of 28’ were built, would they be impacted and how. And what’s the difference to those people on the west side of Spring Street. I think that you’ll find that no matter what is built on the east side of Spring Street it’s going to severely impact their views even if it’s a 1 story structure. While you’re in Manchester I’d like you also to take a look at what’s known as the Foxfire building. It is ostensibly a 2 story, but the first story is quite high, the second story is quite high above 1st story and I think you’ll find it’s close to 30’ to 32’ in height. If you look behind it you’ll see a hillside and the building is still below the hill. If they built to 35’ the likelihood of them impacting the properties to the west, whether it’s the commercial properties that immediately abut them or the home across 3rd street on the west side of Spring Street. I don’t think your going to find that there’s going to be a great impact for that particular piece of property. If your looking at properties that haven’t developed, post office site here, these two sites can build to 35’. The anchors project which in here can build to 35’ and there’s another project in here that can build to 35’. So the only ones that are restricted to 2 story and 28’ would be those on the west side of Colchester and these two sites right here. Realistically is it fair? So when you’re looking at those kinds of design issues I think it needs a hard look at the realities of Manchester. You’re only
dealing with a commercial area of about 8 acres in total, some of which is already committed for development. Now, whether it develops tomorrow or in the next couple of years that remains to be seen. I am here to tell you that there is an economic impact of trying to implement guidelines like this. I respect Mr. Depee’s comments regarding the Bethel Corridor and the limitations to those design guidelines that they’ve had on development in that corridor. Believe me that there are some significant issues. And incidentally, some of the Bethel Corridor guidelines are incorporated here either in total or by reference. By reference I mean they’ve used them as a model for some of the guidelines that are in here. And some of the guidelines are meant to apply to a much larger area that this small commercial area in Manchester. By the way, you’ve heard some testimony tonight that the GMA is pertinent to the type of development that occurs in Manchester. The issue of what’s appropriate was decided in line with the GMA in 2002 when the county adopted the Manchester Community Plan. You do not have the option of looking back to the GMA when you have a plan adopted in concert with that act. It’s what the plan says and it’s what the zoning allows. With regard to the parking issue that Mr. Burbage addressed. I happen to agree with him. All four of the projects that I am associated with have a residential component of 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit and they meet the commercial standard of 1 space for 450sf. Interesting standard, because, the normal standard in the rest of the county is 1 space per 300sf of commercial area. So you have a relaxed parking standard that was adopted in the code. If you were to tighten something up I would support using the countywide standard as opposed to that relaxed standard. While you’re on the subject of parking maybe you ought to get the Public Works together with DCD and resolve whether or not you can have on street parking. So I think there are some other issues that are involved that the planning commission and the county are well advised to do it right. And send the design standards through the code development review committee that’s reviewing the other stuff that’s going in the zoning ordinance.

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

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

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

Chair Taylor: Is there anyone else? Thank you.

9:06 PM

Chair Taylor closes

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

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

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

Chair Taylor: I fully support that.

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

Scott Diener: That’s staffs intention. I had a question for Commissioner Gustavson.

Gustavson: I’ve got one for you too. I didn’t understand from the public’s perspective, when public testimony would be terminated for the Planning Commission.

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

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

Scott Diener: Yes and I believe that’s relevant to the...
**Gustavson:** When could that continue to come in? We should establish a date for the public so they have some guidelines when they need to print this stuff off their computer and submit it to staff.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Jenniges:** I'll accept any explanation that you want to attach, but it would help me.
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
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 Standards
J: Public Comment from Joe Keitsch on Design Standards
K: Public Comment from Ron Robinson on Design Standards
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