The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County Administration Building – Commissioner’s Chambers located at 619 Division Street, Port Orchard, WA 98366. Members present: Chair John Taylor, Fred Depee, Linda Paralez, Michael Gustavson, Tom Nevins, Lou Foritano, Jim Sommerhauser and Dean Jenniges. Staff present: Scott Diener, James Weaver, Katrina Knutson, Philip Fletcher, James Weaver, Mary Seals, Mark Personius and Planning Commission Secretary Amanda Walston.

9:00:06

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

Chair Taylor:

B. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Gustavson to approve the minutes, with modifications, of September 25, 2007.

Sommerhauser, Gustavson: Minor changes in format, sections numbering.

The VOTE:
Yes: 7
Abstain: 1
Motion carries

9:07:45

C. Review of September 11, 2007 Meeting

Taylor: Asks for review of the September 11th Planning Commission meeting.
Kitsap County Planning Commission – September 25, 2007

**Gustavson:** Supports request with liberal use of Point of Order

**Jenniges:** Disagrees with this opinion and believes all discussion on point with one exception regarding his request to remove Open Space Applications. Believes full and open discussion where opinions and concerns are expressed and aired enhances, not hinders, the experience and effectiveness.

*Discussion on whether to hold questions until conclusion of Staff presentations, or to ask questions throughout lengthy presentations.*

**Determination made that a motion is not necessary**

**Chair Taylor:** Will be referencing the Kitsap County Board and Commissions Training Pamphlet throughout the meeting process.

9:16:32

**D. Director Update – Larry Keeton, Director, DCD**

**Keeton:** Staff presentations shouldn’t be 20 minutes and should have breaks along the way, this will be evaluated.

Discusses sewers as an interested topic across the county that Community Development and the Board are addressing. Staff is developing the infrastructure and known lines for the county. The Board’s direction so far is to work with Public Works and additional fund sources.

The Growth Management Hearing Board remand on the sewer portion invalidated the Comprehensive Plan which led to the Board of Commissioners passing a moratorium. Community Development is working to determine how to modify or clarify the order to address areas that currently have access to sewer capacity – so not to stop projects happening county-wide.

The re-organization proposal has been vetted by many groups and is awaiting approval. Biggest change will be establishment of a Permit Center under direction of a Permit Manager with plans to begin in October 2007 and fully implemented by end of 2007.

Discusses new additions to department staff.

**Depee:** Specific to South Kitsap Capital Facilities aspect, asks to reinstate the Citizens’ Advisory Group and reconvene the sewer analysis portions now that complete data is available as opposed to a full review.
Keeton: Confirms that the Board and Department of Community Development are working on these aspects

Sommerhauser: Questions if an Interim Ordinance would come back before the Planning Commission

9:23:56

Keeton, Sommerhauser: Discussion on what the Growth Management Hearing Board ruling invalidated and how Community Development and Planning Commission resources may be affected.

9:25:47

Discussion on availability of Emergency Ordinance, which is posted online and in Planning Commissioners’ packets

Jenniges: How are moratoriums going to affect the permit processing areas? Who is going to pay the cost when you don’t have any permits coming in?

Keeton: In review, there are not as many permits coming in as people may believe. There are a lot of people want to submit and are getting ready to, but can’t right now, so the work will eventually come in. It just delays when it shows up, not if it shows up. Unless we go back and have an exchange where it can be done. Then, it will impact us.

E. Briefing: 2007 Buildable Lands Report: Katrina N. Knutson, Associate Planner, DCD

Knutson: Presents Buildable Lands Report Findings and Recommendations, which is not a binding document and does not require Planning Commission recommendation, but comments are appreciated and should be directed to Katrina Knutson via electronic or postal mail.

9:31:34

Personius: Presents background on methodology, Summary of Population Growth, Residential Growth, Urban Densities, Reasonable Measures

9:49:54

Foritano: Questions if this analysis examines Tribal Planning effects on Infrastructure
Personius: No. The report does allow us to look at infrastructure – clarified only insofar as impact on Buildable lands. For example how much land is needed for sewer treatment?

Nevins: In determining land capacity, did you use four or six homes per acre?

Personius: The Updated Land Capacity Analysis is based on 4 homes per acre.

Jenniges: The Land Capacity Analysis process was intense with many objections and changes. At one time, sewers were included, then challenged and removed. Did this reduction cause a change in homes per acre? Also, if the sewers are out of the plan and we are held on a moratorium, will they be put back in for analysis?

Personius: The overall impact of the reduction was than 5% impact and not a large factor. It also was compensated for by increasing the unavailable land factor.

Jenniges: If sewers being included or excluded from the plan only makes a 5% difference, why are we held at abeyance?

9:54:55

Personius: Explains the Sewer and Land Capacity Analysis process and the Growth Management Hearing Board’s decisions.

Gustavson: Questions the number of unbuilt rural lots do we have and when will we run out. Also questions rates and comparisons of median house and lot prices and median income.

Taylor: Only address when we will run out of rural lots. The other is a market-related issue and not ours.

Personius: This report does not specify all the existing non-conforming lots. We do have a total number of lots and their capacities. Gives description of Building Unit Capacity and zones included in this report.

10:01:30

Sommerhauser: Questions the change in urban to rural development from 1995 (43%/57%) to 2005 (80%/20%).

Personius: Clarifies that the 80%/20% ratio pertains to single-family (80%) to multiple-family (20%) dwellings.
Paralez: Questions the mechanism and frequency of reporting on reasonable measures, which is forward-looking.

10:02:55

Personius: The County will monitor tracking data as provided by the cities.

Discussion on whether this report includes the recently allowed rural incentive program; it does not.

Chair Taylor: We appreciate this report as a briefing and assume you will be back at a later date

Knutson: We will not be back and will be adopting the BLR by resolution and it will go before the Board of County Commissioners in December. As this is not a policy document, Planning Commission recommendation or approval is not required, but comments are wanted and appreciated.

Clarifies Reasonable Measures monitoring; grant money has been allocated for next year that will allow necessary changes to our Land Information System to better report Reasonable Measures which will provide for more accurate monitoring and tracking. This will also allow us to coordinate with cities to better align data collection and reporting procedures.

Work schedule for this process requested; will be emailed

10:06:27

Depee: Questions if Reasonable Measures will stay constant, and if they are based on estimates that may change as new data is received.

Knutson: Clarifies that of the measures adopted, 18 will stay constant. Of the additional, 14 have already been accomplished and we do have a plan of how we will obtain this data.

F. Public Hearing: 2007 Proposed Site Specifics: Philip Fletcher, Senior Planner, DCD

10:08:24

Chair Taylor: Staff will make brief presentation on each report and we will conduct a brief public hearing, but we will be continuing these into next meeting. No final determination will be made at this meeting
Fletcher hands out documents regarding Lindstrom Report comments including a letter from a neighbor and a 15 page review of the original staff report.

10:11:15

Fletcher: Discusses Staff’s reasoning for recommending denial including concern that it would create an island of more dense zoning, the possibility of overtaxing current neighborhood transportation and the moderate to severe geological hazards located on the property which creates severe environmental concerns. Also notes that per Kitsap County’s Legal Department, the Planning Commission is free to evaluate this application as a part of the surrounding area as well as on its own.

Clarification of the areas on the maps included in the Site Specific report

Chair Taylor: Opens Public Hearing portion

10:16:19

Richard Shattuck, Attorney for the Lindstrom Family: The Growth Management Act of 1994 designated this property to be a rural protection zone. Since that time, a topographical study has been completed showing the property is not constrained by the types of critical areas and problems that were anticipated back in 1994.

Point of clarification: The Lindstoms met with staff to review the details of the rural protection zone guidelines and found that of the original 110 acres, 30 acres was constrained by Anderson creek. As a result of these concerns, that 30 acres was removed from the Lindstoms application. Staff’s report and maps are in error and should include corrections.

Mr. Fletcher mentioned severe geological hazard on the property. This is not consistent with the Kitsap County Building Limitations Map which only shows a portion in the corner of the property what is affected.

Another point of clarification: changing this zoning from rural protection to rural residential will not lead to rural sprawl. 5 acre lots are not considered sprawl.

References supporting documentation from Growth Management Hearing Board and Pierce County, Bonney Lake case.

The next issue is environmental concerns. References documentation on Kitsap County case in Silverdale which states that the goal of re-zoning is to examine the issues that pertain to the property itself. Other issues that relate to surrounding areas are to be addressed by other regulations and agencies. Also references a recent appeal to the Growth Management Hearing Board asking if
they looked outside the specific area, and it was stated that Kitsap County’s role
is not to look outside the specific area.

Asks the Planning Commission consider these things when making its
recommendation.

10:23:55

Lindstrom: Feels unfairly treated. This property is surrounded on the west by
2.5 and 5 acre plats and the same to the east. To the south it is 1 acre lots – all
done before GMA when you could have 1 house per acre. It seems logical that
we should at least receive 5 acre zoning. Across the street is a 300 acre park
with plans for expansion to 1000 acres. There is plenty of open space. We
bought this property 44 yrs ago and have been residents for 37 years; we want to
use this property as intended, for our retirement.

Sommerhauser: Where is access to the property?

Discussion determines that access is through the Chaffey Newberry
development across the street via 2 cul de sacs coming into the property

Jenniges: Could access be extended through Northwest Lindberg
Drive??

Shattuck: Per the Kitsap County Building Limitations Map, this area is affected
by the Anderson creek drainage/water systems

Sommerhauser: That road does not continue through the property?

Shattuck: No it does not.

Depee: Is the overlay for that zoning for the whole area, one for ten?

10:29:11

Shattuck: Zoning along the dark green area is one for ten

Taylor: Continues public hearing portion

Fletcher: From a legal point of view, public notice was given. From our own
standard operating procedures, we usually send notice to applicants specifically
when staff reports are revised; this was not done in this case.

Taylor: Clarifies that zoning request is 1 dwelling per 5 acres?
Fletcher: Mr. Shattuck’s mention that the map shows 110 acres is correct, but I want to clarify that staff report is written based on 80 acres.

Discussion confirms that this issue will be added to the next meeting.

10:32:30

Sommerhauser, Taylor: Point of Order; it is noted that the question raised regarding access was raised as part of the testimony

Fletcher: Requests that these two documents be incorporated as part of public hearing.

Depee: Questions the delay in distributing these documents.

Fletcher: Response was highly legalized in nature and we waited for response from Kitsap County’s Legal Department

Depee: Referring specifically to Shattuck’s letter, is it public testimony?

Fletcher: Yes

Chair Taylor: Move for a break

10:34:52

BREAK

10:45:43

RECONVENE

Fletcher: Presents report and staff recommendation for approval on Elzey and Smith application noting no public comment received and that the bulk of this property is already zoned rural residential, this request would re-zone only a small section that is currently zoned rural protection.

Sommerhauser, Fletcher: Discussion on the Critical Area constraints, the only one determined to be on the property is an eagle habitat

Depee: The Comprehensive Plan made great effort to ensure no single division property contained two zonings, why wasn’t this put through as a map correction?

Fletcher: Reason unknown
Chair Taylor: Opens Public Hearing portion

10:50:05

Tom Elzey, Property Owner: Bought property 1 yr ago without knowing about the eagle habitat (not disclosed to us) and are now dealing with this issue accordingly. When posting was on property it was placed on the driveway, and stated that this property was being rezoned from rural protection to rural residential. This implied that it was the whole property, instead of just re-zoning the small corner to rural residential from rural protection. This improper posting caused some concern among the neighbors.

Chair Taylor: Understands this concern. Defers remainder of the Public Hearing to the October 9th meeting.

10:52:00

Fletcher: Presents report and staff recommendation for approval on Anderson Hill property noting the lot is very well developed, surrounding lot is adjacent to rural residential, the only environmental limitation is a small gully on the Northeast corner of the property, no anticipated additional cost to public services.

Sommerhauser: In SIPA status on report, it notes moderate geological hazard area – stream and small water body present. Where is the small body of water?

Fletcher: Believes the small body of water is the stream.

Gustavson: Why isn’t the buffer for intermittent stream shown?

Fletcher: Unsure, but will note these questions and bring back the answers during the deliberation phase.

Sommerhauser: Would like to know why the small body of water is noted separately from the stream, but not shown on the map.

Commissioners request copy of updated map with intermittent stream buffers shown

No public comment received

Chair Taylor: Continue to next meeting in October

10:57:27
Fletcher: Presents report and staff recommendation for approval on the Cole application noting that the original request was from rural wooded to rural residential, and now has been modified to move from rural wooded to rural protection. Also notes that the original zoning is non-conforming as the total lot size is less than 20 acres which is the minimum requirement for rural wooded zoning. Granting this request would make it conforming, but would not change the current status of the land, since rural residential requires one for ten dwelling. Public comment consists of a single neighbor with a one-sentence letter in support. An informal poll of neighbors has drawn no objection.

11:00:33

Gustavson: Questions if applicants would be able to sub-divide the property.

Fletcher: A director could grant a variation. This application will simply pull from non-conforming to conforming and will make it consistent with the surrounding land use.

Chair Taylor: I have summary dated march 28th?

Fletcher: Summary is no longer correct now that the new staff report is ready

Chair Taylor: Opens for Public Hearing:

Darren Cole, Current Landowner and Resident since 1995: Explains that they decided to apply for this re-zoning and see if it was a possible first step before investing considerable money into surveying and other possible options in order to make this lot eligible for possible sub-division into two, 10 acre lots in the future.

Chair Taylor: Defers Public Hearing portion to next meeting

11:04:15

Fletcher: Presents report and staff recommendation for approval of Munro application noting that a new staff report was written last week. Request is to move from current business park zoning, which only allows high-end businesses and fruit stands, to business center. The surrounding properties and businesses are not high-end and since the purposes for business park and business center are the same, staff considers this a lateral change and recommends approval for flexibility without the use of conditional use permits. No written public concern, but did meet with one citizen concerned about a creek located on lower property.

Discussion identifying surrounding businesses
Sommerhauser: The stream shown on map does not include buffer zones.

11:09:40

Chair Taylor: Opens Public Hearing for Munro application

Bob Tucker, Mother resides on property that abuts the subject property on the south portion:

Chair Taylor: Is that accessed off Taylor road?

Tucker: Yes. Our only concern at this point in environmental and drainage impacts that any construction on this property may cause any kind of change to the seasonal or intermittent stream that forms the north boundary of our property and subject property. I’m not sure enough weight has been given to the amount of water and potential erosion, because of the slope, that will end up in the Chico Creek – which is one of major salmon streams in Kitsap County.

Having lived on property for years and having made extensive efforts to keep that viable, it is my understanding that in considering a re-zone, which would have to allow reconsideration of building impacts. While I see some significant changes to what is allowable for building there, we would have to stick to re-zoning. I list 25 examples that would be unacceptable in my testimony including aggregate extraction operation, which means gravel pit. Also, the impact will be affected by entries and exits; the close proximity of a gas plant, a school, a church, and other residences creates concern. These issues have been addressed to Mr. Fletcher, in a letter sent in common.

Depee: Your concern is the environmental issues that will be compromised with this zone change?

Tucker: The zoning change itself will not affect anything, but what is allowed and constructed there will have major impact regarding drainage, erosion?

Depee: Are you against this?

Tucker: Not against, but want to be on record as having concerns

11:16:36

Jenniges: Gravel extraction in that area has ceased, and the area above has homes on it, the other area is a storage area, I believe that with current county regulations, those will be pretty well abated. At that time you will be able to voice these concerns.
Tucker: Again, my concern is getting into the process early enough to give planners opportunity to consider these effects. A few years ago, there was a major washout that endangered the railroad, the school and the gas plant. If you look now, the stream has been dry for six months, but a whole lot of water goes down there.

Jenniges: There also is a big area for stormwater retention?

Tucker: The North area along power line?

Jenniges: Yes, that area has always been dry

Tucker: I can tell you from experience that area gets a great deal of water.

Chair Taylor: Any other public input? Defers public hearing to next meeting.

Fletcher: No closing comments. Deliberations will be held at next meeting.

Sommerhauser: Has requested, from Staff, excerpts from the Critical Area Ordinance relating to Notice to Title, with the intent at the next meeting to forward several of these requests to Notice to Title.

Gustavson: What happened to the original application?

Fletcher: It was withdrawn.

Gustavson: Would also like to address the Notice to Title section of the ordinance at the next meeting as an agenda item.

Chair Taylor: Will discuss this item with Scott Diener

G. Deliberations: Manchester Design Standards, Philip Fletcher, Senior Planner, DCD

Chair Taylor: Staff will present a brief update and are asking us for a recommendation today

Fletcher: The eight significant issues raised at our last meeting have been addressed and resolved in the re-written document you received yesterday. Since that time, the Kitsap County Legal Department and Manchester Downtown Committee have met and submitted comments and suggestions, but these are
not substantive in nature. These remarks will be summarized and distributed to the Planning Commission.

11:23:58

**Sommerhauser:** Questions the reason the Planning Commission has not received copies of these legal opinion.

**Chair Taylor:** It is considered privileged information

**Sommerhauser:** Requests a copy of the Legal Opinion on the Manchester Design Standards as a member of the Public

**Fletcher:** Will forward this request to the Legal Department. The Appendix B (Definition section) is referenced in your document, but is not yet available as it still needs revisions.

**Foritano:** What is the basis for the determination of 20% in regards to View Obstruction?

**Fletcher:** Basis was a cross-section from approximately 20 different View Standards across the country, which varied between 20% – 30%. Asks to review chapter by chapter with discussion and questions.

**Chair Taylor:** We can make a motion to go chapter by chapter and review questions along the way, or can go in one motion to review the entire document

**Discussion:** Commissioners Gustavson, Nevins and Depee state they did not receive a copy via email, others did receive it as part of an email that went to all.

**Sommerhauser:** Several have had this long enough – suggest go through with those who have seen it, making comments anyway.

**Paralez and Jenniges:** Agree we should go forward. We have reviewed this material for a number of weeks, and all know the areas of concern

11:32:43

A motion was made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by Commissioner Paralez to approve Chapter 1 of the Manchester Design Standards.

**The VOTE:**

Yes: 7
Opposed: 1 (Gustavson)
Motion Carries

Paralez: Can it be assumed that minor changes constitute 50% or less, and major would be more than 50%?

Fletcher: Yes. Minor changes would be under 50% and would not trigger design standards. Those that do trigger design standards are listed as the numbered items.

Paralez: Asks that wording be clarified to reflect this

A motion was made by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by Commissioner Nevins to accept Chapter 2 of the Manchester Design Standards with the Minor Changes clarification

Gustavson: It appears that all decisions are resolved by the county. Where does the Manchester Downtown Committee come in?

Fletcher: They are not officially recognized by the County, although Staff does give them consideration from an advisory perspective.

Gustavson: They did not define the character of Manchester in this document

Sommerhauser: The Introduction has discussion of character, which has not been voted on yet

Chair Taylor: ready to vote on Chapter 2

The VOTE:
Unanimous
Motion Carries

A motion was made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Gustavson to approve Chapter 3 with some minor corrections.

Sommerhauser: References several grammatical and passive wording changes.
Sommerhauser: On page 10, under Section B. you have the same thing listed under Guidelines and Standards. Need to choose one or the other to make it either suggested or mandatory.

11:41:29

Fletcher: Will re-word to list as a Standard, making it mandatory

Gustavson: Questions this issue since you cannot build this corner lot of South Colchester and Mann. There is not enough real estate to accommodate it.

Sommerhauser: There are other corner lots in Manchester

Gustavson: The streets are too close together in this area at the central intersection and you cannot build there.

Fletcher: Based on this conversation previously, a paragraph was specifically added to address cases where it is not possible to build and there are variances provided for this point

Sommerhauser: Clarifies that under Chapter 3, Corner Lots there will be Standards only and no Guidelines

Sommerhauser, Taylor: Clarification that motions to approve each section include the questions and changes as answered and clarified in each discussion.

Paralez: Drawing in Section II.A needs to be corrected as the drawing notes 25 feet, and text states 20 feet.

Fletcher: Will be corrected to reflect 20 feet in text and drawing.

The VOTE:
Yes: 7
Opposed: 1
Motion Carries

11:44:39

A motion was made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Paralez to approve Chapter 4 with noted changes.

Jenniges: On Page 13, Chapter 4 Section III.A.7 #7 states that parking shall not be located between a building and the street frontage, how does this apply to current parking?
Fletcher, Jenniges: This doesn’t apply to current; however, if current buildings are removed, on street parking will no longer be allowed unless a variance is applied for.

Jenniges, Gustavson: Concerned that this does not make commercial sense due to limited land and as most business owners want parking in front of their building, references Sedgwick Businesses as example. #12 says parking “may be permitted in front of”. Believes these issues of parking should be reworked.

11:48:22

An amended motion was made to approve Chapter 4 with the removal of Section III.A.7, 10, and 12 by Commissioner Jenniges and seconded by Commissioner Gustavson.

Jenniges: This zoning and Standard eliminates the two things that signify success or failure for a business, visible parking and visible signage.

Nevins, Sommerhauser: This is approximately 20 businesses in Manchester; people intending to shop there will not have difficulty finding them. If there is an upscale, noticeable remodel, these Standards will prevent a parking lot full of cars like Bethel. Every time the community testifies, they say they do not want this. These restrictions are what the community seems to want.

Depee: By eliminating these issues, it gives the developer the flexibility. A mandatory standard like this takes away the options of a business owner or developer.

Discussion continues regarding the views expressed by developers versus the views expressed by the community in relation to parking standards

12:05:05

The VOTE:
Yes: 4
No: 4
Tied – Motion fails

12:05:42

An amended motion was made by Commissioner Jenniges and seconded by Commissioner Gustavson to move Section III.A.7, 10, and 12 to Section III.B. (page 14) under Guidelines
Nevins, Foritano: Changing this Standard to a Guideline doesn’t accomplish anything as it takes away the actual control in regards to the Character of Manchester.

Gustavson: Character not referenced in this document and no public comment relating to this information

Paralez: Section II allows for on-street parking

The VOTE:
Yes: 4
No: 4
Tied – Motion fails

Chair Taylor: Moving back to the original motion to approve Chapter 4.

Sommerhauser: Makes several corrections on page 11; Section II.A.1, the last sentence should be stricken; Section II.A.3 includes a permissive word; Section II.A.4 references a low volume street – is this defined?

Discussion continues regarding which streets would qualify as low-volume streets

Sommerhauser: Changes needed referencing: permissive words listed in Standards Section III.A.1 (page 12) and Section V.A.1.a (page 15); Duplication in Standards and Guidelines in Sections III.A.1 and III.B (page 12); Section V.A.1.a (page 15) permissive word in Standards; Inconsistency in Section V.A.8 (page 16) it is stated that plants shall provide clear views, everywhere else lists 70% - this should be changed to show 70%

Paralez: Also in Section V.A.9 (page 16), change “employ” to “use”

The VOTE:
Yes: 6
No: 2
Motion Carries
A motion was made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by Commissioner Gustavson to eliminate Chapter 5 from the Manchester Design Standards.

Discussion regarding the business owner’s right to determine how to build and the community’s wishes to improve its appearance.

12:16:30

Gustavson, Sommerhauser: A picture in Chapter 5 (page 17) has a caption that references “Northwest” character, which is not referenced anywhere else in this document?

Foritano: The Supreme Court states that Manchester as a community is allowed to define what standards are acceptable and the business owner can evaluate the standards and then make the determination to build or not

Chair Taylor: Question to Staff, if Chapter 5 is eliminated, will all height standards be eliminated?

12:21:27

An amended motion was made by Commissioner Taylor and seconded by Commissioner Jenniges to leave Section II of Chapter 5 of the Manchester Design Standards in tact regardless of the inclusion or elimination of the other sections in Chapter 5.

Commissioner Taylor withdraws his amended motion and is seconded by Commissioner Jenniges

12:23:57

A replacement motion is made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by Commissioner Jenniges to condense the contents of Chapter 5 to contain only the Building Heights and View Protection and Standards section.

Discussion continues regarding the business owner’s right to determine how to build and the community’s wishes to improve its appearance.

The VOTE:
Yes: 4
No: 4
Tie - Motion Fails

192
A motion by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Nevins was made to approve Chapter 5 with suggested modifications as referenced by Commissioner Sommerhauser.

Sommerhauser: In the Intent paragraph, every street in Manchester is a pedestrian street, this does not need to be specified; Section III (page 18) “Human/Pedestrian Scale” is not truly descriptive of this section, should be changed; Section VII.B.4 (page 24) contains “shall” should be replaced; Also remove all references to direction in Section I.B.a.

12:31:58

The VOTE:
Yes: 6
No: 2
Motion Carries

A motion was made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by Commissioner Foritano to accept Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the Manchester Design Standards with modifications.

12:33:30

Sommerhauser: Correct Chapter 7 Section I.A.10 (page 29) to say signs must be down within 14 days of an election to conform to the Kitsap County political sign ordinance.

Paralez, Fletcher: Clarification that irrigation plan refers to sprinkler systems, not drainage.

Discussion regarding whether stormwater and appropriate provisions are contained in this document

12:35:41

The VOTE:
Unanimous
Motion carries

A motion is made by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by Commissioner Foritano to approve the Introduction section of the Manchester Design Standards as written.

Gustavson: There is no one descriptive word on these pages that says what this character is. There is nothing that describes it as a word or pair of words.
Sommerhauser: There is no single word, but there are 5 paragraphs.

The VOTE:
Yes: 5
No: 3
Motion Carries

12:39:00

Discussion and agreement that a revised copy will be submitted to management at the end of the week.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Nevins to approve the entire Manchester Design Standards, including appendices, as modified today Nevins seconds.

The VOTE:
Yes: 5
No: 3
Motion Carries

12:41:09

H. For the Good of the Order: Chair Taylor

A motion is made by Commissioner Nevins and seconded by Commissioner Jenniges to move our meetings to the evenings taking cue from Board to County Commissioners

Nevins: Believes it will align with the Board of County Commissioners and will also allow membership to be more accessible to a wider group of members of the public

Depee: Disagrees because we are a recommending body, not a decision making body. Staff pays their dues now in time and resources, and requiring staff to come back again does not serve a better purpose, other than special meetings, which are already made public in the evening.

Discussion continues the conflicting opinions of having the proceedings more accessible to a wider cross-section of the public and the strains placed on Staff, programs and other budgetary concerns.
Diener: We have discussed this before and made a commitment to communities and boards to allow for evening meetings when public is highly interested, Keyport as an example, if we move toward evening meetings DCD will have to give consideration to the major impact a change like this will have.

Chair Taylor: By discussing and speaking to this issue, we are sending a message to the public that we do consider them and their interests to be a priority in these dealings and decisions

The VOTE:
Yes: 1
No: 7
Motion Fails

Discussion that this meeting was not listed in the Civic Calendar section of the newspaper, although Planning Commission meetings usually are. This will be remedied.

Depee: Recommend that this recent Moratorium by the Board of County Commissioners was a surprise to the community as a whole and all who are involved in citizen’s boards and groups should be encouraged to address and hear their concerns

A motion is made by Commissioner Gustavson and seconded by Commissioner Depee to adjourn.

The VOTE:
Unanimous
The motion carries

Meeting adjourned 12:49:36
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