

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

MINUTES
KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers
Work Study/Public Hearing
September 25, 2007, 9:00 AM

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

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

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County Administration Building – Commissioner's Chambers located at 619 Division Street, Port Orchard, WA 98366. Members present: 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

31
32
33

9:00:06

34
35
36
37
38

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

39
40
41
42

Chair Taylor:

43
44
45

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.

1 **Keeton:** Confirms that the Board and Department of Community Development
2 are working on these aspects

3
4 **Sommerhauser:** *Questions if an Interim Ordinance would come back*
5 *before the Planning Commission*

6
7 **9:23:56**

8
9 **Keeton, Sommerhauser:** *Discussion on what the Growth Management Hearing*
10 *Board ruling invalidated and how Community Development and Planning*
11 *Commission resources may be affected.*

12
13 **9:25:47**

14
15 ***Discussion on availability of Emergency Ordinance, which is posted online***
16 ***and in Planning Commissioners' packets***

17
18 **Jenniges:** How are moratoriums going to affect the permit processing
19 areas? Who is going to pay the cost when you don't have any permits
20 coming in?

21
22 **Keeton:** In review, there are not as many permits coming in as people may
23 believe. There are a lot of people want to submit and are getting ready to, but
24 can't right now, so the work will eventually come in. It just delays when it shows
25 up, not if it shows up. Unless we go back and have an exchange where it can be
26 done. Then, it will impact us.

27
28
29 **E. Briefing: 2007 Buildable Lands Report: Katrina N. Knutson,**
30 **Associate Planner, DCD**

31
32 **Knutson:** *Presents Buildable Lands Report Findings and Recommendations,*
33 *which is not a binding document and does not require Planning Commission*
34 *recommendation, but comments are appreciated and should be directed to*
35 *Katrina Knutson via electronic or postal mail.*

36
37 **9:31:34**

38
39 **Personius:** *Presents background on methodology, Summary of Population*
40 *Growth, Residential Growth, Urban Densities, Reasonable Measures*

41
42 **9:49:54**

43
44 **Foritano:** *Questions if this analysis examines Tribal Planning effects on*
45 *Infrastructure*

1 **Personius:** *No. The report does allow us to look at infrastructure – clarified only*
2 *insofar as impact on Buildable lands. For example how much land is needed for*
3 *sewer treatment?*

4
5 **Nevins:** In determining land capacity, did you use four or six homes per
6 acre?

7
8 **Personius:** The Updated Land Capacity Analysis is based on 4 homes per acre
9

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

15
16 **Personius:** The overall impact of the reduction was than 5% impact and not a
17 large factor. It also was compensated for by increasing the unavailable land
18 factor.

19
20 **Jenniges:** If sewers being included or excluded from the plan only makes
21 a 5% difference, why are we held at abeyance?

22
23 **9:54:55**

24
25 **Personius:** *Explains the Sewer and Land Capacity Analysis process and the*
26 *Growth Management Hearing Board's decisions.*

27
28 **Gustavson:** *Questions the number of unbuilt rural lots do we have and*
29 *when will we run out. Also questions rates and comparisons of median*
30 *house and lot prices and median income.*

31
32 **Taylor:** Only address when we will run out of rural lots. The other is a
33 market-related issue and not ours.

34
35 **Personius:** This report does not specify all the existing non-conforming lots.
36 We do have a total number of lots and their capacities. *Gives description of*
37 *Building Unit Capacity and zones included in this report.*

38
39 **10:01:30**

40
41 **Sommerhauser:** *Questions the change in urban to rural development from 1995*
42 *(43%/57%) to 2005 (80%/20%).*

43
44 **Personius:** *Clarifies that the 80%/20% ratio pertains to single-family (80%) to*
45 *multiple-family (20%) dwellings.*

46

1 **Paralez:** *Questions the mechanism and frequency of reporting on*
2 *reasonable measures, which is forward-looking.*

3
4 **10:02:55**

5
6 **Personius:** *The County will monitor tracking data as provided by the cities.*

7
8 **Discussion on whether this report includes the recently allowed rural**
9 **incentive program; it does not.**

10
11 **Chair Taylor:** We appreciate this report as a briefing and assume you will
12 be back at a later date

13
14 **Knutson:** We will not be back and will be adopting the BLR by resolution and it
15 will go before the Board of County Commissioners in December. As this is not a
16 policy document, Planning Commission recommendation or approval is not
17 required, but comments are wanted and appreciated.

18
19 *Clarifies Reasonable Measures monitoring; grant money has been allocated for*
20 *next year that will allow necessary changes to our Land Information System to*
21 *better report Reasonable Measures which will provide for more accurate*
22 *monitoring and tracking. This will also allow us to coordinate with cities to better*
23 *align data collection and reporting procedures.*

24
25 **Work schedule for this process requested; will be emailed**

26
27 **10:06:27**

28
29 **Depee:** *Questions if Reasonable Measures will stay constant, and if they*
30 *are based on estimates that may change as new data is received.*

31
32 **Knutson:** *Clarifies that of the measures adopted, 18 will stay constant. Of the*
33 *additional, 14 have already been accomplished and we do have a plan of how we*
34 *will obtain this data.*

35
36
37 **F. Public Hearing: 2007 Proposed Site Specifics: Philip Fletcher, Senior**
38 **Planner, DCD**

39
40 **10:08:24**

41
42 **Chair Taylor:** *Staff will make brief presentation on each report and we will*
43 *conduct a brief public hearing, but we will be continuing these into next*
44 *meeting. No final determination will be made at this meeting*

1 ***Fletcher hands out documents regarding Lindstrom Report comments***
2 ***including a letter from a neighbor and a 15 page review of the original staff***
3 ***report.***

4
5 **10:11:15**
6

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

14
15 ***Clarification of the areas on the maps included in the Site Specific report***
16

17 **Chair Taylor:** Opens Public Hearing portion
18

19 **10:16:19**
20

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

26
27 Point of clarification: The Lindstroms met with staff to review the details of the
28 rural protection zone guidelines and found that of the original 110 acres, 30 acres
29 was constrained by Anderson creek. As a result of these concerns, that 30 acres
30 was removed from the Lindstroms application. Staff's report and maps are in
31 error and should include corrections.

32
33 Mr. Fletcher mentioned severe geological hazard on the property. This is not
34 consistent with the Kitsap County Building Limitations Map which only shows a
35 portion in the corner of the property what is affected.
36

37 Another point of clarification: changing this zoning from rural protection to rural
38 residential will not lead to rural sprawl. 5 acre lots are not considered sprawl.
39 *References supporting documentation from Growth Management Hearing Board*
40 *and Pierce County, Bonney Lake case.*

41
42 The next issue is environmental concerns. *References documentation on Kitsap*
43 *County case in Silverdale which states that the goal of re-zoning is to examine*
44 *the issues that pertain to the property itself. Other issues that relate to*
45 *surrounding areas are to be addressed by other regulations and agencies. Also*
46 *references a recent appeal to the Growth Management Hearing Board asking if*

1 *they looked outside the specific area, and it was stated that Kitsap County's role*
2 *is not to look outside the specific area.*

3
4 Asks the Planning Commission consider these things when making its
5 recommendation.

6
7 **10:23:55**

8
9 **Lindstrom:** Feels unfairly treated. This property is surrounded on the west by
10 2.5 and 5 acre plats and the same to the east. To the south it is 1 acre lots – all
11 done before GMA when you could have 1 house per acre. It seems logical that
12 we should at least receive 5 acre zoning. Across the street is a 300 acre park
13 with plans for expansion to 1000 acres. There is plenty of open space. We
14 bought this property 44 yrs ago and have been residents for 37 years; we want to
15 use this property as intended, for our retirement.

16
17 **Sommerhauser:** Where is access to the property?

18
19 **Discussion determines that access is through the Chaffey Newberry**
20 **development across the street via 2 cul de sacs coming into the property**

21
22 **Jenniges:** Could access be extended through Northwest Lindberg
23 Drive??

24
25 **Shattuck:** Per the Kitsap County Building Limitations Map, this area is affected
26 by the Anderson creek drainage/water systems

27
28 **Sommerhauser:** That road does not continue through the property?

29
30 **Shattuck:** No it does not.

31
32 **Depee:** Is the overlay for that zoning for the whole area, one for ten?

33
34 **10:29:11**

35
36 **Shattuck:** Zoning along the dark green area is one for ten

37
38 **Taylor:** Continues public hearing portion

39
40 **Fletcher:** From a legal point of view, public notice was given. From our own
41 standard operating procedures, we usually send notice to applicants specifically
42 when staff reports are revised; this was not done in this case.

43
44 **Taylor:** Clarifies that zoning request is 1 dwelling per 5 acres?
45

1 **Fletcher:** Mr. Shattuck's mention that the map shows 110 acres is correct, but I
2 want to clarify that staff report is written based on 80 acres.

3
4 **Discussion confirms that this issue will be added to the next meeting.**

5
6 **10:32:30**

7
8 **Sommerhauser, Taylor: Point of Order; it is noted that the question raised**
9 **regarding access was raised as part of the testimony**

10
11 **Fletcher: Requests that these two documents be incorporated as part of**
12 **public hearing.**

13
14 **Depee: Questions the delay in distributing these documents.**

15
16 **Fletcher:** Response was highly legalized in nature and we waited for response
17 from Kitsap County's Legal Department

18
19 **Depee:** Referring specifically to Shattuck's letter, is it public testimony?

20
21 **Fletcher:** Yes

22
23 **Chair Taylor:** Move for a break

24
25 **10:34:52**

26
27 **BREAK**

28
29 **10:45:43**

30
31 **RECONVENE**

32
33 **Fletcher:** *Presents report and staff recommendation for approval on Elzey and*
34 *Smith application noting no public comment received and that the bulk of this*
35 *property is already zoned rural residential, this request would re-zone only a*
36 *small section that is currently zoned rural protection.*

37
38 **Sommerhauser, Fletcher:** *Discussion on the Critical Area constraints,*
39 *the only one determined to be on the property is an eagle habitat*

40
41 **Depee:** The Comprehensive Plan made great effort to ensure no single
42 division property contained two zonings, why wasn't this put through as a
43 map correction?

44
45 **Fletcher:** *Reason unknown*

46

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

10
11 **11:00:33**

12
13 **Gustavson:** *Questions if applicants would be able to sub-divide the*
14 *property.*

15
16 **Fletcher:** *A director could grant a variation. This application will simply pull from*
17 *non-conforming to conforming and will make it consistent with the surrounding*
18 *land use.*

19
20 **Chair Taylor:** *I have summary dated march 28th?*

21
22 **Fletcher:** *Summary is no longer correct now that the new staff report is ready*
23

24 **Chair Taylor: Opens for Public Hearing:**

25
26 **Darren Cole, Current Landowner and Resident since 1995:** *Explains that*
27 *they decided to apply for this re-zoning and see if it was a possible first step*
28 *before investing considerable money into surveying and other possible options in*
29 *order to make this lot eligible for possible sub-division into two, 10 acre lots in the*
30 *future.*

31
32 **Chair Taylor:** *Defers Public Hearing portion to next meeting*

33
34 **11:04:15**

35
36 **Fletcher:** *Presents report and staff recommendation for approval of Munro*
37 *application noting that a new staff report was written last week. Request is to*
38 *move from current business park zoning, which only allows high-end businesses*
39 *and fruit stands, to business center. The surrounding properties and businesses*
40 *are not high-end and since the purposes for business park and business center*
41 *are the same, staff considers this a lateral change and recommends approval for*
42 *flexibility without the use of conditional use permits. No written public concern,*
43 *but did meet with one citizen concerned about a creek located on lower property.*
44

45 **Discussion identifying surrounding businesses**

46

1 **Tucker:** Again, my concern is getting into the process early enough o give
2 planners opportunity to consider these effects. A few years ago, there was a
3 major washout that endangered the railroad, the school and the gas plant. If you
4 look now, the stream has been dry for six months, but a whole lot of water goes
5 down there.

6
7 **Jenniges:** There also is a big area for stormwater retention?
8

9 **Tucker:** The North area along power line?
10

11 **Jenniges:** Yes, that area has always been dry
12

13 **Tucker:** I can tell you from experience that area gets a great deal of water.
14

15 **11:18:37**
16

17 **Chair Taylor:** Any other public input? Defers public hearing to next
18 meeting.
19

20 **Fletcher:** *No closing comments. Deliberations will be held at next meeting.*
21

22 **Sommerhauser:** *Has requested, from Staff, excerpts from the Critical*
23 *Area Ordinance relating to Notice to Title, with the intent at the next*
24 *meeting to forward several of these requests to Notice to Title.*
25

26 **Gustavson:** What happened to the original application?
27

28 **Fletcher:** It was withdrawn.
29

30 **Gustavson:** Would also like to address the Notice to Title section of the
31 ordinance at the next meeting as an agenda item.
32

33 **Chair Taylor:** Will discuss this item with Scott Diener
34

35 **11:21:04**
36

37 **G. Deliberations: Manchester Design Standards, Philip Fletcher, Senior**
38 **Planner, DCD**
39

40 **Chair Taylor:** Staff will present a brief update and are asking us for a
41 recommendation today
42

43 **Fletcher:** The eight significant issues raised at our last meeting have been
44 addressed and resolved in the re-written document you received yesterday.
45 Since that time, the Kitsap County Legal Department and Manchester Downtown
46 Committee have met and submitted comments and suggestions, but these are

1 not substantive in nature. These remarks will be summarized and distributed to
2 the Planning Commission.

3
4 **11:23:58**

5
6 **Sommerhauser:** *Questions the reason the Planning Commission has not*
7 *received copies of these legal opinion.*

8
9 **Chair Taylor:** It is considered privileged information

10
11 **Sommerhauser:** Requests a copy of the Legal Opinion on the
12 Manchester Design Standards as a member of the Public

13
14 **Fletcher:** *Will forward this request to the Legal Department. The Appendix B*
15 *(Definition section) is referenced in your document, but is not yet available as it*
16 *still needs revisions.*

17
18 **Foritano:** *What is the basis for the determination of 20% in regards to*
19 *View Obstruction?*

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

24
25 **Chair Taylor:** We can make a motion to go chapter by chapter and review
26 questions along the way, or can go in one motion to review the entire
27 document

28
29 **Discussion:** *Commissioners Gustavson, Nevins and Depee state they did*
30 *not receive a copy via email, others did receive it as part of an email that*
31 *went to all.*

32
33 **Sommerhauser:** Several have had this long enough – suggest go through
34 with those who have seen it, making comments anyway.

35
36 **Paralez and Jenniges:** Agree we should go forward. We have reviewed
37 this material for a number of weeks, and all know the areas of concern

38
39 **11:32:43**

40
41 **A motion was made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by**
42 **Commissioner Paralez to approve Chapter 1 of the Manchester Design**
43 **Standards.**

44
45 **The VOTE:**
46 **Yes: 7**

1 **Opposed: 1 (Gustavson)**
2 **Motion Carries**

3
4 **Paralez:** Can it be assumed that minor changes constitute 50% or less,
5 and major would be more than 50%?
6

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

10
11 **Paralez:** *Asks that wording be clarified to reflect this*

12
13 **11:34:55**
14

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

18
19 **Gustavson:** It appears that all decisions are resolved by the county.
20 Where does the Manchester Downtown Committee come in?
21

22 **Fletcher:** *They are not officially recognized by the County, although Staff does*
23 *give them consideration from an advisory perspective.*
24

25 **Gustavson:** They did not define the character of Manchester in this
26 document
27

28 **Sommerhauser:** The Introduction has discussion of character, which has
29 not been voted on yet
30

31 **Chair Taylor:** ready to vote on Chapter 2
32

33 **11:38:40**
34

35 **The VOTE:**
36 **Unanimous**
37 **Motion Carries**
38

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

42
43 **Sommerhauser:** *References several grammatical and passive wording*
44 *changes.*
45

1 **Sommerhauser:** On page 10, under Section B. you have the same thing
2 listed under Guidelines and Standards. Need to choose one or the other
3 to make it either suggested or mandatory.
4

5 **11:41:29**
6

7 **Fletcher:** Will re-word to list as a Standard, making it mandatory
8

9 **Gustavson:** *Questions this issue since you cannot build this corner lot of*
10 *South Colchester and Mann. There is not enough real estate to*
11 *accommodate it.*
12

13 **Sommerhauser:** There are other corner lots in Manchester
14

15 **Gustavson:** The streets are too close together in this area at the central
16 intersection and you cannot build there.
17

18 **Fletcher:** Based on this conversation previously, a paragraph was specifically
19 added to address cases where it is not possible to build and there are variances
20 provided for this point
21

22 **Sommerhauser:** Clarifies that under Chapter 3, Corner Lots there will be
23 Standards only and no Guidelines
24

25 **Sommerhauser, Taylor:** *Clarification that motions to approve each*
26 *section include the questions and changes as answered and clarified in*
27 *each discussion.*
28

29 **Paralez:** Drawing in Section II.A needs to be corrected as the drawing
30 notes 25 feet, and text states 20 feet.
31

32 **Fletcher:** *Will be corrected to reflect 20 feet in text and drawing.*
33

34 **The VOTE:**

35 **Yes: 7**

36 **Opposed: 1**

37 **Motion Carries**
38

39 **11:44:39**
40

41 **A motion was made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by**
42 **Commissioner Paralez to approve Chapter 4 with noted changes.**
43

44 **Jenniges:** **On Page 13**, Chapter 4 Section III.A.7 #7 states that parking
45 shall not be located between a building and the street frontage, how does
46 this apply to current parking?

1
2 **Fletcher, Jenniges:** *This doesn't apply to current; however, if current buildings*
3 *are removed, on street parking will no longer be allowed unless a variance is*
4 *applied for.*

5
6 **Jenniges, Gustavson:** *Concerned that this does not make commercial*
7 *sense due to limited land and as most business owners want parking in*
8 *front of their building, references Sedgwick Businesses as example. #12*
9 *says parking "may be permitted in front of". Believes these issues of*
10 *parking should be reworked*

11
12 **11:48:22**

13
14 **An amended motion was made to approve Chapter 4 with the removal of**
15 **Section III.A.7, 10, and 12 by Commissioner Jenniges and seconded by**
16 **Commissioner Gustavson.**

17
18 **Jenniges:** *This zoning and Standard eliminates the two things that signify*
19 *success or failure for a business, visible parking and visible signage.*

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

27
28 **Depee:** *By eliminating these issues, it gives the developer the flexibility.*
29 *A mandatory standard like this takes away the options of a business*
30 *owner or developer.*

31
32 **Discussion continues regarding the views expressed by developers versus**
33 **the views expressed by the community in relation to parking standards**

34
35 **12:05:05**

36
37 **The VOTE:**

38 **Yes: 4**

39 **No: 4**

40 **Tied – Motion fails**

41
42 **12:05:42**

43
44 **An amended motion was made by Commissioner Jenniges and seconded**
45 **by Commissioner Gustavson to move Section III.A.7, 10, and 12 to Section**
46 **III.B. (page 14) under Guidelines**

1 **Nevins, Foritano:** *Changing this Standard to a Guideline doesn't*
2 *accomplish anything as it takes away the actual control in regards to the*
3 *Character of Manchester.*

4
5 **Gustavson:** *Character not referenced in this document and no public*
6 *comment relating to this information*

7
8 **Paralez:** Section II allows for on-street parking

9
10 **12:08:24**

11
12 **The VOTE:**

13 **Yes: 4**

14 **No: 4**

15 **Tied – Motion fails**

16
17 **Chair Taylor:** Moving back to the original motion to approve Chapter 4.

18
19 **Sommerhauser:** *Makes several corrections on page 11; Section II.A.1,*
20 *the last sentence should be stricken; Section II.A.3 includes a permissive*
21 *word; Section II.A.4 references a low volume street – is this defined?*

22
23 ***Discussion continues regarding which streets would qualify as low-volume***
24 ***streets***

25
26 **12:11:20**

27
28 **Sommerhauser:** *Changes needed referencing: permissive words listed*
29 *in Standards Section III.A.1 (page 12) and Section V.A.1.a (page 15);*
30 *Duplication in Standards and Guidelines in Sections III.A.1 and III.B (page*
31 *12).; Section V.A.1.a.(page 15) permissive word in Standards;*
32 *Inconsistency in Section V.A.8 (page 16) it is stated that plants shall*
33 *provide clear views, everywhere else lists 70% - this should be changed to*
34 *show 70%*

35
36 **Paralez:** Also in Section V.A.9 (page 16), change “employ” to “use”

37
38 **12:13:55**

39
40 **The VOTE:**

41 **Yes: 6**

42 **No: 2**

43 **Motion Carries**

44

1 **A motion was made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by**
2 **Commissioner Gustavson to eliminate Chapter 5 from the Manchester**
3 **Design Standards**

4
5 *Discussion regarding the business owner's right to determine how to build*
6 *and the community's wishes to improve its appearance.*

7
8 **12:16:30**
9

10 **Gustavson, Sommerhauser:** A picture in Chapter 5 (page 17) has a
11 caption that references "Northwest" character, which is not referenced
12 anywhere else in this document?
13

14 **Foritano:** The Supreme Court states that Manchester as a community is
15 allowed to define what standards are acceptable and the business owner
16 can evaluate the standards and then make the determination to build or
17 not
18

19 **Chair Taylor:** Question to Staff, if Chapter 5 is eliminated, will all height
20 standards be eliminated?
21

22 **12:21:27**
23

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

28
29 **Commissioner Taylor withdraws his amended motion and is seconded by**
30 **Commissioner Jenniges**
31

32 **12:23:57**
33

34 **A replacement motion is made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by**
35 **Commissioner Jenniges to condense the contents of Chapter 5 to contain**
36 **only the Building Heights and View Protection and Standards section**
37

38 *Discussion continues regarding the business owner's right to determine*
39 *how to build and the community's wishes to improve its appearance.*
40

41 **The VOTE:**

42 **Yes: 4**

43 **No: 4**

44 **Tie - Motion Fails**
45

1 **A motion by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by**
2 **Commissioner Nevins was made to approve Chapter 5 with suggested**
3 **modifications as referenced by Commissioner Sommerhauser**
4

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

10
11 **12:31:58**

12
13 **The VOTE:**

14 **Yes: 6**

15 **No: 2**

16 **Motion Carries**

17
18 **A motion was made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by**
19 **Commissioner Foritano to accept Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the**
20 **Manchester Design Standards with modifications.**

21
22 **12:33:30**

23
24 **Sommerhauser:** Correct Chapter 7 Section I.A.10 (page 29) to say signs
25 must be down within 14 days of an election to conform to the Kitsap
26 County political sign ordinance.

27
28 **Paralez, Fletcher:** Clarification that irrigation plan refers to sprinkler
29 systems, not drainage.

30
31 ***Discussion regarding whether stormwater and appropriate provisions are***
32 ***contained in this document***

33
34 **12:35:41**

35
36 **The VOTE:**

37 **Unanimous**

38 **Motion carries**

39
40 **A motion is made by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by**
41 **Commissioner Foritano to approve the Introduction section of the**
42 **Manchester Design Standards as written**

43
44 **Gustavson:** There is no one descriptive word on these pages that says
45 what this character is. There is nothing that describes it as a word or pair
46 of words.

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

Sommerhauser: 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

\

12:47:07

1
2
3 **Diener:** We have discussed this before and made a commitment to
4 communities and boards to allow for evening meetings when public is
5 highly interested, Keyport as an example, if we move toward evening
6 meetings DCD will have to give consideration to the major impact a change
7 like this will have.

8
9 **Chair Taylor:** *By discussing and speaking to this issue, we are sending a*
10 *message to the public that we do consider them and their interests to be a*
11 *priority in these dealings and decisions*

12
13 **The VOTE:**

14 **Yes: 1**

15 **No: 7**

16 **Motion Fails**

17
18 ***Discussion that this meeting was not listed in the Civic Calendar section of***
19 ***the newspaper, although Planning Commission meetings usually are. This***
20 ***will be remedied.***

21
22 12:48:41

23
24 **Depee:** Recommend that this recent Moratorium by the Board of County
25 Commissioners was a surprise to the community as a whole and all who
26 are involved in citizen's boards and groups should be encouraged to
27 address and hear their concerns

28
29 **A motion is made by Commissioner Gustavson and seconded by**
30 **Commissioner Depee to adjourn.**

31
32 **The VOTE:**

33 **Unanimous**

34 **The motion carries**

35
36 ***Meeting adjourned 12:49:36***

37
38
39 **EXHIBITS**

40 **A. BLR**

41 **B. 2007 Proposed Site Specifics**

42 **C. Manchester Design Standards**

1 MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2007.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

John Taylor, Chair

Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Secretary