

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

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

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

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

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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, Lou Foritano, Jim Sommerhauser and Dean Jenniges. Staff present: Eric Baker, Katrina Knutson, Scott Diener, Philip Fletcher, and Planning Commission Secretary Amanda Walston

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

9:05:07

39
40
41
42
43
44
45

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

B. Approval of Meeting Minutes of September 25, 2007

Chair Taylor: Inquires to see if a mailing was received at fellow Commissioners' home addresses.

9:06:26

A motion is made by Commissioner Gustavson and seconded by Commissioner Jenniges to reject the minutes from the September 25, 2007 meeting.

Gustavson: Lists examples of specific questions that were asked and answered in discussion, but the answers are not reflected in the minutes. Would like these answers added to the minutes is to allow the Board of County Commissioners to see the Planning Commission's concerns.

Examples: Sommerhauser's question on page 177, line 4; Jenniges' question on page 178, line 20; Gustavson's question on page 178 line 28; Sommerhauser's question on page 187, line 11; Gustavson's questions (or the intent of the questions) on pg 189 lines 9 and 15. In the case of these questions (on pg 189), the concern is not that you can't build on the property, but that the property is too narrow to accommodate a building and parking in the way that the parking is mandated. The commissioners

1 *need to see this question brought forth. The concern is that property*
2 *owners are being taken out of the ability to build.*

3
4 *Page 189 line 23 has a grammatical error - no should be not. These are*
5 *the reasons I object to the minutes and would like to see a correction*
6 *come back through.*

7
8 **9:08:55**

9
10 **Taylor:** Any additional comments while we wait for Scott Diener to come
11 back in?

12
13 **9:09:25**

14
15 **Jenniges:** *Minutes may have been reduced based on our prior request*
16 *that minutes be shortened, but I agree with Commissioner Gustavson*

17
18 **Sommerhauser:** *Answers are reflected for some questions and not*
19 *others, but not consistently. Asks if Gustavson will table the question.*

20
21 **Gustavson:** *Believes this is a secretarial issue, not staff. We can just*
22 *table the motion and when the corrections are brought to the next meeting*
23 *we can address them.*

24
25 **Taylor:** *Wants to make sure staff (i.e. Scott Diener) understands the issue*
26 *so necessary steps can be taken to correct them.*

27
28 **A motion is made by Commissioner Gustavson and seconded by**
29 **Commissioner Sommerhauser to table the motion to reject the meeting**
30 **minutes from September 25th until Scott Diener returns.**

31
32 **The Motion is tabled.**

33
34 **9:11:35**

35
36 **C. Director Update – Larry Keeton, Director, DCD**

37
38 **Taylor:** Not seeing the Director, we will move on.

39
40
41 **D. Work Study: 2007 Phase II Code Development: Eric Baker, Special**
42 **Projects Manager, Office of the Board of County Commissioners**

43
44 **Baker:** This is associated w/proposed 2007 Code Development Cycle presented
45 and sent to the Planning Commission in August of this year. Title 16, 17, 18 and
46 table indicating where substantive changes can be found.

1
2 **Foritano:** *When sending information – please index or tab this kind of*
3 *information.*
4

5 **9:12:58**
6

7 **Baker:** *Throughout this year, a number of issues were identified by the Planning*
8 *Commission as likely to be changed or commented on. Additional preliminary*
9 *information and input was gathered from the Planning Commission, staff,*
10 *stakeholders and various Directors in departments throughout the County and*
11 *incorporated into the Public Draft you are reviewing. The purpose today is to*
12 *have a discussion on the plan and changed or unchanged text. To facilitate this*
13 *we will review a presentation that goes over lot patterns and what these different*
14 *forms of development look like, which has been a frequent question by the*
15 *reviewing bodies.*

16
17 **9:15:23**
18

19 **Taylor:** *Clarifies document is dated 8/15/07. Would like Baker to*
20 *complete his presentation before taking questions from Commissioners.*
21

22 **Baker:** *A majority of the changes being championed this year are associated*
23 *with proposed subdivision regulations either platting or performance based*
24 *developments.*
25

26 *Generally platting standards are governed by RCW and broken up into minimum*
27 *lot requirements for the zone, often including only roadways, stormwater ponds,*
28 *the lots themselves and critical area protections. Historically there has not been*
29 *direct guidance per the code in regards to features such as parking, active*
30 *recreational activity and sidewalks. Statements from the Hearings Examiner*
31 *have been made referencing public health and welfare and have required these*
32 *features, but provided no guidance.*
33

34 *Performance based Development differs from platting. If you can't meet*
35 *minimum lot requirements you can condense the lot size into smaller chunks for*
36 *performance based development while leaving areas aside for open space,*
37 *active recreational opportunities and parking. This is often utilized to deal with*
38 *topographic constraints, predominantly critical areas. This kind of development*
39 *is used to move higher densities into a smaller geographic area (references*
40 *picture). The Comprehensive Plan encourages this (Performance-based*
41 *Development) kind of higher density in our Urban Growth Areas to maximize the*
42 *public expense of providing Capital Facilities infrastructure such as sewers,*
43 *roads, etc. by amortizing the cost out over the most number of lots.*
44
45
46

1 **9:19:43**

2
3 **Baker:** *We are determining what the minimum Lot area & dimensions should be*
4 *for the Urban Low Zone. Current minimum lot size is 60 ft wide by 60 deep,*
5 *which works well for lower densities (5-6 dwelling units per acre) but is almost*
6 *impossible to use for critical areas. Issues we are looking at include: Building*
7 *Setbacks, Sidewalks, Parking, Inclusion of Recreational and Open Space Area.*

8
9 *Historic Urban Development is defined as 1/3 acre or greater in size, mainly*
10 *served by septic systems. Houses take up majority of the lot size, yards are*
11 *larger. Homes are significantly further back than 20 ft. from roadway. Capital*
12 *Facilities element is more expensive to developers and in turn the public entity,*
13 *due to having fewer homes to spread the cost between.*

14
15 **9:24:26**

16
17 **Baker:** *Since GMA adoption we are seeing an increase in 60 ft lot sizes (4-6*
18 *units per acre), which do meet the lower end of GMA standards for Urban*
19 *Densities. Capital Facilities element is less costly. Homes are closer together,*
20 *more uniform appearance in common subdivision style. (Blueberry Meadow*
21 *development referenced). This density is challenging to provide sewer to the*
22 *some of our UGA's.*

23
24 **9:26:39**

25
26 **Baker:** *The Draft proposes allowing 40 ft lot sizes (7 – 9 units an acre), but does*
27 *not prohibit 60 ft lot sizes. Two-story construction used more often to provide*
28 *adequate square footage. Capital Facilities are less costly not just for sewer,*
29 *stormwater and roadways but also transit, etc. (Poppy Court in Ridgetop*
30 *development referenced)*

31
32
33 **9:29:25**

34
35 **Baker:** *Zero lot line housing: 20 – 35 foot lot widths, 35 is most common (9 – 10*
36 *units per acre). This is the densest available Single Family construction. One*
37 *side of road has house fronts, another road behind has the garage access.*
38 *Homes are roughly 6 feet apart.*

39
40 **9:31:12**

41
42 **Baker:** *Attached housing: Townhouse, condos, ownership apartments (9 – 13*
43 *units per acre). This maximizes the number of units that can be developed on a*
44 *piece of real estate. If using multiple level structures, the maximums go up.*
45 *Capital Facilities are much less expensive. Legal public parking is an issue for*
46 *(Mosher Creek Development referenced)*

1 **9:33: 20**

2
3 **Baker:** *Building Setbacks: 20 ft is standard and reduced setbacks of 10 feet are*
4 *allowed. Code changes are not prescriptive requirements, but open up options*
5 *that did not exist before except in performance based. A key request from*
6 *developers and staff is the desire to accomplish same results without additional*
7 *time, paperwork, etc.*

8
9 *Sidewalks: Large part of Kitsap County does not have any sidewalks. When*
10 *parking is not prohibited on either side of street, it takes away pedestrian access.*
11 *Sidewalks on one side are proposed for lower volume roads, sidewalks on both*
12 *sides are viewed as beneficial for higher volume roads. Per the code this*
13 *distinction and requirement is provided.*

14
15 **9:37:20**

16
17 **Baker:** *Parking: Previously established at 2.5 per unit, multi-family is 1.5 per unit*
18 *and garages are not necessarily included in the parking equation. Amount of*
19 *space between driveways for on-street parking is not sufficient to fit larger cars or*
20 *SUVs without blocking someone else's driveway. Set-aside parking areas are*
21 *another option; locations need to be close enough to encourage use and the*
22 *available amount must be enough to accommodate the volume needed. Rolled*
23 *curbs provide cheaper means of providing for storm water, Vertical curbs are*
24 *required and provide a more clear distinction between the roadway and the*
25 *sidewalks.*

26
27 **9:40:50**

28
29 **Baker:** *Recreational areas: Usually assumed as tot lots or basketball courts, but*
30 *can also be a simple grassy open area. If these are located on very steep*
31 *slopes, difficult to access and not maintained, they are not effective for their*
32 *intended purposes.*

33
34 *Passive recreation areas: Can include trails, loops, etc. that are set apart from*
35 *main roadway. Allows for additional amenities while still adhering to Critical area*
36 *regulations and included as open space of a development. Provides greenery in*
37 *the development while allowing you to concentrate development in other areas.*
38 *(Mosher creek and buffer referenced)*

39
40 **9:44:45**

41
42 **Depee:** Is there a matrix showing the remedies recommended?

43
44 **Baker:** Yes, each item shown appears on the table provided. The far right
45 column shows the section location for specific changes. Any questions please
46 direct to Eric Baker or Angie Silva

1
2 **Depee:** *Doesn't believe the location of tot lots are as big an issue as the*
3 *building standards required for it. Usually the least usable land will be*
4 *used and made to meet the requirements on paper. Would like to see*
5 *specifications in the code that say, for example, that 80% of the land used*
6 *for lot that needs to be leveled to alleviate the issue of slope as you*
7 *mentioned. Parking will allow backing out on a private road?*
8

9 **Baker:** Will allow back-out parking on low-volume public roadways. New
10 designation for very-low volume roadways (roughly 400 trips or less) has been
11 created in the standards. Minor local roads and cul-de-sacs will allow back-out
12 and angled parking on public as well as private roads.
13

14 **Depee:** Are sidewalks proposed on both sides?
15

16 **Baker:** For arterials and collectors. Low volume roadways will be one side.
17

18 **9:47:25**
19

20 **Coppola:** Regarding supplemental set-aside parking. Can these be
21 avoided by using bigger driveways instead? Can tot lots also be avoided
22 by having bigger backyards? These would also make homes more
23 desirable.
24

25 **Baker:** *60 ft lots do allow for these provisions and nothing prohibits this, it is*
26 *builder/developer coordination. Nothing in the code discourages that, but once*
27 *you get down to 40 ft lots, there isn't any additional room beyond the 25 ft*
28 *driveway. The denser you are, the more you will need to accommodate*
29 *supplemental parking – otherwise you will have a congested roadway. The*
30 *answer is yes, when dealing with 4-6 units per acre, but if the density goes any*
31 *higher, supplemental parking needs to be addressed.*
32

33 **9:49:44**
34

35 **Coppola:** If quality of life is an objective, if we start with this kind of
36 housing that will deteriorate over time, we are shooting ourselves in the
37 foot for long term quality of life.
38

39 **Baker:** That's why the code provides these options
40

41 **Coppola:** *Disagrees that we should allow the option to create a ghetto.*
42

43 **Baker:** *We are not trying to create ghetto home with 40 foot lots, but to allow for*
44 *affordable housing.*
45

46 **9:50:45**

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

Foritano: *With this language encouraging developers to use creativity, have you considered mandatory disclosure to potential homeowners looking at model homes that parking may not be a required element in these new developments?*

Baker: *Generally this information is located in every plat documents. We can make exact conditions in Title 16 making these more explicit in that the final conditions are located in a discreet document or even on the face of the plat.*

9:52:10

Jenniges: *This information is normally included in a covenant for the area.*

Foritano: *Covenants often contain a great deal of fine print. Likes idea of discreet bolded document that clearly shows what the final conditions will be.*

Baker: *These kinds of restrictions and conditions should be illustrated on roadway at completion of the first phase, not the completion of the entire project.*

9:53:15

Paralez: *What kinds of incentives are designed in the process to promote the use of low impact development in the 40 ft lots, etc?*

Baker: *When talking about low imp development, we are talking about design characteristics. Some examples are the ability to go with smaller road widths and impervious surfaces. Some things that work against this are the requirements for sidewalks and curbs and gutter, stormwater codes/ponds sizing.*

Paralez: *Can we process permits faster, work better with developers?*

Baker: *No*

9:54:50

Gustavson: *50 yrs ago, major road building stopped. We've added 100k people since then and are looking to add another 150k with no plan from county on how to provide additional access. These kinds of developments are located in every area. We need to see something from staff for big-picture plan for roads in this county. Developers are not following model of 50 years ago in which buyer buys lot and builds own house to suit. Now multi-acre parcels are being bought by developers and motivated by profit to be made as the development is built out. With so few constraints*

1 **10:04:27**

2
3 **Jenniges:** *Most or all the amenities that seem to be requirements are not*
4 *used. Kids still walk in the streets (reference to Esquire Hills) even though*
5 *sidewalks are there. Part of this is that people are still parking on*
6 *sidewalks. We need to look at the location of these 40 foot lots and how*
7 *they contrast. (John Carlson just before Esquire Hills referenced) You see*
8 *\$500k homes on one side of the development, and the other side takes*
9 *you to a little road that runs back to a bunch of cracker boxes with no*
10 *parking and a playground that is overgrown, wet and useless. Some*
11 *neighborhoods have everything dictated to them by covenants*
12 *(McCormick Woods referenced). Flexibility is good, but we need to look at*
13 *what is being done with these 40 foot lots.*

14
15 **10:07:40**

16
17 **Taylor:** *Last time I was in Mosher Creek, vehicles were everywhere,*
18 *sidewalks, yards, etc. Your picture does not show that. What has*
19 *changed?*

20
21 **Baker:** *Fire lane has helped, also these pictures were taken during the day, so*
22 *many may be at work still. Pictures are not illustrations of perfect examples, as*
23 *there is an extreme parking problem in the county. Parking is difficult because*
24 *you don't necessarily want to specify that 4 parking spaces are required for every*
25 *home right now, you want to go with something more middle of the road in hopes*
26 *that 10 years from now it won't be needed as more changes come into play, such*
27 *as more roadways, etc.*

28
29 **10:09:20**

30
31 **Taylor:** *Smaller developments (Fairgrounds Road development*
32 *referenced) with small lots also have a huge parking issue.*

33
34 **Baker:** *Set aside parking is very important for these developments. Making*
35 *streets public vs. private may help*

36
37 **Taylor:** *Thought the public didn't want the responsibility of these roads*
38 *and the maintenance.*

39
40 **Baker:** *With the current budget crunch, the minor cost savings is not as big an*
41 *issue. These roads really should be made public instead of maintained by*
42 *individual homeowners' associations. Public roads also allow interconnectivity*
43 *between plats. Changing road standards is big boon to code development and*
44 *achieving these higher densities.*

1 **10:10:53**

2
3 **Taylor:** *Shall we continue with the second round?*

4
5 **Sommerhauser:** *Yes comments are needed in order for staff to respond*

6
7 **Coppola:** *Clarifies the issue of affordability and quality of living. A certain*
8 *amount of land is available in a plat whether you put the parking at the*
9 *houses or in a separate lot. Since you are using the same amount of dirt,*
10 *it is more desirable to have the parking available around the homes*
11 *themselves. Average home price in Port Orchard, traditionally the lowest*
12 *in the county, is \$262k and is not necessarily affordable as a starter home*
13 *for the average citizen. If we can't have affordable, let's at least have*
14 *desirable.*

15
16 **10:12:55**

17
18 **Foritano:** *Re-enforce the need to seriously look at infrastructure planning*
19 *related to transportation. There has been no discussion on the movement*
20 *of population between the limited major centers and only a handful of*
21 *roadways exist. There is no open discussion of public transportation, no*
22 *encouragement to create more accessible options to ferry systems and*
23 *other forms of transport. We need a county-wide effort to open up the*
24 *serious need for discussion to include public transportation. It may be*
25 *controversial, but it is only this way until they can be shown that they can*
26 *get out of their cars and get to where they need to go using other effective*
27 *options and that alternative measures can be made a reality.*

28
29 **10:14:39**

30
31 **Jenniges:** *Doesn't believe public transportation is the answer as long as*
32 *cars are an option, not until people are forced to get out of their cars. We*
33 *still need to look at the road and highway aspect now. In downtown*
34 *Bremerton, people's homes and yards were cut in half when they had to*
35 *widen major roadways. Need to look at these options sooner rather than*
36 *later.*

37
38 **10:16:07**

39
40 **Depee:** *Raises the point that the example shown at the start of the*
41 *presentation would be considered a non-conforming lot by these*
42 *standards.*

43
44 **Gustavson:** *Reads a quote that 80% of the world's population lives in*
45 *urban areas that occupy 1 % of the land mass.*

46

1 **10:17:20**

2
3 **Sommerhauser:** *This is our 3rd update and request for feedback, what is*
4 *the timeline to look at when a product will be available.*

5
6 **Baker:** *Looking for final comments between now and end of next week. You*
7 *should see a new release by the end of October with potential Planning*
8 *Commission meetings and a Public Hearing in November.*

9
10 **10:18:33**

11
12 **Coppola:** *Sound Transit illustrates that we can build roads faster and*
13 *cheaper than transit systems. Gives an example in Portland where it took*
14 *longer to get to one point using mass transit than it took others to drive*
15 *there.*

16
17 **Foritano:** *States that most of the comments are made from the viewpoint*
18 *of towns with populations of less than 10k.*

19
20 **10:19:31**

21
22 **Taylor:** *Thanks Mr. Baker for his presentation, and will be bringing up*
23 *sewer issues again relating to this code development.*

24 **10:21:03**

25
26 **A motion is made by Commissioner Gustavson and seconded by**
27 **Commissioner Jenniges to remove the motion concerning the minutes of**
28 **September 25th from the table**

29
30 **The VOTE:**
31 **Unanimous**

32
33 **Taylor:** *Main motion to reject the minutes from September 25th is back on*
34 *floor. For the benefit of staff (Scott Diener) not in the room during the*
35 *original motion, will Commissioner Gustavson please briefly re-state it.*

36
37 **10:22:23**

38
39 **Gustavson:** *Secretary has the specific examples where a number of*
40 *direct questions asked of staff, where answers were provided in*
41 *discussion, and answers were not reflected in the minutes. Asks that the*
42 *answers be provided in a corrected set of minutes. If there is a question*
43 *asked by the Commission, the answer by staff should be reflected in the*
44 *minutes.*

1 **10:23:53**

2
3 **Diener:** *Clarifies that the specific areas and changes were given to the secretary.*
4 *Requests the Planning Commission try to submit these corrections prior to the*
5 *meeting at which they are presented for approval.*

6
7 **Sommerhauser:** *Asks that on page 187, a comment by Commissioner*
8 *Sommerhauser requesting a legal opinion states that it is made by a*
9 *member of the public, would like this corrected to state that the request is*
10 *made by an appointed official and member of the Planning Commission.*

11
12 **Diener:** *Discussion on the length of the previous minutes (over 30 pages) and*
13 *the effort being made to reduce and condense minutes and make them more*
14 *likely to be read by the Board of County Commissioners.*

15
16 **Gustavson:** *Believes that these particular questions and examples are*
17 *very salient.*

18
19 **10:25:39**

20
21 **Foritano:** *Appreciates the direction that the minutes are taking and*
22 *believes it was a good summary of the discussion that took place, these*
23 *specific questions and answers aside*

24
25
26 **10:26:08**

27
28 **Taylor:** *Reiterates importance of notifying staff or secretary when we*
29 *review minutes for changes prior to the meeting where they are presented*
30 *for approval.*

31
32 **10:27:14**

33
34 **Taylor, Diener:** *Point of Order all motions must be made in the affirmative*

35
36 **Diener, Commissioners:** *Discussion on how best to clear the motion and*
37 *get the corrections to the minutes made. Decision made to withdraw the*
38 *motion and continue the meeting minutes to the next meeting.*

39
40 **10:28:38**

41
42 **Gustavson:** *Withdraws the motion to reject the minutes, with the*
43 *understanding that a corrected version will be presented at the next*
44 *meeting.*

1 10:28:48

2
3 **Coppola, Diener, Jenniges:** *Discussion regarding the Legal Department and*
4 *who they advise, meet with and provide opinion and information to*
5 *Commissioners request that staff- bring back clarification on this point.*
6

7 10:29:45

8
9 Break

10
11 10:43:54

12
13
14 **Taylor:** *Call meeting back to order. Asks the Secretary to mail hard*
15 *copies of the BLR to all commissioners as not everyone received it.*
16

17 **Discussion regarding when to send hard copies to Commissioners and it is**
18 **determined that anything over 30 pages should be printed and mailed.**
19

20 10:46:30

21
22 **E. Work Study: 2007 Manchester Community Plan Update: Katrina N.**
23 **Knutson, Associate Planner, DCD**
24

25 **Knutson:** *States that this presentation will reference the original plan (2002) and*
26 *the updated/current plan (2007). A tracked changes version will be mailed to*
27 *Commissioners. Comments recently received from Commissioners Paralez,*
28 *Nevins and Jenniges, as well as citizen comments will be incorporated and*
29 *distributed in the next version*
30

31 *Original Plan was adopted 3/18/02 through a good, well-documented process.*
32 *During this process, determinations were made regarding LAMIRD outer*
33 *boundary, view protection, non-conform lot. The new update does not make any*
34 *major changes to the 2002 plan.*
35

36 10:49:48

37
38 **Knutson:** *Design Standards will be added into the Community Plan update as*
39 *Appendix A upon adoption. The Plan is divided into chapters based on the*
40 *groups formed for each category. These groups averaged 45 community*
41 *members with updates provided via mailing lists and websites. It should be*
42 *noted that Natural Resources planners worked on Natural and Public zones, as*
43 *there were no citizens or groups formed for these sections. Goals and policies*
44 *were updated and language that was difficult to understand was clarified.*
45
46

1 **10:53:00**

2
3 **Knutson:** *Reviews history of Manchester and community. This Plan is a*
4 *blueprint for future decisions on zoning, natural resources, parks, infrastructure,*
5 *etc. In 1997 Washington State Legislature adopted changes to the Growth*
6 *Management Act defining rural character, rural development and rural services*
7 *under RCW 36.70A.070 Subsection 5 and LAMIRDs were also defined in this*
8 *subsection, which applies to Manchester.*

9
10 *Sign-In sheets and meeting summaries will be provided prior to the public*
11 *hearing to show that Public Participation requirements were met. (References*
12 *maps showing the Building Footprints prior to 1990 and Manchester's historic*
13 *buildings.) Copies of maps (Appendix D) will also be mailed to Commissioners*
14 *that are more clear and readable.*

15
16 **Gustavson, Knutson:** *Clarification that purple areas on the maps shown*
17 *are Public Areas and gold areas are historic buildings.*

18
19 **10:56:13**

20
21 **Knutson:** *Reviews zoning and platting as listed in the 2002 Plan adoption.*
22 *Zoning. Manchester Village Residential contains standard lot sizes at ¼ acre lots*
23 *or 10,890 sq ft. and the Plan set these as the minimum lot sizes. Manchester*
24 *Village Low Residential contains standard lot sizes at ½ acre or 21,780 sq ft., but*
25 *to acknowledge the smaller plats within the zone the 2002 plan set minimum*
26 *developable lots to ¼ acre to allow residents to develop on their smaller lots.*
27 *The new plan does not propose to change this.*

28
29 **10:58:50**

30
31 **Knutson:** *Eric Baker clarified the Non-Conforming Lot language of the 2002 plan*
32 *which was adopted via the 10 yr plan. For this plan, legal made a few additional*
33 *clarifications, but no substantial changes are proposed*

34
35 *This Plan does encourage cluster development due to lack of open space and for*
36 *stormwater and wildlife reasons. Developers must leave 40% open space and*
37 *leave an extra lot for every 5 lots.*

38
39 *Manchester Village Commercial is consistent and also relies heavily on the*
40 *design standards. A parking section was added; as parking is major concern in*
41 *Manchester. Parking is scarce on weekdays and exacerbated further on the*
42 *weekends when visitors come in. A large amount of parking at the port is*
43 *reserved for boat trailer parking and there is no parking at Pomeroy Park, which*
44 *is the only park with beach access parks. We are recommending that parking be*
45 *addressed by comprehensive parking study in coordination with Public Works*
46 *and the Port.*

1
2 **Commissioner Gustavson questions the timeframe for this parking issue**
3 **being addressed, Chair Taylor asks to hold questions until the end of the**
4 **presentation.**

5
6 **11:02:45**
7

8 **Knutson:** *No changes are proposed to View Protection. Buildable Areas are*
9 *defined on page 13 as adopted through the 10 year update. Clarifies what can*
10 *be developed beyond 35 feet. (As referenced by the View Protection Overlay*
11 *and View Protection Map.) The 2002 Plan includes Vegetation restrictions that*
12 *states any set of three or more trees cannot be maintained in a way that impacts*
13 *views. This plan does not propose any changes to this restriction.*

14
15 **11:04:38**
16

17 **Knutson:** *The Natural Systems chapter is consistent with Kitsap County's*
18 *Critical Areas Ordinance, includes goals and policies to address wetlands,*
19 *geologically hazardous areas, fish and wildlife habitat and conservation areas.*
20 *All of Manchester's water comes from aquifer recharge areas and this plan does*
21 *have goals to limit groundwater pollution from agriculture, failing septic tanks and*
22 *such. GIS working on a frequently flooded areas map, and will be included in the*
23 *plan. Air Quality is dependent on Puget Sound Clean Air agencies. Questions*
24 *should be directed to Kitsap County Fire Marshall's office. (Building Limitation,*
25 *Shoreline Master Plan maps referenced)*

26
27 **11:06:24**
28

29 **Knutson:** *Jim Rogers from Public Works conducted a traffic analysis on the main*
30 *roads and all roads received an "A" grade for level of service standards with the*
31 *exception of Mile Hill west of California, which received a "D" grade. Analysis*
32 *results remained consistent when projected out to 2025. This Plan suggests*
33 *making Mile Hill a four-lane roadway.*

34
35 **11:09:15**
36

37 **Knutson:** *Manchester water district handles all water needs from 11 deep*
38 *aquifer wells and anticipates no problems now or in the future based on their*
39 *distribution and reserves*

40
41 *The sewer system is designed to serve up to 460K GPD. Based on capacity*
42 *analysis, if every lot were to hook up to sewer, we would still have adequate*
43 *sewer capacity.*

44
45 **Knutson:** *Page 32 of this plan lists current County imposed Stormwater*
46 *mitigation factors, however we have an impervious surface limit of 40% for*

Kitsap County Planning Commission –October 9, 2007, 2007

1 *residential properties greater than .51 acres and 50% for residential properties*
2 *less than .5 acres to decrease stormwater issues*

3
4 **11:11:40**

5
6 **Knutson:** *The plan encourages building a community center that will allow*
7 *housing for large groups such as meetings and cultural affairs, as currently most*
8 *are held in the Library which is very small.*

9
10 **11:12:45**

11
12 **Knutson:** *This Plan approves improvements to Pomeroy Park, which is the only*
13 *public beach access in Manchester. Colchester-Haida property is currently*
14 *owned by Public works, but has a community-built trail leading down to the*
15 *shoreline. Public Works has agreed that citizens can use and develop this area*
16 *as a park with a gravel trail and picnic benches until stormwater restrictions*
17 *dictate otherwise. Manchester State Park and SKSELL parks are there also.*

18
19 **11:15:15**

20
21 **Knutson:** *Contents of the Appendices to the plan are referenced.*

22
23 **11:16:50**

24
25 **Knutson:** *The community wanted Cluster Zoning removed. If open space*
26 *maintenance is poor, it can cause safety issues, and brings down property*
27 *values. A caveat draft with community requires a homeowners association that*
28 *funds maintenance of these open spaces.*

29
30 *Minimum Lot Size has been highly debated and will come up at Public Hearing.*
31 *In essence, the plan changes Manchester Village Residential zoning from 4 per*
32 *acre up to 5 per acre. Voting is split in community. Legal and UGA*
33 *considerations recommend ¼ acre lots.*

34
35 *Legal added some clarifying language to the Non-Conforming Lot section. Some*
36 *community members want this section removed*

37
38 **11:20:36**

39
40 **Knutson:** *Legal opinion regarding the expansion of LAMIRD boundaries is that if*
41 *changes are to be made, it will have to be proven that staff was in error when*
42 *they specified said boundaries. Changes of this nature have never been upheld*
43 *in Washington State. The next public hearing is scheduled for October 23rd as a*
44 *night meeting. Staff recommends beginning deliberations that night if time*
45 *permits.*

1 **11:22:50**

2
3 **Taylor:** *Asks if Commissioners have Appendices*

4
5 **Knutson:** *Will mail copies if needed.*

6
7 **11:24:00**

8
9 **Taylor:** *Would like maps be 11x17 in color, and would like a note bolded*
10 *on the Public sign-in sheets asking them to print their information.*
11 *Confirms that Manchester Finding of Fact does not requires a vote.*

12
13 **11:25:17**

14
15 **Gustavson:** *Questions inconsistency in the draft in a few areas and*
16 *specifically the height restrictions being 28 or 35 feet, but will provide*
17 *handwritten changes to staff.*

18
19 **Knutson:** *Height restrictions have been changed based on the Planning*
20 *Commission's vote on the Designer Standards. Newest version will show 28*
21 *feet. Legal opinion has confirmed this change is acceptable even though Design*
22 *Standards have not been officially adopted.*

23
24 **11:28:10**

25
26 **Sommerhauser:** Chapter 2.4.2, Height Restrictions make no mention of
27 stories in height. The community has repeatedly asked for 28 feet AND
28 story restrictions. Chapter 4.1.2.4 lists main roads, but are all other roads
29 in the LAMIRD low-volume roads? If not, then provide a list of all that are
30 not low volume road.

31
32 **Knutson:** *Will present these*

33
34 **Foritano:** Will this meeting be heavily "over-advertised"?

35
36 **11:29:00**

37
38 **Knutson:** Yes

39
40 **Jenniges:** Does this appear in the Port Orchard Independent?

41
42 **Knutson:** *Yes and an article may also be forthcoming.*

1 11:30:46

2
3 **Taylor, Diener:** *Confirm that the Director's Update will be continued to next*
4 *meeting.*

5
6 **Sommerhauser, Diener:** *Confirm that a re-organization update and new*
7 *chart will be given.*

8
9
10 **F. Briefing: Illahee Community Plan: James Weaver, Senior Planner,**
11 **DCD**

12
13
14 **Weaver:** *This project was begun as part of the 10 year plan. When moratorium*
15 *came into effect, staff was reallocated and Illahee has been shifted to 2008 due*
16 *to the moratorium.*

17
18 11:34:12

19
20 **Jenniges:** *Is staff reviewing their plans and working with citizens in*
21 *advance of County meetings?*

22
23 **Weaver:** *No formal comment or recommendation structure exists for updating*
24 *the community groups.*

25
26 11:35:48

27
28 **Jenniges:** *Would like to see if feedback can be organized in a way that*
29 *DCD expects and can use efficiently.*

30
31 **Weaver:** *We cannot provide this*

32
33 **Taylor:** *We need to move on*

34
35 11:37:30

36
37 **Jenniges:** *The community does not want to be a high density which*
38 *causes all these rural requests, so if you can quash that upfront it would*
39 *be useful.*

40
41 **Weaver:** *Many communities do not want to be urban at all, and many do.*
42 *Blending these aspects is part of our difficult job and is in its infancy and we will*
43 *continue to work diligently on them.*

1 **11:38:20**

2
3
4 **G. Deliberations: Site Specific Comprehensive Plan Amendments:**
5 **Philip Fletcher, Senior Planner, DCD**
6

7
8 **Fletcher:** *Notes were given Friday and this morning. (References key to various*
9 *zoning and purposes allowed and the response to Attorney Shattuck's memo.)*
10 *After each presentation, maps will be provided for orientation, and a brief*
11 *summary of site reports.*
12

13 **11:40:40**

14
15 **Discussion regarding what order to proceed in.**
16

17 **A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and is seconded by**
18 **Commissioner Gustavson to continue the Lindstrom site specific report to**
19 **November 13th meeting.**
20

21 **Fletcher:** *Document circulated yesterday summarizes Shattuck and staff*
22 *comments/arguments*
23

24 **11:44:12**

25
26 **The VOTE:**
27 **FOR: 5**
28 **AGAINST: 3**
29 **Motion Carries**
30

31 **11:44:35**

32
33 **Fletcher:** *Anderson Hill LLC request for rural protect to rural resident zone.*
34 *Summary of staff's recommendation for approval;*
35

36 **A motion is made by Commissioner Gustavson and seconded by**
37 **Commissioner Jenniges to approve the report.**
38

39 **11:27:08**

40
41 **Fletcher:** (Displays maps.)
42

43 **Coppola:** *Asks to see Critical 1 and Critical 2*
44

45 **Depee:** *What will this allow on the property?*
46

1 **Fletcher:** *This will essentially allow 15 acre lot to subdivide into (3) 5-acre lots,*
2 *but will be limited by rural residential rules*

3
4 **11:49:20**

5
6 **Sommerhauser:** *The Re Zoning Map alone puts me strongly against this*
7 *proposal. This piece of property has one boundary connecting to lower*
8 *zoning and 3 boundaries connecting to higher zones. This would open up*
9 *the entire area to criteria for up-zoning and allows all surrounding*
10 *properties to apply for up-zoning. Commissioner Nevins emailed and*
11 *asked to enter his comments: "If I was there, I would speak against the*
12 *site specific that removes rural protection zoning. The result of changes to*
13 *rural residential would increase lots in a rural area." It is unfortunate that*
14 *this citizen is caught in the middle, but if you allow one, you open up*
15 *having to allow the rest.*

16
17 **11:51:40**

18
19 **Depee:** *Appreciates this, but this is also an invisible line on the zoning. It*
20 *is not possible for the Comprehensive Plan to cover every circumstance*
21 *and the cartography should not have to reflect every single instance. I*
22 *don't agree that this is a disguise for down-zoning.*

23
24 **Jenniges:** *A lot of this was originally 2.5 acres. (References Sunset*
25 *Farms) which has been split up. The GMB itself considers 5 acre lots to*
26 *be rural. Feels limiting this to 15 acres does an injustice to every citizen,*
27 *and they are who we are here for.*

28
29 **Gustavson:** *Everything around is small parcels. This only adds 2 houses.*

30
31 **11:54:32**

32
33 **Fletcher:** *It is obvious on this map that the parcel looks like a thumb under the*
34 *Rural Protection zone. This was considered by staff and still recommended*
35 *because this property has a curved southern line linking up with and very directly*
36 *creating a functional part of rural residential area.*

37
38 **The Vote (To accept staff recommendation for approval of Anderson Hill)**

39 **For: 6**

40 **Against: 2**

41 **Motion carries**

42
43 **11:56:44**

44
45 **Commissioner Gustavson leaves**

46

1 **Sommerhauser:** *Gave copies of notice to title. And would like to move*
2 *that the Planning Commission recommends that Staff include Notice to*
3 *Title as part of their action on this rezone.*

4
5 **Commissioners would like to know what they would be seconding.**

6
7 **Sommerhauser:** *Notice to Title was originally required if any action was*
8 *submitted to the county for platting, building permits, etc. if you go to*
9 *Critical Area ordinance. This property has critical areas including a*
10 *recharge area, stream and slope. This should trigger notice to title.*

11
12 **Taylor:** *Code says that it has to have notice to title –as a result it will*
13 *require that it go in the title*

14
15 **Sommerhauser:** *It will only go in if he splits it. It should go in on the*
16 *rezone action.*

17
18 **Coppola:** *What area is covered by critical areas?*

19
20 **Fletcher:** *First are the aquifers (level 1 and 2.) Category 2 has fragile water*
21 *table and does not allow any industrial uses. Category 1 has restricted*
22 *wastewater disposal constraints.*

23
24 **Depee:** *Is that for residential also? This is strictly residential, why would*
25 *industrial uses apply?*

26
27 **Fletcher:** *It contains moderately steep slopes, but does not require SIPA reports,*
28 *so determined non-significant.*

29
30 **Coppola, Fletcher clarify that the stream buffer for this stream is 50 feet.**

31
32 **12:01:00**

33
34 **Sommerhauser:** *The list of all things answered in Scott's email to us are from*
35 *19.100.10 Applicability B. The last part reads: "for other permits leading to*
36 *development or alteration of land and rezones if not combined with another*
37 *development or permit C. says: Non project actions requiring but not limited to*
38 *rezones annexations and adoptions of lands and programs" If he wants to sub-*
39 *divide the area and give it to his children, they should know when they get the*
40 *property that there are critical areas*

41
42 **Depee:** *Guarantees that the building permit process will make this clear.*

43
44 **Sommerhauser:** *Reference Elzey/Smith application which also speaks*
45 *this issue.*

46

1 **Jenniges:** *Is there any reason why we can't continue this?*

2
3 **Depee:** *Elzey/Smith should be re-submitted as a map correction. Can we*
4 *take care of this in this way?*

5
6 **Fletcher:** *Suggests that the commissioner make a motion to that effect.*

7
8 **12:05:30**

9
10 **Depee, Fletcher:** *Discussion continues and determination made that Mr.*
11 *Fletcher will go back as the assigned planner and bring up this method of*
12 *Correction and ask them to decide.*

13
14 **12:07:18**

15
16 **Sommerhauser:** *You may assume a strong consensus from the*
17 *commission.*

18
19 **Taylor:** *The next 2 site specifics need to be moved forward. Can we*
20 *move through these quickly?*

21
22 **12:08:20**

23
24 **Fletcher:** *Cole requests to move from rural wooded to rural protection zoning.*
25 *Staff recommends approval.*

26
27 **A motion is made by Commissioner Foritano and is seconded by**
28 **Commissioner Jenniges to approve this request.**

29
30 **The VOTE:**
31 **Unanimous**
32 **The Motion Carries**

33
34 **12:11:27**

35
36 **Fletcher:** *Munro requests move from business park to business center zoning.*
37 *Staff recommends approval.*

38
39 **Coppola, Jenniges:** *Confirm location is behind Ferrell gas*

40
41 **Jenniges:** *Mr. Tucker's major concern is that any business put in there*
42 *will be handled poorly and is concerned about floods on his property and*
43 *into Chico creek. I understand these concerns, but also feel that these*
44 *can be addressed during the public hearings.*

1 **A motion is made by Commissioner Jenniges and seconded by**
2 **Commissioner Foritano to approve this request.**

3
4 **Sommerhauser:** *At the public hearing, it was noted that the stream*
5 *buffers should be 150 ft. This map doesn't show this.*

6
7 **Fletcher:** *One reason for recommendation is that environmental concerns,*
8 *particularly regarding streams, would be taken care of in building/subdivision*
9 *process. Uses are comparable for both zoning.*

10
11 **Taylor:** *Emphasizes that Chico creek is a major creek that did wash out*
12 *the bridge and encourages that once a permit is issued and machines are*
13 *on ground, DCD ensures contractors follow the rules so that downstream*
14 *land owners are protected.*

15
16 **The VOTE:**
17 **Unanimous**
18 **Motion carries**

19
20 **A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by**
21 **Commissioner Jenniges to continue the Elzey/Smith application to the**
22 **October 23rd Planning Commission meeting as an agenda item for quick**
23 **approval.**

24
25 **The VOTE:**
26 **Unanimous**
27 **Motion Carries**

28
29
30 **H. Adoption of Manchester Findings of Fact: Philip Fletcher, Senior**
31 **Planner, DCD**

32
33 **A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and is seconded by**
34 **Commissioner Jenniges to approve the Manchester Findings of Fact**

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

39
40 **12:21:00**

41
42 **A motion is made by Commissioner Jenniges and seconded by**
43 **Commissioner Depee to adjourn the meeting.**

44
45 **Time of adjournment: 12:23:32**
46

Kitsap County Planning Commission –October 9, 2007, 2007

- 1 EXHIBITS
- 2 A. Manchester Community Plan Update
- 3 B. 2007 Proposed Site Specifics

4
5
6
7

8 MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2007.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

John Taylor, Chair

Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Secretary