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

Members present: Robert Baglio, Mike Brown, Fred Depee, Tom Nevins, Lou Foritano, Linda Paralez, Carol Smiley and Jim Sommerhauser

Members absent: none

Staff present: Katrina Knutson, Heather Adams, Scott Diener, and Planning Commission Secretary Mary Seals

6:00:13

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

B. Adoption of Agenda

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Paralez to adopt the agenda as posted.

The Vote

Unanimous

The motion carries

6:06:47

C. Public Comments

D. Findings of Fact: Site Specifics (Yamamoto, McCormick/Sunnyslope, City of Port Orchard, Seabeck Developers, Palmer/Stokes/Campbell, Palmer/Stokes/Mullenix) – Katrina Knutson, Associate Planner, DCD

Knutson reviews the Findings of Facts.

A motion is made by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by Commissioner Sommerhauser to approve the Yamamoto, McCormick/Sunnyslope, and City of Port Orchard.

The vote

Unanimous

The motion
Knutson presents the Rural Density and Dimension Tables and Development Regulations Findings of Fact to correct with the Planning Commission recommended language changes.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Depee to approve the as revised.

The vote
Unanimous
The motion

6:11:05

Diener discusses the Planning Commission request to have staff make a more firm recommendation as regards to criteria.

6:15:00

E. Continuation of Deliberation and Recommendations: Site Specific Seabeck Developers – Heather Adams, Associate Planner, DCD

Adams reviews the Seabeck Developers application.

A motion is made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by Commissioner Baglio to approve the site specific application for Seabeck Developers.

Sommerhauser expresses concern about the applicant not being able to document a need for more commercial development. He asks what is still operating commercially within this area.

Nevins states that there is a about a 3,500 sq. ft. convenience store with a fair amount of traffic. There was also a real estate office and vacant space.

Depee states that there is a lot of population out there and if anyone is going to be snowed in it will be in the Seabeck arena. He states that the restaurant and gas station are heavily used. He points out that there was a new school built out there recently because of the population need. He’s for it because it’s pretty far out there to service the people out there.

6:21:34

Nevins states that people who live in rural area know what the weather is and how to deal with it. He believes that a lot of the traffic comes from other places; where the residents work, etc. He states that commercial establishments in that part of the county are sparse and he agrees that that it is a viable commercial space.

Baglio states that staff came up with mixed findings on items 3 and 4. The staff indicated that on item 4 that it is difficult to serve, but it’s not going to affect adjacent parcels. He points out that on item 3 and the main reason they have mixed finding is because there is a vacant lot next to it. He states that we don’t know why it is vacant. He states that the area really does serve the rural area out there.
Nevins states that he does tend to favor this one because it is quite a distance and it's not within 5 miles of an Urban Growth Area. He does not believe it is not going to impact the potential growth of an Urban Growth Area.

The vote
Yes: 7
No: 1
The motion carries.

6:26:06

F. Continuation of Deliberation and Recommendations: Site Specific
Palmer/Stokes/Mullenix – Heather Adams, Associate Planner, DCD

Adams reviews the Palmer/Stokes/Mullenix application. She states that the applicant has agreed to staff’s proposal for this property; for all rural industrial.

Nevins asks if the northern most property split zone occurred because of most recent boundary line adjustments.

Adams states that it is because of the condos being recorded.

Diener states that the property line goes to the center of the Right of Way.

Nevins asks why there is more property included in the condominium area.

Depee asks how the condominium process go over into the rural zoned property.

Diener states that as he understands it, the condominium subdivision process can readjust their lot lines doesn’t necessarily mean they can use the property as industrial.

Depee states that he is confused by the little kick out that is shown on one map on and shown on the other. He asks what parcel is the kick out part of or is it a stand alone as part of the condominium parcel 008.

Diener states that Depee is an older version. So the condominium altered the lot line.

When was the date of the boundary line adjustment or condominium?

Diener defers to the applicant.

William Palmer states that he’s not sure the precise date of the boundary line adjustment, but the condominium was done in the fall of 2008. The boundary line adjustment was prior to that.

6:31:55

A motion is made by Commissioner Nevins to approve staff’s recommendation regarding the Palmer/Stokes/Mullenix site specific application excluding the condominium bump out.
Nevins explains that his objection is because there is industrial property out there and there was a line that indicated what the industrial area was, but he is wary of this bump out because there was a boundary line adjustment, then the condo split later, then asking to have it all done industrial. He is very bothered by this. The reality is that we done pay much attention to boundary lines or zoning and it’s time to call it down.

Diener states that the reason for the bump out is because there are concrete, paved surfaces there; it will never be re-vegetated, it will never serve a practical purpose for the balance or the rural protection zone property. From staff’s perspective if you are to approve this it is practical to include this.

Depee states that it was unclear about what the bump out area is and he has come to the conclusion that it is all part of the legal lot in its totality. He states that Nevins is creating split zoning with the motion.

Diener states that the lot lines are legal. There is no use on the property currently. He states that if the Planning Commission were to approve the application that it includes the bump out as well.

No second is made to the motion.

Nevins withdraws his motion.

6:36:40

A motion is made by Commissioner Depee and seconded by Commissioner Brown to approve the application as is recommended by staff.

The vote
Yes: 7
No: 1
Them motion carries.

6:41:33

G.  Continuation of Deliberation and Recommendations: Site Specific
Palmer/Stokes/Campbell – Heather Adams, Associate Planner, DCD

Adams reviews the Palmer/Stoke/Campbell

A motion is made by Commissioner Nevins and seconded by Commissioner Sommerhauser to deny the Palmer/Stoke/Campbell site specific application.

Nevins states that it is within a couple miles of other commercial development, within 3 miles of an Urban Growth Area, and it represents expansion of a commercial piece that does not necessarily serve the rural population. He points out that a population that may have to pass that location probably has to pass other commercial areas and certainly is within striking distance of an Urban Growth Area. He doesn’t feel it’s justified.
Sommerhauser references the comments from DOT that have concerns about two of the sites at the intersections. The industrial to the south is an existing use, this is not an existing use. He agrees with all that Nevins said.

The vote
Yes: 4
No: 4
The motion fails.

Break: 6:44:42
Reconvene: 6:56:32

H. Findings of Fact: Site Specifics (Seabeck Developers, Palmer/Stokes/Campbell, Palmer/Stokes/ Mullenix) – Heather Adams, Associate Planner, DCD

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Foritano to approve Palmer/Stokes/ Mullenix Findings of Fact with staff recommendation for all industrial and agreed by the applicant.

The vote
Yes: 7
No: 1
The motion carries.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Foritano to approve Seabeck Developers and Palmer/Stokes/Campbell Findings of Fact as presented.

The vote
Yes: 7
No: 1
The motion carries.

7:01:17

I. Work Study: Shoreline Master Plan Inventory and Characterization – Patty Charnas, Environmental Programs Manager, DCD and Sue Donahue, Watershed Project Coordinator, DCD (Est. 45 min)

Charnas gives an overview of the first product from the SMP Update – the Shoreline Master Plan Inventory and Characterization.

Donahue discusses the parameters for the SMP update:
- the contents of the book
- Characterization Areas
- Marine Drift Cell Tables
- Freshwater Tables
- Shoreline Use Analysis
- Data Gaps
- Appendices
• Review and Comment Process
• Changes made to the initial draft
• SMP update Task Force and the Inventory and Characterization
• SMP Update Task Force and DCD Recommendations on the Inventory and Characterization

Discussion is held about what they are evaluating in the document.

J. For the Good of the Order: Chair Baglio

Time of Adjournment: 8:15:54

EXHIBITS
A. Letter from Bill Palmer regarding Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park
B. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Vicinity Map
C. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Existing Zoning Map
D. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Proposed Comp. Plan Map
E. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Site Plan
F. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – North Scale Map
G. Mullenix Industrial Properties – parcels within 1 mile of subject
H. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – 5 mile radius
I. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Aerial Photography
J. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Land Use
K. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Vacant Lands
L. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map Notice of Application postcard
M. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map Notice of Application – mailing list
N. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map Legal Notice
O. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Staff Recommended
P. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Proposed Zoning
Q. Stokes/Mullinex Industrial Park Map – Current Zoning
R. Stokes/Campbell – Legal Notice
S. Stokes/Campbell – Mailing List
T. Staff Report – Seabeck Developers Site Specific Application
U. Letter from Map Ltd regarding Seabeck Developers Application
V. Seabeck Developers Map – 5 Mile Radius
W. Seabeck Developers Map – Land Use
X. Seabeck Developers – parcels within 1 mile of subject
Y. SMP Draft Inventory and Characterization presentation

MINUTES approved this ________ day of _______ 2010.

________________________________________
Robert Baglio, Planning Commission Chair

________________________________________
Mary Seals, Planning Commission Secretary