

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

**KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Administration Building – Commissioner’s Chambers
December 17, 2019 @ 5:30 pm**

These minutes are intended to provide a summary of meeting decisions and, except for motions made, should not be relied upon for specific statements from individuals at the meeting. If the reader would like to hear specific discussion, they should visit Kitsap County’s Website at <http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm> and listen to the audio file (to assist in locating information, time-stamps are provided below).

Members present: Kim Allen (Chair), Aaron Murphy (Vice Chair), Amy Maule, Richard Shattuck, Jim Svensson

Members absent: Joe Phillips, Gina Buskirk, Mike Eliason

Staff present: Peter Best, Angie Silva, Dave Ward, Amanda Walston (Clerk)

5:32:12

A. Introductions

B. Adoption of Agenda

- **Motion:** Richard Shattuck moves to adopt the agenda as presented
- **Second:** Jim Svensson
- **Vote:** Unanimous – Motion carries

C. Approval of Minutes

- **Motion:** Mr. Svensson moves to approve the minutes of 09/24/19
- **Second:** Amy Maule
- **Vote:** 5 in Favor – Motion carries

D. General Comment:

- Chair Allen opens the floor for general comments.
- Seeing and hearing no speakers, Chair Allen closes the floor.

5:35:15

E. Work Study: 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) Update – Peter Best, DCD Planning & Environmental Programs (PEP) Planner

- Mr. Best provides a brief summary of the process to date, including previous meetings, upcoming Open Houses; referencing materials provided; tonight’s outline.
- Revisions to the docket approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) include changes to Clarifying Edits, Centers and Dickey Pit Rezone Site-Specific Application; addition of Kingston Phase 2; removal of KCC 21.08 from consideration in this update cycle.

5:43:13

• **CLARIFYING EDITS**

- Mr. Best notes proposed edits are limited text and map amendments to improve clarity and consistency; no substantive changes.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

- 1 • Mr. Best reviews proposed changes; noting Amendment #16 adds Silverdale design
2 standards and district map to Title 17; updates regulations for zones renamed in 2016;
3 removes references to Mixed Use zone, which was eliminated in 2016.
4 • **COMMENT:** Mr. Shattuck thanks staff for removing Mixed Use references.
5 Staff appreciates the input and feedback from Mr. Shattuck on this issue.

6 **5:47:00**

7 • **CENTERS**

- 8 • Mr. Best reviews proposed changes; noting terminology is realigned with Kitsap
9 Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) including:
10 • Rural Center will be used – instead of rural town center – for Keyport, Port
11 Gamble and Type III Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development
12 (LAMIRD).
13 • Military Installation designation will be removed from Naval Base Manchester, as it
14 does not meet State legal requirements for number of individuals employed by the
15 military.

16 **5:50:19**

17 • **DOWNTOWN KINGSTON PHASE 2**

- 18 • Mr. Best reviews the organization and information provided for this proposal, noting
19 Phase 2 of the process is under consideration this year covering implementation of
20 policies and updates to the Kingston Urban Village Center (UVC) zone. Last year's
21 update included Phase 1 policy and code changes.
22 • Mr. Best notes feedback from the Kingston UVC Workgroup led the County to address
23 barriers to achieving the existing vision for downtown Kingston, such as code
24 preventing development and opportunity for thriving businesses.
25 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Shattuck asks which stakeholders were involved in the workgroup.
26 • **ANSWER:** Kingston UVC Workgroup consisted of 10 members appointed by
27 Commissioner Gelder and 2 staff members, meeting for 15 meetings over 2
28 years' time. Names and backgrounds are also included in the staff report.
29 • Mr. Best notes some of the barriers addressed were:
30 • Small underdeveloped lots, highly fragmented owners; High number of
31 existing commercial vacancies, investors waiting for more population;
32 Stagnant, shrinking downtown housing supply; Ferry service to employment
33 centers, regional transportation connections; Limited existing frontage
34 improvements, due to cost and lack of pedestrian connectivity; No existing
35 improvement districts or downtown parking management program.
36 • Parking is a recurring issue, especially ferry's effect on downtown.
37 • **QUESTION:** What is the Port of Kingston's role or their ability to partner or
38 develop a parking management program?
39 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Best notes the intent is to build opportunity,
40 groundwork for an entity or district to develop or manage a program.
41 This could be the Port, the County or another.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

- 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
- Mr. Best notes in Phase 1, the workgroup found a community with a large amount of empty commercial space, and little development interest, largely due to Mixed Use zoning requirements.
 - Phase 1 removed the Mixed Use zone and prioritized residential development first, followed by commercial development and pedestrian improvements, as well as capitalizing on the large supply of available public parking.
 - Phase 2 addressed topics including:
 - Residential use restrictions and limited housing options, by allowing the market to decide what is desirable, as long as requirements are met; Accessory dwellings were prohibited, i.e. homes attached to main home/business; During Kingston’s transition from small neighborhood to an urban area, transitional time and vision needs time to develop; Unconventional housing options, such as boarding houses, bedrooms for rent, etc. would allow additional residential development.
 - **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Amy Maule asks, and Mr. Best confirms references to ‘downtown’ Kingston include all 3 areas on the map, representing 3 design districts.
 - **NON-RESIDENTIAL USE RESTRICTIONS** (particularly downtown)
 - Mr. Best reviews proposed changes including:
 - Redundant and conflicting design criteria; Remodels/additions and changing use of existing structure require entire property to meet current design standards, not just proportionally; Differing maximum building height limits affect potential density and view corridor issues; On and offsite parking.
- 6:13:01**
- **WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS**
 - The workgroup compared communities including Bainbridge Island, Poulsbo, Friday Harbor, La Conner, Steilacoom, Clinton; and focused on the UVC zone applicability to broader downtown and recommended alignment of planning boundaries in downtown Kingston.
 - Maps were improved to make it clearer, what zones and uses apply where.
 - **DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS**
 - Some modification & alternatives added to workgroup recommendations.
 - Strikeouts were used in the draft, to make clear which were the group recommendations and how staff modified.
 - Expand many workgroup recommendations to broader downtown areas and incorporate regional and Countywide Planning Policies; Reorganize, update the Kingston Subarea Plan for retired goals and policies; update allowed uses for UVC zone; Update Kitsap County Code to repeal redundant design standards; define high capacity transit station areas near Kingston ferry to directly align with KRCC.
 - **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, the high capacity transit designation opens the area up for funding opportunities.
 - **DESIGN STANDARDS for Community of Kingston**

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

- 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
- Mr. Best notes this was not a rewrite, the intent is to: Improve clarity and consistency with other development regulations; Update the applicability; Incorporate Kingston complete street plans;
 - Mr. Best notes staff recommends designation of pedestrian oriented commercial street frontages, which the workgroup recommended strongly against.
 - This is a key difference between recommendations, the staff report references appendices showing design standards in full.
 - **QUESTION:** Chair Allen asks if this would be required street frontage?
 - **ANSWER:** Mr. Best notes language in design standards is intentionally vague to provide flexibility.
 - Mr. Best continues review of topics, including: Designation of alleys with a strong preference for alley loading but unclear implementation; Addition of off-site flexible options for some open space landscaping requirements, especially on very small lots.
 - **COMMENT:** Mr. Murphy notes this may help in parcel partnering to meet design standards, which could help with development agreement.
 - Additional topics include: Increasing allowed building height in the Old Town waterfront and Lindvog Commercial Design District; Repealing the required palette colors; Incentivizing alternatives to surface parking and including some on-street parking in their count.
 - **QUESTION:** Chair Allen asks about feasibility of underground parking with the proximity to waterfront.
 - **ANSWER:** Mr. Best notes a few proposals have been made but is unaware of a specific feasibility study.
 - Mr. Murphy notes it is a steeper climb than many other areas.
 - Chair Allen notes downtown Redmond had a similar issue and had to build in a place for the water to sit. Idea is good, but implementation may require more than anticipated.
- 6:28:50**
- **QUESTION:** Mr. Shattuck asks if this proposal been submitted to the workgroup committee; or if they are aware of the difference in staff's recommendations.
 - **ANSWER:** Mr. Best notes 1 response asking for clarifications was received.
 - Mr. Murphy asks how long they have had to review, deadline for response?
 - Mr. Best notes it was distributed about 2 weeks ago, and a the same public comment period applies for responses.
- 6:30:51**
- BREAK**
- 6:37:48**
- Mr. Best notes keeping the barriers discussed at the forefront when reviewing and deliberating may be helpful. The workgroup found many discussions referenced back to the barriers and looking at intent, etc.
 - Mr. Best notes complete streets plan is not attached; but is housed on the county website.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

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

6:42:15

- Mr. Best reviews, on screen, each amendment and update; referencing the maps and appendices; noting the high capacity transportation station area and the ½ mile walk to the ferry terminal.

6:47:40

- **PARKING STANDARDS (Amendment #6)**
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, offsite parking agreements will be paired with the land; designated both where the use is located and where the parking is provided.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Best confirms, there are opportunities for shared parking involving hours of operation.
- **QUESTION:** Mr. Murphy asks if there has been pushback on street improvements like sidewalks, curbs, gutters because though the intent is to improve walkability, it could be a financial detriment.
 - **ANSWER:** Mr. Best confirms, noting market provisions come into play; developers can defer by signing a non-protest agreement with the county – where the connection must still be provided, but the space can still be utilized, if deferred.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, there are surface parking spots in downtown Kingston.
 - Chair Allen asks if those will remain, as surface parking often is first to go in a transition to an urban area.
 - Mr. Best notes transitioning the spots somewhere offsite could be allowed; this is an instance where a parking management plan would be helpful.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Shattuck asks, and Mr. Best confirms, other models considered included management by the Port or similar entity.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Best confirms, if a shared parking agreement was made with another property owner, a rider requiring sign-off of both property owners in order to end the agreement, regardless of whether either property changed ownership.
 - Mr. Best notes if a new owner wanted to redevelop the area, it would still have to provide the use agreed to, unless a new agreement is made.

6:56:10

- **COMMENT:** Chair Allen notes there is no limitation to the frontage, just the lot.
- **QUESTION: Mr. Svensson asks if the workgroup is supportive of staff's proposal.**
 - **ANSWER:** Mr. Best notes the one responder hasn't voiced much concern. **JS:**
- Mr. Best notes that for Single Family Residences (SFR) in this area, garages will be counted as parking spaces, which is not allowed in other areas in Kitsap County; On-street parking will not be counted.

7:02:05

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

- 1 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, Set-aside parking could
2 be onsite or offsite, counted by half spaces, time-based for commercial or residential
3 use, meaning there could be more than one car in that space.
- 4 • Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, the physical space must be built,
5 but not designated to any particular unit, could be a shared pool for the
6 project to allow flexibility.
- 7 • Chair Allen notes a half space per unit could be costly for a large
8 development, especially if on-street can no longer be counted.
- 9 • Mr. Best notes difference in recommendations on mortuaries; workgroup wanted a
10 reduction in spaces, department recommended keeping them, as probable high use,
11 but not likely for downtown.
- 12 • Mr. Best notes parking increase of over 10% or reduction by greater than 25%, if
13 granted through Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP); Conditional Use
14 Permit (CUP) depends on percentage, incentive to reduce amount of surface or street
15 parking and demonstrate transportation needs are being met another way.
- 16 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Shattuck asks about ridership and use of the George’s Corner Kitsap
17 Transit lot.
- 18 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Best notes some routes have been modified and they are
19 trying to grow ridership as the fast ferry and other transit options develop.
- 20 • Mr. Murphy notes the buses seem to be well utilized, with lots of traffic
21 boarding buses from the ferry.

22 **7:09: 42**

- 23 • **USE TABLE (Amendment #8)**
- 24 • Mr. Best reviews proposed changes include allowing Single Family detached dwellings
25 as long as they meet density; referenced in footnotes.
- 26 • **COMMENT:** Mr. Shattuck notes the effort to eliminate footnotes.
- 27 • Dave Ward, DCD PEP Manager, notes some transition time is still needed,
28 until the dimension and density table review next year.
- 29 • Mr. Best reviews additional proposed changes including allowing Espresso Stands; also
30 noting there may be additional changes to the storage categories – while the
31 workgroup specifically opposed self-storage in downtown area, they recognized there
32 may be a need for businesses to have storage for their operations, code update will
33 make this clear.

34 **7:14:12**

- 35 • **POLICIES – SUBAREA PLAN**
- 36 • Mr. Best reviews proposed changes noting they explain the change and why.
- 37 • Policy 51 updates design standards to include input from the Kingston community in
38 revisions to support development; with modification to monitor redevelopment
39 activity and collect feedback for future improvements or updates.
- 40 • **COMMENT:** Mr. Murphy notes Kingston Policy 50 references land use compatible to
41 current design standards, which seems ambiguous; Chair Allen agrees, suggesting
42 specific call out of the specific plans.

43 **7:21:23**

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

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

- **DESIGN STANDARDS**
- Mr. Best notes many changes related to clarifying applicability, such as location of parking spaces, which wasn't clear; the workgroup and department differed on some details, but staff offered some clarified calculations for one location everyone can find.
- **COMMENT:** Mr. Shattuck notes as farmland is redeveloped, what had been used for parking may now be lost to sidewalks.
 - Mr. Best notes the Complete Streets Plan tries to avoid that, with Public Works requesting some initial level of design allowed for the developer, so horizontal placement is clear.
 - Chair Allen asks about setbacks and department recommendations, which by removing the commercial designation could result in dwellings 3 feet from the sidewalk.
 - Mr. Best notes the question is how to do this and maintain it as pedestrian oriented in the future but also make sense in transition.
 - Mr. Shattuck notes the assumption that a residential unit may be turned into commercial with little to no remodel changes, may not be accurate.
 - Mr. Best notes intent also allowed for the unit above street level could be residential, the lower street level could be commercial.
 - Mr. Ward cites an example of the French Quarter in New Orleans, where many residences are right on the street, which changes the character.

7:29:22

- Mr. Best notes Public Works has agreed to create standards for the Alley designation.
- **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Best confirms, a link to the Alley Plan will be included.
- **COMMENT:** Mr. Murphy would like to see links included to look up parcel numbers.
- **COMMENT:** Chair Allen believes vagueness could be troublesome. There are some certain hallmarks of what commercial standards are, but standards for this area need to be clearer for builders or developers.
 - Mr. Murphy agrees, noting interpretations could mean metal instead of wood as acceptable, or even stretch into number of units or square footage, stamped plans, etc.
 - Mr. Best notes the workgroup had a strong desire to allow flexibility and appreciates the feedback here from the PC.

7:37:10

- **HEIGHT LIMITS**
- **QUESTION:** Chair Allen asks if the proposed 45 ft with setback for upper stories addresses the view issues.
 - **ANSWER:** Mr. Best concurs, in part, noting portions of old town are at the bowl or bottom of Kingston and other areas have different angles.
 - Chair Allen likes the setback, which helps eliminate the canyon effect that can cause issues for walkability and helps with parking issues.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

- 1 • Mr. Best notes a revision that includes minimum stories as well as maximums.
2 **7:43:22**
- 3 • **DICKEY PIT SITE SPECIFIC AMENDMENT**
- 4 • **Mr. Shattuck notes he has been involved, professionally, in this project over some**
5 **time, and recuses himself from the Work Study, leaving the Chambers.**
- 6 • Mr. Best provides a brief description of the amendment, noting that the complete
7 staff report is not complete yet, that the application originally came in during the 2018
8 update but was withdrawn revised and resubmitted.
- 9 • Mr. Best introduces the Applicant, Project Representative, Levi Holmes.
- 10 • Chair Allen requests an improved visual map with the outline of the subject property
11 at the next meeting.
- 12 **7:50:50**
- 13 • Mr. Holmes reviews the history of site, which has been dormant since 1990, formerly
14 owned and operated by Port Orchard Sand and Gravel, referencing on a paper map
15 where the area is located.
- 16 • Mr. Holmes notes all minerals have been extracted but the project technically has an
17 active mining permit, only because reclamation activities required are too expensive;
18 a Bonneville easement also runs through the site.
- 19 • A permit for an industrial park/office complex was completed, with the SDAP grading
20 and everything else completed except paving driveway; the project was then
21 abandoned due to market conditions and the permit expired.
- 22 • A provision in code allows some reclamation by Dept. of Ecology allowing Kitsap
23 County to oversee the process; thinking is why bring in materials to fill and restore if
24 they are only going to be taken out for redevelopment.
- 25 • Changing the zoning based on the mix needed for the land capacity analysis creates a
26 unique opportunity to allow commercial uses for this community and surrounding
27 area; could be restaurants, coffee shop, retail, senior/convalescent homes.
- 28 • Our company has deep background in developments in Kitsap County, including
29 several assisted living and skilled nursing facilities as well as medical centers and
30 residential communities.
- 31 • Mr. Holmes notes neighborhood commercial zones is one of the best, from raw
32 development perspective, as it allows flexibility to bring a large project together,
33 referencing designer's vision, and areas on the map that allow for different scale,
34 height, zones, etc. and renderings of what some developments could look like.
- 35 • Chair Allen notes for the mine site, an asphalt background on that side, provides
36 buffering for SFR from that side, but adjacent to the mine seems less buffered.
- 37 • Mr. Holmes notes due to previous mining activity, not much vegetation is left, but it a
38 berm would likely be built up; no foreseen development near the top leaves a natural
39 buffer; lower boundary's former mine site was deep creating a sound barrier.
- 40 **8:02:16**
- 41 • Mr. Holmes reviews developable and net acreage and setbacks; notes the main reason
42 for this application is taking industrial land, that is not in high demand in Kitsap, that

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

- 1 has been sitting for 30 years and turning it into some additional forms of much
2 needed housing.
- 3 • Mr. Best notes maps & SEPA Determination and Checklist have been provided, staff
4 would appreciate input to incorporate and address in the Staff Report.
 - 5 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, the PC will only be
6 hearing and making recommendation on the zoning, not any specific development
7 proposals, which would go through land use.
 - 8 • Chair Allen requests more specificity on zones, parcels and scale,
 - 9 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, the County has included
10 a condition on the face of the plat addressing potential compatibility issues for
11 surrounding areas.
 - 12 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Murphy asks about public noticing for the project.
 - 13 • **ANSWER:** Mr. Best notes notice of site-specific applications are directly
14 mailed to adjacent property owners, and posted onsite.
 - 15 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best and Mr. Holmes confirm,
16 development proposal would be subject to public process with a preliminary plat a
17 Type III Hearing Examiner decision; only commercial proposals could be through a
18 binding site plan process, all others would be individual.
 - 19 • **QUESTION/ANSWER:** Mr. Murphy asks, and Mr. Holmes confirms, the rezone will
20 provide the developer with permitted uses that are allowed outright, noting that the
21 Use Table is currently under review, so some changes may take place.
 - 22 • **COMMENT:** Mr. Murphy suggests looking closely at setbacks adjacent to the mine,
23 and where stream continue and terminate; as public interest in very high when mining
24 activities and sites are heard before the PC.
 - 25 • Mr. Ward notes the proposal considered must be viewed as the zoning only, not
26 based on the potential projects, we don't know what will happen in the future. This
27 property could be sold, or plans changed.
 - 28 • Chair Allen notes compatibility with existing, surrounding zoning should be
29 considered.
 - 30 • Mr. Holmes will bring additional maps and materials to have onsite at the hearing.
 - 31 • **COMMENT:** Ms. Maule notes noise concerns could potentially be addressed working
32 through peer review, hired noise consultants to provide noise studies and monitoring,
33 calculate the size of a berm required to mitigate the noise and provide protection.
 - 34 • **COMMENT:** Mr. Murphy notes adjacent zones, impacts, fit should be considered.
 - 35 • **Mr. Holmes** notes current Industrial zoning could allow for development next to an
36 Urban Residential zone as it is. Mr. Best notes this is referenced in the SEPA Checklist.
 - 37 • **COMMENT:** Mr. Murphy notes they have been cautioned and conditioned not to
38 create zoning islands, but this case and some other may make sense.
- 39 **8:17:30**
- 40 • **COMMENT:** Mr. Svensson clarifies that there are other non-residential buildings in the
41 area, but we are looking at creating this unique situation for this specific site.
 - 42 • Mr. Best notes there is no Neighborhood Commercial zones nearby, but
43 there are some near Blueberry Hill and Dickey Road.

Kitsap County Planning Commission Minutes – December 17, 2019

- 1 • **QUESTION:** Mr. Svensson asks if staff has any concern the process may be
- 2 problematic.
- 3 • Mr. Best notes there is a great deal to be considered.
- 4 • Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, there is some presumption that
- 5 Neighborhood Commercial is compatible with residential, as it is intended to be
- 6 commercial that is accessed by surrounding population, nearby use.

7 **8:21:15**

8 **F. Administrative Update: Angie Silva, DCD Assistant Director**

- 9 • Ms. Silva Introduces herself, thanking the PC for their time, energy and consideration.
- 10 • Ms. Silva provides some background information on her 15 years career as a County
- 11 employee, which began in DCD, spanned 13 years in the BoCC office as a Policy
- 12 Adviser and now circles back to DCD as the Assistant Director.
- 13 • Chair Allen and the PC welcome Ms. Silva.

14

15 **G. For the Good of the Order**

- 16 • None

17

18 **Time of Adjournment: 8:22:45 pm**

19

20 Minutes approved this 21st day of January 2020.

21

22

23 

Kim Allen, Planning Commission Chair

24

25 

Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk

26