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CHAPTER-1

Executive Summary

*The Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan* is a community based transportation study focused on Sidney Road SW and Pottery Avenue between Sedgwick Road to the south and Tremont Street to the north. This section describes the plan development processes utilized and the development of the guiding principles, then describes the vision for the corridor, and finally concludes with a discussion of the preferred as developed from this process.

**Why the Sidney Pottery Corridor** – As growth and development occurs through zoning and land use, it is of high importance to ensure a roadway infra-structure that creates a sense of identity, continuity, and supplies the multi-model transportation needs of an area far into the future. The Port Orchard City Council determined that Port Orchard’s residents would be better served by advance planning within the corridor area to insure that consistent infrastructure development occurs for future commercial and multi-family uses. This plan facilitates the expressed goals, both written and verbalized of the citizens, land owners, and elected officials.

*The Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan* is an eight-month planning effort that began in early spring 2009. The effort was facilitated by the city of Port Orchard Planning Commission with technical support from Port Orchard Planning and Engineering Departments. With the coordination of Planning Commission, a corridor study plan sub-committee was created that included three members of the Planning Commission, area property owners/developers and members of the public interested in guiding the design and

**Six Goals Guiding the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan**

1. Minimize future congestion as area is developed.
2. Encourage Pedestrian, bicycle and transit mobility and access to schools and businesses in the south end of the corridor.
3. Provide a continuity of roadway design and aesthetics.
4. Include public and stakeholder participation.
5. Provide consistent and predictable roadway improvement standards.
6. Support measures to reduce air pollution and global warming.
aesthetics of the corridor. The committee worked through a planning process that developed and assessed a variety of options for changing the character of the Sidney/Pottery Corridor and ultimately selected a preferred concept for the corridor. The preferred concept grew out of multiple needs and interests expressed by stakeholders. Ideas brought to the process are reflected in the alternatives and concept which respond to both the transportation and aesthetic needs of the community. With the six guiding goals for the Sidney/Pottery corridor plan as a basis, the effort undertook and completed a multi-step brainstorming, analysis, evaluation, and prioritization of the consensus building process that resulted in the recommendation of alternatives for a comprehensive transportation and infrastructure plan for the corridor.

This document should be used as a reference tool when developing detailed plans for the corridor, reviewing current and future development proposals, determining phasing and implementation strategies and understanding the concerns of the community. The Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan accommodates the community's desire to have a safer, pedestrian friendly, parkway linkage that knits Sidney Road and Pottery Avenue into the fabric if the community while facilitating the requirements and standards associated with the operation of a City thoroughfare. The Plan reconfigures the roadway from a 2-lane rural standard configuration to a minimum of a 3-lane configuration with commuter bike lanes, parking improvements, accommodation for transit, and streetscape character improvements. Promoting a vision for a safer, more aesthetically pleasing and bike friendly corridor all within the framework of City Road Standards is clearly articulated as a primary goal of this plan.
CHAPTER - 2
The Planning Process

The intent of the plan is to implement a comprehensive approach to roadway and public infrastructure development along the newly annexed southerly portion of the Sidney/Pottery corridor. The public planning components included coordination with the City Council, the Planning Commission and Planning Staff all working together and resulting in the creation of a joint taskforce for the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Study Plan. The sub-committee was created to facilitate public charrettes, create a uniform vision, and to propose alternatives for development along the corridor.

Public Participation – The efforts to include the public to develop a cohesive corridor plan included a range of notifications, public meetings, workshops, flyers, and communication tools. The city staff specifically notified the citizens of corridor planning efforts both within the city and within the adjacent unincorporated urban growth area in three specific ways including local media advertising, direct mailings, and community calendar postings. The Port Orchard independent published news articles explaining that the city efforts to recruit volunteers for the development of a plan for the Sidney/Pottery Corridor and set the dates of the committee meetings. The city also sent a mailer to all property owners with property that fronts on Sidney Road or Pottery Avenue. Additionally, notice of committee meetings were posted on the Kitsap Sun’s calendar of events as well as within City documents. The Committee met in three consecutive month beginning in June, 2009 and presented minutes of the meetings to the Planning Commission at their regularly scheduled public meetings.

The planning process for the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Study Plan was a multi-step effort that identified issues, vetted the issues with the stakeholders, and then developed the alternatives for the future development of the Sidney/Pottery corridor. Recommendations for road widths and traffic amelioration were coordinated with the traffic analysis conducted by Kitsap County prior to annexation of the area. Additionally, the preferences of this plan will be incorporated into an update to the transportation Capital Facilities Plan. Although the roadway width standards may be discussed in previous Capital Facilities Plan, the stakeholders were provided an opportunity for additional community input regarding the roadway design and development. Additional issues such as limited access and landscape islands were discussed as their impacts to the overall goals and vision of the thoroughfare.
CHAPTER-3
Vision for the Corridor

Since beginning its life as a rural county road, the Sidney Road (the southern portion of the corridor) has been two lanes void of sidewalks and curbing. Historically, existing land use consisted of small working farms, pastures and large acreage lots. The north half of the Corridor (Pottery Avenue) is slightly more improved and in places has sidewalk, curb and gutter. Stakeholders and the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan committee envisioned an arterial that maintains a walkable thoroughfare and provides a place for safe biking while maintaining a Level of Service (LOS) that is acceptable to the citizens using the corridor. In addition to the quantifiable requirements for transportation, the involved citizens wanted to create a corridor that has a continuity of design with improved aesthetics that was more than a way to move traffic within this north-south corridor. The committee reviewed a multiplicity of lighting, street furniture styles, vegetation types and locations and ultimately agreed upon an overall look for the corridor.

The stakeholders agreed that with the Sedgwick/Sidney developing as a commercial hub, it was important to ensure that sidewalks were of sufficient size and style to allow free and unobstructed pedestrian and bicycle travel along the corridor. Therefore, the stakeholders decided on five foot wide sidewalks separated by a five- foot planting strip containing grass and street trees.

CHAPTER-3.1
Committee’s Vision for the Corridor

The Sidney/Pottery committee initially determined that although this is a single corridor of approximately two miles in length, there were two separate and distinct roadway requirements. The entire corridor is diagonally bisected by State Highway 16 at the approximate mid-point of the corridor. The Highway 16 overpass was also a place where
the possibility of continuity of roadway design is challenged because as the roadway crosses underneath Highway 16, the road is forced to narrow. Without State involvement, and a costly reconstruction of the overpass, the effective usable right-of-way is sixty feet. As discussed elsewhere in this Plan, the alternatives for improvement recommend for obtaining a total width of eighty feet for right-of-way along the corridor length. In addition to the aforementioned challenge, large portions of the area north of Highway 16 has been recently developed and additional new development in the northern portion of the corridor is anticipated to be minimal and only consist of incremental infill within the first ten or fifteen years of development.

As a result, the committee determined that the north and south portions of the corridor were too dissimilar for a cohesive design would be difficult to apply to both areas. The committee divided their recommendations into two separate sections with State Highway 16 being a natural divider. The northern area was labeled Pottery Avenue improvements and the southern area was named Sidney Road improvements.
CHAPTER-4
Committee Alternatives

The committee met multiple times to discuss various elements to be included within the alternatives. The first two committee meetings were focused on developing a single strategy for a comprehensive roadway plan for the corridor, “Alternative-1” (see appendix A) was the result of the group’s focus. Throughout the process it became evident that there were dissenting opinions regarding certain aspects of the design and in meeting three, the committee determined that the best approach would be include two additional alternatives to analyzed and brought forward for consideration. Descriptions of the three alternatives are provided below.

Section-4.1
ALTERNATIVE-1

The committee created an alternative that captured the recommendations of the majority of the stakeholders and met the requirements of the proposed impacts of the adjacent surrounding development. Alternative 1 was the end product of a process where several factors and goals were considered and assimilated into a plan that has been vetted by City staff and analyzed as a component of the transportation capital facilities plan update. The alternative, similar to alternatives two and three, provided the committee with a balance between competing interests. The most significant competing interests included, defined future transportation needs as the area intensifies in development, safety of children...
commuting to and from schools, general aesthetics of the corridor, providing the development community with consistency of requirements, meeting the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan to reduce dependence on automobiles and complete a trail system for pedestrians and bicycle riders alike, and above all, realistic designs that could actually be constructed.

**SIDNEY ROAD FROM BERRY LAKE ROAD SOUTH to SEDGWICK**

During their analysis of the local transportation impacts and the needs of the committee, the committee determined that a three-lane roadway would best meet the needs of the developing region until well past the year 2025 for the section of the Sidney Road connecting between Berry Lake Road and Sedgwick Road. However, the committee also wanted to ensure that future development would not preclude the roadway from Berry Lake road south to Sedgwick from being ultimately widened to five lanes. Both options of three or five lanes would include a center planting strip with turn pockets where necessary for combined accesses into the adjacent development or parcels.

The committee recommended a three lane roadway design that would include a five-foot sidewalk, five foot planting strip, 5 foot bike lane, then an 11 foot wide driving lane

\[1\] an 12 foot center planting median with turn pockets, an 11 foot driving lane, a 5 foot planting strip then along the westerly edge of the right-of-way, a planting strip and a 10 foot wide multi-model trail. The aforementioned requirements would put future right-of-way between 67 and 80 feet in width.

One of the issues that arose when the

---

\[1\] It may be noted that additional road width beyond the committee recommendations may be required to satisfy Fire District requirements.
committee’s desired goal to maintain the flexibility for a possible expansion of the corridor to five lanes was consistently expressed as a concern that this goal specifically, conflicts with Port Orchard Municipal Code (POMC) Section 16.55 Design Guidelines. The section of municipal code identifies general design guidelines that upon development, buildings are oriented to maintain a direct pedestrian connection to the entrances street-side with an encouragement for parking to be screened from the public right of way and oriented in the rear of the buildings. The committee recognized specific municipal code revisions to POMC Section 16.55 are necessary to address conflicts and ensure the city wide general design guidelines were supportive of the vision, goals, and elements of the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan.

**Traffic Controls** – Traffic controls were a major point of discussion throughout the committee meetings focusing on the various aspects of the signalization of intersections as opposed to the round-a-bout traffic control solutions. The committee recommended that for Alternative 1, provisions for a round-a-bout be made at the intersection of Hovde Road and Sidney Avenue.

Additional sub-committee discussion revolved around the expected traffic improvements on Sedgwick and Highway 16 (Lowes Intersection) and that it may become a four-way signal providing a secondary access point for development parcels adjacent to the Sidney Road corridor. The sub-committee expressed their desire for a by-pass access road from Sedgwick Road intersection to the south and with an alignment parallel to Highway 16, terminating with an intersection with Hovde Road to the north. As a subsequent phase of transportation development, a round-a-bout was determined by the committee to be needed to facilitate safe traffic movements onto Sidney road without impediments to the traffic flow in the manner that a traffic signal might. The increased traffic flow expected from the build-out of the commercial areas surrounding the corridor was identified to include a pedestrian signal at the corner of Birch Street and Sidney Road. The committee was especially concerned regarding the safety of students from the Junior High School and the Elementary school that both abut Sidney Avenue. With the improved roadway design it was expected that more youth will avail themselves of the bike lanes and safe walkways and utilize non-motorized transportation alternatives for school. In addition directly across from the elementary school were baseball fields that were identified to attract large number of youth. The pedestrian signal was an improvement that could afford a way to cross the street without fear of increased interaction with cars, busses and trucks.

**Berry Lake Road intersection** – Berry Lake Road was identified as a primary access to the recently completed annexation of McCormick Woods and associated density proposed for the annexed area. The anticipated analysis provided that existing traffic patterns were forecast to change substantially in the area of this intersection. In
addition, the commercial development along the Sidney Corridor at build out would likely become a destination for travel from residences to the west, both in the city limits and out. The committee incorporated this information in the recommendation of a three-way traffic signal at the Berry Lake intersection with Berry Lake Road being widened to allow a right turn lane.

**Pottery Avenue from Berry Lake Road north to Lippert Drive** – Just north of the Berry Lake intersection Pottery Avenue passes underneath Highway 16. There are presently no access points to the State Highway 16 at the overpass and none are shown or expected within the Washington State Department of Transportation long range plans. It was identified by the committee; however, as Pottery Avenue nears the overpass there is clearly a narrowing of useable right-of-way. Existing right-of-way and roadway sections indicated that the street would support consistent form and function with a continuity of design. Although this section of the corridor will require narrowed cross sections, including sidewalks, curb, median and bike lanes, preliminary analysis by the committee indicated that these improvements would be able to be located between the existing overpass structure abutments. The committee also expressed the desire for rolled sidewalk curbs to facilitate fire equipment to be mountable on the sidewalk if the need arises.

North of the Highway 16 overpass, the existing right-of-way again widens to accommodate a greater width of infrastructure improvements, but the committee acknowledged that the larger tracts of land have been developed recently and individual sidewalks may need to be revised to meet Corridor Plans objectives.

**Pottery Avenue from Lippert Drive north to South Kitsap Blvd** – Much of this section of the corridor was recently developed and on the east side of the right-of-way, sidewalks have been installed with curb and gutter. It was recommended and supported by the committee that the plan include a left turn lane for accessing onto South Kitsap Boulevard to allow automobiles who are waiting to turn left a place to stage without impeding the flow of traffic traveling north. It was identified by the committee that a traffic signal or three way stop sign at this intersection would not be warranted within the analysis of the plan. The committee acknowledged that at some point in the future, traffic conditions may change and a signalized intersection or stop signs may be required. The City’s traffic consultant suggested that at some time in the future a roundabout might warranted at this intersection to keep traffic flowing smoothly.

**Pottery Avenue from South Kitsap Blvd north to Tremont Street** – Sidewalks were recommended by the committee to be installed through this section of the corridor with bike lanes. It was identified that the existing right-of-way within this portion of the corridor would not be sufficient to accommodate a continuation of a landscaped center
island. The recommendation included for the existing two-lane roadway section to be maintained with improvements to sidewalks and provisions for bike lanes.

Section-4.2
ALTERNATIVE-2

The committee decided that it would bring forward an alternative that provided the improvements similar to that of Alternative 1 design that did not include any roundabouts.

Sidney Road from Berry Lake Road south to Sedgwick Road Between Berry Lake Road and Sedgwick Road, the committee determined that a three-lane roadway would meet the needs of the developing region until well past the year 2025. However, the committee also wanted to ensure that future development would not preclude the roadway from Berry Lake road south to Sedgwick from being ultimately widened to five lanes. Both options of three or five lanes were recommended to include a center planting strip with turn pockets where necessary for combined accesses into the developments.

The committee recommended a three lane roadway design that would include a five-foot sidewalk, five foot planting strip, 5 foot bike lane, then an 11 foot wide driving lane, an 12 foot center planting median with turn pockets, an 11 foot driving lane, a 5 foot planting strip then along the westerly edge of the right-of-way, a planting strip and a 10 foot wide multi-model trail. The aforementioned requirements would put future right-of-way requirements at between 67 and 80 feet in width.

Similar to Alternative 1, the committee’s desired goal to maintain the flexibility for a possible expansion of the corridor to five lanes was consistently expressed as a concern. Specifically, conflicts with Port Orchard Municipal Code (POMC) Section 16.55 Design Guidelines were identified. This section of municipal code identifies general design guidelines that upon development, buildings are oriented to maintain a direct

---

2 It may be noted that additional road width beyond the committee recommendations may be required to satisfy Fire District requirements.
pedestrian connection to the entrances street-side with an encouragement for parking to be screened from the public right of way and oriented in the rear of the buildings. The committee recognized that specific municipal code revisions to POMC Section 16.55 would be necessary to address conflicts and ensure the city wide general design guidelines were supportive of the vision, goals, and elements of the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan.

**Traffic Controls** – In this iteration of the corridor plan, the committee recommends that traffic controls at the Hovde/Sidney intersection consist of one of three possibilities, allowing the intersection to remain in the existing uncontrolled status, installing a three-way traffic signal, or installing a three way stop sign. The proximity of the intersection to a potentially high number of pedestrians and bicycle ridership wanting to frequent area retail establishments may require selection of one of the viable types of three-way traffic controls. Similar to Alternative 1, additional committee discussion revolved around the expected traffic improvements on Sedgwick and Highway 16 noting that it could become a four-way signal providing a secondary access point for development parcels adjacent to the Sidney Road corridor. The committee expressed their desire for a by-pass access road from Sedgwick Road intersection to the south and with an alignment parallel to Highway 16, terminating with an intersection with Hovde Road to the north.

The increased traffic flow expected from the build out of the commercial areas will require a pedestrian signal at the corner of Birch Street and Sidney Road. The committee was especially concerned regarding the safety of students from the Junior High School and the Elementary school that both abut Sidney Avenue. With the improved roadway design it is expected that more youth will avail themselves of the bike lanes and safe walkways and get to school in ways other than motorized vehicles. In addition directly across from the elementary school are baseball fields that attract large number of youth. The pedestrian signal proposed would afford pedestrians a way to cross the street without fear of being in conflict with cars, busses and trucks.
**Berry Lake Road intersection** – Berry Lake Road was identified as a primary access to the recently completed annexation of McCormick Woods and associated density proposed for the annexed area. The anticipated analysis provided that existing traffic patterns were forecast to change substantially in the area of this intersection. In addition, the commercial development along the Sidney Corridor at build out would likely become a destination for travel from residences to the west, both in the city limits and out. The committee incorporated this information in the recommendation of a three-way traffic signal at the Berry Lake intersection with Berry Lake Road being widened to allow a right turn lane.

**Pottery Avenue from Berry Lake north to Lippert Drive** – Just north of the Berry Lake intersection Pottery Avenue passes underneath Highway 16. There are presently no access points to the State Highway 16 at the overpass and none are shown or expected within the Washington State Department of Transportation long range plans. It was identified by the committee; however, as Pottery Avenue nears the overpass there is clearly a narrowing of useable right-of-way. Existing right-of-way and roadway sections indicated that the street would support consistent form and function with a continuity of design. Although this section of the corridor will require narrowed cross sections, including sidewalks, curb, median and bike lanes, preliminary analysis by the committee indicated that these improvements would be able to be located between the existing overpass structure abutments. The committee also expressed the desire for rolled sidewalk curbs to facilitate fire equipment to be mountable on the sidewalk if the need arises.

North of the Highway 16 overpass, the existing right-of-way again widens to accommodate a greater width of infrastructure improvements, but the committee acknowledged that the larger tracts of land have been developed recently and individual sidewalks may need to be revised to meet Corridor Plans objectives.

**Pottery Avenue from Lippert Drive north to South Kitsap Blvd** – Much of this section of the corridor was recently developed and on the east side of the right-of-way, sidewalks have been installed with curb and gutter. It was recommended and supported by the committee that the plan include a left turn lane for accessing onto South Kitsap Boulevard to allow automobiles who are waiting to turn left a place to stage without impeding the flow of traffic traveling north. It was identified by the committee that a traffic signal or three way stop sign at this intersection would not be warranted within the analysis of the plan. The committee acknowledged that at some point in the future, traffic conditions may change and a signalized intersection or stop signs may be required.
Pottery Avenue from South Kitsap Blvd north to Tremont Street – Sidewalks were recommended by the committee to be installed through this section of the corridor with bike lanes. It was identified that the existing right-of-way within this portion of the corridor would not be sufficient to accommodate a continuation of a landscaped center island. The recommendation included for the existing two-lane roadway section to be maintained with improvements to sidewalks and provisions for bike lanes.

Section-4.3
ALTERNATIVE- 3

Alternative 3 is the end product of a process where several factors and goals were considered and assimilated into a proposal and vetted with input from City staff in regards to the update of the transportation capital facilities plan. All three alternatives have been identified to provide what the committee viewed as a balance between competing interests and interests expressed by the stakeholders. The competing interests include, future transportation needs as the area develops, safety of children commuting to and from schools, general aesthetics of the corridor, providing the development community with consistency of requirements, meeting the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan to reduce dependence on automobiles and complete a trail system for pedestrians and bicycle riders alike, and above all, realistic designs that could actually be constructed.

Sidney Road from Berry Lake Road south to Sedgwick Road Between Berry Lake Road and Sedgwick Road, it was determined by the sib-committee that a three-lane roadway would meet the needs of the developing region until well past the year 2025. However, the committee also wanted to ensure that future development would not preclude the roadway from Berry Lake road south to Sedgwick Road from ultimately being widened to five lanes. Both options of three or five lanes were recommended to include a center planting strip with turn pockets where necessary for combined accesses into the developments.
The committee recommended a three lane roadway design that would include a five-foot sidewalk, five foot planting strip, 5 foot bike lane, then an 11 foot wide driving lane, an 12 foot center planting median with turn pockets, an 11 foot driving lane, a 5 foot planting strip then along the westerly edge of the right-of-way, a planting strip and a 10 foot wide multi-model trail. The aforementioned requirements would put future right-of-way requirements between 67 and 80 feet in width.

Similar to the other alternatives, the issue arose regarding the committee’s desired goal to maintain the flexibility for a possible expansion of the corridor to five lanes was consistently expressed as a concern. Specifically, conflicts with Port Orchard Municipal Code (POMC) Section 16.55 Design Guidelines were identified. This section of municipal code identifies general design guidelines that upon development, buildings are oriented to maintain a direct pedestrian connection to the entrances street-side with an encouragement for parking to be screened from the public right of way and oriented in the rear of the buildings. The committee recognized for specific municipal code revisions to POMC Section 16.55 would be necessary to addressed conflicts and ensure the city wide general design guidelines were supportive of the vision, goals, and elements of the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan.

Traffic Controls – The sub-committee recommends that provisions for a round-a-bout be made at the intersection of Hovde Road and Sidney Avenue with the possibility of the by-pass to being constructed as shown on the alternative-3 map. Similar to the other alternatives, additional committee discussion revolved around the expected traffic improvements on Sedgwick and Highway 16 noting that it would become a four-way signal providing a secondary access point for development parcels adjacent to the Sidney Road corridor. The committee expressed their desire for a by-pass access road from Sedgwick Road intersection to the south and with an alignment parallel to Highway 16, terminating with an intersection with

---

3 It may be noted that additional road width beyond the committee recommendations may be required to satisfy Fire District requirements.
Hovde Road to the north. Upon construction, the committee desired a round-a-bout to allow traffic to enter safely onto Sidney road without impeding traffic in the way a traffic signal would.

The increased traffic flow expected from the build out of the commercial areas will require a pedestrian signal at the corner of Birch Street and Sidney Road. The sub-committee was especially concerned regarding the safety of students from the Junior High School and the Elementary school that both abut Sidney Avenue. With the improved roadway design it is expected that more youth will avail themselves of the bike lanes and safe walkways and get to school in ways other than motorized vehicles. In addition directly across from the elementary school are baseball fields that attract large number of youth. The pedestrian signal proposed would afford pedestrians a way to cross the street without fear of being in conflict with cars, busses and trucks.

**Berry Lake Road intersection** – With the recently completed annexation of McCormick Woods and the potential of construction of 2,500 new homes, it is expected that existing traffic patterns will change substantially in the area of this intersection. In addition, the commercial development along the Sidney Corridor at build out is likely to become a destination for properties to the west, both in the city limits and out. Therefore, the committee recommended a three-way traffic signal at the Berry Lake intersection with Berry Lake Road being widened to allow a right turn lane.

**Pottery Avenue from Berry Lake north to Lippert Drive** – Just north of the Berry Lake intersection where Pottery Avenue passes underneath HWY 16, there are presently not any on-off ramps at the overpass and none are expected, however, as Pottery Avenue nears the overpass there is clearly a narrowing of useable right-of-way. Preliminary measurements indicate that the street can support in form and function a continuity of design, Although this section of the corridor will require narrowed and sidewalks, curb, median and bike lane can all fit between the existing hard overpass structure.

North of the Highway 16 overpass, the useable right-of-way again widens but the larger tracts of land have been developed previously and sidewalks are sporadic and may need to be revised to meet Corridor Plans objectives.

**Pottery Avenue from Lippert Drive north to South Kitsap Blvd** – Much of this section of the corridor was recently developed and on the east side of the right-of-way, sidewalks have been installed with curb and gutter. It was recommended and supported by the committee that the plan include a left turn lane for accessing onto South Kitsap Boulevard to allow automobiles who are waiting to turn left a place to stage without impeding the flow of traffic traveling north. It was identified by the
committee that a traffic signal or three way stop sign at this intersection would not be warranted within the analysis of the plan. The committee acknowledged that at some point in the future, traffic conditions may change and a signalized intersection or stop signs may be required.

*Pottery Avenue from South Kitsap Blvd north to Tremont Street* – Sidewalks were recommended by the committee to be installed through this section of the corridor with bike lanes. It was identified that the existing right-of-way within this portion of the corridor would not be sufficient to accommodate a continuation of a landscaped center island. The recommendation included for the existing two-lane roadway section to be maintained with improvements to sidewalks and provisions for bike lanes.
CHAPTER-5

Lighting, Street Furniture, and Landscaping

To help provide a continuity of design and a general boulevard appearance for the corridor, a component is street lighting and street furniture. Specific recommendations were not provided by the corridor plan committee however, the committee suggested that planning staff provide a recommendation for full consideration by the Planning Commission.

Street Lighting - Street lighting should emphasize a relatively modern commercial area concept and at some point may also provide a basis for a unified theme or street character. The intent of the requirements of this corridor plan are to ensure that subsequent installations are consistent with the recommendations of the committee and this plan, while acknowledging that occasionally circumstances may require occasional deviations from this plan. To minimize utility costs to the city, all street lighting is intended to include solar power and energy efficient LED technologies.

Street Furniture – Street furniture selection is similar to the street lighting. Street furniture provides a location for pedestrians to rest while waiting for public transit or to relax while walking the corridor and include public signage, garbage cans, bollards, bike racks, and similar pedestrian oriented facilities. The corridor is approximately two miles long. Benches and trash receptacles are encouraged to be located within half mile of each other in addition to locations required by Kitsap Transit. As with the street lighting, the intent of the requirements of this corridor plan are to ensure that subsequent installations are consistent with the recommendations of the committee and this plan, acknowledging that occasionally circumstances may require occasional deviations from this plan.
Landscaping and Street Trees – The majority of landscape areas have been recommended to be low growing native and drought resistance varieties. Grasses and sedges are encouraged. The preferred street tree has been recommended is a flowering cherry. This tree grows to a moderate height, is very successful in an urban transit environment, and has been a recommended tree specifically due to the less intrusive root system and limitation of future damage to sidewalks. Trees are encouraged to be evenly spaced at intervals of not more than thirty-feet.

To maintain an aesthetically pleasing look for the corridor, there are opportunities to maximize the beneficial effects of soft-scaping in order to offset the visual effects of the built environment and hard-scapes. Any proposed future revisions to the landscaping code could include additional options for screening of parking areas and commercial buildings that will provide visual interest to blank walls.
Chapter-6
Public Transportation

Kitsap Transit - The City of Port Orchard is serviced by Kitsap Transit, which also services most of Kitsap County including the Cities of Bremerton, Poulsbo, and Bainbridge Island. Kitsap Transit has developed a long range plan which contains historic data regarding its operation, future and financial plans. As a part of its plan, Port Orchard has joined with the other cities in an inter-local agreement with Kitsap Transit to implement Adaptive Transportation Demand Management programs as required by the Washington Trip Reduction Law of 1991 (SSHB 1671). Under the agreement, Kitsap Transit is to ensure certification of consistency with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan requirements for Transportation Demand Management programs.

Meeting Transportation Goals – This corridor plan is in conformance with city’s Comprehensive Plan, Transportation, Chapter 8. An important goal of this plan, in conformance with State and regional transportation policies, is to minimize the need to access this commercial center by single occupancy vehicles. As the commercial area along the corridor develops, it will become more important to partner with Kitsap Transit regarding route expansions that will meet the needs of residents that live, work and frequent retail stores in the southern portion of the corridor. (Glenwood south to Sedgwick) Existing senior housing along Pottery Avenue portion of the corridor and the potential for new multi-family units near the Sedgwick/Pottery intersection will help to provide the impetus for expansion of bus routes to and through the area. Each new commercial and multifamily development in the area of the Sidney/Pottery corridor will necessitate review by Kitsap transit who will then determine when an economic viability threshold in crossed for bus route expansion.

Bicycle and Non-Motorized Considerations - In December of 2000, Kitsap County Department of Public Works developed the “Kitsap County Bicycle Facilities Plan”. The
Bicycle facilities plan addresses the transportation component of the 1996 Greenways Plan and was initiated by the County, through the Kitsap County Department of Public Works (KCPW), in 2000 to further refine and focus efforts towards developing and expanding a comprehensive system and to strengthen bicycling as a viable, safe, attractive form of alternative transportation.

This Sidney/Pottery Corridor Study Plan and the installation of the proposed bicycle lanes throughout the corridor further enhances the goals and policies of the Kitsap County Bicycle Facilities Plan by including specific designs and interconnections to County bicycle facilities.

**Bus stops** – Where necessary along the corridor, bus stops should be designed that provide protection from the elements, are comfortable and are well lit. Any new commercial and/or multi-family development designs should consider and make provisions for non-motorized access to and from the development projects. In addition, bus stops should be designed in such a way that a bus can pull out of the traffic flow to safely pick up and drop off passengers. Appropriate signage should be included showing routes and pick-up times.
CHAPTER-7

Implementation

A significant challenge to implementation of the Corridor Plan includes financing of the individual components of the plan. As with many projects during design and construction, a clear path to implementation of the plan is required to ensure that plan design with real end results is the product of the efforts. During development of the Corridor Plan a reoccurring theme was that either the city must be the lead in improving the roadway or at the very least developers must be provided with certainty the requirements for infrastructure along the corridor to maintain a consistent incremental approach to the construction concurrently when development occurs. There are four primary efforts identified by the committee that will aid with the implementation of this Corridor Plan.

- **Secure Federal and State Transportation funding** – Obtaining funds from Federal and State agencies are anticipated to be cyclical and are recommended as a primary source of ongoing infrastructure improvement capital to help complete the implementation of the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan.

- **Public/Private Partnerships** – Provide means for developers to participate in the construction of roadway improvements in conformance with city road designs and dedicate the appropriate amount of right-of-way in conformance with preliminary road-way designs as mitigation for project specific impacts and to contribute to regional traffic system improvements.

- **Local Improvement District** – Provide a mechanism for property owners benefitting from improvements to agree to pay a proportionate share of the improvements.

- **Impact fees** – Include installation of impact fees as a mechanism for new development to contribute to the system improvements required for roads and transportation infrastructure and facilities.

- **Capital Facilities Funds** – Designate specific City funds to priority projects, such as the Sidney / Potter corridor improvements.
In addition to the above potential funding sources, identify additional grant opportunities that may be available for road improvements from the state county and Federal Governments that would be available as additional funding sources. For a project of this size and scope, all of the described funding sources will most likely be utilized. Additionally the Port Orchard transportation capital facilities plan update may provide for a more definitive description of the city-wide implementation plan.
## CHAPTER-8

### APPENDICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 1:</th>
<th>Maps and Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2:</td>
<td>Public Meeting Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3:</td>
<td>Engineering Data and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4:</td>
<td>Public Notices and Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5:</td>
<td>Street Furniture Alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Sidney/Pottery Study Area: Zoning

This map was created from existing map sources, not from field surveys. While great care was taken in using the most current map sources available, no warranties of any sort, including accuracy, fitness, or merchantability accompany this product. The user of this map assumes responsibility for determining its suitability for its intended use. This map is not a substitute for field survey.
Sidney/Pottery Study Area:
Subcommittee Recommendations
Alternative 1
Sidney/Pottery Study Area:
Subcommittee Recommendations
Alternative 2
Sidney/Pottery Study Area:
Subcommittee Recommendations
Alternative 3
Sidney/Pottery Study Area: Subcommittee Recommendations
Alternative 1

- Possible Future Access Road
- Roundabout
- Northbound left-turn pocket
- Future Four-way signal
- Future Three-way signal
- Pedestrian signal
- Roundabout as needed

This map was created from existing map sources, not from field surveys. While great care was taken in using the most current map sources available, no warranties of any sort, including accuracy, fitness, or merchantability accompany this product. The user of this map assumes responsibility for determining its suitability for its intended use. This map is not a substitute for field survey.
Sidney/Pottery Study Area:
Subcommittee Recommendations
Alternative 2
Sidney/Pottery Study Area:
Subcommittee Recommendations
Alternative 3
May 27, 2009

Dear Sidney/Pottery Subcommittee Members,

Thank you to everyone who has been involved in this subcommittee so far. I felt that our first meeting was very productive. Our next meeting is June 3, 2009 so I am including some attachments for your consideration and future discussions. I will have handouts of the attachments available at the meeting but I thought that I would send them to you so that you’ll have time to formulate some ideas, questions and solutions to the development in the corridor.

I have taken many of the things we discussed in the last meeting and put them to paper, in addition, I have asked Mark Dorsey, City Engineer, to attend the meeting so he can answer the nuts and bolts question of engineering principles. We will try to stay focused on aspects of the corridor study that we have been charged with by the City Council and in doing so we can advance the study.

Attachments:

20090526 Sidney pottery draft signalization; This is a map of the corridor study area showing the locations of signalizations we discussed and other possible locations where traffic controls may be necessary. In addition, as discussed, the corridor study area has been divided into two areas, the Sidney section and the Pottery section.

Draft Sidney cross section; This draft cross section is for the Sidney section of the corridor study. I think that it meets what the committee recommendations were for the roadway including an asymmetrical design with a multi-purpose trail on the west side of right of way that keeps bicyclists out of the traffic lane, with a sidewalk on the east.

20090606 subcommittee meeting memo; This attachment are the notes from the previous subcommittee meeting. This memo was presented to the Planning Commission at their last regular meeting. We will need to go over it to correct any miss-statements that may be included in the document.

Proposed Agenda for June 3rd meeting:

1. Briefly discuss the meeting notes from the May 6th meeting.
2. Discuss possible road sections for the Pottery section of the corridor plan.
3. Obtain the City Engineer’s input on varied aspects of the study plan and refine signalization.
4. Types and locations of street trees.
5. Preliminary street furniture discussions.

I’ll send out one more email approximately 24 hrs prior to the meeting as a reminder. See you there.

Tom Bonsell
Associate Planner
(360) 876-4991
Subcommittee Meeting Summary

To: Sidney/Pottery Subcommittee
From: Thomas Bonsell, Associate Planner
Date: July 8, 2009
Subject: Goals and actions

A special thank you to those subcommittee members those were able to make our last meeting on July 8, 2009. Also a thank you to those who have attended any of the subcommittee meetings and helped the committee to formulate some design alternatives for the Sidney/Pottery Corridor. The following are the notes as I remember them from the meeting and some that came in later.

If I missed anything important please email me back with the information so I can give an accurate representation of committee recommendations and concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Goal or action</th>
<th>Action/concern</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Provide a realistic roadway design that does not put too onerous a burden on the developers or on city finances.</td>
<td>If plans are too grandiose, project will end up like Bethel and never get constructed.</td>
<td>Reduce recommended roadway from five lanes as previously discussed to three lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Committee wants to ensure that roadway in whatever configuration is constructed.</td>
<td>Concerns that road will end up like Bethel, nice plans but no construction. Developers want consistency of construction requirements.</td>
<td>Have the city be the lead for construction by traffic fees or LID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Have practical and Public works approved street trees</td>
<td>Prior to final selection of street trees get</td>
<td>Yoshino Flowering Cherry and existing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIDNEY - POTTERY CORRIDOR PLAN: APPENDIX 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>recommendation from P/W.</th>
<th>trees in median near Jr. High School.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Are three lane cross sections shown approved by Fire District</td>
<td>Subcommittee will check with Fire Department.</td>
<td>Conversation with Greg Rogers (Fire Marshal) revealed that when Islands are utilized, Fire wants 20 feet of asphalt unless a waiver is granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Planning should include site design so the city doesn’t have to pay for commercial right of way.</td>
<td>If five lanes are required in the future, site designs should not allow buildings to be constructed within X number of feet of right of way</td>
<td>Look at revising POMC Chapter 16.45 (Design Guidelines) so that parking can be placed next to streets for future expansion of roadway. Not Bethel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Provide three viable alternatives</td>
<td>Alternatives were created as discussed in the subcommittee meeting</td>
<td>They are in the process of being updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think that is it, but if not let me know. Again thanks.

Tom Bonsell  
Associate Planner  
(360) 876-4991
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Commission  
From: Thomas Bonsell, Associate Planner  
Date: June 4, 2009  
Subject: Sidney/Pottery Corridor Subcommittee meeting notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Goal or Action</th>
<th>Action/Concern</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Move cars efficiently and smoothly through corridor.</td>
<td>Concern was expressed over number of traffic signals along Sidney.</td>
<td>Although previous discussions were against round-bouts, committee decided one would be appropriate at Hovde and Sidney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Move cars efficiently and smoothly through corridor.</td>
<td>After annexation of McCormick Woods, Traffic will increase significantly along Berry Lake Rd. to Sedgwick</td>
<td>Create five lanes from Berry Lake to Sedgwick instead of three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Road sections need to be specific to the Sections of the corridor (Possibly 4 will be needed)</td>
<td>Road sections will be cleaned and put in Perteet study.</td>
<td>Create four road sections for different sections of the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is the possibility of school closure going to impact corridor plan?</td>
<td>Are the two schools along the corridor going to remain or be located?</td>
<td>Contacted the school district to discuss the issue with the Cap Fac. Director Tom O’Brien. No change is expected for at least 7 Yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Following the recommendations of Perteet Inc Studies</td>
<td>Committee wants to insure coordination with Perteet</td>
<td>City engineer will set up meeting with Perteet. Recommendations were discussed with Perteet on 6/4/2009. Additionally the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choosing street furniture</td>
<td>Committee did not want to look at street furniture.</td>
<td>Staff will provide alternatives for city council consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Selection of street trees</td>
<td>Would like recommendations from P/W for types and placement</td>
<td>Committee will provide recommendations after internet research for City Council consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subcommittee Meeting Summary

To: Sidney/Pottery Subcommittee  
From: Thomas Bonsell, Associate Planner  
Date: May 11, 2009  
Subject: Goals and actions

The Sidney/Pottery Corridor Study Plan subcommittee held its first meeting on Wednesday, May 6, 2009. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the transportation needs and create a series of recommendations to the Planning Commission. As the recently annexed commercial properties along the Sidney/Pottery corridor develop, it is important to have a consistency of roadway design to insure orderly development. The subcommittee meeting was productive and below are listed the primary issues that were discussed. The *italics* portions of the below matrix is subsequent information where research was warranted. These discussion points are still subject to change and will be further developed in subsequent meetings.

The subcommittee will continue to meet on the 1st Wednesday of the month in June and July and is open to the public. The next meeting will be held on June 3rd, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Goal or action</th>
<th>Action/concern</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Move traffic as efficiently as possible for complete build out (beyond 2025). Number one issue.</td>
<td>Obtain R/W for eventual 4 lane roadway.</td>
<td>Roadway design for corridor must show 80’ R/W with agreement from Perteet: <em>OK in Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Committee wants to split corridor study into two corridor regions</td>
<td>Discuss potential problem with Director</td>
<td><em>No problems in doing so.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIDNEY - POTTERY CORRIDOR PLAN: APPENDIX 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Move traffic as efficiently as possible for complete build out</td>
<td>Is there any problems with requiring 4 lane R/W and constructing three lanes</td>
<td>Check with Director: <em>As long total R/W requested include full width of boulevard it is OK.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Obtain more R/W is ball park area</td>
<td>Would ball fields have to move? Would they be better served if relocated?</td>
<td>Check with director for possibilities: R/W can move over to supply R/W from who can provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Construct two lane road with center turn lane</td>
<td>If center has planting strips, will city be able to maintain</td>
<td>Check w/ P/W for availability of future funds for maintenance: <em>Suggest have community maintenance program (adopt a planter program).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>No traffic circles on Sidney Pottery</td>
<td>Not pedestrian friendly</td>
<td>Have statement as such in CFP by Perteet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Need at least two intersections with traffic lights or signals</td>
<td>Design light for Berry Lake road and light or all way stop for Lippert Drive.</td>
<td>Have statement in CFP in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Concerned about school agers and traffic calming measures through school zones</td>
<td>Have flashing pedestrian light at Birch</td>
<td>Have statement in support in CFP and shown on plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Inconsistent speed limits</td>
<td>Research possibility</td>
<td>Discuss with P/W: <em>Differing speeds limit are a result of City-County conflicts.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Have limited access to new commercial projects</td>
<td>Create Ordinance requiring shared access</td>
<td>Discuss with Director: <em>Not through ordinance but in CFP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Create ULID to facilitate construction of improvements</td>
<td>Doesn’t want this corridor to become a Bethel Avenue</td>
<td>Check with P/W for feasibility: <em>P/W can create an improvement district for road construction, will be discussed at next meeting.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>No parking on street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have supporting statement in CFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Concerned about children riding bicycles to school in traffic lane</td>
<td>Design joint bike/pedestrian path to act as a trail</td>
<td>Check with Director to see if more grants are available is joint use trail is created as opposes to a bike lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Possible 4 lane road to begin with</td>
<td>Check with P/W</td>
<td>Discussed at next subcommittee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Concern with pedestrian crossings at Tremont and Pottery</td>
<td>Make provisions for pedestrians crossing Tremont</td>
<td>Check with P/W for plans. Design is in process, will be discussed at next subcommittee meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Wants CFP to support Corridor Plans recommendation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss with P/W: CFP will be influenced by subcommittee goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>What is the county zoning designations for the yet un-annexed portions of the corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>County zoning map will be provided at next subcommittee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Need Kitsap Transit bus stops with pull outs</td>
<td>Kitsap Transit does not want pull outs, but to maintain smooth traffic flow, pull outs are necessary.</td>
<td>Show approximate locations for stops and pull-outs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Commission
From: Thomas Bonsell, Associate Planner
Date: June 4, 2009
Subject: Sidney/Pottery Corridor Subcommittee meeting notes.

The second of three meetings of the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Study Plan was held on June 4, 2009. The meeting was focused on the following items;

1. Briefly discuss the meeting notes from the May 6th meeting.
2. Discuss possible road sections for the Pottery section of the corridor plan.
3. Obtain the City Engineer’s input on varied aspects of the study plan and refine signalization.
4. Types and locations of street trees.
5. Preliminary street furniture discussions.

1. A copy of the minutes from the last meeting was provided and reviewed by subcommittee members to insure that planning staff transcribed the notes from the meeting properly and that the main points discussed were documented for the record.

2. The subcommittee was provided with draft road sections for portions of Sidney and Pottery roads. The committee, under guidance of Mark Dorsey, City Engineer suggested that there may need to be as many as four different road cross sections for the corridor. The subcommittee also determined that Sidney Road from Berry Lake Road south to Sedgwick Road should in all likely-hood be five lanes. The subcommittee wanted revisions to the draft corridor map showing five lanes.

3. Discussions about refining the signalizations brought up concerns about too many signals and how this might negatively impact traffic flow. With the City Engineers guidance, the subcommittee determined that there not be a traffic light at Pottery and South Kitsap Blvd, only a north bound left turn lane, a four-way traffic light at Lippert and Pottery, a three-way traffic light at Berry Lake and Sidney, a pedestrian light at Birch and Sidney and a round-about at Hovde at such time an access by-pass road is built from Sedgwick to Hovde.

4. The subcommittee was given a list of potential street trees and was charged with looking them up on the internet and coming back next month with recommendations.

5. The committee felt it was unnecessary to look at street furniture so staff will provide some recommendations to the Planning Commission as a whole for consideration.
Attendees to the subcommittee were Bek Ashby, Annette Stewart, Tom Bonsell, Darrell Fields, Pat Waters, Craig Baldwin, Fred Depee, and Gary Anderson et.al.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Goal or Action</th>
<th>Action/Concern</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Move cars efficiently and smoothly through corridor.</td>
<td>Concern was expressed over number of traffic signals along Sidney.</td>
<td>Although previous discussions were against round-bouts, committee decided one would be appropriate at Hovde and Sidney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Move cars efficiently and smoothly through corridor.</td>
<td>After annexation of McCormick Woods, Traffic will increase significantly along Berry Lake Rd. to Sedgwick</td>
<td>Create five lanes from Berry Lake to Sedgwick instead of three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Road sections need to be specific to the Sections of the corridor (Possibly 4 will be needed)</td>
<td>Road sections will be cleaned and put in Perteet study.</td>
<td>Create four road sections for different sections of the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is the possibility of school closure going to impact corridor plan?</td>
<td>Are the two schools along the corridor going to remain or be located?</td>
<td>Contacted the school district to discuss the issue with the Cap Fac. Director Tom O’Brien. No change is expected for at least 7 Yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Following the recommendations of Perteet Inc Studies</td>
<td>Committee wants to insure coordination with Perteet</td>
<td>City engineer will set up meeting with Perteet. Recommendations were discussed with Perteet on 6/4/2009. Additionally the Subcommittee recommendations will be Alternative 1 and Perteet’s will be alternative 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Choosing street furniture</td>
<td>Committee did not want to look at street furniture.</td>
<td>Staff will provide alternatives for city council consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Selection of street trees</td>
<td>Would like recommendations from P/W for types and placement</td>
<td>Committee will provide recommendations after internet research for City Council consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Street Cross Section for Pottery Avenue at Underpass

- 60 Feet of usable ROW
- Side Walk: 5'
- Bike Lane: 6'
- Driving Lane: 12'
- Landscape median and turn pockets: 14'
- Driving Lane: 12'
- Bike Lane: 6'
- Side Walk: 6'
- Concrete covered Slope
Two-Lane (with Center Lane or Median) Principal, Minor or Collector Arterial with Bike Lanes

65-71' for Three lane Cross section
Two-Lane (with Center Lane) Principal, Minor or Collector Arterial with Multi-Use Path

59-70' for Three Lanes and Multi-Use Trail

12' (plus 2' shoulder each side if possible)
Two-Lane Minor or Collector with Bike Lanes and Parking

69-75' for Two lane plus parking cross section
Subject: Sidney/Pottery study area

Dear Port Orchard Resident,

Thank you for considering this letter. Recently, the city has annexed large tracts of undeveloped land along Sidney Road and the surrounding area. To that end, the city will be evaluating future traffic needs for the area and to maintain a continuity of design along Sidney/Pottery road from approximately three-hundred feet south of Sedgwick Avenue, north to the Tremont Street intersection. The city is looking for citizens who will participate during this three month public process and are willing to provide input and suggestions to accommodate the transportation needs of the area and help create an aesthetically pleasing corridor. You are invited to a Corridor Study sub-committee, formed to review the transportation & aesthetic elements of the roadway infrastructure while maintain traffic Level of Service (LOS) standards that meet the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Meetings will be held once per month after hours in the city council chambers.

The Corridor Sub-committee will have a formal kick-off meeting with the Planning commission on April 20th, 2009 at 7:00 PM in the Robert G. Geiger meeting room. At that meeting, there will be a sign up sheet for those persons who would like to be on the subcommittee. In Addition, there will be an opportunity for public comment, both written and oral.

The Sidney/Pottery Corridor Plan Sub Committee will be made up of your friends and neighbors who are Port Orchard residents and who live, work or traverse through the Sidney/Pottery study Corridor. The Committee will meet monthly to discuss the needs of the corridor and develop a strategy for comprehensive and uniform pedestrian & roadway development along this arterial. The goals of the subcommittee will be to provide input for the roadway cross sections, street lighting, furniture and sidewalks, bicycle lanes, school zones, and location of transits stops. Although a difficult process, the subcommittee will be considering all the issues within the corridor study area and identifying ways to best accommodate the growth through a preliminary roadway that maintains continuity and aesthetics along the entire length of the corridor study area.

After receiving the subcommittee’s and the general public comments and suggestions, a corridor plan will be developed and brought to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to the City Council.

I look forward to receipt of your comment letters.

Respectfully,

Thomas Bonsell
Associate Planner
City of Port Orchard
Planning Department
216 Prospect St.
Port Orchard, WA  98366

Please visit www.portorchardplan.com or www.cityofportorchard.us for information on the City's Sidney/Pottery Corridor Study Plan. You'll find information on meetings, workshops, staff contacts, etc.

---

COMMENT CARD – City of Port Orchard Sidney/Pottery Corridor Study Plan

Name, address, phone:___________________________________________________________________________

E-mail: _________________________________________________________________________________________

☐ Yes  ☐ No  Would you like to be included in the Sidney/Pottery Corridor Study Plan email list?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Tom,
Thanks for asking for our input regarding bus stops in the Pottery/Sidney area. I hope this answers most of your questions.

Kitsap Transit prefers NOT to have turn-outs for our buses but just bus stops along the sidewalks. We generally try to locate bus stops about every two blocks or near major generators of foot traffic, like grocery stores, apartment complexes or other dense housing areas, etc. If there is room within the right-of-way, it's very nice if a concrete pad for a passenger waiting shelter is installed at the same time as the sidewalks. We prefer the pads to be 13' long by 6' deep but we can be flexible to some extent on that. The width of the sidewalk is a factor as well as the right-of-way available. We generally have two shelter sizes, one is 4' x 8' and the other is a canopy style where the side walls are 2' deep but the roof is 4' deep. This works in areas where there is limited space. The extra 5' of pad at the end of the shelter enables our ramp or lift for wheelchairs to deploy to load or unload wheelchair passengers.

John Clauson, my supervisor and a Port Orchard council member, and I are always willing to meet with you to go over the plans and give you our input about where bus stops should be located. Currently, we do not have bus service in this area and with the economy the way it is, it might be a few years before we can expand our service to this area.

If you have other questions or would like to meet with us, please don't hesitate to e-mail or call us. You have my e-mail address. My phone number is 478-6224. John's number is 478-6223.

Thanks again for thinking about Kitsap Transit in your planning,
Doug Johnson
Transit Planner
Memo to Planning Commission for November 16, 2009
regular meeting
The following are street furniture alternatives from local providers

**BENCHES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative - A</th>
<th>Alternative - B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASCADE CA-2</td>
<td>Galleria GA-V1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative - C</th>
<th>Alternative - D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL - 5</td>
<td>MT-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRASH RECEPTICALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative - A</th>
<th>Alternative - B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR - 16</td>
<td>TR - 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Alternative - A" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Alternative - B" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Designs shown are Patent Pending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative - C</th>
<th>Alternative - D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR - 5</td>
<td>TR - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Alternative - C" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Alternative - D" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BICYCLE RACKS

Alternative - A
Br – 1.5

Alternative – B
BR – 2

Alternative – C
BG – 3

Alternative - D
BG – 6.1
## BOLLARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative - A</th>
<th>Alternative - B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B – 1 UNLIGHTED</td>
<td>B-4-8A2 UNLIGHTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – 1 – L LIGHTED</td>
<td>B – 4 – 5A2 L LIGHTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRENCH GRATES

Alternative - A
STA Series

Alternative - B
SLC Series

Alternative – C
CQR Series

Alternative D
LPT Series
CITY PREFERRED CHOICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative - C</th>
<th>Alternative - A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL - 5</td>
<td>TR - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image of a bench]</td>
<td>![Image of a trash can]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative - A</th>
<th>Alternative - A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Br – 1.5</td>
<td>B – 1 UNLIGHTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image of a bike stand]</td>
<td>![Image of a bollard]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative - A</th>
<th>Alternative - A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B – 1 – L LIGHTED</td>
<td>STA Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image of a bollard]</td>
<td>![Image of a tree in a grate]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>