

**2024 Comprehensive Plan Preliminary Alternatives- Public Comments as of 03/15/23**

*(Deadline for Comment on Preliminary Alternatives is April 14, 2023)*

Name	Summary of Concern	Comment
Chadrick Ashby	Opposes including in Alt 3	<p>My name is Chadrick Ashby and I am a Port Orchard native and local property owner. My family and I own and operate a small farm along Cool Creek, which directly borders the land being considered in Reclassification Request #49. I would like to highlight the discrepancies between Reclassification Request #49, and the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies document. Please consider two key details: •Expanding the UGA per Request #49 (alternative 3) exceeds population growth needs while taking away the rural character of Kitsap County. •Critical conservation areas including salmon habitat and waterways will be negatively affected by the proposed UGA expansion. According to the Planning Policies document, Kitsap County has a primary focus on creating urban/civic centers while promoting rural character. The Phillips Road corridor in Port Orchard, has historically been a rural, forested area, that people chose to live along for these reasons. Expanding the UGA down Phillips Road is not focusing growth on downtown Port Orchard, and is taking away from the rural nature of our community. According to this document, section UGA-3-h: “Urban Growth Area expansion shall not result in new areas being included for population or employment capacity that exceeds what is necessary to accommodate the growth management planning projections, plus a reasonable land market supply factor, or market factor.” According to the Alternatives Summary document, Alternative 3 “exceeds expected population growth needs.” More specifically in Port Orchard, adding undeveloped land along Phillips Road into the UGA for SFRs (Request #49), while taking existing UGA properties with existing SFRs OUT of the UGA along Aiken Road, is contradictory. Why remove existing SFR legacy lots from the UGA, just to add undeveloped forested land along Phillips Road into it? This seems contradictory and unfitting for community development. In Element D of this document, the very first policy’s (R-1) focus is: “Preserving rural character and enhancing the natural environment, “ and aims to “preserve the character of identified rural areas by protecting and enhancing the natural environment, open spaces, recreational opportunities, and scenic and historic areas. Support small-scale farming and working resource land, promote locally grown food, forestry, eco- and heritage-tourism.” Considering Alternative 3 in Port Orchard (specifically reclassification request #49) will do the exact opposite of this stated goal. Expanding the UGA south along Phillips Road will NOT preserve the rural character of this area and will be a detriment to the surrounding natural environment. This option will be a threat to the Cool Creek habitat and our family’s farmland and small herd of cattle that use this creek as a water source. Additionally, according to NE-3-a of this document, “The County and the Cities will conserve and enhance the County’s natural resources, critical areas, water quality/quantity, and environmental amenities while planning for and accommodating sustainable growth by: •Protecting critical areas (wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, steep slopes, and geologically hazardous areas). “ If Reclassification request #49 is considered, it would be a direct violation of Kitsap County’s policies regarding the protection of our natural environment. Critical areas, including Cool Creek and surrounding wetlands, run through the properties in this request, and approving it will increase the housing capacity from 4 homes to a maximum of 180 homes. It would be ignorant to think that this level of development would not have an impact on the surrounding critical area. In fact, there has already been a total disregard for this wetland. Last summer, this land almost sold to a developer, and not only did the developer destroy over the allotted 7000 sq. ft of land performing their feasibility studies and other tests, but much of that destroyed land was within the designated wetlands/Cool Creek. The Kitsap County Code Enforcement team was forced to issue a stop work order in order to protect this critical area from this developer’s negligence and recklessness. According to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Coho salmon are already considered a threatened species at the federal level. Kitsap County’s Planning Policies must give special consideration to the listed species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The county “shall preserve, protect, and where possible, restore the functions of natural habitat to support ESA-listed species, through the adoption of comprehensive plan policies, critical area ordinances, shoreline master programs, and other development regulations that seek to protect, maintain or restore aquatic ecosystems associated habitats and aquifer through the use of management zones, development regulations, incentives for voluntary efforts of private landowners and developers, land use classifications or designations, habitat acquisition programs or habitat restoration projects.” Ignoring the struggling salmon population that spawn in Cool Creek, and allowing UGA expansion for up to 180 SFRs on and near these critical areas is a direct violation of our planning policies and the ESA, as well as grossly negligent. Please note that my grandfather, William Ashby, Sr. is a local cattle farmer and owns land along Cool Creek. He worked with county and state authorities to install over one mile of fencing around Cool Creek and its surrounding wetlands to preserve wildlife habitats. He spent thousands of hours and dollars doing this. Our family takes conservation seriously and we hope the County considers potential negative ecological impacts when considering UGA expansion. Please DO NOT consider Alternative #3 map for Port Orchard (specifically Reclassification Request #49). Please consider only Alternative #1 or #2 for Port Orchard.</p>
Emilee Ashby	Opposes including in Alt 3	<p>Dear Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Team, Thank you for the opportunity for public comment on the future planning of Kitsap County. Just as important as the desires of landowners wanting to rezone their properties, are the real impact that such requests will have on neighbors and surrounding communities. I am a 4th generation property owner and community member of South Kitsap. My family has lived on and worked farmland in Port Orchard since the 1960’s, and the conservation and protection of our rural lands are of utmost importance to us, our neighbors, and our community. The environmental impact of urban sprawl in South Kitsap is a constant threat to our livelihood and needs to be addressed. When studying the Alternatives Maps that were published last week, there are several discrepancies with the Port Orchard Alternative 3 option that I would like to highlight. According to the Comprehensive Plan Update, the purpose of this update is to ensure adherence to the Growth Management Act (GMA) in order to plan for the next 20 years of population and employment growth. If complying with the GMA is of primary importance, I would like to point out direct violations of GMA compliance with Alternative 3 in Port Orchard, specifically Reclassification Request #49, along Phillips Road. They are as follows (GMA components are bulleted, my comments are bolded in parentheses): • Encourage development in urban areas near public facilities and services (Request #49 was taken out of the UGA in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update, for several reasons, including environmental concerns, the prevention of urban sprawl, and to make the border of the UGA more linear. Adding these 20 acres back into the UGA (with zoning for 5-9 single family residences [SFR] per acre) would not encourage development in existing urban areas, which directly violates the GMA. Additionally, there are no public services or existing infrastructure to accommodate 100-180 more homes and families along Phillips Road.)•Reduce sprawl (Alternative #3 will directly contribute to urban sprawl in South Kitsap. In both Alternative #2 and #3 maps for Port Orchard, there are legacy lots with existing SFRs along Aiken Road that are removed from the UGA to accommodate UGA expansion in other areas. In Alternative #3, these Aiken SFR properties are taken out of the UGA only to add undeveloped, forested land along Phillips road to the UGA. This seems contradictory.)•Encourage multimodal transportation (Kitsap Transit does not service Phillips Road, and the nearest bus stop is over a mile away and only services people in the early AM and for Southworth ferry commuters in the evening. There are no sidewalks or bike lanes along Phillips Road)•Plan for and accommodate housing at all economic segments (If an additional housing development were to go in on Phillips Road (which is extremely likely if Reclassification Request #49 is approved), similar to the Richmond homes on Baker/Phillips, then the home prices would range from \$499-\$799k. Not many people in our community can afford these prices, and this option does not promote housing diversity.)•Protect private property rights (The private property rights of bordering farmland and rural property owners to the properties included in Reclassification Request #49 have already been violated. This property owner invited developers onto their land to do feasibility and other tests in summer of 2022. This developer made 2 illegal access entrances to the property off of Phillips Road and destroyed over their allotted 7000 sq. feet of land performing these tests. Much of this destroyed land is considered a critical area. Kitsap County Code Enforcement was involved which resulted in a stop-work order being issued. The developers ignored this order and continued to damage more land before the County could stop them. The actions of these developers and property owners of this land negatively impacted their neighbors; the illegal entry points were subsequently used by unwanted guests to explore the trail system with ATVs and by foot, resulting in trespassing on neighboring properties and privacy violations by known convicts. The property owners of this land did not block the illegal entrances, patrol the area, or place no trespassing signs- my family and I had to.)•Protect the environment and enhance quality of life (This is arguably the biggest discrepancy regarding Alternative #3, especially along Phillips Road. Cool Creek is a Coho and Chum Salmon Spawning habitat that runs through the wetlands of the property in Reclassification Request #49. Adding 20 additional acres of UGA land will allow this property owner to sell a total of 40 acres of property zoned 5-9 homes per acre. This would mean up to 360 homes could be built on the banks of Cool Creek. This critical area and all wetlands up and downstream from this property will be negatively impacted, which is especially unfortunate considering an already struggling Washington State salmon population.)As you can see, entertaining Reclassification Request #49 is a direct violation of the GMA. Keeping these 20 acres as-is, will allow 4 homes to be built on the banks of Cool Creek, which is acceptable to neighbors and surrounding community. For this reason, I encourage you to adopt Alternative 1 or 2 in Port Orchard and leave Reclassification Request #49 OUT of the UGA.</p>

William D. Ashby Sr.	Opposes including in Alt 3	My name is William Dean Ashby Sr. I have lived in Port Orchard since my family and I moved here from South Dakota in the 1940s so my father could take a job at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard. In 1965, my wife and I started a 40-acre cattle farm along Cool Creek in Port Orchard. This is the property that my children, my grandchildren, and now my great-grandchildren have all been raised on. This place is my livelihood and I want to protect it for generations to come. I would like to briefly tell you about the conservation efforts that my late wife, Myrna, and myself, took on in the 1990s in order to promote the Coho Salmon population throughout Cool Creek and other feeder streams on our property. Because of the small head of cattle that we keep (15-25 Hereford cows/steers), we wanted to make sure that we were being responsible to the native salmon populations while maintaining a viable and healthy water source for our animals. We teamed up with the Mid-Sound Salmon Enhancement Project in order to fully fence our farm and wetlands, rehabilitate the stream system, and promote salmon habitats for future generations. We put in over 7 miles of fencing over the course of almost 10 years. We created a meandering stream with native plants, fish ladders, and pools for spawning. For nearly a decade, myself and my family gave all of our free time to this project, as it was the most responsible thing to do. The Coho salmon population increased on our properties in the years to follow. Our efforts have lasted decades and we all still work very hard to maintain this property and this salmon stream. If Alternative 3 is entertained in Port Orchard, the conservation efforts that myself and my family worked so hard for, will be greatly threatened. In 2016, when the Comprehensive Plan Update was revised, there was an identical request to 2024's Reclassification Request #49. This 20 acres of land was left OUT of the UGA in 2016 for multiple reasons, but a large part due to the environmental concerns that development of this land will bring. These Comprehensive Plan Updates should not be a "put and take" activity. Our neighborhood and community should have some assurance of dependable, lasting decisions! There are many good reasons this land was removed from the UGA in 2016; and the environmental concerns that we had in 2016 have only been amplified today. Between the threat of climate change and urban sprawl. There is an even bigger cause for concern regarding the environmental impacts of urban development, especially along our stream systems. The abundance of coho salmon remains unstable in WA state, and the population varies between years because this species of salmon is particularly susceptible to changes in conditions. If reclassification request #49 is considered (Alternative 3 in Port Orchard), it would put 20 acres of forested land along Phillips Road into the UGA. This will allow for 5-9 homes per acre. That is 100-180 homes (instead of currently zoned for 4 homes), on the banks of critical wetland habitat, that will absolutely put my farm, cows, and the native Coho salmon population, in real danger of non-existence. According to the Countywide Planning Policies in Kitsap, "Rural land use designations in the County's Comprehensive Plan shall recognize ecological functions and support rural uses such as farming, forestry, mining, recreation, tourism, and other rural activities, and permit a variety of low-density residential uses that preserve rural character and ecological functions, and can be sustained by rural service levels. " Please keep our rural farmlands, stream systems, and wetlands in mind when considering changes made to our 2024 Comprehensive Plan. I urge you to adopt Alternative #1 or #2 for Port Orchard, and leave Reclassification Request #49 OUT of the UGA. My farm and livelihood depend on it.
Hannah Orlando Baldus	Supports Alt 2	I'm urging you to adopt a Focused Growth/ Urban Center Focused approach to the 2024 plan. As a current Kitsap County farmer and nearly lifelong Silverdale resident, I have deep roots here and I love our community. Encouraging economic growth and encouraging ecological conservation (such as preserving our farmlands) are not mutually exclusive; we can do both. And this is exactly what the Focused Growth proposal can accomplish. Furthermore, we need an Agricultural Board, or at least an Agricultural seat at the table for planning decisions. A clear need has been identified, time to make it happen.
Don Proctor	Move Portion to Alt 2	See Attachment
Jason Highberg	Central Kitsap - Oppose Rezoning	We don't need any rezoning in Kitsap. The central valley area is beautiful and needs to be preserved. What we need is to not have greedy rental companies asking for so much money that keeps renters away. Building so many more new homes on top of each other where there is no chance for a lawn with each property does not help the situation when these are just going to be sold at current prices and do nothing for lowering average prices. Address the real issues before destroying the environment.
Deborah Brennan	Opposes Island Lake Rezone	I am against rezoning the acreage of the Old Christa Camp on Island Lake from Rural to Urban Low for several reasons. 1) How can this level of density be approved when it is next to Barker Creek? 2) Homes in this area are currently using septic systems. How will the sewer needs be addressed? 3) With our changing climate, what about the impact of all of these additional homes have on our water supply 4) With increased traffic on Central Valley Road, will that road need to be widened? Does the county have the easements and would the developer be liable for the associated costs? 5) Additionally, the proposed density will be out of keeping with the surrounding properties. If the property is approved for development it should be at the current rate of one house per five acres.
Colleen O'Brien	Opposes Crista Camp Development	What is going to happen with all the traffic on the upper portion of NW ISLAND LAKE ROAD? Just back into or out of my driveway is already a nightmare with the humans driving way over the speed limit. Yes, I have spoke to Ron Pierce. Yes, they did put the computerized rubber speed "strips" across the road last last Summer. What a joke!!! I watched the same automobile go up and down the street THREE TIMES at crazy rate of speed and it only registered it ONCE between 55-59 MPH. I understand it is a Level I street during the Winter for busses. Now you want to add 350 homes with at least two people working and flying past my home. That is at least 700 more cars on a tiny road, with curves...and that is just before and after work. What about trips to store, school busses, garbage pick-ups, etc. TWO SUGGESTIONS... 1. Speed bumps from Gallery to Bennington. There needs to be at least three. 2. Close NW Island Road where it meets Camp Court so none of the traffic comes up the hill (heading West). All those automobiles can drive on the lower part of NW Island Lake Road near the lake WHERE THERE ARE ONLY A HANDFUL OF HOUSES. The condos on Slate and Granite would have two exits to get out. The four houses that are on the South side of NW Island Lake Road, just up the hill from Camp Court, can easily change their addresses to Silverdale vice Poulsbo, per the Silverdale Postmaster. Additionally, the upper portion of NW ISLAND LAKE ROAD has a sidewalk and has AT LEAST 100 people walking right next to cars going 40 MPH. I have a Service Dog and TWICE we have almost been hit by people flying down the road. Yes, they came across the 2-foot "green patch" and onto the sidewalk. You going to pay for a new trained Service Dog for me when we get hit? As far as calling 911...Please...They ask me what kind of automobile and license plate, SERIOUSLY? I tell them it was white or light grey or cream colored...I can not tell with a streak going past my home. Since I started this email, I have counted 22 cars going AT LEAST 35 MPH. I have repeatedly called Sheriff to complain. Deaf ears. When someone is hit and killed on this street...NOT IF...the county will be liable. There are speed humps on Tracyton Beach. Do not lie and say "Level I roads can not have speed bumps". The county can make so much money by having a Sheriff sit on this street and nail every speeder.
Brent Hecht	Supports Island Lake Rezone	Just putting in my two cents are Christa Camp: let's get more housing in the county!
Laura Izzard	Opposes Rezoning	Hi my name is Laura Izzard and I am writing to let you know my concerns about the rezoning. I think it is unbelievable that the rezoning is possibly going to change so drastically. I live on Plateau Circle in the Point of View neighborhood and we all know the developers are going to cut down the forest which is unfortunate because we have seen deer, owls,raccoons, frogs and many animals in the forest. So many of my neighbors and myself are heartbroken about these new changes and If you change the zoning and allow developers to come in and build massive buildings.....the animals don't stand a chance. Please do the right thing and keep the zoning guidelines the same.

Aleena Yunuba	Opposes Island Lake Rezone	I live in the neighborhood of the land formerly called Camp Christie, 95 acres which has been proposed to be rezoned from Rural to Urban Low Density. We live at 1410 NW Island Lake Rd and own our home, and are concerned about the development. Our primary concern is the traffic flow to and from the proposed development. The main access road to this area is a single-lane dirt road which branches off of Island Lake Rd at the bottom of a hill. The hill here is very dangerous during winter road conditions and while we have lived here, cars have slid down the icy road and into the properties at the base of the hill multiple times and caused property damage to the fences there. This will likely happen more with the increased traffic on the road, as well as be more damaging since large construction trucks will be routinely traveling in and out. This area also doesn't have good visibility around the corners and cars often speed. Combined with the lack of sidewalks, it makes it dangerous to walk along the road and the increased traffic would increase the danger. Currently I walk my dog along this road every day but I do not know if I will be able to should the land be rezoned without any additional steps. We would like to lobby for any or all of the following to address this issue: - Sidewalks installed along at least one side of Island Lake Road, specifically on the hill between 1410 and Camp Court. - A reduced speed limit for the area - Speed bumps, again specifically on the hill. - Street lamps at top and bottom of hill to improve visibility. We also have concerns about the environmental impact of the development. Other neighbors who have lived in this neighborhood longer have shared stories about a development in the 80s that clearcut trees and caused massive soil runoff, then didn't drill deeply enough to reach the water table and drained several inches out of the lake. We are concerned that this development will not be handled responsibly and we will see a repeat of these issues, or a crop of other unintended consequences. We hope that the county will require a full report of potential environmental impacts based on the development and regulate the construction appropriately to protect the area in which we live. I am also curious whether a survey has been conducted or will be conducted on the land to assess indigenous/cultural impacts of developing the land, prior to rezoning/issuing permits for development. Finally, my understanding is that the developer intends to build rental properties, not properties to sell to new homeowners. I do have concerns about the quality of our neighborhood and of Island Lake Park if the majority of these people are short-term renters with no investment in the area - specifically that they will bring an influx of litter, disrespect our park, and make this a less pleasant place to live. Thank you for taking the time to read through my concerns. I hope some are able to be addressed before rezoning the land.
Danna Olson	Opposes Crista Camp Development	I am asking you to please not implement by our plan for land owners to build up to 360 houses total on our road. Please realize that the reason we all moved out this way to get away from close neighbors and traffic originally. I know that all you think about is the money which is unfortunate and sad. We wanted more peace and quiet which has become an absolute joke. I know you don't care because it's all about the tax money to you. But the residents out here do care. We don't need any more housing out here or traffic. Please start listening to us and don't allow this plan to go through... none of them. We are on SE Emelia Ln and hear the cars on Phillips speed on it all hours of the day. There is no way the speed limit should be 45!!!!!! It is not a highway. People aren't driving the limit— instead they go about 50?to 55! It's crazy. That speed limit needs to be lowered immediately. It is not safe. Phillips road speed limit is higher than many like mile hill road that is even 35. Please don't be deaf to our concerns about not allowing any mor building and ruining our current rural area anymore than you already have in the past by allowing so many new houses out here!!!!!!!!!! I am not the only one who feels this way and don't know why you all feel like you have to make changes to the current plan.
Forrest Nichols	Supports Alt 2	I have lived in Kitsap County for 36 years, and have seen it change an enormous amount in my time here. It is important to plan for responsible development with the inevitable future growth of our county. Of all the options that are being considered, the "Focused Growth/Urban Center Focus" Is the only one that allows for kitsap to grow and to still maintain farmland, wildlife habitat, and open space.
Heather Carnocki	Supports Alt 2	I, Heather Carnocki, am a Kitsap resident and small scale farmer in Seabeck, WA and I want to let you know I support: 2. Focused Growth/Urban Center Focus: Population growth is focused in existing urban areas with policies to incentivize more diverse housing types such as townhomes, multi-family and cottage housing. I support preserving farmland in Kitsap County. I believe we need an agricultural land use designation, and someone representing Agriculture on the board.
Joe Crawford	Opposes Island Lake Rezone	I'm reaching out you regarding the potential rezoning of the 95 acres along Barker Creek in Central Valley from the current rural zoning to your proposed urban low density zoning. As a resident homeowner on Island Lake, I'm highly concerned and absolutely against this rezoning proposal. The environmental impact this will have on one of the last fresh water reservoirs in the area would be potentially devastating. It goes without saying the long term safety and security of Island Lake itself is at stake here and will be completely impacted with your rezoning decision. With the environmental impact rezoning such a large area adjacent to it with potentially hundreds of new homes, I see absolutely nothing positive promoting the health of Island Lake. I urge you to consider NOT rezoning this area and seek alternative methods to safely secure the area adjacent to Island Lake.
Donald Fenton	Opposes Island Lake Rezone	I am commenting on a portion of Alternative 3 of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. I as well as several of my neighbors are very much opposed to the inclusion of 3 parcels being added to the Silverdale Urban Growth Area (UGA) as proposed in Alternative 3 of the plan update. These properties are identified as: App ID #13 being tax parcel 102501-1-016-2004 App ID # 56 being tax parcel 102501-4-001-2005 and 102501-4-002-2004 App ID # 13 is the eastern portion of the Crista Camp property and borders Island Lake at its Northwest corner. This property also is a part of the Barker Creek Watershed as Barker Creek begins on this property and runs the entire length of it. App ID # 56 is approximately 20 acres due south of the Crista property. It is also part of the Barker Creek Watershed with the creek running the entire length of this property from north to south. All of these tracts are rural in nature and a part of the Central Valley corridor. They are for the most part, densely wooded properties. They provide much needed habitat for many deer, birds, coyotes, small animals, and fish. It would be a travesty should these properties be included in the Silverdale UGA resulting in destruction of critical wildlife habitat that will be impossible to replace. My opposition is based on 3 main points: 1) Environmental: The Barker Creek Watershed has been a crucial waterway in the Central Valley area. It has been adversely impacted by the development of the properties west of the creek off Ridgetop Boulevard. Just since Christmas 2022, the Cottages development off of Ridgetop has contaminated Barker Creek two times with muddy runoff entering the creek. Who knows what other contaminates we're carried into the creek during those events. The Barker Creek Watershed cannot afford to have urban densities on property east of the creek and remain a viable waterway. Wisely, in 2006, the then County Commissioners refused to include property within the Central Valley corridor in the Silverdale UGA. The County Commissioners were praised by the State Department of Ecology for their vision in DOE publication No. 09-10-029 titled "Barker Creek The Future of a Watershed". Today we need to see that same vision by the current County Commissioners by preserving and protecting this valuable watershed and exclude the above identified properties from the Silverdale UGA. 2) Resources and Infrastructure: The properties in question are critical to the Island Lake Aquifer recharge. The Island Lake Aquifer is classified as a Category 1 aquifer by the state, meaning that there is a high probability that potable water is vulnerable to contamination and impaired recharge. As existing permeable land is developed and replaced impermeable surfaces (roofs, streets, driveways, etc.), the aquifer recharge is negatively impacted. The properties under consideration for rezone represent one of the largest remaining tracts within the Central Valley corridor that contributes to recharge of the Island Lake Aquifer. Additionally, these properties are not in close proximity to a potable water source but would likely be served by Silverdale Water which further depletes the Island Lake Aquifer. Other necessary infrastructure such as sanitary sewers are not in close proximity to these properties, nor is an adequate electrical supply which, according to Puget Power, is already under stress with current electrical demands and aging infrastructure according to articles published in the Kitsap Sun in 2022. 3) Promises: After the debacle with the development of Silverhills Estates in the late 1980's and early 1990's which nearly destroyed Island Lake, we the lakefront owners were promised by the then County Commissioners that the Central Valley corridor would be kept "Rural". We recognize their promises are not binding on future decisionmakers. We ask that you do follow their lead and keep the Central Valley corridor free from urbanization and reject the above properties from being included in the Silverdale UGA and reject their subsequent rezone from rural to urban.
Donna Etchey	Opposes Island Lake Rezone	Regarding the rezoning of parcels: 016, 001 and 002 from Rural Density to Urban Low Density. I live on the corner of Island lake Rd and Carry St. The traffic that this type of development would bring to our small community is unfathomable. We walk island lake road quite often and the shoulder already is tight to walk on. I get nervous every time a car comes towards me. This development would bring hundreds of cars a day into our small community. Let's talk about what this development would bring to our lake. It is a known fact that the number of homes that this development has plans for would be detrimental to the lake. Even with the best of intentions on controlling the runoff. The lake would be gone in less then 10 years or at least become nothing more than a swampy pond. I cannot imagine this area without the forest or the wild life that live here, instead, full with Housing, Condos, Townhouses and apartments. Please reconsider and keep the parcels in urban density. Silverdale currently has a population of 21,301 and is one of the best places to live in Washington. Living in Silverdale offers residents a dense feel. The public schools are rated very good and we have a fairly low crime rate. The traffic in Silverdale is already challenging. What is the county's plan for streets and traffic if you keep adding these types of developments so close to town. Keep Barker Creek Urban density

Edeb Heald	Supports Alt 2	Please choose alternative 2 when addressing future growth issues in Kitsap County, especially keeping Central Valley as undeveloped as possible. I am curious and alarmed to consider how all of this new construction of homes will source the water supply for all these new families as our local rainfall continues to diminish, and the thought of seeing this delightful valley turned into a densely populated area which would not be safe for folks to ride their bikes and horses along the roads any longer just plain turns my stomach. We already have a hospital which can't support the current population. If you're PLANNERS, then make GOOD PLANS!
Jane Rebelowski	Supports higher density in Silverdale (Alt 2)	Please concentrate growth in Silverdale instead of re-zoning rural properties for higher density housing.
Jerry Butler	Supports Alt 2	Dear Kitsap County Planning commission — I am a resident of Tracyton, in unincorporated Kitsap County.....I love the drive down Central Valley Road through the Central Valley area.....it is a precious area full of wildlife, a beautiful lake, and bucolic setting. I do NOT want to see this area developed via more homes and businesses and therefore I support Alternative 2, which you have presented....please keep this 100 acre Central Valley area zoned rural re future growth, and have businesses and multiple occupied residences in Silverdale, close to transportation, a hospital and businesses.
Mike Shoudy	Supports Alt 2	We support keeping the 95 acre parcels 016, 01 and 02 Rural due to following concerns:-Destruction of the forest leading to erosion and wetter critical areas delineated on the county map. Forested areas are needed to recharge the Island Lake Aquifer where many of us get our clean well water. - Pollution of Barker Creek due to toxic runoff from clearing and from impermeable surfaces once covered with homes cars and blacktop. Also warming of the creek with tree canopy gone. -Road access to Central Valley is inadequate for construction or bussing, garbage or EMS. -Strain on utilities/ power, water and sewer systems: Current plans are to use Silverdale water which has wells that pump out of Island Lake Aquifer to supply drinking water and also pump millions of gallons back into the lake to keep the level up. There has been a moratorium on digging private wells in the area for years due to concerns about draining the aquifer and lake. A sewage pump station is planned next to the creek and unsure that sewer treatment facilities can handle the amount of sewage created by a thousand new homes. We support Alternate 2 in Silverdale, keeping and expanding housing in current Urban area and supporting our rural areas in Central Valley which is why many of us live here. It supports many animals, deer, rabbits, bear, eagles, osprey and hawks to name a few. It seems it would be necessary to have an environmental impact statement complete before rezoning 95 acres of rural wetland with a salmon stream running through it and designated on the map as nearly half critical area to urban. Waiting until approval of the rezone then EIS seems backwards to us.
Heather Biermann	Supports Alt 2	I would like to express my support for a focused growth/urban center focus, in order to protect and manage the quickly shrinking amount of farmland and habitat within Kitsap County. Having grown up near the Auburn Valley, and then in the Skagit Valley, I have witnessed two vastly different outcomes where farmland and open space are concerned. The Auburn Valley was comprised of mostly farmland when I was growing up; it was not actively protected, and now has dwindled to a small percentage of land, in favor of warehouses, commercial properties, and homes. The Skagit Valley, in contrast, took a managed approach to preserve farmland, and has a majority open space, in stark contrast to the area north of the main valley, which is now malls, businesses, and housing developments. Farms and open space are important, for food, conservation, provide important habitat, and contribute to people's mental and physical health, through contact with nature, in the form of parks, trails, farm visits, and fresh food. Farms and conservation represent livelihood for people; conservation projects, parks, and food and nature based tourism create jobs and livelihoods for individuals, families, and communities (look at the success of farms and "agritourism" in Jefferson County). Additionally, the open spaces of Kitsap County, and the farms contained therein, create a unique character, which should be preserved, rather than turning the county into "anywhere USA". I have lived in Kitsap County for 20 years, long enough to see many changes, including reduction of farmland and habitat spaces; I have also witnessed, expanded programs to create parks and trail systems, grassroots efforts to preserved watersheds, and an increase in interest in farmer's markets/stands, and farm visits. I believe that Kitsap County should focus on these positive efforts, and create policy and systems to manage our precious natural resources, including farms.
cheylee	Opposes Island Lake Rezone	I was sad to hear that Crista camp sold to developers a short while ago. But hey,it's a sign of the times I suppose. However, i am writing to voice my opposition to the developers intention to rezone the property from rural 1 home per 5 acres to 5-9 homes per acre. Rural development of 5 acres with only 1 home was decided on by voters in 2013. The fact that a developer owns the property should not give them the ability to decide it's density. With 350 plus homes that are being planned on the 50 acres nearby this,rezoning of the 100 acres would add a possible 700 plus more homes! The infrastructure can in no way handle that increase especially in such a fast span of time. The access roads in the Island Lake area are one lane in each direction narrow, with many turns and homes on both sides of the roads, also Central Valley Road and the roads going into Ridgetop neighborhoods are also one lane roads in each direction. These roads I'm sure were not intended to handle that much traffic and weight each day. The impact on our community will be felt in our already understaffed businesses, schools, hospital and medical community. There will also be an environmental impact. The lack of accountability is concerning as there is no environmental impact report required at this time. This property borders Island Lake which is the headwaters to Barker Creek.
Bieber, Peter K	Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	I am opposed to the rezoning of parcels: 016, 001, and 002 from Rural Density to Urban Low Density per The Kitsap County Comprhensive Plan 2024. As a county we should be looking to preserve our forests and add to them and not clear them to increase our density. Forests are used by individuals and all the animals both ground dwellers and those that live in the trees. Our waterways no matter how small also need to be protected. The rezoning could have an big impact on Barker Creek.
Amber Taylor	Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	Island lake is already being destroyed by many homes. The allege growing from chemical run offs of peoples yards is taking over the lake. Killing many animals and causes humans who swim in the lake to get bacteria infections. This water is drinking water for Silverdale?! With more houses planned to go around the lake I don't see how this water will be safe for anyone to drink. Stop the rezoning for the safety of people and the animal habitats surrounding the area. Leave the land untouched and keep Barker Creek rural.
Mary D Ramsey	Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	I am writing to encourage a thoughtful process to the request to rezone parcels 016, 001 and 002 from rural density to urban low density. This area is forest land and a natural habitat for wildlife. It is also a environmentally sensitive are for Barker Creek and Island Lake. As you know Island Lake is not in the best health and further development would not help. I am concerned that Kitsap County will succumb to urban sprawl like many other precious areas of Puget Sound. The reason most of us live here is to enjoy the tranquil beauty which surrounds us. As can be evidenced when out and about driving, Kitsap County has not addressed the infrastructure to support the development. Such as roads/traffic, schools, utilities, water, medical care, law enforcement, fire & rescue to name just a few that are impacted by more housing and population. I understand that development is inevitable but careful consideration must be made when the request is for critical and vulnerable areas such as Barker Creek & Island Lake. Also, at some point making money for a small few is not in the best interest of the many. I am asking that the rezoning of these parcels be denied until the broader impact can be addressed.

Jeffery Stockdale	Supports Alt 2	Central Valley has a rich history, and has added immensely to the quality of life for our community for many generations. Today it is threatened because of development permitted in previously rural zoned areas. No in-depth study of the impact on the environment is required before rezoning. This is unfathomable to me. This acreage is home to an abundance of wildlife including bear, deer, coyotes, eagles, hawks, and many other woodland animals. We see the larger animals each summer since they migrate our direction during the busy camp time, but there isn't enough habitat to sustain them in our area year round. Destruction of the forest destroys their habitat, but it destroys ours as well. Development of up to nine houses per acre will lead to erosion and a rise in temperature without the cooling affect of the trees and forest. These forested areas are also needed to recharge the Island Lake Aquifer which supplies the whole valley with clean well water. Many have worked on the restoration of Barker Creek, and yet, approval of this development totally ignores the existence of this important salmon stream. There will be a warming of the creek with the tree canopy gone. There will be additional pollution of Barker Creek due to the toxic runoff from clearing the property, and from impermeable surfaces once they're covered with homes, cars, and blacktop. We can already say this will happen, and yet, the reality of this is being ignored in favor of more revenue in the county coffer. The road access to Central Valley is inadequate for construction or bussing, garbage or EMS. It appears that our county shirks its management responsibilities for road requirements by placing them on the developer. This hands-off approach leads to trouble. The small winding roads around Island Lake were never meant for high volume traffic, and there is no way to expand them with the type of terrain and existing buildings surrounding the area. To expect a small rural area to easily absorb over one thousand homes, perhaps up to three to four thousand new residents, is unrealistic. We oppose using our small private road off of NW Walker as an ingress and egress for this development. These roads weren't made for this volume of traffic, and our community wasn't envisioned to become an urban jungle. This development will strain the existing utilities/power, water and sewer systems: Current plans are to use Silverdale water which has wells that pump out of Island Lake Aquifer to supply drinking water, and also pump millions of gallons back into the lake to keep the level up. There has been a moratorium on digging private wells in the area for years due to concerns about draining the aquifer and lake. Without study, how do we know the Island Lake Aquifer can provide water for this additional population? What happens if wells start going dry? Lawsuits for the developer and the county for allowing this? Existing homeowners would have first rights to the water. The current plan is to place a sewage pump station next to the creek. This is trouble just waiting to happen. We are unsure that sewer treatment facilities can handle the amount of sewage created by a thousand new homes. In addition, this development does nothing to help Kitsap County residents have affordable homes they can own. The plan is to have an out of state corporation own and lease these homes to renters. We know that they will seek to maximize their revenue, so they will charge what the market will bear. This means their target market will be the Seattle area and California residents, and we will still not have affordable housing. In addition, we need pride of home ownership. It's generally known that homeowners will take better care of their property, and it is an investment for their future. So, we will line the pockets of the developers, the corporation that will buy and run this as a business in the heart of Central Valley, and the county. Our county residents, our rural Central Valley, our wildlife and pristine waterways, will all suffer. This is not a good or fair exchange. But there is a better way. We suggest full support of Alternate 2 in Silverdale, keeping and expanding housing in current urban areas, and supporting our rural areas such as our treasured Central Valley. We already have the pressure of development around us, but to decide to keep rezoning from rural to low-density urban on whatever the piece next to it is, doesn't make sense. This will eventually gobble up all rural areas where a developer thinks he can make a buck. One house per five acres as currently zoned makes sense. An environmental impact statement should be completed before making a decision on rezoning over one hundred acres of rural wetland, with a salmon stream running through it and designated on the map as nearly half critical area, to urban. We ask that the request for rezoning from rural to low-density urban for the approximately 100 acres previously owned by Crista for the Island Lake Bible Camp, be denied. We ask that the request for rezoning from rural to low-density urban for the additional twenty acres owned by Kevin and Denise Courter also be denied. This is more than our little rural valley can bear. It would be a disservice to our citizens to rush this through without a thorough study of the area and its importance. To push through this rezoning would be reckless, and could be seen as neglecting your duty to preserve this area.
Joan Gorner	Opposes Island Lake Rezone	Planners, the stresses and strains currently being sought by developers and currently being considered by DCD would put a great strain on the areas surrounding the Island Lake Camp. The additional homes will have not only a major impact on Central Kitsap, but all of Kitsap County. The strain on utilities, including water, will prove to be a far greater problem in the future than the findings show and therefore they are not a basis for long term decisions. After due consideration and weighing all of the environmental consequences, a re-appraisal of the Comprehensive Plan changes should be mandated.
Rose-Marie Stacy	Land Preservation in Central Kitsap	This email is in favor of preserving and protecting our beautiful natural resource right here in central kitsap. And the Rezone of parcels 016,,001,002. under the Kitsap county comprehensive plan 2024. While I understand what is to become of these parcels,I am also reminded that once this land is developed it will never return to its natural beauty. I have lived in the area of Island lake for 20 years, I am fortunate to own 5 acres of land and have observed a lot of flora and fauna, animals have been able to more freely through our properties and live amongst us. With development will come the loss of so much we all appreciate. Please consider supporting growth and development that allows for the preservation of land and natural resources. Keeping development to a minimal while allowing others to share in our community of an healthy environment. While protecting nature, animals and our sanity.
Rhonda K. Harer	Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	I am a tax-paying homeowner who resides off Central Valley Road. Please save Central Valley and Barker Creek. Please stop allowing the raping of our land and killing of our natural waterways. Please stop developers from buying up every patch of land, just to destroy the land by building as many living units as they can. Please put aside what financially looks good on paper. For once, think of the toll you are putting on our environment. About fifteen years ago the County sent out people to talk to residents about how we were polluting Barker Creek and steps we should take to restore it. Since that time the County has allowed more than 25 houses to be built within a half mile radius of our home. This over development is what is killing Barker Creek. The allowance of developers to come in and build as many units as permitted is ruining the environment. Please, please stop this selling and development of land. It is ok for trees to grow and wild animals to have refuge. It is ok to say "no" to permits that would allow the decimation of the little bit of nature we have left. Please, think ahead.
Kathleen Pulici and Jacques Dubos	Opposes Island Lake Rezone	As residents living near Island Lake, we are urging you to consider the damage a rezone of 95 acres south of the lake would have on the lake, Barker Creek and Dyes Inlet. A rezone would be detrimental for all the reasons already put before the commission. Do your job and protect this property. High density should be encouraged around urban centers, not adjacent to a lake and a salmon stream.
Thomas and Katherine Zimmerman	Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	I live on lake shore drive, right on island lake. I am very concerned about the plan to rezone the 100+ acres which includes Barker creek. How can you ensure the creek will not affected thru the course of building that many houses? 55 acres have already been zoned for higher density with only one road designated for access, the roads in the area are quite narrow. With plans to build 350+houses already in process, you are putting " low density urban zoning " into a rural area. Please keep the 100 acres zoned rural and protect my neighborhood, and protect Island lake and Barker creek.
Nathan Hart	Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	I'm a resident of the Island Lake Community near Central Valley Road. I've recently been made aware of your commission's plan to re-zone along the Barker's Creek area; parcels 016, 001, and 002. I cannot overstate the concern I have for this irresponsible proposal. While the former Christa Camp development is concerning enough, nothing can be done about it due to it being a private deal. However, the commission trying to rezone the aforementioned parcels can and should be stopped. The environmental impact of the Christa Camp deal is going to go unrealized for, potentially years, if not decades. Before this project has even broken ground, you people want to rezone, for urban low development, almost another 100 acres of land that directly impacts a salmon stream and an untold amount of wild animals and natural resources. This isn't even talking about the quality of life impact on the citizens that already live in the area and do so, primarily, because of its current zoning. Your plan is going to not only impact current residents and wildlife, but also dramatically alter the quality and capacity of the Island Lake aquifer, and place an undue burden on the area's ability to accommodate the added traffic, pollution, infrastructure demands, and available natural resources. It appears, from my humble unqualified perspective, that the primary driver of population growth in our area is due to people moving here from Seattle and making the commute. It seems as though you plan to fulfill that demand by making this county into the very concrete jungle they're trying to escape and in so doing destroy everything that makes our county so special. With that said, let it be known, that I absolutely do not support this re-zoning plan. Any vote that I may take part in that supports any part of this plan or any person who supports this plan will be voted against by me, and, I suspect, by most everyone else who lives in the area and would be affected by this absurdity.
Jana Otto	Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	My name is Jana Otto, and I live in the Lakeland Heights condominiums. The forthcoming Island Lake development of 354 homes on current pristine forest land is already a done deal, but I am sending this email in protest of the new potential rezoning of the 95 acres along Barker Creek in Central Valley from the current zone of Rural (1 home on 5 acres) to the new designation of Urban Low Density (5 to 9 homes per ONE acre). It is my understanding that it is not too late to stop this mistake. I am joining other like-minded neighbors to make our voices heard. Please reconsider this short-sighted and potentially disastrous plan. The 354 homes going in closest to me is too late to stop, but please don't compound the problem with this new proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

Maria Carlos	Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	<p>I am a resident homeowner of Kitsap County, living on Lost Lake Way, off of Central Valley Road. I use Central Valley Road daily as I conduct personal business in Poulsbo and Silverdale and sometimes Bremerton. I recently learned of plans to rezone some parcels south of us, which will impact our use of Central Valley Road, as well as possibly the utilities available in our area. Specifically, I refer to changing the zoning of areas south of Island Lake, parcels 016, 001 and 002 in particular, from Rural Density to Urban Low Density. As someone who lives in a Rural Density area, I know well what an increase in density has the potential to achieve. I am concerned about several factors that will be impacted by rezoning these parcels in particular. The parcels are adjacent to Island Lake and Barker Creek. Their development will require use of Central Valley Road for construction in the beginning, and daily access for residents in the newly built areas. Increased density will affect the health of Island Lake and Barker Creek, which empty into Dyes Inlet. Toxic runoff from impermeable surfaces covered with houses and blacktop, as well as from cars traveling through the area, can pollute the Creek. As Island Lake is part of the Silverdale water supply, additional homes using that same water supply will increase the load on the Lake. Further, more homes will greatly increase the load on sewage treatment facilities. Has an environmental impact study recommended how to mitigate these effects? Further, increased density will place a heavy burden on utilities such as electrical power, internet supply networks, and garbage/recycling pickup. Then, there is the increased burden on emergency services such as ambulance and fire. With every windstorm, we who live in our area become concerned about all of these services if just one tree falls in the wrong place. Increased density will only increase the load on these rather fragile services. Are there any plans to increase capacity for these services? I am not usually opposed to growth and progress. However, in this particular case, I am greatly concerned about the impact of growth without careful consideration to its impact in an area already burdened.</p>
Deborah Gates	Include name of owner/applicant in list	<p>I appreciate the interactive maps and the PDFs and other documents in the above-referenced matter.</p> <p>I suggest that you supplement the documents to include the name of the entity (individual, business, etc.) requesting the reclassification. In the past, this was included in the list and all documents describing the reclassification requests.</p> <p>Of course, this information is available via the Open Records Act. In the interest of transparency, I respectfully suggest that you include the name of the entity seeking reclassification in all of the above-referenced. This is in the interests of the public. Commissioner Garrido has long gone on record about supporting transparency of governmental actions.</p>
Grace Quartson	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>Specifically, concerning the proposal to revise the zoning to allow for 5-9 houses per acre on what was formerly rural residential property, I would like to ask the county to consider the negative environmental impact to wildlife that is present in the ecosystem surrounding Island Lake, which also feeds into the rest of Barker Creek. The applicants have stated that only "birds and squirrels" reside on the property. I believe there should be a more extensive study to either prove their claim, or discover additional species. We know that deer, coyote, racoon, frogs, and even bear have been residing in the region and to say that they don't exist on former camp property is hard to believe.</p> <p>It is my understanding that the urban growth boundary serves to preserve some percentage of undeveloped rural space in our county and that creeks are of particular importance to protect. If there are still areas to develop INSIDE the current urban growth boundary, then why would Kitsap County want to allow critical drainage areas to be developed instead of protecting them? Doesn't the state require the county to adhere to protecting wetlands? If the critical drainage areas require a 150ft buffer, is that being held to for this development? If not, why is it OK to infringe on this property, but not all of the other properties along Barker Creek?</p> <p>As for infrastructure, are the current roads equipped for the amount of traffic this new development would produce? Will the burden of road improvements be placed on the developers?</p> <p>It is my hope that Kitsap County stands with residents and developers equally. It is my perception, as someone who has gone through the building process on Rural Residential land, that code standards are enforced on home owners, so they ought to be consistent when it comes to developers. Developers should not just get to "re-zone" something to make themselves more buildable space, if that space has already be delineated as a critical drainage area.</p>
Barbara Culbert	Supports Alt 2	<p>Of the three visions set forth , my preference of the three is the second one. I favor the "village" ideal where there is a cluster of homes that would support a few local businesses. Driving for twenty minutes to the nearest grocery store for a needed onion is also desirable. Fifty years ago there were far more options available to pick up misc merchandise. The convince stores then had a varied selection of food staples and supplies. Sure they cost a bit more but not the cost of a gallon of gas per item. There was limited fresh food. But they seemed to survive OK . I think Kitsap could do a better job making local markets successful.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>

David/Nina Morse	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>I agree with recent Kitsap Sun OPED writer, Jeri Stockdale, who implores local residents to join her in promoting preservation of the Rural Residential Status of Central Valley She refers to the recent sale of 150 acres of the former Island Lake Camp property where 55 acres has already been successfully rezoned from the (1unit per 5 acres) to the lower URBAN DENSITY of (5-9 units per 1 acre). My husband and I do NOT support changing the (1-5 acre) Rural Residential Zoning for the remaining 100 plus acres We support and ask that Kitsap County Planners choose Alternative 2 for any future growth in the greater Central Valley area.</p> <p>I too, site environmental issues of having access to adequate water; previous development around Island Lake saw articles abound in the paper of then residents siting insufficient water and even the lake level itself had lowered due to the increased housing. Barker Creek runs south through this property in a parallel way all along Central Valley Road and has a host of wildlife that any marked development would negatively impact. But interestingly enough, no environmental statements are required to rezone! Why is that planners? Only when an owner or perspective owner brings a proposal for a project does such a statement be required for review by Kitsap County.</p> <p>While it has been some time, and no active development has appeared as yet, back on November of 2015 Royal Valley LLC had proposed a Reclassification Request for the 155 acres to have URBAN CLUSTER RESIDENTIAL Zoning be added for Single Family, Multi-family, Congregate Care (Senior Living) Mixed Use Residential and Commercial Activities for a community wide vision for acreage that fronts on then Waaga Way, now designated as State Hwy 303 that runs north to Paulson Road. Access to St Hwy 303 and Fire/Police ingress/egress off Paulson Road was proposed. We already had issues with the ingress/egress for services as how would you prevent residents to not opt to come out the back way onto Paulson Road, a side road that is not designed to carry the kind of traffic that could handle a development's needs. The intersection of Central Valley and Paulson Road would end up requiring a light or mitigation of some kind. This development would negatively impact the Central Valley area. This plan proposal never materialized.</p> <p>In more recent years, a prosed buyer of this same Royal Valley LLC property had again, another low density plan request of the county and the sale was contingent upon Kitsap County approval of their plan. I did not follow through on the status of that request...no development is apparent at this point.</p> <p>Why do my husband and I care about the environmenal and rural status of the Central Valley area? We live here, 330' feet from the intersection of Paulson Rd and Central Valley and up to the 3rd 2.5 acre site carved from an original 10 acre plot. We purchased our raw land in 1987 and put a single wide mobile in where we lived with two children for 4 years ahead of building our 2,400 sq foot home. We developed our own septic/drainfield system, have a well, and added propane for our heating and cooking. After four years of research and getting told we would have gas since they wanted to tie the loop up crossing over Waaga Way, the county "gave" or "sold" Waaga Way to the State and lengthened St. Hwy 303 and would no longer cross a State Hwy with the gas lines. Taxes for 2023 on our 330x330 parcel, land/custom home has risen to \$6,226,28. We successfully paid off our home mortgage in 2022 and are very interested in maintaining the livability of this Central Valley area we have grown to love.</p> <p>We have deep roots here, our children are fourth generation Kitsap County born. I graduated in 1971 from CKHS, my kids as well, in 1997 and 1999. I even spent 24 years working and retired from CKSD. We have seen changes occur in this area that have changed Silverdale from the community that you drove through the singular "blinking light" down from CKHS to a community with a commercial mall and the surrounding businesses that accompany such growth. Silverdale, alas, is not incorporated and must rely on Kitsap County Planners to develop responsibly. We who live in the county must rely on our County Planners to not be swayed by the development dollars they would receive from such huge proposals that literally strip our communties of their "rural" feel and status that we expect to maintain our tax values from. After all, the price tag you say our home is worth lessens when indiscriminate, possibly reckless development invades spaces that have been so been protected by our forbearers.</p>
Brian Berdan	Supports Alt 2 or no Growth	<p>A vibrant life, strong community, and energy efficiency are all made possible by making close connections. This can't be done in 'dispersed growth' in our rural areas. When the Comprehensive Plan is updated, I would like to see continued focused growth... though I would of course prefer no growth at all. That's another letter, but I will say the county needs to support reproductive healthcare options, of which we have been recently facing a shortage.</p>
Dave Wixson	Supplemental Information for Request #4 - Please include in Alt 3	<p>See Attachment</p>
Jacob Cook	Would like property to be considered for rezone	<p>I am attending the meeting and from what I can gather I need to request a zoning reclassification. How do I go about this and get my change added to the alternative 2?</p> <p>My properties, 252501-1-058-1008, 252501-1-059-1007, 252501-1-060-1004 total 5.5 acres and connect with the Silverdale UGA. They are in walking distance of the Faith Fellowship Church Park and Ride which serves the Worker/Driver Bus to PSNS. I would like the propertyies rezoned in order to be able to fill Kitsap Countys need for more housing: In particular multifamily dwelling units in the form of duplexes.</p> <p>Please let me know if there is anything I can do to move forward with getting the land rezoned. Thank you.</p>
Beverly Parsons	Additional questions about alternatives	<p>I have three points to make about the alternatives being considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I support the comments of the early speakers at the Planning Commission's public hearing who spoke in support of protecting farmland. The loss of farmland in our county is shocking. How can we develop food security in this county without protecting farmland? I support Alternative 2 to protect farmland and the natural environment. Alternative 2 also improves the possibility of housing for farm workers.</li> <li>2. In alternative 3, I want to express opposition to the rezoning from 1unit/20 acres to 1 unit/5 acres. Such rezoning would increase single family dwellings rather than the affordable housing we need. It also would reduce the rural and forested lands that are so important to the health of all living beings. We need to respect the homes of wildlife in our county.</li> <li>3. EIS seems to look at the amount of degradation that is occurring. It seeks to minimize damage/degradation. Yes, it is important to minimize environmental damage, but less damage is not the same as rejuvenation of our land and natural environment. Can the EIS also assess the effect of a given alternative's ability to allow for and support the rejuvenation of our natural environment? Can you design the EIS to determine how to rejuvenate our natural environment? This might not be a state requirement, but we need to be more visionary in our ways of doing things to support the well-being of future generations.</li> </ol> <p>Along these lines, I would like to see the consultants include the following questions/criteria in their EIS work.</p> <p>To what extent does the alternative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. promote a safe, healthy, fair, and sustainable relationship among the people, cultures, and natural environment of Kitsap County for current and future generations with attention to climate change and the limits of a healthy ecosystem?</li> <li>b. promote a local economy that provides a living wage and quality of life for all; the ability to live and work in one's community; and protects and rejuvenates our ecosystems in the midst of climate change?</li> <li>c. ensure that all people are treated equitably, protected, and secure with clean (non-toxic) air, water, and land where they live, work, and play?</li> <li>d. assure that the county's ecosystems (including forests, air, soil, water, streams, and wildlife) are protected, safe, healthy, and sustainable for current and future generations of Kitsap inhabitants, human and endemic forms of life?</li> </ol>

Kane Fenner	Supports Alt 3 (for affordability reasons)	<p>My internet cut out before I was able to testify. Kindly add these thoughts to the record for public feedback.</p> <p>Kitsap County must respond to the local affordability crisis (which parallels the regional and national crises) by reducing constraints and allowing a dramatic supply increase. By contrast, increasing regulations and other barriers to entry have made it more difficult to build for the lower price points. This reality has grown over the decades.</p> <p>"From 1976 through 1979, 418,000 entry-level single-family houses/year were built, 34% of all new homes constructed. In the 1980s, the number fell to 314,000/year, still 33% of all new homes built. In the 1990s it shrank to just 207,000/year, and in the 2010s about 150,000/year. During the just completed 2010s, starter homes averaged just 55,000/year, or just 7% of new residential construction. Yikes!" Source: www.econ70.com</p> <p>Therefore, I support a combination of the Kitsap Planning Commission's Dispersed Growth Proposal: Distribute growth similar to historic trends focusing on single-family housing. Urban areas are expanded to accommodate growth and some additional rural development is allowed for housing and jobs.</p> <p>Opponents do not recognize that attempting to preserve the status quo will only delay their children from buying (or even renting!) a starter home that they would have been able to afford in their 20's ...until their 40's.</p>
Dr Sheila Sheinberg	Opposes including in Alt 3	Opposed to option #3. Phillips Road is not designed to accommodate hundred of additional residences.
Mike Shoudy	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>I attended and spoke at the Planning Commission Mtg on Feb 21.</p> <p>Concerns I have for the proposed rezoning of the 95 acres East of Barker Creek are:</p> <p>Destruction of the forest leading to erosion and wetter critical areas delineated on the county map. Trees help air quality.</p> <p>Rural areas are needed to recharge the Island Lake Aquifer where many get our well water. Drilling in the Island Lake Aquifer was prohibited for years due to drop in lake levels. The solution was for Silverdale Water to drill new wells on Ridgetop and pump millions of gallons into the lake each year. I am concerned for local wells running dry with additional water needs of new large developments</p> <p>Pollution of Barker Creek due to toxic runoff from clearing and from impermeable surfaces and warming of the creek from loss of forest canopy.</p> <p>Inadequate road access on Lakeview road to Central Valley for construction, bussing, EMS, road is very narrow.</p> <p>Destruction of habitat for animals, birds, fish...</p> <p>Infrastructure strain on Sewer, Power, Water, Schools, Hospital, EMS, Law enforcement...</p> <p>Fear of spread of Urban rezone all through Central Valley if this is approved.</p> <p>No guarantee of affordable housing as there are no requirements for developers to provide that. The 55 acres on the West side of Barker Creek has proposal for 340 homes which are rentals and are rumored to be sold to a California investor. We need to figure out how to incentivize and or require affordable home ownership. New homes are needed but also need to be truly affordable.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Studies should be required before approving a rezone of a sensitive area.</p>
Cindy Alpress	Supports Alt 2, Opposes Island Lake Rezone	<p>First of all we want to clarify that we understand that there is a housing shortage. As the county tries to plan the future growth we would like to be proactive and participate in the process. Our hope is that the county chooses ALTERNATIVE 2 to meet the need for housing in central Kitsap.</p> <p>As 150 acres of the Island Lake camp was sold to developers, and may be rezoned to low-density urban, we are very concerned about the counties growth management considering rezoning of the Island Lake area. If this were to be rezoned to allow 5-9 houses per acre, that would result in over 1000 homes in that area. We are unclear as to when an impact/feasibility study would be done but it sounds as if it would NOT be accomplished PRIOR to a rezoning. That makes no sense to us. This will effect aquifers, creeks, wildlife habitat etc., the need for additional utilities, not to mention the traffic problems. Central Valley road is not capable of handling that amount of additional vehicles. Developments and developers, are always devastating to the land and natural habitat, because the developer will most likely clear cut that land and their only concern is their bottom line. We've seen this already in new housing areas where the houses are 20ft apart.</p> <p>We own a farm off central valley road and my husbands family has been here for 3 generations. Its very disappointing to realize the loss of so many farms in this county. The county doesn't seem to recognize the importance of family farms whatsoever. When you look at any Kitsap County websites there is LITTLE OR NO MENTION OF FARMING. We have children coming for field trips to see our cows, chickens and gardens and it surprises me to no end that they have no idea where their food comes from (except Safeway). NO FARMS, NO FOOD.</p> <p>Also there is a plan for 159 homes to be built just east and adjacent to our farmland. Its very disturbing that according to the developer, there is NO PLAN TO LEAVE ANY TREES as a buffer to our pastureland. We have requested that they retain some trees between properties, but we have never received a straight answer, and our concerns have fallen on deaf ears at the DCD. So Im very leary of any new projects in our area.</p> <p>Lets look at what we want Kitsap to look like in the future, just another urban community or do we have a vision of something a little more original ?</p> <p>Keep the urban growth in Silverdale. I hope that there will be some effort to help those of us who want to keep the farming industry healthy in Kitsap. I dont see that as a priority at the present.</p>
Rick Cadwell	Opposes including in Alt 3 (opposes downzone from RC to UR)	See Attachment



Tim Parker	Supplemental Information	Thank you very much for allowing me to speak Tuesday evening. Our parcels are the four which front on 11631 and 11643 Silverdale Way. As noted, they are ideally located for amenities: access to dog park, skate park, Clear Creek walking trail, transit, and utilities. They are also served by Silverdale Way and Schold Road. We also know that housing affordability and energy usage are critical. As a businessman, whatever is done must be economically feasible. As I stated I look forward to leaving a legacy of positive development. I hope that whatever is done here will meet my high standards.
Marshall Crenshaw	Supports Alt 2	I think Alternative 2 is the best and most Comprehensive Plan.
William Palmer	Various Issues with County Plans	The plan has several flaws. A)It does not reflect Kitsap County's needs!! B)The UGA is too small!! C)Climate change provisions are not supportable by actual science. D)No preplanning for future roads. E)No substantive and workable solutions to address housing affordable for all income levels and in particular the median income households and navy families, E3-E5, in particular. F)No meaningful involvement of citizens in plan construction. Open house is not interactive debate about what should or should not be addressed in plan.
Richard A. Brown	Various Issues with County Plans	Not workable. This plan not enough urban growth area. It will destroy single family housing.
Bernie Kenworthy	Bernie Kenworthy on Behalf of Baumgarter, Parcel #092501-4-081-2001, 092501-4-064-2002 & 092501-4-080-2002). More supplemental information was sent for the record on Feb 17, 2023.	See Attachment
Bernie Kenworthy	Bernie Kenworthy on behalf of Parker, TPN: 092501-4-013-2004, 092501-4-019-2008, 092501-4-041-2000, 092501-4-014-2003. More supplemental information/support was sent	See Attachment
Bernie Kenworthy	Bernie Kenworthy on Behalf of Dumont Parcel (James Alford), (TPN: 4472-002-021-0101), More supplemental information/support was sent on Feb 17, 2023	See Attachment
Caroline Putaansuu	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	I am writing concerning the new zoning plan that would rezone parcels 016, 001 and 002 from Rural Density to Urban Low Density.  I know that the county is under pressure to get more housing. However, I think one still has to consider the stewardship of the land for ALL, including wildlife.  Please keep this land Rural.  We have spent plenty of money trying to mitigate the damage we have done to the salmon habitat. PLEASE don't change this. Please be cognizant of the impact this will have on wildlife in the area that depend on that area for refuge and access to water.  If you look at areas of this photo, you will see which areas at the top that have been built up and how thick it can be. The trees directly below will all be gone. From the shed on middle left, where Barker Creek starts to flow, would be better served to remain open. (The picture is from the top of the current development project is, looking south. Emerald Heights Elementary is to the top right as a reference.)  I am sorry that land bought on spec. by California developers might not turn the big profit. However, there was a reason this land wasn't zoned differently. We need to be cognizant of how we are impacting our environment.
Danna Olsen	Opposes Phillips Rd. Rezone	Leave things the way they are!! Last time they adjusted the comprehensive plan we got screwed over so bad —it was ridiculous. And it was CORRUPT! Jan Angel put an individual or two on the committee who had vested interest in property that they rezoned from 1 house per 5 acres to 6-7 houses per acre over on Baker/Phillips Rd. When the guy. Dupree submitted plans he didn't even show our community Lake on his plans! So corrupt! All about the money for him and more tax money for the county of course. You've got to start taking into consideration why we moved out this way originally—>> to have more land and peace and quiet! Please consider our feelings once in a while instead of money, money, money for developers. It has become a zoo out by us. We can't afford to move. Just leave Phillips road alone PLEASE!!! We don't need any more housing out this way. The traffic is crazy on Phillips and the speed limit of 45 needs to be reduced from 45 down to 35. We are 5 houses up from Phillips and it sounds like a freeway as the cars go about 55! Our Lake Emelia was ruined by the Ridgeline development . Just stop changing land use out here. Leave it alone. No more building except for 1 house per 5 acres. I am sick of our county reps not representing our views.
William Broughton (Kit	Supports Alt 1 and Alt 2	I support both alternatives 1 and 2.

Mark Mauren (Ueland)	Supplemental information for request	<p>As you are aware Ueland Tree Farm (UTF) owns over 2000 acres in central Kitsap County with over 20 millions tons of permitted basalt and round rock that will support Kitsap County for decades to come. We also recycle concrete, asphalt and are permitted to construct a soil facility that will take in woody debris and create wood chips, mulch, compost and top soil. We support Alternative 3 ( <a href="https://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/CompPlan2024_BremWest%20UGA_draft_zoning_map_ALT3.pdf">https://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/CompPlan2024_BremWest%20UGA_draft_zoning_map_ALT3.pdf</a> ).</p> <p>The proposed zoning in Alternative 3 will bring the permitted uses in the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan in line with the historical industrial activity at Kitsap Quarry that dates back to at least the 1960s, as well as anticipated future industrial uses. These industrial uses include taking in clean fill, concrete, asphalt and woody debris that will provide a variety of recycled, basalt, round rock and soil products for residents and businesses in Kitsap County. The community directly benefits from having these resources centrally located and near major roads. Both transportation costs and the carbon footprint are lower because these products are available closer to their customers. Plus, operating locally keeps family wage jobs in the County and substantially reduces the number of long haul truck trips driven on the County's roads. Kitsap Quarry often has trucks dump clean fill, concrete and asphalt and then leave with a finished product, reducing operator and project costs as well as the negative environmental impact of the activity.</p> <p>After considerable private investment, the main access to Kitsap Quarry is via Werner Road, which has long been an arterial road that supports industrial uses and provides direct access to Hwy 3.</p>
Jodee Strickland	Supports Alt 3, in particular reclassificatoin to property on Nels Nelson Road	<p>I would like to go on record that I support the implementation of Alternative # 3 changes in the Silverdale Growth area. In particular the change to property on Nels Nelson Road.</p> <p>Thank-you for including this email into the record and for choosing Alternative # 3 for the Sivlerdale area.</p>
Dave and Diana McRey	Supports Alt 1; Concerned with clear cutting of forest land, and Opposes Barker Creek Rezone	<p>Helpdesk@kitsap.gov]</p> <p>We love Kitsap County and live here because of it's unique beauty and quality of life. We strongly feel that Kitsap County is a special place that needs to be protected from further development.</p> <p>Last year, we were devastated to learn that a developer (Sequoia Springs) had submitted an application that proposes to completely clear-cut 55 acres of pristine forestland adjacent to our home. This development is on land already zoned for Urban Low Density. Sequoia Spring's proposal for premium lease/rental homes provides no buffer or greenbelt between the existing neighborhoods. Our concerns about the impact of this development and future proposed developments include:</p> <p>The clear-cutting of forest destroys the natural beauty of the neighborhood(s) and cause potential damage to surrounding properties.</p> <p>The complete destruction of habitat for animals, birds and fish.</p> <p>Removal of trees that are needed for air quality and ground stability. Island Lake needs rural areas to recharge Island Lake's Aquifer.</p> <p>The Barker Creek will become polluted from impermeable surfaces and warming of the creek from loss of the forest canopy.</p> <p>Kitsap County's infrastructure is already strained. Residents of the area are already highly cognizant of this fact! Adequate roads, sewers, power, water, schools, hospital, EMS/fire department and law enforcement all need to be in place BEFORE any additional developments are approved.</p> <p>For these reasons and more, we are in favor of "Alternative One" of the Comprehensive Plan. We do not want to see any additional rezoning of Kitsap County land at this juncture.</p>
Deborah macKinnon	Supports Alt 2	<p>The Port of Kingston Newsletter Issue 03/March 2023 outline three alternatives for the comp plan updates.</p> <p>I would simply like to go on record in support of Alternative 2 "Compact Growth/Urban Center Focus."</p>
Staci C. Jocson	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>It is ridiculous to cram in 5-9 houses per acre in an already too congested area. Silverdale Kitsap is turning into a city with the population of Seattle moving to this side and out of staters in droves since Covid driving up house prices and availability. Homelessness is up and so is crime. These homes will not be affordable to low income or senior citizens so it is only going to add to our problems. Our own children who grew up here cannot even afford to buy their own homes in their home towns. Our infrastructure cannot keep up. Too many people here already for our local schools, police, firefighters, and hospitals to keep up. If you offer up these new homes the prices will still be way too high and it doesn't help any locals who have paid into and developed this area for years or help keep families together. It's only gotten worse and this new explosion of homes is adding to the problems. Say "NO" to the re-zoning of the Barker Creek/Central Valley/ Island Lake areas. We are not equipped to add that huge development here.</p>

Dan Parker	Supports Reclassification and Supplemental Information	<p>My name is Dan Parker and along with my wife Emese Parker and my parents, Tim and Becky own the Parker parcels up for reclassification (TPN: 092501-4-013-2004, 092501-4-019-2008, 092501-4-041-2000, 092501-4-014-2003).</p> <p>I grew up in Kitsap County and I am a proud graduate of Central Kitsap High School, later graduating from the University of Puget Sound and eventually Tufts Medical School, and my parents have lived in Silverdale for 30 years. My father worked as a local teacher and my mother worked and continues to work as a local pharmacist. Over the last 10 years we have developed and rented local properties and have current low income housing tenants. We understand the difficulty facing Kitsap county residents in finding affordable housing.</p> <p>It is our desire to transform these four parcels into an active and vibrant neighborhood which can meet our community's needs. The parcels are ideally situated close to downtown Silverdale and the freeway, with easy access to parks, bus service, and community trails. Utilities will be easy to access on Silverdale Way, and the parcels are flat lots without streams or wetlands and will be very easy to develop.</p> <p>We would like to maintain active ownership of the property, and will seek to work with the county to provide environmental and affordable housing to meet future needs. We have a dream to make the entire community Zero Net Energy if possible, or at least low energy, which will greatly reduce the energy costs of the occupants and the burden to the energy grid. To this end, we need the zoning to allow for Urban Medium-Density so that energy gains can be had through shared walls and structures. Urban Medium-Density will also enable us to keep more units available for affordable housing.</p> <p>As a doctor, I would also like to see if Harrison Hospital has interest in long term rental of some of the dwellings to allow traveling nurses and other short term and new staff the opportunity to meet local needs. This partnership has worked well for other communities and could be a huge win for Kitsap County in providing the critical medical staff we need.</p> <p>We have a sincere interest in developing this property in a responsible manner with long term implications, and we would like to partner with the Planning Commission to make this happen. We are a small family with limited resources and will seek the partnership of state and local government to make a truly exciting community for Kitsap County. Our ability to undertake this project hinges directly on the overall burden and cost of the project. We would like to meet the housing and community needs of Kitsap while also pioneering the way into the future of zero energy housing, so please help us in this process.</p> <p>Please approve our rezoning to Urban Medium with Urban Medium-Density comprehensive plan designation.</p>
Paul Groomer	More advanced notice and outreach is needed for large multifamily projects.	<p>I just received in the mail the newsletter from Port of Kingston detailing the update to the comp plan that is underway. All of the public meetings on the schedule have already occurred, before notice was given to Kingston residents. This lack of advance notice is unacceptable. This update affects Kingston probably more than any other part of the county. If the goal is to have a plan that takes into consideration the needs of the public, how can this be fair? Why has DCD not made its own outreach to the community?</p> <p>We currently have a 140 unit apartment project sitting unfinished and vacant in Kingston which is a blight on our community. Before we proceed with more efforts like this to force unaffordable multifamily housing we need to involve as many residents in the process, rather than have people wonder how this happened after the fact. We already have zoning in place that allows for dense housing in buildings up to 45' in height. Please consider revising your schedule to include more engagement opportunities with the community.</p>
Jason Rhoads (North K	Supports Alt 2 and Alt 3. This parcel was part of UGA in 2006 Comp Plan.	<p>North Kitsap School District has reviewed all three alternatives and supports both alternatives 2 and 3.</p> <p>As a provider of community services, North Kitsap School District believes that both options 2 and 3 uphold the intent of the Growth Management Act and provide practical means to accommodate growth.</p> <p>Specifically, the North Kitsap School District owns property currently adjacent to the Silverdale UGA. Our parcel, 032501-2-002-2007, is identified for inclusion into the Silverdale UGA as part of both alternatives 2 and 3. The NKSD parcel was previously part of the Silverdale Urban Growth Area. (2006 Comprehensive Plan)</p> <p>The property has access to utilities and public services such as transit and can serve as a sensible zoning transition for the border of the Urban Growth Area.</p> <p>NKSD thanks the planning commission for its efforts and consideration of alternatives 2 and 3.</p>
Lori Iles	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to further-rezoning of the former Island Lake Crista Camp property which would allow builders to construct 5-9 houses per acre, rather than current zoning of 1 home per 5 acres. 150 acres in total (some has been rezoned already) would be so jam-packed with houses, people, cars, crime, pollution, etc). The rural Central Valley area needs to be protected from the urbanization and detriment such a change would cause!</p> <p>Four generations of my family have enjoyed the country life that Central Valley offers. With acreage between homes, we and our neighbors have farmed, raised livestock, rode horses, ice-skated together on local ponds, attended potlucks and barn dances, and contributed well to society. Get the picture?! ... We did not overburden our roadway, waterway (aquifer), or any other 'way'. There was an abundance of wildlife, health and happiness as we grew up! 'Hoot Creek' in Central Valley was named after my brother. Our roots run deep here, and I am adamant in wanting the Central Valley area protected from overzealous land developers forcing detrimental consequences. Our rural community deserves better!</p> <p>Please divert growth toward the already urbanized Silverdale area rather than compromise the future and legacy of our Central Valley gem!</p>
John Bogen	Opposed to these reclassifications	<p>Hello, several neighbors of Creekside Lane in Central Kitsap contacted me regarding a rezone request for parcels 222501-4-016-2004, 222501-4-025-2003 and two others at the end of Creekside Lane. This email was given to me as a person who could provide information about the rezone process.</p> <p>The rezone of these parcels would substantially increase traffic on Creekside lane and I do not believe any of us have been officially notified of this rezone request. We were wondering at what stage the request is in, and where and when we can provide testimony as to the proposals.</p>

Tom and Kathleen Wa	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone General Environmental Concerns	<p>Item from the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Chapter ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The Environment chapter describes how the County intends: to protect the natural environment. Intact ecosystems, forest lands, shorelines, freshwater systems, and other critical areas make up the natural environmental of Kitsap County. Human well-being depends on a healthy, natural environment to provide for clean air, clean water, food, and overall quality of life. A community that embraces sustainability must continually improve the relationship between the developed and natural environment. This includes managing the natural environment as an essential asset alongside other assets like roadways, buildings, capital facilities and revenue.</p> <p>Human well-being - not pleased with Planned destroying of the CANOPY, DANGERS from CONGESTION (the area can not support an inundations of so many more - autos, trucks, school busses, delivery trucks, UPS, USPS, Fed Ex, Amazon etc., Utility, Emergency Response, Fire Trucks; DANGEROUS to pedestrians (walking on own, strollers and those with disabilities maybe using wheelchairs or walkers - children/adults riding bikes, skate boards, tricycles . . . ), (the area has a vast and interesting assortment of animals, birds, fish, critters . . .).</p> <p>We Live here, they Live here and Desecrating the forest or strands of trees and creating a DOMINO effect on the AQUIFERS or WELLS and the area jewel: Island Lake - ALL REQUIRE WATER - We Live here, they Live here! IMPACT ON: Watershed, the Stormwater Management (runoff from digging and rearranging the landscape trying to mold with construction (Please, please don't let possible liquidization of the soil (Refernce OSO deadly and devastating landslide). and - EROSION the dirt, mud, debris and probably liter shakin' off logging trucks).</p> <p>There is so much more, but I'm getting to upset. I can't choose which of the alternatives suggested would be best. More heartfelt caring is needed. MORE STUDY IS NEEDED. The presented (plans) is DESTRUCTION of this area - We Live here, they live here - These plans are shrinking/crowding, destroying the WELL-BEING of this area.</p>
Stephanie Avery Guillo	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>I have concerns about environmental impacts, traffic etc. Also, Kitsap County will no longer be the beautiful County it is if we only have pockets of forested land.</p> <p>More study needs to be done on this.</p>
Aleena Yunuba	Supports Alt 2	<p>I wrote earlier expressing concerns about the proposed re-zoning of land in the Barker Creek area, but I have an addition concern based on news that a state bill has proposed rezoning single-family areas within cities to duplex or fourplex housing areas. While Silverdale may not meet the requirements for this bill at this time, I'm concerned about the future given the trends of both the legislature and population growth in our area. Namely, I am concerned that if the comp plan chooses Alt 3 (single-family home zoning in rural areas), we will instead see duplex/fourplex housing in these areas in the next few years, which will entirely overwhelm the infrastructure of the area.</p> <p>I am in favor of Alt 2 of the comp plan, which accommodates these duplex/fourplex homes in an area which will provide adequate support for them. The roads and transit options in our area particularly do not seem well-suited to an influx of hundreds of new residents.</p>
Greg Englin (Port of Kir	Recommendations for Kingston Subarea Plan	<p>Good evening. I wanted to submit our suggestions regarding the Kingston Subarea Plan. Attached is only the Economic Development Section. KCAC did not address Economic Development specifically and the Port is statutorily required to promote economic development so we put most of our effort toward this section.</p> <p>We are reviewing the KCAC recommendations regarding other components of the Subarea Plan – especially Transportation section and general comments regarding Buildable Lands. KCAC sent the amended Subarea Plan recommendations regarding the alternatives yesterday. We are reviewing that against our policy recommendations. Rather than restate their content we are reviewing it against our feedback and only highlighting goals or objectives where we may add or differ from those recommendations. I expect we can complete that by tomorrow.</p> <p>Lastly, we would welcome having you meet with the Port Commission at this coming Tuesday work session, March 6, from 8:30-10:30 to discuss if you are available. You can also zoom in since I know it is a good drive. Or we could even call a special session next week. We just need 24 hour advance notice. I am BCC'ing the Port commission on this message.</p> <p>Thanks for all your work throughout the County on this critical planning process.</p>
Judy Arbogast	Need more density and housing options	<p>I attended the open house recently. I mainly focused on the Port Orchard options and saw only one small area along Bethel Road that would increase density. This small area would not meet the anticipated need for density with projections of population growth I have seen. Are other cities planning for a larger increase in density? Did I miss something?</p> <p>Is there an estimate of the increased number of housing units for the county in each of the two main options shown on the maps? How much of the county would be classified as "green space" without new buildings allowed?</p> <p>My biggest concern is the lack of affordable housing and not seeing where the increased density will allow for more housing options to avoid homeless issues in the future.</p>
Deborah Vedin	Opposes any expansions in in Sinclair Ridge and McCormick areas due to environmental concerns	<p>want to address the potential for Zoning Changes, particularly in the Sinclair Ridge/Gorst and McCormick areas of Kitsap County. These areas were all previously Port Orchard and Bremerton Watersheds, and currently contain multiple Endangered Salmon Streams Certified by WDF, which have maintainable contracts under FFFP, and pending Culvert Projects at State Highway 16 and Kabelac Creek in Gorst through to the Bay.</p> <p>These all happen to be near multiple recent slides, and flooding that have closed State Highway 16 in Gorst since the owners of the Sinclair Ridge property clear cut that property. It's gotten worse with the addition of more clear cutting for McCormick Woods expansion. We are watching a movie of OSO happening in Gorst with devastating effects!</p> <p>My family originally owned ALL the land I'm describing. Over 2500 acres. Our heritage goes back to before Washington was a State. Please know that any expansion in that area would be deadly. Trees aren't even holding on. I've spoken with Geologists from the UW and they agree</p>

Carma Foley	Do not overdevelop, focus on livability	<p>I am wondering if there is a current measurement of the housing projects in the works.</p> <p>It seems to me that there are many housing types started in the greater Kitsap County area recently.</p> <p>I would just like to make sure we don't overdevelop in our area. It is important to have open space and parks also for people/animals to enjoy as well.</p> <p>I would like to see more emphasis on neighborhoods and communities in the new housing, instead of how many houses can we cram in this space.</p> <p>Many people that create the housing seem unconcerned if the units promote a livable, sustainable environment. Could it possibly be because they don't live here?</p> <p>We who live here want to embrace a united community that promotes safety and well-being also.</p>
Kathy Meysenburg		<p>I am a Kitsap County resident of 48 years. For the last ten years I have taken my free time to imbed myself into the craziness of land use changes that seem to be happening all around me. With what seems a blink of a few eyes and quiet back-room developer handshakes, rezones and developments are being established without much input or opposition from the County. With private project ideas, zoning changes, comprehensive plan update ideas being passed around, property designations seem to be changing with the wind and no one who understands what is going on can keep up until it's too late to question. As I can appreciate the process for public comment around the comp plan update, we all know that the entire process is solely to meet a GMA requirement. A mandated process, not a process at the county's free will. It is true that the everyday Joes/Jills don't understand what land use is as its applied to current and long-range planning. Unless taxpayers do their own research, many don't even know what the comprehensive plan is and therefore rarely give comment or feedback. With this aside, I am part of the few that does understand and I have extreme worry. I have seen first-hand property's change their zoning designations multiple times in just a couple years and even given new zoning terms that have never been used in Kitsap before. It is with my observation that it all seems coincidental the changes happening in conjunction with the many playbooks of developers' agendas. I personally know that large housing projects have been pitched with developers choosing no community process. By County code they are not required to have community meetings which could help the developer rather than hinder relationships. I have seen what seems like, the County pushing and supporting the upzoning of lots to increase density in areas once noted as agriculture/ farmland with farfetched grasps towards the comprehensive goals and so-called visions. Honestly for me it's hard to not take it personal; what is going on feels like a witch hunt for property and farmland owners. The county increases their revenue over time winning at the expense of the landowner's dream. Let's be real, the lay person to whom resides in Kitsap doesn't understand land use until they are affected by a new development moving in next door. It is those very few of us who do understand the process that try and keep the County accountable by asking questions, being involved, pushing for transparency and honesty, and to demand that community goals and objectives be adhered to. With this said, I would like to know why it is that in the current Comprehensive Plan, the word "farm" or "farming" only comes up 15 times and "agriculture" one time. However, words such as "growth" comes up 218 times, "development, developments, or future developments", 460 times. Sadly, even in the Introduction of the comp plan there is no speak of the history of farming in the county and no discussion on retaining this portion of the foundation the county was once built upon. The County notes "The key to maintaining Kitsap's character is to preserve existing open space in rural areas, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks and recreation facilities". For a county with so many people supporting farming, there is nothing written about it. Farming in Kitsap dates itself back when the rise of homesteading and logging was rampant, the 1800's. Being that we are not in living in the 1800's, I however challenge you to ask your neighbors if they would like to see the retainage of farmland within their community or would they prefer more retail, stacked housing and apartments. As I am not sure who is responsible for incorporating the vision of the once loved lazy day community of Kitsap, but it's apparent that it's not represented evenly by just county staff, commissioners, committees, deep pocket developers and a few vocal citizens.</p> <p>Last, county officials speak of increasing job opportunities, multi model transportation options, and vibrant diverse affordable housing, but what they forget to remember is that the infrastructure must support these ideas. How much capacity is the sewer treatment plants and pump stations going to be able to handle? What about water resources and potable water options? As studies and analysis can be done by professionals and forecasted with the utmost best engineering, the reality is this county has done a good share of putting carts before horses with what seems to be no regard. Studys at this point just fill the need to address long term forecasting model requirements. Example, look at the shipyard at 3:00. Look at traffic on a Saturday on ridgetop. Furthermore, what are the plans for EV needs. Power grid demands. Is the County looking to push this onto the developers as an impact or will taxpayers again be taking on the costs? Where are the resources going to be for this increased demand? Wind and solar farms? You increase population density but are there plans to increase life safety with fire, police and sheriffs? Have you looked around our County lately? Have you looked at the police blotter and seen the crime? You increase density, you defund vital resources.</p> <p>I note this all primarily to become a part of the process and as a public record. I feel it is my responsibility to point out and address that which is not often communicated and shared. I voice my concerns and my opinions for our future as it's my civic duty as a tax paying citizen of this county not to mention a passionate farm owner.</p>
Doug Skrobut	Supports including Reclass in Alt 2 and Alt 3	<p>I am writing in support of this small-scale request in rural South Kitsap County being included in both Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. A reclassification from R20 to R10 would add only three additional lots, and a reclassification to R5 (which is the zoning of adjacent parcels) would add only eight additional lots. This request has the attribute of adding family housing capacity near the Kitsap County Park at Wicks Lake. South Kitsap has traditionally been the location of the most affordable for sale housing in Kitsap County. A reclassification to R10 (or R5) would give additional families the opportunity, particularly military families with the VA home loan program, to obtain home ownership and begin building wealth. 20 Acre residential lots that sell for up to \$500,000 have become estate lots not obtainable by typical Kitsap County residents.</p>
Kirsten Romtvedt	Supports Alt 2	<p>I would say Alternative 2 is best. I need better transportation. I enjoy able to drive to social events in Poulsbo, Bainbridge island, Lynnwood, Port Townsend and Tacoma. We used to drive to those places to dance. Now we drive to downtown Kingston because it isn't safe to walk along the road.</p> <p>I'm hoping we will not have to move to a place with real public transportation. I may not be able to drive in a few years due to my eye sight. When we moved here there was a bus stop I could safely walk to. The service wasn't great running only once an hour at best, not on weekends or after 7pm.</p> <p>Many places with good public transportation focus on those over 60. I want to be in an inclusive community. I want a walkable with affordable housing for everyone. I want to be able to use a bus to do my shopping, medical appointments, and social activities.</p>

HeatherBiermann	Supports Alt 2	I would like to express my support for a focused growth/urban center focus, in order to protect and manage the quickly shrinking amount of farmland and habitat within Kitsap County. Having grown up near the Auburn Valley, and then in the Skagit Valley, I have witnessed two vastly different outcomes where farmland and open space are concerned. The Auburn Valley was comprised of mostly farmland when I was growing up; it was not actively protected, and now has dwindled to a small percentage of land, in favor of warehouses, commercial properties, and homes. The Skagit Valley, in contrast, took a managed approach to preserve farmland, and has a majority open space, in stark contrast to the area north of the main valley, which is now malls, businesses, and housing developments. Farms and open space are important, for food, conservation, provide important habitat, and contribute to people's mental and physical health, through contact with nature, in the form of parks, trails, farm visits, and fresh food. Farms and conservation represent livelihood for people; conservation projects, parks, and food and nature based tourism create jobs and livelihoods for individuals, families, and communities (look at the success of farms and "agritourism" in Jefferson County). Additionally, the open spaces of Kitsap County, and the farms contained therein, create a unique character, which should be preserved, rather than turning the county into "anywhere USA". I have lived in Kitsap County for 20 years, long enough to see many changes, including reduction of farmland and habitat spaces; I have also witnessed, expanded programs to create parks and trail systems, grassroots efforts to preserved watersheds, and an increase in interest in farmer's markets/stands, and farm visits. I believe that Kitsap County should focus on these positive efforts, and create policy and systems to manage our precious natural resources, including farms.
Randy Berg	Supports Alt 2	I have been a Kitsap resident for 54 years, 43 of those as a Central Valley home owner. I want to express my support for Alternative #2 in the county plan to update the Kitsap Comprehensive Plan. When the Comprehensive plan was first implemented the county assured Central Valley residents that the entire Central Valley would not be subject to future large scale development. Alternative 2 supports keeping Central Valley rural.
Marlene Berg	Supports Alt 2	As a lifelong resident of Kitsap county. I have seen tremendous growth in the county, especially in Silverdale and the surrounding area. When the Comprehensive Plan was originally developed, the elected county officials at that time constantly assured Central Valley residents that they would keep Central Valley rural. Alternative 2 supports directing future growth in Silverdale. I fully support alternative 2.
Unknown	Barker Creek corridor	My comments for the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan update 2024 are concerning the Barker Creek corridor from Wagga Way to Dyes Inlet. Please take into consideration the millions of dollars that the county and state have spent over the last 25 years procuring land to preserve as well as upgrade infrastructure along the Barker Creek corridor. All of this work, along with volunteer time was undertaken for the preservation and support of salmon habitat. A Comprehensive review of the entire Barker Creek corridor should be accomplished and plan accordingly versus individual site-specific requests. Adequate infrastructure isn't currently available to support the up-zone thats being requested of parcels in the Barker Creek corridor. Would it be more appropriate to have the infrastructure in place or a solid plan for infrastructure before changing zoning designations? It appears five parcels who are requesting an up-zone are inside the City of Bremerton Water Utility Well Category I Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas in the Barker Creek Corridor. This information was found on the City of Bremerton's webiste. Specific to requests #23, #26, #27, 28, & #29.
Kingston Community A	See Attachment	See Attachment
Ron and Peggy Vanbia	Supports Alt 2	We support Alternative 2, the "Compact Growth/Urban Center Focus" and oppose Alternatives 1 and 3, which do not encourage growth within the Kingston and Silverdale urban centers.
Anita Orban Banks	Supports request of Commercial	<p>My name is Anita Orban Banks, I am writing on behalf of the Angeline Orban Estate. The estate owns the Subject Property which currently holds the Comprehensive Plan Designation of Urban Industrial. The Estate submitted Reclassification #12 to request a Comprehensive Plan change for the Subject Property from Industrial to Commercial. The Estate supports the County's Recommended Zoning of Commercial (10-30 DU/Ac) that was proposed for Alternatives 2 &amp; 3 regarding Subject Property's account.</p> <p>A little bit about the Subject Property: Subject Property has been owned by the Orban family for almost 60 years. The parcel was originally 9 acres when it was acquired by the Orban family, but is now approximately 7.10 acres after the county acquired approximately 2 acres from the Orban family to construct Greaves Way in 2007. Consequently, the Subject Property fronts Greaves Way and holds a direct curb-cut access to that thoroughfare. The Subject Property is located within the Silverdale UGA and the Waaga Way Town Center Design District.</p> <p>Regarding utility access to Subject Property: According to Kitsap County GIS data, utilities are in place on the Subject Property's frontage road Greaves Way, and can be easily connected to the Subject Property. Alternatively, utilities are also accessible from NW Martha Lane on the NW corner of the Subject Property where there is a 40' Easement for Ingress, Egress and Utilities per short Plat No. 2135.</p> <p>Public Utilities and Services easily provided: Water – Silverdale Water District Power – Puget Sound Energy Sewer – Kitsap County Sanitary Sewer Police – Kitsap County Sheriff Fire – Central Kitsap Fire School – Central Kitsap School District</p> <p>Regarding Transit Service to Subject Property: Public transit is conveniently located on the Subject Property's frontage road Greaves Way. The Subject Property is .4 miles (about 2,000' or about an 8-minute walk) to the existing Silverdale Kitsap Transit Center. The existing Silverdale Kitsap Transit Center will be moving to Ridgetop Boulevard across from St Michael Medical Center. Kitsap Transit anticipates that one or more routes will be maintained on Greaves Way after the transit facility is relocated.</p> <p>Regarding critical areas or other sensitive areas (wetlands, streams, steep slopes, shorelines, etc.): According to the Kitsap Critical Areas map the Subject Property does not include critical areas, critical aquifer recharge areas or other sensitive areas. Kitsap County GIS Topographic map of the Subject Property shows no steep slopes. There is a steep slope NE of Greaves Way on the County easement.</p> <p>Regarding the creation of an opportunity to increase residential housing stock: By reclassifying the Subject Property to Commercial, the opportunity to increase the following residential housing stock can be created through the use of the Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP): Convalescent home or congregate care facility</p>

Wndy Suzanne Arness	Leapfrog Development in Kingston	<p>In regard to reviewing the current Kingston UGA, I need to discuss the leapfrogged area between the Kingston northern UGA boundary and Apple Tree Point development. This area is adjacent to dense residential areas on several sides, nicely fitting the definition of UGA. It also fulfills the GMA's Commute Trip Reduction requirement with its short walking distance to downtown Kingston, access to both foot and auto ferries plus a major arterial highway. I should highlight that none of this traffic will have to cross the State Highway to access the ferry or the post office and grocery store! In stark contrast, we have the long promised and now happening Arborwood. While this will greatly increase the number of homes in the Kingston UGA, as the State has recently urged, the South Kingston Road, whether going to Poulsbo or to Kingston will become severely overburdened, even with the planned commercial zone within Arborwood.</p> <p>Why was this area leapfrogged? The concept of density, and growing out from an urban commercial center seems to have been lost if not abandoned as far as Kingston is concerned. Earlier zoning in this area was high density (Residential 3-MH), and in the 1984 Subarea Plan, zoning was semi-urban and included in the Sewer Service Area. My brother, Bill, attended several, if not all, relevant meetings trying to work toward a better community for Kingston. Much of the area is now divided into two and a half or smaller size properties. I am aware that there is a deep ravine as well as Sandy Beach and other high bank/beach problem properties in the this area; these environmental issues are covered by several [other] regulations. Most of the properties I am talking about here have good soils and reasonable slopes. Sewer service could be gravity with no pump station required.</p> <p>If it is decided that the Kingston UGA currently has enough acreage designated for the next twenty years' population growth, and if the desired design chosen, with no consideration of the area between the northern UGA boundary and Apple Tree Point development, is accepted, in spite of the logical closeness to the existing Kingston downtown, our family will be saddened. My niece and I own over fifty acres within this area, and while we believe in the concentration of a people-filled urban area, we are interested in getting a handle on our future and can hold out only so long. If this area remains rural, we will end up having to take advantage of some great vistas and sell off five acre home lots-making at least ten families happy. It is not what the GMA was created for; but, we can only offer so much.</p>
D. Lemke	Impacts from expansions/development at Phillips Rd.	<p>County Commissioners: Please take note of any changes to the comprehensive [plan that adds any more traffic and congestion to Phillips Road between Sedgwick Road and Mullenix Road. Since the Ridgeline Development is not currently 100% built and Emelia Landing is just started the increase of traffic is unbelievable at times during the day and allowing more development in this area will only be a detriment to those of us currently living in the area.</p> <p>Also the impact on Mullenix Ridge Elementary, fire services etc. needs to be addressed before the allowing more development of this area.</p>
Beth Nichols	Supports Alt. 2	<p>I would like to submit my preferences and comments for the County Comprehensive Plan. It is crucial as we look at habitat loss, climate change, and other negative side effects of sprawl that we aim to protect and rejuvenate our ecosystems.</p> <p>Alternative 2 is the best option as a foundation for concentrating growth in the Urban growth areas and not dispersing growth in rural areas.</p> <p>I would propose that the County hold off on any requests for changes to rural zones or LAMIRDs until the completion of the Comp plan. The Plan should come first, to guide the zoning more wisely. This would allow for thoughtful zoning changes that meet the goals of protection of the natural environment, support of responsible farming and sustainable timber harvest practices.</p> <p>Of concern in North Kitsap are two proposed zoning changes: -400 acres near PGFHP change from 1 dwelling per 20 acres to 1 dwelling/ 5 acres. NO. -No zoning change for the LAMIRD request near Bond Rd. NO.</p> <p>It is a new day for all of us environmentally. We need to keep the urgent crises of climate change and biodiversity loss at the forefront of County planning, so that we all have future quality of life in Kitsap County. We need creative thinking and recognition of our responsibilities to the land, the water, and the air- for the survival of human, plant and animal communities. We also need to work for the needs of communities of ALL income levels in Kitsap.</p> <p>Of utmost importance is to support transit and affordable housing options that promote Alternative 2. Invest in nonmotorized transportation that connects communities for work, school, shopping, and daily life for the residents of the County, prioritized over visiting recreational tourists.</p> <p>Building codes should encourage leaving natural vegetation on housing sites as a more environmental approach to development, the benefits are many. I am attaching an excellent article about the importance of natural vegetation preservation. I witnessed the devastating, massive clearcut of the Arborwood development near me in the Kingston area; development could have happened without the tragic removal of expansive tree and plant cover and the resulting negative environmental consequences. Consider incentives for planting native plants to help restore habitats and address biodiversity loss. Trees are a precious part of our life support system and there should be incentives to preserve and replant native trees at every opportunity.</p> <p>I ask that residents have the information about the costs to the County taxpayers of the differing alternatives, including the ongoing costs of maintenance. Ensure that developers pay the actual costs of development, for roads and impacts, so that taxpayers are not unfairly burdened .</p>

Cheryll Lippy	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>Zone 1,2 &amp; Zone Changes 2 maps- no comment.</p> <p>Zone 3 &amp; Zone Changes 3 maps - comments as follows.</p> <p>Why was the site 4.016 selected? This area is part of the Barker Creek Corridor.</p> <p>The 3 Springs (4.006) wetlands flow into 4.016 property making the buildable area smaller due to wetland setbacks. There is a creek that starts in the SW area of 4.016 from a clay cliffs that seeps water. This creek flows towards 3 Springs.</p> <p>Where will the utilities tie in be located? Will the Creekside lane bridge over Barker Creek be updated? The dirt road will need updating.</p> <p>These are all impactful to the Barker Creek Corridor.</p>
James Hardy	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Comprehensive Plan. I have attended presentations at both the County Commission spaces as well as the Silverdale Library Branch along with reviewing recorded meetings on the Kitsap County webpage.</p> <p>I am against the proposed change in zoning in the Silverdale Subarea Plan, in particular changing the development boundary and increasing housing density (5-9 DU/acre) in the vicinity of Island Lake under Alternative 3. The focus of this density type of development needs to be in the downtown area close to employment, shopping, services, etc.</p>
Allen Gibbard	Opposes rezones near Nels Nelson Road and Barker Creek	<p>I'm writing to voice my concerns regarding proposed Central Kitsap Alternative 3 Zoning Map proposal. Specifically, the blue UR-Urban Restricted and yellow UL-Urban Low Residential alternatives east off Nels Nelson Road highlighted in subject map.</p> <p>The areas in question were restricted from development in the past because of adjacent wetlands and Barker Creek encroachment. Since nothing to my knowledge as changed since the last attempt at developing those parcel's, I'm alarmed at their proposed usage change now.</p> <p>I intend on being present at the April 10th public hearing to question these changes and hear your justification for those proposed zoning changes.</p>
Judith Kaylor	Opposes Island Lake/ Barker Creek Rezone	<p>I'm a neighbor who has been living in the Island Lake area for 48 years (and below the curve of Island Lake Road as it passes Camp Court NW, on the southwestern side of the Lake). You've changed the housing density on property no. 004, which is 55 acres of the former Christa Bible Camp, to 5-7 homes per acre, rather than 1 home per 5 acres. That's approximately 700 cars residing in a cul-de-sac with only Camp Court as their route to other roads. I'm curious, and alarmed, wondering how many of the downhill vehicles (on Island Lake Road) are going to miss the curve either turning to the North (Island Lake Road) or the South (Camp Court NW) on snowy, icy, or careless driving days and therefore pummeling through my fence and onto my property. With the traffic that uses Island Lake now, there is a collision at least once a year. How are you planning to configure that turn in the road so that my property isn't mauled constantly by all the expanded traffic using Camp Court as its only in/out access to their home?</p> <p>In reference to the other 125 acres on the east side of Barker Creek, I understand you plan on turning its density from 1 home per acre to 5-7 homes per acre (Alternative 3). No more trees, wild animals, clean water for Barker Creek, etc. Will Barker Creek end up being one more huge "Chico Creek" expenditure in the future? Stick to Alternative 2 on your planning chart and move your solid wall of homes someplace else in Kitsap County. Please.</p>



2/22/23

Kitsap County Department of Community Development, Planning Commission, and Board of County Commissioners:

Re: Objection to a portion of Alternative 3 of the ten-year comprehensive plan update

Dear Sirs and Madams,

Please consider the following as objection to changing the zoning of the property located at 9506 Mickelberry from Regional Commercial to Urban Restricted as contained in Alternative 3 of the currently contemplated ten-year comprehensive plan update.

This property as currently zoned (Regional Commercial) allowing multifamily housing, meets the goals of State House Bill 1220 as well as Alternative 2 contained in the currently contemplated ten-year comprehensive plan update. Among the goals, features, and policy initiatives this property helps meet as currently zoned include:

**-Helps meet population and employment growth.**

**-Increases housing diversity** by promoting multi-family and missing middle housing.

**-Property Tax Programs, expedited permitting and regulatory flexibility to incentivize development in centers.** The subject property would be a prime candidate for the contemplated Multi-Family Tax Exemption to increase affordability. Over-the-counter permitting as well as establishing this general area as a SEPA exclusionary zone due to recent studies with positive outcomes conducted related to traffic, wetlands, geotechnical, and hydrogeology on the subject property as well as the neighboring properties that have recently been developed as well as the regional hospital serving the greater area located just a couple of blocks to the Northeast. All of the above lead to more timely and affordable housing.

**-Multifamily in this zone does not affect density or alterations in rural areas.**

**-This property is located within walking distance to major employers** and would help support transit if established at 30 minute intervals within the Silverdale Urban Center.

**-Urban Growth:** This property has been proven to encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist.

**-Reduces Sprawl:** This property reduces the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.

**-Transportation:** This property encourages efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated the County comprehensive plan.

**-Housing:** This property helps plan for accommodate housing that is affordable to a majority of economic segments of the population and helps promote a variety of residential densities and housing types.

**-Economic Development:** This property, as currently zoned, encourages economic development throughout the area that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans and promotes economic opportunities for citizens in the area.

**-Property Rights:** The current property rights of landowners shall be protected against arbitrary and discriminatory actions. Below is the stated purpose of the “Urban Restricted” zone being proposed in Alternative 3 from the Kitsap County Zoning Code:

*“The urban restricted zone is applied to areas within urban growth areas that have been identified with a significant concentration of critical areas regulated pursuant to Title 19, or are planned as greenbelts, and are therefore appropriate for lower-density development. These areas may include significant salmon spawning streams, wetlands and/or steep slopes. Actual densities allowed will be determined at the time of land use approval, following a site-specific analysis and review of potential impacts to the on-site or adjacent critical areas.”*

Numerous studies are currently on file with Kitsap County that prove there is not a “significant concentration of critical areas” as stated in the purpose of zoning this property as Urban Restricted.

In summary, to zone this property as Urban Restricted as outlined in the proposed Alternative 3 would be arbitrary and discriminatory.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Rick Cadwell  
Kitsap County Resident

1 March 2023

## Comprehensive Plan Update 2024

My comments for the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan update 2024 are concerning the Barker Creek corridor from Wagga Way to Dyes Inlet.

Please take into consideration the millions of dollars that the county and state have spent over the last 25 years procuring land to preserve as well as upgrade infrastructure along the Barker Creek corridor. All of this work, along with volunteer time was undertaken for the preservation and support of salmon habitat.

A Comprehensive review of the entire Barker Creek corridor should be accomplished and plan accordingly versus individual site-specific requests.

Adequate infrastructure isn't currently available to support the up-zone that's being requested of parcels in the Barker Creek Corridor. Would it be more appropriate to have the infrastructure in place or a solid plan for infrastructure before changing zoning designations?

It appears five parcels who are requesting an up-zone are inside the "City of Bremerton Water Utility Well Category I Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas" \* in the Barker Creek Corridor. This information was found on the City of Bremerton's website.

- <https://gis.bremertonwa.gov/portal/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=82359fbd2e8e4b27b421583038858b61>

requests #28, #27, #29, #26 & #23

Re: Wixson Reclassification request & Public Comment for Consideration (#4 on KC County Reclassification list)

Parcel #'s: 022501-2-007-2003, 022501-2-034-2000, 022501-2-006-2004, 352601-3-024-2000, 352601-3-023-2001

I am writing this document in regard to my public comment/request for zoning reclassification on parcels that I own off of Anna Rd in Poulsbo (North end of Central Valley Rd.). These parcels were not included in Alternative 3, for consideration by Kitsap County Board of Commissioners.

Following the release of the current proposed plan I phoned Colin Poff and he explained to me that the main reasons a parcel(s) would not be considered for reclassification from Rural Protection to Rural Residential are:

1. If it has more intense critical areas
2. Or to avoid spot zoning.

In this document I will describe why those restricting characteristics do not describe my parcels. I believe that with further evaluation, these parcels should be identified as Rural Residential in the Alternative 3 Plan.

All five parcels included in my reclassification request are owned by my wife and me and are contiguous to each other. We have owned these parcels since the 1980s/1990s. These Parcels are currently zoned Rural Protection (1 Du/ 10 Ac), we are requesting a zoning change to Rural Residential (1 Du/ 5 Ac). With Rural Residential zoning and the few additional lots we will be able to add, it will be feasible to bring utilities to our parcels, which can then eventually be sold and developed into additional housing stock for Kitsap County. It is worth mentioning that we already have PSE Primary power 660' into our property and Silverdale Water has confirmed that a water main is available to serve this property from Anna Rd.

Rural Protection and Rural Residential zoning are very similar in description. We believe it is important to point out the similarities in "purpose" to these two types of zonings to show that they can coexist successfully (like they currently do in many parts of Kitsap County). According to the Kitsap County website, both the Rural Residential and Rural Protection zones "...promote low-density residential development and agricultural activities that are consistent with rural character".

### **Spot Zoning**

Other parcels that are on the Alternative 3 list requesting RR from RP are also bordering RP zoning. Our parcels also legally abut RR zoning.

These parcels abut publicly owned Anna Rd via a private driveway (60'x 660') that is owned by us. This means that they physically abut the zoning area that we want, just like other parcels in our area that have requested to reclassify from RP to RR. As Colin Poff mentioned in his follow up email, there is no specific criteria for how much of a parcel must abut the requested zoning. Since our contiguous parcels abut RR, as well as abutting another parcel (owned by our neighbor) that is on the Alt 3 list for RR consideration, our request cannot be excluded by using "spot zoning" as a reason.

Anna Rd. is the North/South split between Rural Residential and Rural Protection zoning, so if our zoning is changed, we will not be changing the neighborhood feel to Anna Rd. residents, as half of them already

have rural residential zoning, and the overwhelming majority of parcel owners on both sides off Anna Rd are on parcels much smaller than 5 acres.

We were made aware (by Colin Poff) that the planning commission does not take historical zoning into account when making decisions about current and future zoning, however historical zoning has allowed 90% of neighboring parcels to be 5 acres or smaller already. By making this note, we are not trying to infer those previous zonings allowed smaller lots (ironically historical zoning would have allowed our parcels to be 2.5 acres), we are simply pointing out what lot sizes exist in our area, and how if ours were made smaller, they would in turn fit in better to our neighborhood.

In the entire cluster of parcels that span the distance from Anna Rd to Liberty Bay (as shown on the county parcel search “zoning” overlay) I have only been able to count 9 parcels that are even bigger than ten acres. Because of the Rural Protection classification - Kitsap County is negatively restricting just 9 parcel owners in this area. The remaining parcel owners in this area are unaffected by the change to 5 acre lots, even if the entire region adopted 1 du/ 5ac zoning.

Even if reclassifying our property to RR was “Spot Zoning” (although as previously defined it is not “Spot Zoning”) - it would have no negative effect on our neighborhood as the majority of our neighboring parcels are 5 acres or smaller.

Early in this process we had a virtual Q&A with a staff member from Kitsap County (I believe her name is Melissa Shumake). She mentioned that I should try to get one of my neighbors involved in the reclassification request as it would be more likely to get consideration if more than one family/parcel was making the same request. I did discuss this point with one of my neighbors (Case Zegstroo) and he too wanted to request RR zoning for his parcel. He filled out an application and was able to make it on to the Alt 3 list, and ironically we were not. Does that make his inclusion (and our exclusion) in the Alt 3 recommendations - spot zoning? To be clear – we are in no way suggesting that the Zegstroo property should be removed from the RR recommendation.

## **Critical Areas**

According to Kitsap County’s “purpose” for each zoning classification, as well as phone and email correspondence with Colin Poff the differences in the two zoning classifications - involve critical areas. Rural Protection; “...protects environmental features such as significant visual, historical and natural features, wildlife corridors, steep slopes, wetlands, streams and adjacent critical areas”. Whereas Rural Residential; “... is applied to areas that are relatively unconstrained by environmentally sensitive areas or other significant landscape features. These areas are provided with limited public services”.

When questioned on these differences, Colin did share the following explanation: “...Again, RP generally covers properties that have more critical areas than RR would, but this is not always the case. This is not always consistent because RP covers large areas, and RR covers large areas. We wouldn’t necessarily have an RP parcel surrounded by RR, simply because it has more critical areas”.

Our parcels can easily be described as “relatively unconstrained” by critical areas, a key word in the Rural Residential zoning purpose. We have equal or less critical areas than other parcels on the

Alternative 3 list as well as equal or less critical areas on parcels currently zoned Rural Residential - according to the Kitsap County Parcel Search "critical areas" overlay.

When our parcels are examined on the Kitsap County parcel search "critical areas overlay" it can be observed that our parcels do not contain any extreme critical area characteristics that would group them into not being able to fit with rural residential zoning. We do not have "steep slopes", "large fish streams" or "wetlands". Our property's critical areas can be easily defined as "relatively unconstrained by environmentally sensitive areas or other significant landscape features".

I have included in my email, a document showing three examples of similar parcels that wish to be rezoned to Rural Residential that have made it onto the Alt 3 list, which contain multiple types of critical areas that are equal to or more extreme than the critical areas found on our parcels.

I have also included a couple of examples of parcels that are near our parcels, that already have Rural Residential zoning, and contain critical areas equal to or more extreme than our parcels.

With these minimal relatively unconstrained critical areas, we believe that it is incorrect to say that "critical areas" prevents our parcels from being good candidates for Rural Residential zoning.

### **Request**

Because of the reasons discussed, we believe that our parcels should be reconsidered for inclusion in the current zoning reclassification map as Rural Residential. We do hope that the members of the board will take the time to review the details that we have shared. If the Board decides not to recommend our property for Rural Residential zoning we would like to know the reason(s) why we would be excluded. We appreciate your time in this process.

Sincerely,

David Wixson


## Critical areas on our parcels

022501-2-007-2003 (10.69-acre parcel)

Has low-moderate slope on less than half of parcel with a seasonal 1ft wide creek running along one edge of the parcel. On the Kitsap County Parcel Search “critical areas” overlay, it should be noted that the creek is light blue signifying that it is a “non-fish habitat”. According to my own knowledge of the parcel and the “critical area” overlay, there are no areas with “hydraulic soils/potential wetlands”, there are also no “DNR NWI Surveyed wetlands or waterbodies”.


When using the measuring tool on the Kitsap County Parcel search to create a 100 ft buffer from the seasonal creek, there are 6.5 acres of almost level, usable land. If we split this parcel horizontal, to create two 5-acre parcels (like the four existing 5-acre parcels to the north of our 10-acre parcel), each of our two 5 acre lots would have approximately 3.25 acres of property for a homesite, yard, driveways, septic system, and 1.75 acres of trees, walking trails, and preserved rural forest.

The angled black vertical line drawn on the parcel below displays a potential 100 ft buffer from the creek. The horizontal black line is an example of how to split the parcel into two five acre lots. These two lots would each have over 3.25 acres of buildable area.



022501-2-006-2004 (7.43-acre parcel)

Parcel has low-moderate slope on approximately 10% of parcel with no creeks, waterbodies, or wetlands of any kind. There are no other critical areas of any kind on the parcel it is gently sloped to the north.






352601-3-024-2000 (12.08 acres)

352601-3-023-2001 (6.3 acres)

The 12-acre parcel (highlighted in green) has low to moderate slope in two areas of the property but is not by any means incumber by these areas. The parcel search shows a non-fish creek that extends 20 feet into the parcel on the eastern line, there are no other critical areas of any kind on this parcel.

The 6-acre parcel (to the left of the highlighted parcel) has no wetlands, streams, or any kind of critical areas, except for a low slope on the western property line in about the middle of the parcel.

Neighboring parcels to the west (5 acre lots) have more critical areas than these two parcels.



**Example 1 of parcel on Alternative 3 list with critical areas.**

Reclassification Request #25


Parcel #'s: 012401-1-023-1008, 012401-1-023-1009

Owner: Hubert's Christmas Tree Farm

Location: Seabeck Hwy

Two 20-acre parcels both with critical areas (High seismic hazard area and Moderate erosion hazard area). The zoning on these parcels is currently Rural Wooded (1 DU/ 20 Ac). Owners have requested Rural Residential (1 DU/ 5 Ac). These two parcels are on the Alt 3 map.

Our parcels have equal critical areas in terms of "moderate erosion hazard" but our parcels have no dark purple overlay signifying "High seismic hazard area". We are only trying to change one zoning level, this parcel owner is changing two levels.



**Example 2 of parcel on Alternative 3 list with critical areas.**

Reclassification Request #74


Parcel #: 342601-1-002-2001

Owner: Gloria Edwards

Location: Central Valley (Northwest of our parcels)

One 11.5-acre parcel with critical areas (High seismic hazard area, Moderate erosion hazard area). The zoning on these parcels is currently Rural Protection (1 DU/ 10 Ac). Owners have requested Rural Residential (1 DU/ 5 Ac).

Our parcels have far less critical areas than this parcel. Our parcels, like this one about the rural residential zoning that we both have requested, but this parcel is on the alt 3 map, and we are not.



**Example 1 of parcel in general vicinity of ours with critical areas and existing Rural Residential zoning.**


Parcel #: 282601-1-001-2000

Owner: James and Carolyn Nall

Location: Central Valley (Northwest of our parcels towards HWY 3)

One 31.8-acre parcel with critical areas (Fish Habitat Stream, Moderate erosion hazard area, Potential Wetlands). The zoning on this parcel is currently Rural Residential (1 DU/ 5 Ac).

Our parcels do not have any fish habitats or potential wetlands. We share the same “moderate erosion hazard” overlay, however this parcel is almost completely covered in this overlay. This parcel has more critical features than any of ours.




**Example 2 of parcel in general vicinity of ours with critical areas and existing Rural Residential zoning.**

Parcel #: 272601-2-019-2009, 272601-2-021-2005, 272601-3-037-2005, 272601-3-016-2000, 272601-3-017-2009

Owner: Larry Mueller

Location: Northwest of our parcels West of Viking Way off Hallman Rd)

5 parcels totaling 48.46 acres parcel with critical areas much more extreme than our parcels have (Fish Habitat Stream, Moderate erosion hazard area, Potential Wetlands, 100 year floodplain, High seismic hazard, DNR surveyed wetlands). The zoning on this parcel is currently Rural Residential (1 DU/ 5 Ac).



February 11, 2023

Colin Poff  
Planning Supervisor  
Kitsap County DCD  
[CPoff@Kitsap.gov](mailto:CPoff@Kitsap.gov)

**Subject: Rezone/UGA Incorporation for Parcel 262702-2-030-2003 (Kingston)**

Colin,

Thank you for your notification that our parcel is under consideration for rezone to Urban Restricted (UR 1-5 DU/AC). We see that it is included in Alternative 3, which is the “Dispersed Growth/Rural Jobs Focus” scenario, instead of the Alternative 2, the “Compact Growth/Urban Center Focus” scenario. We think that a portion of our 20-acre parcel should be considered to be zoned UM and included with Alternative 2 and that doing so would advance the County’s goals for the Kingston area as much or more than other proposed UM inclusions (shown on Alternative 2) mainly because our parcel abuts two relatively small parcels that are already zoned UM so that all three parcels together make a higher density development more feasible for the area.

But, we are not asking for our entire 20 acres to be rezoned (see Exhibit A, attached). We submitted a subdivision application in 2022 that would create one 5-acre lot along Highway 104 (adjacent to the two UM zoned parcels) and one 15-acre lot to the north. We desire to withdraw the 15-acre lot from the rezone request after the subdivision is approved. As part of the subdivision application, we have surveyed all critical areas and buffers as delineated by our consultants (also shown on Exhibit A) and our geotechnical consultant has determined that the area is feasible for construction. Following is a list of reasons why we think our proposal is beneficial to the Kingston area and the County’s planning goals:

1. Our new 5-acre parcel will provide up to about 3 acres of buildable area which could be an attractive multi-family project especially if combined with the adjacent 2 acres of undeveloped UM zoned parcels.
2. A multi-family development at this location would fit in well with the surrounding uses. It would be the third complex in a row along the north side of the highway. Zoning along the south side of Hwy 104 is Industrial. The other sides would be open spaces which would be very nice for a multi-family development to have somewhat of a rural characteristic and environment for at least some of the residents. Our new 5-acre lot will not abut any existing single-family homes so that development of a multi-family project there would not make any existing homeowners uncomfortable.
3. Our parcel is on Hwy 104, has access rights onto WSDOT right of way, is less than one mile to the ferry system, and there is a Kitsap Transit stop one block away.
4. Inclusion of our parcel would spread the costs for extending utilities into the area over more development and make all other projects more feasible, increasing the chances that the County’s plans for this part of Kingston will come to fruition sooner.


Thank you for your consideration.

Don and Christine Proctor  
26437 Leyman Ln NE  
Kingston, WA 98346

copy: [compplan@Kitsap.gov](mailto:compplan@Kitsap.gov) ; [RGelder@Kitsap.gov](mailto:RGelder@Kitsap.gov) attachments: Exhibit A

AFTER SUBDIVISION IS COMPLETED (2023), WE REQUEST THAT THE 15 ACRE LOT 1 REMAIN ZONED FOR 5 ACRES OR LESS DUE TO STEEP SLOPES AND ABUNDANCE OF CRITICAL AREAS (ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING SEEMS MOST APPROPRIATE FOR THIS PARCEL)

NEW LOT LINE  
(PENDING SUBDIVISION APPROVAL)  
15 ACRES LOT 1 (NORTH)  
5 ACRES LOT 2 (SOUTH)



ADJACENT UN/UNDER DEVELOPED UM PARCELS ARE RELATIVELY SMALL WHICH RENDERS THEM LESS FEASIBLE FOR A MULT-FAMILY PROJECT (ESPECIALLY IN REGARDS TO UTILITIES EXTENSION)

EXHIBIT A  
PARCEL 262702-2-030-2003  
REZONE/UGA INCORPORATION REQUEST  
DON AND CHRISTINE PROCTOR  
26437 LEYMAN LN NE  
KINGSTON, WA 98346  
206.499.2591

## Colin Poff

---

**From:** Berni Kenworthy <berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 17, 2023 8:25 AM  
**To:** Eric Baker; Colin Poff  
**Cc:** jimalford1701@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Planning Commission - Dumont Parcel Reclassification Request Letter of Support  
**Attachments:** EmailFromMegSands.jpg


**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

[CAUTION: This message originated outside of the Kitsap County mail system. **DO NOT CLICK** on links or **open attachments** unless you were expecting this email. If the email looks suspicious, contact the Helpdesk immediately at 360-337-5555, or email at Helpdesk@kitsap.gov]

Eric & Colin – I am submitting the following to the Planning Commission record for the referenced reclassification request.

Planning Commissioners,

I am a representative for the Dumont parcel (TPN: 4472-002-021-0101) reclassification application which requests to revert the subject parcel back to its pre-2016 **Urban Low** zoning designation. The Dumont parcel is outlined in green below and is home to a single-family residence:



The neighboring parcel to the north which is home to the Tracyton Tavern (TPN: 4472-002-016-0207) filed for a reclassification during the 2016 comprehensive plan update in an effort to bring its parking lot into compliance. The request was to rezone from **Urban Low** to **Neighborhood Commercial** to resolve the nonconforming use of a parking lot in a residential zone. A boundary line adjustment was then to be conducted in order to place the tavern and parking lot on the same parcel while maintaining code-required setbacks. See below for an aerial of the neighboring parcel (Tracyton Tavern) outlined in green for reference.





The Dumont parcel to the south was inadvertently also rezoned from **Urban Low** to **Neighborhood Commercial** during the comprehensive plan update. The Dumont parcel was not part of the request, and it was later confirmed by Kitsap County Planner, Meg Sands, that the rezone of the Dumont parcel was in error and that the error would be corrected during the next update (see attached email from Meg Sands). I respectfully request that this parcel now be rezoned back to **Urban Low** as part of the preferred alternative in order to correct the noted error.

Thank you,  
Berni Kenworthy



**Berni Kenworthy, MSE, PE**  
Owner at Axis Land Consulting

PO Box 596  
Poulsbo, WA 98370

**Mobile:** 360-509-3716  
**Email:** [berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com](mailto:berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com)

## Colin Poff

---

**From:** Berni Kenworthy <berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 17, 2023 11:12 AM  
**To:** Eric Baker; Colin Poff  
**Cc:** Tim; 'Dan Baumgartner'; Jeff Coombe - JCM Property Management (jeff@jcmpm.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Commission - Baumgartner & Simons Family Reclassification Request Letter of Support

[CAUTION: This message originated outside of the Kitsap County mail system. **DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments** unless you were expecting this email. If the email looks suspicious, contact the Helpdesk immediately at 360-337-5555, or email at Helpdesk@kitsap.gov]

Good morning,

Please note the following correction below.

Thank you,  
Berni


---

**From:** Berni Kenworthy  
**Sent:** Friday, February 17, 2023 7:42 AM  
**To:** Eric Baker <Ebaker@kitsap.gov>; Colin Poff <CPoff@kitsap.gov>  
**Cc:** Tim <tim@benik.com>; 'Dan Baumgartner' <dan@benik.com>; Jeff Coombe - JCM Property Management (jeff@jcmpm.com) <jeff@jcmpm.com>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission - Baumgartner & Simons Family Reclassification Request Letter of Support

Eric & Colin, I am submitting the following to the Planning Commission record for the referenced reclassification. Thank you, Berni

Planning Commissioners,

I am a representative for the reclassification application for the Baumgartner (Benik Corporation) and Simons Family (Silverdale Plumbing) parcels (TPN: 092501-4-081-2001, 092501-4-064-2002 & 092501-4-080-2002). The application requests that all three parcels be rezoned to **Business Center** with an **Urban Industrial** comprehensive plan designation. The two northern properties are currently zoned as **Business Park** and are home to Benik Corporation and Silverdale Plumbing. The southernmost parcel is currently zoned as **Urban Low Restricted** and is a vacant parcel where Benik Corporation would like to expand. The parcels are outlined below:



These three parcels are centrally-located to the Silverdale core – a regional center anticipated for population growth which will create an increased need for primary wage employment in the professional and technical fields. These parcels are easily served by existing access, utilities and transit services within Silverdale Way. No wetland, stream or geotechnical hazard areas are mapped on the vacant lot making expansion easily feasible from a critical areas perspective. Development of the vacant lot would be subject to the land use/development regulations and permitting requirements in place at the time of application. However, it is the intent of the owner that the development of the lot would result in neighborhood character similar to the existing character of the Fairfield Business Park. Because the parcels are uniquely located to provide living wage employment opportunities in an area of expected growth, I respectfully request that this application be considered for retention as part of the county’s preferred alternative.

Thank you,  
Berni Kenworthy



**Berni Kenworthy, MSE, PE**  
Owner at Axis Land Consulting

PO Box 596  
Poulsbo, WA 98370

**Mobile:** 360-509-3716  
**Email:** [berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com](mailto:berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com)



## Colin Poff

---

**From:** Berni Kenworthy <berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 17, 2023 7:52 AM  
**To:** Eric Baker; Colin Poff  
**Cc:** tkparker99@aol.com; dansportsmed@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Planning Commission - Parker Reclassification Request Letter of Support


**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**[CAUTION: This message originated outside of the Kitsap County mail system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you were expecting this email. If the email looks suspicious, contact the Helpdesk immediately at 360-337-5555, or email at Helpdesk@kitsap.gov]**

Eric & Colin, I am submitting the following to the Planning Commission for the referenced reclassification. Thank you,  
Berni

Planning Commissioners,

I am a representative for the reclassification application for the Parker parcels (TPN: 092501-4-013-2004, 092501-4-019-2008, 092501-4-041-2000, 092501-4-014-2003). The application requests that all four parcels be rezoned from **Urban Restricted** to **Urban Medium** with an **Urban Medium-Density** comprehensive plan designation. The parcels are outlined below:



These four parcels are centrally-located to the Silverdale core – a regional center anticipated for population growth and associated housing needs. These parcels are easily served by existing access, utilities and transit services within Silverdale Way. No wetland, stream or geotechnical hazard areas are mapped on the vacant lots making development easily feasible from a critical areas perspective. Development of the properties would be subject to the land use/development regulations and permitting requirements in place at the time of application. It is the goal of the owner to explore alternative housing types to help address the housing affordability crisis within the Kitsap region. Because the parcels are uniquely suited to provide housing density where growth is expected and near living wage employment opportunities in the Silverdale urban growth area, I respectfully request that this application be considered for retention as part of the county's preferred alternative.

Thank you,

Berni Kenworthy



**Berni Kenworthy, MSE, PE**  
Owner at Axis Land Consulting

PO Box 596  
Poulsbo, WA 98370

**Mobile:** 360-509-3716

**Email:** [berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com](mailto:berni.kenworthy@axislandconsulting.com)