

Alternatives Workshop Meeting Summary [Final]

Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update ■ Kitsap County ■ May 29, 2006



Alternatives Workshop Meeting Summary

Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update

May 15, 18 and 24, 2006

Prepared for:

Kitsap County
614 Division Street MS-36
Port Orchard, WA 98366-4682
Contact: Eric Baker

Prepared by:

AHBL
1200 6th Avenue, Suite 1620
Seattle, WA 98101-3123
206.267.2425
Fax 206.267.2429

Jones & Stokes
11820 Northup Way, Suite E300
Bellevue, WA 98005-1946
425.893.6422
Fax 425.822.1079

May 2006

This document should be cited as:
AHBL and Jones & Stokes. May 2006. Alternatives Workshop Meeting
Summary. (J&S 06075.06.) Olympia, WA. Prepared for Kitsap County

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. North Kitsap Alternatives Workshop 1-1

- 1.1. Introduction 1-1
- 1.2. Question & Answer Session..... 1-2
- 1.3. UGA Station Discussion..... 1-4
 - 1.3.1. Station 1: Kingston/Poulsbo 1-4
 - 1.3.2. Station 2: Port Orchard/ULID 6 1-6
 - 1.3.3. Station 3: SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst 1-7
 - 1.3.4. Station 4: Silverdale/Central Kitsap..... 1-8
 - 1.3.5. Station 5: East Bremerton/Central Kitsap..... 1-9
- 1.4. Comment Sheets 1-10

Chapter 2. Central Kitsap Alternatives Workshop 2-12

- 2.1. Introduction 2-12
- 2.2. Question & Answer Session..... 2-12
- 2.3. UGA Station Discussion..... 2-14
 - 2.3.1. Station 1: Silverdale/Central Kitsap..... 2-14
 - 2.3.2. Station 2: Silverdale/Central Kitsap..... 2-16
 - 2.3.3. Station 3: Silverdale/Central Kitsap..... 2-17
 - 2.3.4. Station 4: East Bremerton/Central Kitsap..... 2-18
 - 2.3.5. Station 5: East Bremerton/Central Kitsap..... 2-20
 - 2.3.6. Station 6: East Bremerton/Central Kitsap..... 2-21
- 2.4. Comment Sheets 2-22

Chapter 3. South Kitsap Alternatives Workshop 3-26

- 3.1. Introduction 3-26
- 3.2. Question & Answer Session..... 3-26
- 3.3. UGA Station Discussion..... 3-27
 - 3.3.1. Station 1: Port Orchard/South Kitsap/ULID 6 3-28
 - 3.3.2. Station 2: Port Orchard/South Kitsap/ULID 6 3-29
 - 3.3.3. Station 3: SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst 3-31
 - 3.3.4. Station 4: SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst 3-32
 - 3.3.5. Station 5: Silverdale/Central Kitsap/East Bremerton3-34
 - 3.3.6. Station 6: Silverdale/Central Kitsap/East Bremerton3-35
- 3.4. Comment Sheets 3-36

Chapter 1. North Kitsap Alternatives Workshop

Location: Kingston Junior High School, Kingston

Date: May 15, 2006

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Meeting Participants: 28

1.1. Introduction

Kitsap County Commissioner, Chris Endresen, welcomed meeting participants, thanked them for their involvement and encouraged comments on the alternatives presented at the workshop.

Jones & Stokes consultant and meeting facilitator, Melinda Posner, then asked meeting attendees how they heard about the meeting and highlighted the purpose of the workshop was to gather community feedback on the three alternatives to be studied in the Environmental Impact Statement and to provide feedback to the Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission. She explained the meeting format and reviewed the ground rules.

Kitsap County Department of Community Development Project Manager, Eric Baker, reviewed the requirements for updating the comprehensive plan, and summarized how the visioning process, public comments, and sub-area planning groups all work together to produce a plan for the anticipated countywide population increase of 100,000 by 2025.

Eric provided a recap of the March 2006 Vision Workshops and summarized the key vision themes identified at the meetings. They include:

North Kitsap

- Natural environment and open space protection and enhancement, balanced with growth
- Livable and healthy urban areas and cities
- Rural open space and buildings
- Transportation plan that is balanced, measurable and includes road and transit improvements
- Responsive government
- All vision elements should be linked and balanced

Central Kitsap

- Consider broader natural environmental context and open space connections
- Urban communities, livable and healthy, connected, safe and innovative
- Affordable and diverse housing

- New transportation approaches
- Define and distinguish urban and rural areas
- Fair governance

South Kitsap

- Improved ferries and transportation
- Economic prosperity
- Affordable and varied housing choices
- Natural environment, open space and parks

1.2. Question & Answer Session

A question and answer session followed Eric’s welcome and introduction.

Q = Question; A = Answer; C = Comment

Q How were population targets determined?

A The state Office of Financial Management (OFM) provides a range of population projections. The Kitsap County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) has adopted the projections that are in the middle range.

Q Are population allocations assigned to a particular area?

A The BOCC adopts the overall projections for the county and then these numbers are allocated to each of the urban growth areas. Some of the factors that enter into the UGA allocations include looking at existing conditions, trends, and expectations about where and what kind of future growth might occur.

Q Urban development outside of urban growth areas takes opportunity away from commercial and residential development within the UGA (e.g., Jefferson Point Road).

A Rural areas are scattered between these small lot areas. The county is responsible to provide adequate capacity and services such as sewer. Reaching these smaller lots would require serving the less dense areas in between which is cost-prohibitive.

Q In some areas, there are the same densities on two sides of the road, but one is in UGA and one isn’t. We have a lot of these situations where on one side we’re developed to urban densities. Imbalance comes from not including all those areas that are developed to urban.

A There are some cases where this occurs. Generally, urban areas are those that are, or will be, served by urban services.

- C Sewer district has said no expansion along Jefferson Beach due to lack of money.
- C In order to put sewer out there, septic users will be forced to pay for sewer (may not be a good idea).
- Q What cities are involved in the KRCC? Does King County have any say?
- A Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council members include Bainbridge, Poulsbo, Port Orchard, BOCC and the Tribes. King County does not participate.
- Q Thank you for these meetings and for making county government accessible to the public. It's important to note that the lack of free parking in many areas of the county makes it difficult for people to attend meetings. If you're truly committed to public participation, parking must be free and accessible. (Noted particularly in the Port Orchard area where the BOCC holds meetings.)
- A We realize this is an issue. The county is currently in the midst of on-going parking negotiations with Port Orchard.
- Q I am disappointed in the maps. I requested that critical area maps be overlaid on zoning maps so people could see the correlations more clearly. For example, some high-density areas are proposed within critical areas.
- A The county staff tried the overlay, but it was too difficult to read. Instead the critical area maps are posted side-by-side with the alternatives. CAO regulates development around critical areas through strict guidelines. It doesn't prohibit development; rather it places restrictions based on critical area issues. High-density development can occur in critical areas with appropriate development standards (e.g., "no net loss in critical areas") and mitigation. High-density development doesn't necessarily mean higher levels of environmental impact.
- C It may not mean higher levels of environmental impact, but it does mean greater costs.
- C If you want to save critical areas such as salmon habitat, you can't develop in those areas or you'll ruin the habitat. You cannot develop in all critical areas.
- C In some locations, it means moving a particular development to another area.
- Q What happens to CAO regulations when a city incorporates? Do the regulations remain or do they change to the county standards?

A Cities and counties can have different CAO regulations with different restrictions. If a city incorporates, the elected officials decide whether the county or city CAO regulations are observed.

Q Where does the county currently stand on the issue of low impact development (LID)?

A The County is very interested in this and is working with the Home Builders Association to develop LID standards that will provide stormwater credits. Draft language has been developed.

Q More population is allocated for some UGAs such as East Bremerton. How will this be addressed?

A The County will discuss the options, hear input from the community and also coordinate with the city of Bremerton.

1.3. UGA Station Discussion

After the formal presentation and question and answer session, the audience was divided into three separate groups and asked to proceed to one of five UGA stations. Participants remained at each station for 15 minutes, and then rotated to the next. The three groups visited all stations. Each facilitator provided a brief overview of the station's two (or in some cases three) UGA areas, and then led their group through a set of questions.

Melinda reminded people that the purpose of the workshop was to assess the level of community support of each of the three alternatives. She encouraged participants to “put on the Board of County Commissioner’s shoes” and provide “big picture,” countywide input. She asked them to consider issues beyond their respective neighborhoods.

1.3.1. Station 1: Kingston/Poulsbo

After a brief overview of each UGA, station participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- The 2005 Kingston Subarea Plan will be implemented with development regulation amendments, such as amendments to the downtown design standards. What features of Downtown Kingston do you like? As the downtown changes over time, what should it look like (e.g. building scale, appearance, etc.)? How can County zoning and design standards be improved in this area?
- A subarea plan was completed for Kingston in December 2005. The Alternatives for the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update incorporate the subarea plan. UGA boundaries are not proposed for change and can accommodate the 2025 growth projections. Periodically the County reviews UGA boundaries and growth levels. For years beyond 2025, do you have a sense of future

logical boundaries for the UGA (recognizing there are critical area constraints to the west and stormwater issues to the north)

- The County has a cooperative planning system with the City of Poulsbo. The County uses City zoning standards in the Poulsbo UGA to ensure development has a similar character as in the city and to facilitate future annexation. What do you see as the pros and cons of this cooperative planning system? Do you think it would be useful to apply with other cities in the County?
- There are four land use reclass requests under consideration in the Poulsbo alternatives. What are your thoughts about these requests? Would they expand the UGA in appropriate locations? Are the uses proposed appropriate for these areas?

Parcel Location	Parcel Size	Current Zoning	Requested Zoning	Current Use
21455 Big Valley Road Poulsbo, WA	2.49	RP	UR	House, barn pasture
1389 Finn Hill Road Poulsbo, WA	2.37	Residential Low PUTA	IND	Single-family mobile home
568 NE Bernt Rd Poulsbo, WA 98370	12	RP	Inclusion in UGA	---
19660 10th Avenue Poulsbo, WA 98370	40.24	RR	UL	Forest land

No changes were noted on the Station 1 maps. The following comments represent flip charts notes taken during group discussions.

Kingston

Design Guidelines

- Guidelines for rest of Kitsap area, outside of core to mitigate impact of infill, preserve neighborhood character and protect views
- Guidelines for service establishments and urban/rural transition
- Human scale development and no sprawl
- Mixed use allowed in all residential zones
- Show developable areas
- Pedestrian safety when ferry is in

Future Growth Areas (post 2025)

- White Horse
- Across West Kingston Road
- Growth proposals should match transportation
- Keep 2025 set; no future expansion
- Develop south of West Kingston Road, south of new school

Poulsbo

- Infrastructure in UGAMA must meet city standards
- 40-acre request (Johnson) is constrained by critical areas
- 12-acre and 2.49-acre parcels are constrained (water quality, erosion, ponds, quality of Dogfish Creek)
- Access to proposed Industrial site is through residential area
- Concept of Poulsbo bypass
- Alternative 1 is favorable
- Johnson Creek merits rural/county protection
- 40-acre parcel request would change rural atmosphere
- More concerns about 12- and 2.49-acre environments
- Poulsbo CAO perceived as weaker than county CAO (it needs update)
- Johnson Creek is not shown adequately enough to evaluate the map and respond to the questions
- Johnson Creek merits corridor protection (e.g., Barker Creek)
- Wetlands on IND (request parcel)

1.3.2. Station 2: Port Orchard/ULID 6

After a brief overview of each UGA, participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- Should the UGA be expanded out to Long Lake?
- Which alternative is preferred in the area west of SR 16 between Port Orchard and McCormick Woods? What are the pros and cons of each alternative?
- The alternatives identify locations for increased multi-family development (*point out areas along corridors and near parks*). How can the County help make future multi-family development in these areas successful? Where is increased density most appropriate or inappropriate?
- The Port Orchard/South Kitsap area proposes increased commercial uses along corridors (*point out Bethel and Mile Hill*). What kind of commercial is most appropriate in these areas – neighborhood commercial, community commercial, big box, mixed use?

No changes were noted on the Station 2 maps. The following comments represent flip charts notes taken during group discussions.

- Extend to Mullenix for UGA
- How is densification of UGA being addressed in alternatives?
- How is transportation being addressed?
- How are basic services such as fire, libraries and schools being provided?

- How are critical areas addressed in the Comprehensive Plan and both action alternatives?
- Population allocation constraints should be used to extend to Mullenix
- New CAO constraints should be reconfirmed in analysis to identify any additional impacts
- There are more houses west of Long Lake to be included in the UGA. Residents should be asked if they want sewer.
- Upzoning shouldn't be applied to South Kitsap. Infill without infrastructure isn't improving the area.
- Affordable housing is negatively affected by infill and up-zoning
- Pictures of density to convey development types
- Why are the rural areas left between McCormick and Port Orchard?
- Why is McCormick an existing UGA? Can a "self-sufficient" community sub-area occur elsewhere?
- Not supporting extension to Long Lake
- Why haven't other alternatives to sewer/septic been investigated?
- Isn't the whole point of being in the city to encourage urban services so that the city can collect additional revenue?

1.3.3. Station 3: SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst

After a brief overview of each UGA, participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- Should future employment growth continue to be focused in SKIA or should employment growth be more distributed around the County?
- Should uses other than Business Center or Industrial be permitted in SKIA (e.g. commercial, recreational)?
- In trying to accommodate population in West Bremerton, some UGA expansions are proposed in Rocky Point and between West Bremerton and Gorst. Urban Low and Urban Medium designations are shown in places. Are the amount and mix of residential designations appropriate? If not, what would you change and still meet the population allocated to this area?
- Is the mixed-use residential/commercial expansion shown along National Avenue in West Bremerton about right, too much, too little? If not, what would you change and how?
- Is the addition of commercial and residential uses to Gorst an appropriate mix given the future reclamation of the mineral lands area?
- For any future major development proposal, should the developer be required to pay for improvements to Sherman Heights Road (e.g. McCormick Woods approach – agreement that developer fund certain portion of infrastructure)?

No changes were noted on the Station 3 maps. The following comments represent flip charts notes taken during group discussions.

SKIA

- Open employment opportunities to other areas of county to minimize commuting and transportation-related impacts

West Bremerton

- Provide more neighborhood commercial areas mixed in with residential. People should be able to walk to the store, library, etc.
- Go for West Bremerton Alternative 3 to help offset population increases not met in East Bremerton

Gorst

- Will the cost of reclaiming the mineral resource site be worth it? Will it pencil out if commercial and residential development is added?
- Is the Gorst area served by public transit?
- Will a portion of the reclaimed mineral resource site remain as open space or will it all revert to commercial, industrial and residential?
- Designation of reclaimed area is not clear. We need more details regarding the intended use for this area.
- Reclaiming and re-zoning the mineral resource site is a great idea. It reuses the land and creates jobs.

1.3.4. Station 4: Silverdale/Central Kitsap

After a brief overview of each UGA, participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

Silverdale

- How much expansion area should be included in the Chico area? What about expansion around the llama head?
- This UGA may exceed the population target, what are the priority areas to include?
- What type of employment uses should be designated, considering a balance between commercial and industrial jobs?
- Are there other areas that should be intensified, outside of the mixed-use area?

Central Kitsap

- There is only one geographic way to expand the Urban Growth Boundary. Does expansion in Gilberton and north of Waaga Way make sense? If not, then how should the County accommodate population identified for Central Kitsap?

Silverdale & Central Kitsap

- What should the boundary between Central Kitsap and Silverdale be? Should there be a rural corridor?

No changes were noted on the Station 4 maps. The following comments represent flip charts notes taken during group discussions.

- Create an inner city
- Add apartments, condos, townhouses rather than continuing to expand out
- Save farmland
- How does development occur? Density must be able to pencil out to provide urban services
- Are these the type of areas that developers would like to expand into?
- Create a corridor with services (shopping, libraries, etc.) within walking distance for those who live in apartments, condos, townhouses
- Don't have time to take public transit
- Will Silverdale Alternative 3 accommodate the population allocation that is over and above for Central Kitsap?
- Use Alternative 3 because it accommodates all projected population
- Develop intersection in northwest; it would solve some transportation issues if county wants to expand northward. Waaga Way has great constraints.
- Very congested in Central Silverdale, seems like putting more people there will only make it worse
- What makes most sense for Silverdale to incorporate? Make those recommendations.

1.3.5. Station 5: East Bremerton/Central Kitsap

After a brief overview of each UGA, participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- Recognizing the need to accommodate more population in East Bremerton, is the intensification of mixed use and medium/high-density proposed along Perry Avenue and Sylvan Way about right? Similar question for multi-family along Pine Road. If not, then where?
- Recognizing the need to accommodate more population and respect environmental features in East Bremerton and Central Kitsap, what are the appropriate densities along Illahee Road NE? Note multi-family and urban restricted designations in this area in Alternatives 2 and 3.

- Given the need to accommodate more population, do the mixed use and multi-family nodes along Wheaton Way and in the vicinity McWilliams make sense? If not, then where?
- In order to accommodate additional population, how should we balance between infill (along Wheaton and near McWilliams) and proposed expansions (in Gilberton and north of Waaga Way)?

No changes were noted on the Station 5 maps. The following comments represent flip charts notes taken during group discussions.

- What is meant by mixed-use? Illustrate the concept.
- Pedestrian friendly
- How to accommodate high-density?
- Protect and enhance farmland
- Urban restricted vs. urban low (critical areas taken into consideration)
- Build extremely high-density
- Build more than three stories (e.g., 10 or more stories)
- Densify corridors
- Preserve rural areas
- Provide amenities to compliment dense corridors and rural areas
- What does the neighborhood want?
- Perry Avenue is a difficult area
- Wheaton Way/SR-303 is a disaster

1.4. Comment Sheets

Meeting participants were asked to respond to several questions related to the Comprehensive Plan alternatives. A tally of their responses is included here:

- There are two ways to accommodate projected population increases: expanding urban growth boundaries or increasing densities within current urban growth areas. Which of the following best describes your preference to accommodate future growth?

Seven responses:

- 5 Provide increased densities within current urban growth areas, and try not to expand the urban growth areas
- 2 Provide a combination of increased urban densities and expansion of the urban growth area

- As proposed, Alternative 3 would retain the County’s current standard of five to nine dwelling units per acre in the Urban Low Residential classification. Alternative 2 proposes to modify the range of densities to four to nine dwelling units per acre. Should the range of Urban Low Residential densities be extended to accommodate four units per acre?

Six responses:

 3 Yes

 3 No

Overall, which countywide land use alternative map does you prefer, Alternative 1, 2, or 3? Please write down the number of the map (or maps), which fit into each category:

Six responses:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Preferred	3	1	0
Neutral	1	2	0
Opposed	1	1	3

Note: some respondents indicated more than one choice in each category.

The following comments were included on the comment sheets/comment cards:

- Thank you for the opportunity to learn more about county plans and to provide input into the planning process. We appreciate having the opportunity to meet in our local community. Regarding South Kitsap (SKIA UGA), we are strongly in favor of Alternative 2 and strongly opposed to Alternative 3.
- Relieved to know that the UGA boundaries around Poulsbo are not expanded or moved.
- We, Johnson Creek Association, are striving to create a protected corridor along Johnson Creek to the southwest of Poulsbo’s UGA. There exist many critical areas and habitats, which do not show up on your maps. Please contact me and I will provide information.
- Alternative 1 for Poulsbo, prefer any growth where the priority is intensifying density where the land has already been built on. Preserve those areas that are not built on.
- Preserve Johnson Creek! Please keep growth upward, not outward. Require builders to fund infrastructure. Do not allow Poulsbo city standards to apply.
- For Poulsbo, I prefer Alternative 1.
- Any changes to the policies/projects of the Kingston sub-area plan should be held until the Plan’s 5-year review (2007/2008). That review should be a comprehensive and representative community review of the Plan’s performance and from that needed changes [made].

Chapter 2. Central Kitsap Alternatives Workshop

Location: Kitsap County Fairgrounds, Bremerton

Date: May 18, 2006

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Meeting Participants: 61

2.1. Introduction

Kitsap County Commissioner, Patty Lent, welcomed meeting participants, thanked them for their involvement and encouraged comments on the alternatives presented at the workshop.

Jones & Stokes consultant and meeting facilitator, Melinda Posner, then asked meeting attendees how they heard about the meeting and highlighted the purpose of the workshop was to gather community feedback on the three alternatives to be studied in the Environmental Impact Statement and to provide feedback to the Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission. She explained the meeting format and reviewed the ground rules.

Kitsap County Department of Community Development Project Manager, Eric Baker, reviewed the requirements for updating the comprehensive plan, and summarized how the visioning process, public comments, and sub-area planning groups all work together to produce a plan for the anticipated countywide population increase of 100,000 by 2025.

Eric provided a recap of the March 2006 Vision Workshops and summarized the key vision themes identified at the meetings. He briefly summarized the alternatives for each UGA using a slide show and focused in more detail on the UGAs that were organized for small groups discussions that evening. He noted that Alternative 2, in all UGAs, is recommended to study an urban low residential density of 4-9, rather than 5-9. Eric concluded his remarks with encouragement to visit the MyKitsap Web site and send comments.

2.2. Question & Answer Session

A question and answer session followed Eric's welcome and introduction.

Q = Question; A = Answer; C = Comment

- Q If an area is upgraded from urban low density to medium density, what impacts will this have on critical areas?
- A It may provide more opportunities to preserve critical areas by concentrating development in one area. However, there may be higher costs associated with developing higher densities in critical areas. It could also mean more impacts to critical areas if low impact development standards and other mitigation are not implemented. Each property is addressed on a case-by-case basis.
- Q This project seems to have a disconnect in planning for those who work across the water. Southworth and Kingston have ferries. Why does the UGA for Southworth have 5 DU/per acre?
- A Southworth is restricted by its lack of services, especially for water and sewer. With new technologies being developed for sewer systems (pocket plants, for example), Southworth may be considered in the future.
- Q One map shows urban restricted (1 to 5 DU/per acre). Why change for more density?
- A A higher urban density could potentially mean more protection for urban areas if appropriate development standards are applied. Because critical areas limit what and where development can occur, this has to be assessed on a case-by-case basis to factor in the extent of the critical areas, the type of use proposed and what mitigation will be considered. This is an alternative that the county will test in the EIS.
- Q The state mandates that the county seek public input. How much does the public input count?
- A We need your comments to help us determine how to balance new population, costs associated with new infrastructure, and meeting the collective vision for the county. Your comments on the alternatives you see tonight will help us do these things. You can also go to the MyKitsap.org Web site and send comments from there.
- Q I love Barker Creek. In Alternatives 2 and 3, I see the creek as becoming a barrier for annexation. Why was it pulled out? Can't use as a barrier and separate the urban growth corridor between Silverdale and East Bremerton.
- A This is only proposed in Alternative 2. This is exactly the kind of input we're looking for. Please share your comment in the small group discussions.
- C A list of streams was pulled out, including Chico.

2.3. UGA Station Discussion

After the formal presentation and question and answer session, the audience was divided into six separate groups and split up between three groups focused on Silverdale/Central Kitsap and three groups focused on East Bremerton/Central Kitsap. Participants visited two stations (30 minutes each); each focused on one of these areas. Each facilitator provided a brief overview of the station's two (or in some cases three) UGA areas, and then led their group through a set of questions. An open house period was held at the beginning and the end of the meeting allowing participants to walk around and see the maps for other UGAs.

Silverdale/Central Kitsap UGAs

Small group participants were encouraged to identify specific map modifications and to identify additional comments on easel sheets. In some cases, the groups did both; in others, they provided just map comments or just easel sheet comments. After a brief overview of each UGA, station participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

Silverdale

- How much expansion area should be included in the Chico area? What about expansion around the llama head?
- This UGA may exceed the population target, what are the priority areas to include?
- What type of employment uses should be designated, considering a balance between commercial and industrial jobs?
- Are there other areas that should be intensified, outside of the mixed-use area?

Central Kitsap

- There is only one geographic way to expand the Urban Growth Boundary. Does expansion in Gilberton and north of Waaga Way make sense? If not, then how should the County accommodate population identified for Central Kitsap?

Silverdale & Central Kitsap

- What should the boundary between Central Kitsap and Silverdale be? Should there be a rural corridor?

2.3.1. Station 1: Silverdale/Central Kitsap

Comments noted on Silverdale/Central Kitsap Alternatives maps

Alternative 1 Map

- No comments noted

Alternative 2 Map

Area west of Central Valley Road NW and north of NW Waaga Way

- More restrictive or keep Alternative 2

Rural Residential area north of NW Fairgrounds Road and West of Central Valley Road NE

- Preserve rural, retain quality of life, respecting property owner desires, less stress on infrastructure
- GMA says continuity of growth, located between two UGAs has sewer nearby
- Barker Creek should be protected, eliminating drain fields will help
- Combination of expansion out and intensify in (not going 5 stories along corridors)

Urban Restricted area in vicinity of Brownsville

- Urban Restricted makes less sense than Urban Low Residential referenced on Alternative 3 map

Mixed-use area along SR-303

- Intensification of uses along SR-303 makes sense
- High-density residential along that corridor should have buffer between it and SR-303

Urban Restricted area west of Brownsville Highway NE and north of NE Waaga Way

- Logical expansion for Central Kitsap with sewer line extension
- Extend sewer north along Ogle Road

Urban Low Residential and Commercial areas directly west of SR-3 NW

- Support expansion of Business Center

Urban Restricted area outside UGA and directly west of Illahee Road NE

- Change to Urban Low Residential

Urban Restricted area directly east of Central Valley Road NW and north of NE Waaga Way

- Change to Rural Residential

Alternative 3 Map

Area outside UGA, in vicinity of Brownsville and Gilberton

- How much land is really available here? How much is buildable?
- Locate new growth near existing water/sewer infrastructure
- Locate near infrastructure where viable; there is only one water treatment plant

- What does it mean to be an urban separator? Does it get written into deed? Have residents in that area agreed to it or been polled?
- Don't like petition driving the planning process
- How do you integrate UGAs into countywide (implications for infrastructure)?
- When integrating between UGAs, consider public facilities

Tracyton, in vicinity of May Street NW and Hansberry Street NW

- More neighborhood commercial

Area south of UGA, in vicinity of NE John Carlson Road and Aegean Blvd NE

- Neighborhood commercial
- Barker Creek as rural residential
- Industrial should have good access to sewer and transportation (no high slopes)

Area directly east of Central Valley Road NW and north of NE Waaga Way

- Consider industrial
- Large focus on population, need greater focus on jobs

Area directly west of Clear Creek Road NW and north of NW Trigger Avenue

- With new road intersection improvements and easier access, suggest expansion here rather than Chico

2.3.2. Station 2: Silverdale/Central Kitsap

Comments noted on Silverdale/Central Kitsap Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

- Mixed-use, why height restrictions?
- South of Central Kitsap (West Hills)
- Increased density
- Less restriction on property owners is better
- Supports property owner rights
- Silverdale must develop its services
- CK UGA should incorporate separately
- Follow current UGA boundaries, go north of Waaga Way
- Retain historic farms (e.g., Peterson and Schold farms)
- Old Frontier, storage facility proposal permitted in commercial zoning?

- Opposed to expansion north of Waaga Way
- South of Bangor, potential expansion, protect aquifer
- Maintain critical areas in their existing conditions as much as possible
- Consider residential in Business Center area
- I like Barker Creek as separator
- Look for large tracks of Urban Low Residential to increase to Urban Medium Residential
- Retain bay, no expansion
- Increased density and mixed-use along Perry Avenue; urban renewal up to forest
- Favor including Mentor reclassification request in Alternative 2 to gain capacity

2.3.3. Station 3: Silverdale/Central Kitsap

Comments noted on Silverdale/Central Kitsap Alternatives maps

Alternative 1 Map

- No comments noted

Alternative 2 Map

Area north of NW Fairgrounds Road and west of Central Valley Road NE

- Keep Barker Creek as a rural corridor

Urban Restricted area outside UGA, in vicinity of Brownsville, directly north of NE Waaga Way

- Not in any UGA (“opt out”), but some want in
- Where are the jobs?
- What if no one moved there?
- Larger lot size and lower density in critical areas
- Up-zoning, yes! We like open space, especially commercial corridors
- Illahee survey (remain as separate community)

Business Center area outside UGA, south of NW Trigger Avenue and west of SR-3

- Take advantage of views in Harrison Hospital area, lift height restrictions
- Is county partnering with developers to provide utilities?
- Expand commercial/Business Center zone in Silverdale

Business Center area within UGA, north of Kitsap Mall Blvd/SR-3 interchange

- Should be HTC or regular commercial

Highway Tourist Commercial area within UGA, directly Kitsap Mall Blvd/SR-3 interchange

- Should be higher commercial

Alternative 3 Map

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

- No comments noted

East Bremerton/Central Kitsap UGAs

After a brief overview of each UGA, station participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

East Bremerton

- Recognizing the need to accommodate more population in East Bremerton, is the intensification of mixed use and medium/high-density proposed along Perry Avenue and Sylvan Way about right?
- Recognizing the need to accommodate more population and respect environmental features in East Bremerton and Central Kitsap, what are the appropriate densities along Illahee Road NE? Note multi-family and urban restricted designations in this area in Alternatives 2 and 3.

Central Kitsap

- Given the need to accommodate more population, do the mixed use and multi-family nodes along Wheaton Way and in the vicinity McWilliams make sense? If not then where?
- In order to accommodate additional population, what should be balance between infill (along Wheaton and near McWilliams) and proposed expansions be (in the Gilberton and north of Waaga Way)?

2.3.4. Station 4: East Bremerton/Central Kitsap

Comments noted on East Bremerton/Central Kitsap Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments - General

- Mixed use is a good idea
- Less mixed use makes sense for Perry
- Concentrate development and move closer to Wheaton Way
- Alternative 2 (concerns regarding traffic Pine Road with Urban Medium Residential
- Multi-family may be okay (Urban Medium Residential already at Pine Road)
- With Perry and Sylvan it makes sense to intensify commercial multi-family along arterials
- Mixed-use along Sylvan Way is supportable as population growth occurs. Makes sense to develop additional multi-family.

Flip Chart Comments - East Bremerton/Central Kitsap, Alternative 3

- Where is mixed use in the county? How can we make more mixed use? We need more.
- Designate a neighborhood commercial center
- Need residential above Safeway
- Transportation will drive mixed use development
- If we use existing zoning, the text has to go with map
- Multi-family housing where there are services
- Transportation lines not reflected here: link bus routes w/intensified use
- Transportation agency representatives never at these meetings (Kitsap Transportation needs to be involved)
- Neither Alternative 2 nor 3 accommodate for increased population
- Bremerton government wants tax base (government wants all the commercial, not listening to the people)
- We're running out of water. The county needs to speak up against growth. Citizens should drive growth. Multi-use development needs to look at jobs and affordable housing. High-density correlates to higher education needs.

Flip Chart Comments - East Bremerton, Question 2

- Urban Medium Residential in Illahee (Alternative 3) is not feasible for affordable housing; prefer Urban Low Residential (engineering cost!) unstable area
- Concern regarding sewer extension for small lots in Illahee where septic fails
- Include mixed use along Pine and Riddell
- Consider Urban Restricted vs. Urban Medium Residential in Illahee (Alternative 3)
- Talk with Illahee Conservation (Jim Aho)

Flip Chart Comments - Central Kitsap

- Lots of unstable soil in Illahee area
- Alternative 2 is better than Alternative 3
- Corridor is a traffic oriented business
- Minimize high residential development along Wheaton Way
- Buses go there: plan to put houses where buses are, or move buses to areas where houses are
- Brownsville commercial zone promotes neighborhoods
- Condos, etc. are good
- Protect critical areas
- Plan where water, sewer should go and not just uses
- Gilbertson should be lower density because of critical areas
- Connect Illahee with Bainbridge with a bridge

Flip Chart Comments - Central Kitsap, Question 1

- Develop and sell county-owned Illahee forest parcel
- Restrict Brownsville area
- Include light industrial north of Waaga Way (near Brownsville)
- Gilberton area within UGA
- Alternative 3 (Central Kitsap) makes sense
- Preserve Illahee trust lands; may need to grow out and expand UGA; pull out trust lands
- Increase height limits in high-density zones (5 to 7 stories allows parking inside building; easier to combine)
- Tell the state to limit population growth
- Look at urban residential (change the code; restrict at four)
- Add to UGA by adding north of Brownsville
- Include Rocky Point (reduce Bremerton) in UGA (septic problem)
- More high-density in Alternatives 2 and 3

2.3.5. Station 5: East Bremerton/Central Kitsap

Comments noted on East Bremerton/Central Kitsap Alternatives maps

Alternative 1 Map

- No comments noted

Alternative 2 Map

Rural Residential area inside UGA, north of NW Fairgrounds Road

- Barker Creek wants to be rural (it's on record)
- Some development near critical areas is okay
- More mixed use
- Less UGA expansion

Illahee area outside UGA, south of NE 3rd Street and north of NE Sylvan Way

- Illahee Community Plan is underway to preserve historic community

Rural Residential area north of NE Waaga Way and east of Central Valley Road NW

- No expansion north of Waaga Way
- Impact and precedent
- Concern that urban reserve will be developed at 5 DU/acre as has been done in past
- Is current sewer line usable in this area?
- Existing infrastructure should guide new growth
- More up-zoning within existing UGA

- Better preservation of critical areas to retain rural character even within urban areas

SR-303 Corridor

- Increase density along Waaga Way and SR-303
- Town center concept and mixed use

Alternative 3 Map

Urban Medium Residential area in Illahee

- Why have medium density in Illahee when no urban services are available?
- Medium density not appropriate in critical areas

Flip Chart Comments

- Areas of cultural and historical significance should be identified and considered for exclusion when up-zoning
- Reduce required lot size to one acre in rural areas (will increase tax base)
- Economics drives the provision of facilities
- Protection of Steele Creek
- Prevention of intensive development for north part of SR-303
- Increased density will force people out
- Flexibility of population between the UGAs should be considered
- Minimize high-density areas so as not to increase crime rate and create parking and transportation problems
- Pride in ownership comes with smaller lot sizes (1-3 per acre) in rural areas

2.3.6. Station 6: East Bremerton/Central Kitsap

Comments noted on East Bremerton/Central Kitsap Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

- Waaga Way north should be higher density from Pond Rd to Silverdale
- Preference of urban restricted for environmentally sensitive areas
- Barker Creek should be in the Silverdale UGA
- Brownsville investigation into sewer
- Opposition to north of Waaga Way. Density increases or UGA
- Utilities consolidate on one side of road or underground on Wheaton Way
- Barker Creek proposed in (or) UGA for Silverdale
- Existing infrastructure should determine where UGA growth occurs (especially sewer)
- Support mixed use on Perry

- Four units supported /3 units/acre preferred
- Barker Creek should be projected regardless of in or out of UGA
- Fault protection should be considered when siting high-density
- More focus on high-density redevelopment for selective areas near Bremerton
- Support inclusion of Rocky Point in UGA
- Illahee prefers one unit/three acres, a rural designation and to be pulled out of a UGA
- No services currently and urban medium is inappropriate
- Urban separator proposed for Illahee preserve between Port
- Urban medium should be relocated north of Sunset and McMillion
- Urban medium also should be relocated along Perry following existing sewer lines
- Are school districts considered in alternative discussion
- Affordable housing should be considered near Wheaton Way
- North of Waaga Way should be left out of UGA
- Stay out of aquifer recharge areas for UGA
- Separate proposal for commercial north of Waaga Way (more commercial)
- Support Wheaton Way up-zoning

2.4. Comment Sheets

Meeting participants were asked to respond to several questions related to the Comprehensive Plan alternatives. A tally of their responses is included here:

- There are two ways to accommodate projected population increases: expanding urban growth boundaries or increasing densities within current urban growth areas. Which of the following best describes your preference to accommodate future growth?

Sixteen responses:

 4 Provide increased densities within current urban growth areas,
and try not to expand the urban growth areas

 10 Provide a combination of increased urban densities and
expansion of the urban growth area

 1 Do not accommodate growth

 1 Decrease and remove UGAs – these are areas that should remain rural

- As proposed, Alternative 3 would retain the County’s current standard of five to nine dwelling units per acre in the Urban Low Residential classification. Alternative 2 proposes to

modify the range of densities to four to nine dwelling units per acre. Should the range of Urban Low Residential densities be extended to accommodate four units per acre?

Seventeen responses:

- 12 Yes
- 3 No
- 2 1,2 – 4 units/acre

Overall, which countywide land use alternative map does you prefer, Alternative 1, 2, or 3? Please write down the number of the map (or maps), which fit into each category:

Ten responses:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Preferred	5	3	1
Neutral	1	3	1
Opposed	4	4	8

Note: some respondents indicated more than one choice in each category.

The following comments were included on the comment sheets/comment cards:

- The cap per acre should be lower than nine! Low Residential should be no more than 2 to 4 per acre.
- The area along Silverdale Way, north of the mall needs to be kept rural. Traffic is already heavy; we need the needed infrastructure built for these changes!
- Urban growth limited to Silverdale, Bremerton, Point No Point, and Port Orchard. Keep as much rural land rural. Mixed shops with apartments in downtown Port Orchard, Bremerton and Silverdale. Low density urban should be 2 to 4 per acre, no more!
- Please consider the cost of infrastructure improvements required for each change.
- Critical areas must be parks and/or critical rural (1 to 4 per acre). Try that!
- Build up. Allow 4 to 5 story buildings in mixed use and high-density areas!
- Support property owner rights. Have one house per 2.5 acres outside urban areas. The fewer restrictions on property owners, the better.
- Don't make special situation out of Barker Creek—adds complication that can better be handled in other way
- Don't make UGAs so small that long-range planning is stifled. Plan ahead!
- Silverdale serves one of the largest employers—size large enough to develop some infrastructure to support that need
- Too small gets us backed into corners, e.g., sewer, roads, water—that's how we get stuck with what we have

- The population densities in your alternatives presume property owners will utilize their properties in line with the plan. I suggest many will not. This will terribly flaw your plan and possibly create a housing crisis. Additionally, urban areas are generally for lower income families. Rural areas will only be accessible to higher income families. Historically lower income, higher density urban areas attract crime and slow decay of these areas. The housing problem will become a crisis under this type of planning. Let the free market drive growth management.
- Expand the Barker Creek rural corridor to include the area bounded by Waaga Way, Old Military Foster and Central Valley. This area presently has a rural character and little potential for redevelopment.
- Intensify density along the 303 corridor.
- Include Mentor reclassification property in Silverdale UGA. When possible, develop critical areas last to help preserve the rural character of the county. Also leave Barker Creek corridor undeveloped. It would also be great to preserve the Schold and Peterson farms as historic sites. Someday they would make interesting living history museums.
- Provide some means to discourage continued building of “big box” commercial buildings while many are empty (such as the old Lowe’s). How about high-density housing to replace these empty “boxes.”
- Wildlife corridors in all developing areas. Wildlife such as coyotes and bears are becoming a problem. Provide now for corridors for these animals to safely move through.
- I strongly oppose moving the UGA north of Waaga Way to the area bounded by Central Valley Road. I don’t believe the increased capacity in this urban restricted area warrants the risks associated with setting the precedent of increased development in what is now rural central valley. One of the objectives is to maintain a rural character in Kitsap County. How many other rural views/areas in Silverdale/Central Kitsap area are there other than north of Waaga Way in the Central Valley area?
- Central Kitsap—no way to Alternative 3. Leave Central Valley Road alone. Let it stay the way it is. It’s working just fine so why change it?
- 100% opposed to Alternative 3 for Central Kitsap. Alternative 2 goes too far north for Central Kitsap. Keep Central Kitsap rural. No more commercial at Silverdale Way and Hwy 308.
- This County is about to run out of water. Planning for more people to share in our limited water resource is not a good plan. It takes about 8 to 10 acres, on average, to supply recharge for the legal amount that can be withdrawn from an exempt well. Higher density will block off recharge to aquifers and at the same time use too much water. I don’t like any alternative. It’s like asking which is the best alternative to bankruptcy or death.
- The Comp Plan (as devised by Kitsap County government) is running Kitsap County. The perception is that Department of Community Development responds only to the big-moneyed special interests. You’ll do what is predetermined. This, from a former supporter of your work.
- I support protection of the environment. I was able to attend most of the meeting tonight, but did not stay to participate in both small groups, just one (Central Kitsap/Silverdale). I’m

afraid I am unable to choose an alternative at this time. It is complex. My input would be to protect the environment. I'm sorry I can't provide more specific input at this time. I will try to follow the process. Maybe I can contribute more at a future time.

- Yes, I see no discussion of urban separators and open space corridors. There is no alternative that denotes historic communities. Alternatives do not denote steep slopes, aquifer recharge areas, environmentally sensitive areas and areas which are seismic. Alternative overlays do not show buildable lands (how much is actually buildable). Barker Creek left out of UGA urban separator.

Chapter 3. South Kitsap Alternatives Workshop

Location: Givens Community Center, Port Orchard

Date: May 24, 2006

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Meeting Participants: 68

3.1. Introduction

Kitsap County Commissioner Jan Angel welcomed participants and encouraged them to comment on the alternatives presented at the workshop.

Jones & Stokes consultant and meeting facilitator, Melinda Posner, then asked meeting attendees how they heard about the meeting and highlighted the purpose of the workshop was to gather community feedback on the three alternatives to be studied in the Environmental Impact Statement and to provide feedback to the Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission. She explained the meeting format and reviewed the ground rules.

Kitsap County Department of Community Development Project Manager, Eric Baker, reviewed the requirements for updating the comprehensive plan, and summarized how the visioning process, public comments, and sub-area planning groups all work together to produce a plan for the anticipated countywide population increase of 100,000 by 2025.

Eric briefly summarized the alternatives for each UGA using a slide show and focused in more detail on the UGAs that were organized for small groups discussions that evening. Eric concluded his remarks with encouragement to visit the MyKitsap Web site and send comments.

3.2. Question & Answer Session

A question and answer session followed Eric's welcome and introduction.

Q = Question; A = Answer; C = Comment

Q The county is using OFM's mid-range population projections. Why not use the high-range since it is allowed by GMA?

- A More UGA, needs more urban services – costs associated – need balance cost/need
- Q When will we have public transit through Gorst?
- A County working with Kitsap Transit – not sure when, but it’s coming w/increased need for transit options
- Q What is the high end of OFM’s population range?
- A 380,000 – 390,000
- Q State population forecast accurate?
- A County is trending low to medium – using OFM projection is “safe”
- Q South Kitsap – increase priority of Bethel Corridor Plan – finish it
- A County proceeding with plan; acquiring ROW currently
- Q Given the difficulties in accommodating the population projections for Alternatives 1 and 2, why reduce Urban Low to 4-9 DU/per acre?
- A Balance various GMA goals – housing, commercial, quality of life
- Q Septic issue in Gorst – why can’t we create yearly septic “license” to prove functionality, instead of paying high monthly costs
- A Interesting concept – county will talk with county health dept
- Q Would 5 units per acre make it cheaper for sewer?
- A Often, yes. The greater the number of units, the easier it is to spread the cost of sewer between them.

3.3. UGA Station Discussion

After the formal presentation and question and answer session, the audience was divided into six separate groups and split up between two groups focused on Silverdale/Central Kitsap/East Bremerton; two groups focused on Port Orchard/South Kitsap/ULID 6; and two groups focused on SKIA/Gorst/West Bremerton. Participants visited three stations (15 minutes each); each focused on one of these areas. Each facilitator provided a brief overview of the station’s two (or in some cases three) UGA areas, and then led their group through a set of questions. An open house period was held at the beginning and the end of the meeting allowing participants to walk around and see the maps for other UGAs.

Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGAs

After a brief overview of each UGA, station participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- Should the UGA be expanded out to Long Lake?
- Which alternative is preferred in the area west of SR 16 between Port Orchard and McCormick Woods? What are the pros and cons of each alternative?
- The alternatives identify locations for increased multi-family development (*point out areas along corridors and near parks*). How can the County help make future multi-family development in these areas successful? Where is increased density most appropriate or inappropriate?
- The Port Orchard/South Kitsap area proposes increased commercial uses along corridors (*point out Bethel and Mile Hill*). What kind of commercial is most appropriate in these areas – neighborhood commercial, community commercial, big box, mixed use?

3.3.1. Station 1: Port Orchard/South Kitsap/ULID 6

Comments noted on Port Orchard/South Kitsap Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

- Keep/move development west of SR-16 under any alternative
- Accommodate first-time home buyers with range of housing alternatives, including high-density housing
- Keep rural pocket between McCormick UGA and area south of Berry Lake (Alternative 3)
- Commercial corridor along Mile Hill Road and Bethel is good; plan to eliminate traffic congestion (e.g., Wheaton Way)
- Commercial areas should not abut rural areas; rural areas should be buffered by residential transition
- Support continuous commercial along Mile Hill Road (Alternative 3)
- Prohibit non-sustainable (e.g., strip mall) development along Bethel commercial corridor
- Encourage transportation alternatives (e.g., bus) to Bremerton and other key destinations
- Encourage existing residential density within UGA as shown in Alternative 1
- Support development north of rural pocket as shown in Alternative 3
- Promote development along water/beach front northwest of existing alternatives
- Minimize commercial designations along Mile Hill Road past existing UGA
- Extension to Long Lake makes sense to alleviate sewer issues
- Commercial extension around west SR-16 interchange makes sense to capture rural and west area needs
- Commercial area south of Lider/SR-16 area not needed

- Narrow strip north of McCormick (Alternative 3) makes sense for development
- High-density along Sedgewick and Bethel makes sense (Alternative 3)
- 5 to 9 (ideally 7 or more units per acres is supported)
- Leave new UL (Alternative 3) NE of McCormick out of any alternative
- Revise colors on alternatives maps

3.3.2. Station 2: Port Orchard/South Kitsap/ULID 6

Comments noted on Port Orchard/South Kitsap Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

- Horse farms zoned commercial along Sydney should be allowed to opt out (exclusion from UGA)
- Has corporate campus expansion of 1,500 units been reviewed and considered? It should be reevaluated.
- Inclusion of Long Lake extension
- Concern over habitat corridor along and near Long Lake
- Concern regarding costs and financial improvements of Long Lake sewer extension
- Endorse southern connection in addition to Berry Lake
- Bremerton should return population to UGA
- Berry Lake should be included for public transit
- Like PowerPoint presentation; should be available for people to view at county offices
- Keep big box in concentrated areas
- Makes sense to put multi-family near jobs and commercial
- Avoid siting schools on major roads with traffic; locate them in areas where children can safely walk
- Consider energy; how we use it for development and how to make it more efficient
- Changing from 5 units/acre to 4 units/acres (Alternative2) is a bad idea; not part of original Alternative 2; more difficult to pay for facilities and services
- Rural separator between Port Orchard and Bremerton is needed
- 4 to 9 units/acre makes sense for Alternative 2, given steep slopes and other environmental issues
- Makes sense to add sewer to area with existing development near Long Lake; would allow other sewer connection
- Parkwood sewer should be revamped
- Is it important to connect to McCormick Woods? City wants water/sewer rates
- McCormick Woods development never made sense, it isn't near any other urban areas

- Anderson/Berry Lake never wanted in
- Urban Reserve zones need to be eliminated or resolved; keeps property owners in limbo and creates anger/conflict with property owners
- Rural residential, or equivalent, is appropriate in Anderson/Berry Lake
- We need an urban separator between Port Orchard and Bremerton
- If Bremerton annexes McCormick Woods, they should annex Gorst as well
- If the NASCAR track comes in, it wouldn't make sense to have urban separator between ULID 6 and Port Orchard
- According to the plan we didn't make progress with the Bethel corridor; we violated the plan with Wal-Mart and we will change again to accommodate Home Depot
- MV on Bethel makes sense
- Alternative 2 doesn't accommodate MF HS above Alternative 1
- Multi-family should go by transportation and bus/public transit for employment
- Consider concept of "centers" on commercial corridors
- "Centers" near freeway exits and commercial areas
- Given all the designated commercial areas, how does the county plan to attract those businesses? What economic development plans exist?
- Profits from commercial development should pay for road improvements (e.g., Stage Coach Road and Bethel)

SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst UGAs

After a brief overview of each UGA, station participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- Should future employment growth continue to be focused in SKIA or should employment growth be more distributed around the County?
- Should uses other than Business Center or Industrial be permitted in SKIA (e.g. commercial, recreational)?
- In trying to accommodate population in West Bremerton, some UGA expansions are proposed in Rocky Point and between West Bremerton and Gorst. Urban Low and Urban Medium designations are shown in places. Are the amount and mix of residential designations appropriate? If not, what would you change and still meet the population allocated to this area?
- Is the mixed-use residential/commercial expansion shown along National Avenue in West Bremerton about right, too much, too little? If not, what would you change and how?
- Is the addition of commercial and residential uses to Gorst an appropriate mix given the future reclamation of the mineral lands area?
- For any future major development proposal, should the developer be required to pay for improvements to Sherman Heights Road (e.g. McCormick Woods approach – agreement that developer fund certain portion of infrastructure)?

3.3.3. Station 3: SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst

Comments noted on SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

SKIA

- Track can be a catalyst for further development (but will take land away from job creation activities)
- How does this airport compare to Tacoma Narrows airport (which is closing)?
- Involve airport commission in planning the area
- Alternative 2 more practical because better industrial land exists in SKIA and not yet developed (also good buffer)
- Are roads adequate for projected growth?
- Removing land for residential (Gorst Alternative 2) puts land on tax rolls rather than idle industrial zoned land
- Need improved transportation; infrastructure as catalyst
- Like Alternative 2
- Combine 2 & 3 (take out McCormack & allow increase in industry)

West Bremerton

- Coordinate with Bremerton housing authority on more mixed uses near their planned housing project
- Commercialization—still need to plan for kids, sidewalks, etc.
- Prefer West Bremerton Alternative 3
- Look beyond single-family housing—more housing options/affordability
- Improved transportation system critical

Gorst

- Need to talk to area residents
- Strongly prefer Gorst Alternative 3: more residents will increase resident interest in area; more pride and interest
- Experiment with increased height limitations in Gorst
- Public access to “nature” in Gorst
- Alternative 2 or 3 for Gorst look better as solution to water/sewer problem
- Fix roadways to improve transportation
- Develop model programs for environmental innovations as a condition of re-zoning or development

3.3.4. Station 4: SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst

Comments noted on SKIA/West Bremerton/Gorst Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

SKIA

- Should allow more mix of uses in this area
- Maintaining jobs in this area good idea
- No down-zone of McCormack (Overton land), rural wooded proposal – should remain as commercial – shouldn't be reclassified as rural wooded
- Will county re-open scoping comment period?
- There isn't land available in Kitsap Co. to accommodate 20 years of growth/population
- Speedway more appropriate than NASCAR track because it would have less impact on neighborhood and would be more affordable to area residents
- Alternative 3 preferred because it consolidates commercial in one area, which means lower infrastructure costs.

West Bremerton

- Mixed use is good, but more appropriate at Rocky Point rather than National Ave – mixed use better near residential
- Road design standards – county should provide access and maintenance
- Need to balance growth w/competition and cost of housing
- Shouldn't be limited to hearings board designation of zoning & UGAs – should be open to jurisdiction (to decide)
- County making mistake – need to look at rural areas, not just urban – need to plan roads, etc. in anticipation of future growth
- County should have built bridge/link from Port Orchard to Bremerton (across water)
- Need organized road pattern for rural and urban
- Increased mixed use along National Ave good approach
- Auto access may be issue w/increased mixed use because increased traffic would result – give thought to avoiding traffic impacts
- Urban high zoning for “Navy Yard City” (Alternative 3)
- Urban high for Sherman Heights (Alternative 3)
- Affordable housing options added in Sherman Heights (Alternative 3)
- Too much industrial concentrated in South Kitsap – consider re-distribution of UGAs
- If urban hi is designated for Sherman Heights, county must consider lack of transportation access – need to provide better road connections (Alternative 3)

Gorst

- If resource site is reclaimed, (use) it should be clearly defined – shouldn't be open to interpretation
- If residential is added, underlying industrial zoning should remain, but must be clearly defined
- Belfair Hwy better entrance to proposed residential area
- County should work w/Port Orchard to bring sewer to Gorst – avoid septic impacts on adjacent water body
- Clarify when mineral resource parcel will be reclassified – that influences transportation/public transit planning

Silverdale/Central Kitsap/East Bremerton UGAs

After a brief overview of each UGA, station participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

Silverdale

- How much expansion area should be included in the Chico area? What about expansion around the llama head?
- This UGA may exceed the population target, what are the priority areas to include?
- What type of employment uses should be designated, considering a balance between commercial and industrial jobs?
- Are there other areas that should be intensified, outside of the mixed-use area?

Central Kitsap

- There is only one geographic way to expand the Urban Growth Boundary. Does expansion in Gilberton and north of Waaga Way make sense? If not, then how should the County accommodate population identified for Central Kitsap?

Silverdale & Central Kitsap

- What should the boundary between Central Kitsap and Silverdale be? Should there be a rural corridor?

East Bremerton

- Given the need to accommodate more population, do the mixed use and multi-family nodes along Wheaton Way and in the vicinity McWilliams make sense? If not then where?

- Recognizing the need to accommodate more population in East Bremerton, is the intensification of mixed use and medium/high density proposed along Perry Avenue and Sylvan Way about right? If not, then where?

East Bremerton & Central Kitsap

- Recognizing the need to accommodate more population and respect environmental features in East Bremerton and Central Kitsap, what are the appropriate densities along Illahee Road NE? Note multi-family and urban restricted designations in this area in Alternatives 2 and 3.

3.3.5. Station 5: Silverdale/Central Kitsap/East Bremerton

Comments noted on Silverdale/Central Kitsap Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

Silverdale

- Put higher density closer to Perry rather than Illahee
- Commercial development in Strawberry & Koch Creek area not desirable due to pollution
- Blend Central Kitsap UGA with Bremerton UGA for pop allocation
- Creates unnecessary conflicts
- CK is future Bremerton Annexation Area
- No distinction between the 2 UGA

Central Kitsap

- Some residents would like to remain in county, not annexed
- Protect Illahee area from high-density
- Increase density along Chico Way
- Keep urban low at 5 to 9 units per acre
- To better provide urban facilities
- Higher density near core
- Waaga Way extension area
- Convert from business center to commercial
- Take advantage of and preserve natural vistas and resources
- Leave Clear Creek out of UGA
- Protect natural resources & farm land
- Maintain habitat corridor

Barker Creek Corridor

- What is reasoning for retaining area?
- Preserve to maintain wildlife corridor
- Preserve quality of life
- Is lower density fair to the rest of the population which will have to develop at higher density if this area is removed or down-zoned
- Is an asset as it is, leave it out

Wheaton Way Corridor

- Do not intensify if not in line with Bremerton planning
- Encourage maximum use of existing commercial land

3.3.6. Station 6: Silverdale/Central Kitsap/East Bremerton

Comments noted on Silverdale/Central Kitsap Alternatives maps

- No comments noted

Flip Chart Comments

- Steele Creek & Barker Creek areas need to be reduced (there is more population moving into the most critical areas)
- Does not make sense to have a rural corridor between Silverdale and Central Kitsap UGA
- Does not make sense for infrastructure
- Property with access to sewer should be an urban designation, makes economic sense
- Along SR-3, north of Silverdale core; more HTC, less business
- Let development go as it may, without mandates
- Land near Chico Way can't connect to sewer, even though the land is only a few miles from a sewer hook-up
- Alternative 2 does not extend enough to connect to infrastructure
- Kitsap County should not be concerned with a "Bright Line"
- It should plan for what "makes sense"
- Alternative 3 is good because it is not as restricted (land area wise) as Alternative 2
- Take the larger Alternative 3, because it allows us to plan better for the future
- This (Alternative 3) would allow for better planning of infrastructure, instead of "reinventing the wheel"
- Alternative 3 would allow for a better sense of place because we could plan better
- With Alternative 3, we wouldn't have to "go back to the drawing board"
- If urban areas are to work, planners/county needs to involve citizens on a larger level

- Need implementation of citizen ideas in order to have plans that work
- Civic pride
- Citizens groups need to have a plan, a plan to carry out the plan, and help from the county
- Area north of Waaga Way should be included in the central UGA instead of the Silverdale UGA
- Provide more housing choices (such as town homes, duplexes) to create more options for the young and low income
- Increase housing density
- Make sense to upzone In Silverdale UGA because bus service and other infrastructure exist
- Reserve Barker Creek area to have a full break between Bremerton and Silverdale
- Make is so the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs could potentially be annexed into the city of Bremerton
- Recommend higher densities where it makes sense to preserve wetlands
- If all red (commercial) were incorporated, we would be allocating more retail than we would need
- Driving on highway is more enjoyable when one does not see large box developments
- More multi-family zoning in county
- HTC along SR-303, should include higher densities to house more multi-family (has a good view, good area)
- Should have a lower density west of Gilberton to preserve natural environment
- Current population allocation is not set in stone
- East Bremerton should have higher density in the middle for infrastructure (so the Puget Sound would stop being polluted by septic tanks)
- Perry Avenue design guidelines would encourage more urban-village-type development

3.4. Comment Sheets

Meeting participants were asked to respond to several questions related to the Comprehensive Plan alternatives. A tally of their responses is included here:

- There are two ways to accommodate projected population increases: expanding urban growth boundaries or increasing densities within current urban growth areas. Which of the following best describes your preference to accommodate future growth?

Seventeen responses:

- 3 Provide increased densities within current urban growth areas, and try not to expand the urban growth areas

14 Provide a combination of increased urban densities and expansion of the urban growth area

- As proposed, Alternative 3 would retain the County’s current standard of five to nine dwelling units per acre in the Urban Low Residential classification. Alternative 2 proposes to modify the range of densities to four to nine dwelling units per acre. Should the range of Urban Low Residential densities be extended to accommodate four units per acre?

Eighteen responses:

- 15 Yes
- 3 No

Overall, which countywide land use alternative map does you prefer, Alternative 1, 2, or 3? Please write down the number of the map (or maps), which fit into each category:

Eighteen responses:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Preferred	2	5	11
Neutral	2	9	0
Opposed	9	0	5

Note: some respondents indicated more than one choice in each category.

The following comments were included on the comment sheets/comment cards:

- We are still wondering about road improvements! Specifically Bethel Road. I find it very difficult to reach Baja restaurant in Bethel Center. I would like to see our county road plan! Sometime leaving Hwy 16 on Sedgwick exit to Bethel takes 10 minutes at heavy commute time! Thanks.
- [UGA] expansion is needed – the bigger the better for the UGA
- Rezone my land on Longlake Road across from the Howe Farm to Urban Low as shown in Alternative 3. Rezone my parcel on Mile Hill (4090 Mile Hill Drive lot 028) to commercial.
- Re: 5023 Beach Drive – Karcher Creek Sewer District planned 10 or 11 for the 6.6-acre piece having only one older home – that R2 was changed – downzoning to RM? should not be permitted, as all sides are developed along the waterfront into approximately ½-acre residences. The sewer district planned for divisions and proposed survey was for ten additional residences.
- Likes Alternative 3 with extension of the waterfront past the lighthouse.
- I would like to see the Berry Lake area included in Alternative 2.
- These sessions are extremely valuable to me.

- Need more opportunities for townhouse and condo ownership.
- Housing mix – zoning only single family density lots not acceptable – we need a higher density mix – townhomes, condos, etc. – most first time buyers priced out of current real estate market
- I prefer a combination of Alternatives 2 and 3 – I would like to pick bits and pieces from both and to delete portions from both.
- Good presentation
- I live outside the UGA scope on Holly Rd. Growth in urban ones affects those in the rural areas. Traffic flow into “town” is difficult during commute hours. None of us wishes to see our great area turn into the mess in areas like Bonney Lake. I prefer 4 units per acre only and the existing 1/5 outside the UGA.
- If the meeting says it starts at 6 p.m., please do not start the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Save the “open house” for the end of the meeting.
- Need to have a legend on display that defines the color codes and terms on the maps.
- No Barker Creek watershed urban separator
- No forced lot aggregation
- No forced open space on property owners (conservation easements, notice to title as a condition of permit.
- I do not support any efforts to force property owners to aggregate non conforming lots
- Public involvement plan – 3.3 why are property owners lumped in with developers? Please separate.
- I’m very concerned that the UGA will not be large enough to accommodate the projected population once critical areas are factored – in the plans – none of them take this into consideration.
- While we may be attempting to limit sprawl we don’t want to live on top of each other either – we need some privacy!