

# Draft Plan Open Houses Summary

Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update ■ Kitsap County ■ September 2006





# Draft Plan Open Houses Summary

## Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update

August 29, September 7 and 14, 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

September 2006

This document should be cited as:  
AHBL and Jones & Stokes. September 2006. Draft Plan Open Houses  
Summary. (J&S 06075.06.) Olympia, WA. Prepared for Kitsap County.

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Chapter 1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1. Context.....	1-1
1.2. Notification .....	1-1
1.3. Meeting Format & Materials .....	1-2
1.3.1. Land Use.....	1-2
1.3.2. Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems .....	1-2
1.3.3. Economic Development/Housing .....	1-2
1.3.4. Transportation/Utilities/Capital Facilities .....	1-2
<b>Chapter 2. North Kitsap Draft Plan Open House .....</b>	<b>2-3</b>
2.1. Introduction .....	2-3
2.2. Question and Answer Session .....	2-3
2.3. Draft Comprehensive Plan Alternative Element Stations .....	2-5
2.3.1. Station 1: Land Use.....	2-5
2.3.2. Station 2: Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems ...	2-5
2.3.3. Station 3: Economic Development/Housing .....	2-5
2.3.4. Station 4: Utilities/Transportation/Capital Facilities .....	2-5
2.4. Comment Cards.....	2-5
<b>Chapter 3. South Kitsap Draft Plan Open House .....</b>	<b>3-7</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	3-7
3.2. Question and Answer Session .....	3-7
3.3. Draft Comprehensive Plan Alternative Element Stations .....	3-10
3.3.1. Station 1: Land Use.....	3-10
3.3.2. Station 2: Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems .	3-10
3.3.3. Station 3: Economic Development/Housing .....	3-10
3.3.4. Station 4: Utilities/Transportation/Capital Facilities .....	3-11
3.4. Comment Cards.....	3-11
<b>Chapter 4. Central Kitsap Draft Plan Open House .....</b>	<b>4-12</b>
4.1. Introduction .....	4-12
4.2. Question and Answer Session .....	4-12
4.3. Draft Comprehensive Plan Alternative Element Stations .....	4-15
4.3.1. Station 1: Land Use.....	4-15
4.3.2. Station 2: Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems .	4-15
4.3.3. Station 3: Economic Development/Housing .....	4-16
4.3.4. Station 4: Utilities/Transportation/Capital Facilities .....	4-16
4.4. Comment Cards.....	4-16



# Chapter 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Context

Kitsap County released the Draft 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update and Environmental Impact Statement on August 29, 2006 for public review. Three public open houses were held on August 29 (North Kitsap), September 7 (South Kitsap) and September 14 (Central Kitsap) to gather comments. Three Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) public hearings followed on September 18, 20 and 21.

For purposes of environmental review, the Kitsap County Planning Commission and BOCC defined three alternatives to be analyzed in the draft documents. The menu and range of the three alternatives was based on public comment, sub-area plans, Washington State population projections, Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements, Growth Management Hearings Board cases, and Countywide Planning Policies. The three alternatives include several key components:

- Varying abilities to accommodate the anticipated growth through 2025
- Different levels of housing variety
- Up-zoning as well as Urban Growth Area expansions
- Consideration of minimum density (4-9 dwelling units per acre or 5-9 dwelling units per acre) for Urban Low and Urban Cluster Residential
- Priority study areas and recommended land use plans studied by Silverdale and Port Orchard/South Kitsap Citizen Advisory Committees
- Review of land use reclassification requests and many other regulation amendments

## 1.2. Notification

The community was notified of the open houses and public hearings through several means. 32,500 newsletters were printed and distributed to property owners within and adjacent to the alternatives. Three large display boards announcing the upcoming meetings were placed at the Kingston Community Center, Kitsap County Fair & Stampede and Givens Community Center located in Port Orchard, and meeting announcements were placed on the project Web Site, MyKitsap.org. One hundred sixty one people attended the three open houses and 23 comment cards were submitted at the meetings.

## 1.3. Meeting Format & Materials

Each open house began with introductions, project updates and a question and answer session. Participants were encouraged to visit the four display stations, speak with project staff members, and record their thoughts on flip charts or comment cards. In addition to maps and supporting data, key elements were displayed for each alternative element station:

### 1.3.1. Land Use

- UGA sizing, land capacity analysis, upzoning, and mixed use
- Population banking
- Comprehensive Plan designations/rezones
- Reasonable measures
- Stormwater/Low Impact Development

### 1.3.2. Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems

- Rural Wooded
- Transfer of Development Rights
- Urban Restricted (UR) Zone
- Regulatory vs. non-regulatory environmental protection
- Parks and open space plan and Parks (P) Zone

### 1.3.3. Economic Development/Housing

- Economic diversification
- Employment projections
- Industrial Multi-Purpose Recreational Area (IMPRA) designation
- Housing diversity
- Private and public incentives for affordable housing

### 1.3.4. Transportation/Utilities/Capital Facilities

- Level of Service
- Funding
- Broadband and alternative energy
- Sewer provision and water availability

# Chapter 2. North Kitsap Draft Plan Open House

Location: Kingston Junior High School, Kingston

Date: August 29, 2006

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Meeting Participants: 36

## 2.1. Introduction

Kitsap County Commissioner, Chris Endresen, welcomed meeting participants, thanked them for their involvement and encouraged comments on Volume I: Draft Comprehensive Plan Policy, Volume II: Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and Volume III: Proposed Regulation documents.

Jones & Stokes consultant and meeting facilitator, Melinda Posner, then asked meeting attendees how they heard about the meeting and highlighted the purpose of the open house was to introduce the draft planning documents, and gather community feedback on the three alternatives analyzed in the documents. She explained the meeting format and reviewed the ground rules. She also described the public hearing opportunities later in September.

Kitsap County Department of Community Development Special Projects Manager, Eric Baker, provided a brief recap of the May 2006 Alternatives Workshops; described the process for developing the alternatives and draft documents; gave an overview of key issues and features of the draft documents; and reviewed the upcoming steps in the Plan Update process.

## 2.2. Question and Answer Session

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

Q Are the densities indicated for Kingston the same as for the other Urban Growth Areas?

A Yes, it is for all the Urban Growth Areas.

Q Concern about mixed use. Why isn't there more emphasis on the urban village idea, e.g., more corridors?

A Bremerton is addressing this through the use of District Centers. In the Central Kitsap, East and West Bremerton UGAs, Centers are located around old transit nodes. The benefits are similar to those gained with urban village planning.

- Q 'Mixed use' and 'urban village' seem different. The Kingston urban village example is located away from the center of town. Projects during WWII had food stores, hardware stores, etc. [located nearby]. I don't think the idea [of mixed use] is being considered.
- A That's the concentric ring philosophy. Some areas of the Comprehensive Plan address this but the county is taking smaller steps to get there. The Plan considers both without putting all eggs in one basket.
- Q Urban corridors. This is what you're getting. I don't want Central Kitsap to look like East Bremerton, but it does. Are there any ideas to move away from this approach?
- A Yes, shifting to the District Center approach.
- Q How do you provide continuity between critical areas and developed areas?
- A This can be achieved through close county and city coordination, the use of Best Available Science, and Urban Growth Area Management Agreements (UGAMAs). In instances where city/county designations and agreements don't mesh, the county will work closely with the city. The city has jurisdiction over all areas within city limits.
- Q Can land-locked parcels be incorporated into the proposed Urban Growth Area?
- A Any property can be incorporated, though critical areas must be considered.
- Q What if a parcel is land-locked due to a legal easement?
- A It can still be included using the proper legal procedures.
- Q What about full utilization of four to nine in the Urban Growth Areas?
- A The County is considering the minimum of four for the Urban Low and Urban Cluster. The UGA could be developed at higher levels; this is why the Comprehensive Plan must be updated every 10 years.
- Q What if you continue with the minimum utilization but the areas don't develop?
- A Development will have to occur at the minimum utilization (four). If land remains vacant, the next 10-year update will review that. To date, this has not happened in Kitsap County.
- Q Concern about the CAO and projected population increase. The current standard requires a 100' buffer around drain fields, yet the Health Department issues waivers for 25' buffers. Is the Health Department coordinating with the county for CAO consistency?
- A The two agencies work together. In some cases, waivers are issued.

## 2.3. Draft Comprehensive Plan Alternative Element Stations

After the formal presentation and question and answer session, participants were invited to roam the room and visit each of the four element stations. Staff members were available to answer questions and note comments on a flip chart.

### 2.3.1. Station 1: Land Use

The following represents flip chart comments recorded at the Land Use station:

#### Alternative 1

- Poulso UGA; plenty of under-utilized land left for urban growth

#### Alternative 2

- Imperative for Central Valley community and Chums of Barker Creek petitions, representing majority of people from the area.
- Keep Alternative 2 for Illahee area.
- Change Thompson Lane from Urban Low to Urban Restricted.

#### General Comments

- Continue allowance of up to 5 du/acre so that sewer extension will be affordable.
- No minimum densities preferred.

### 2.3.2. Station 2: Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems

No flip chart comments were recorded at this station.

### 2.3.3. Station 3: Economic Development/Housing

No flip chart comments were recorded at this station.

### 2.3.4. Station 4: Utilities/Transportation/Capital Facilities

The following represents flip charts comments recorded at the Utilities/Transportation/Capital Facilities station:

- Keep sewers out of Illahee; keep water in streams for fish
- Royal Valley should not have sewer expansion

## 2.4. Comment Cards

Open house participants were encouraged to submit comments via the cards available at the meeting, a written letter or email. The following comments were submitted at the open house:

- We have property in the Kingston UGA and are opposed to changing the Urban Restricted to one to four dwelling units per acre. We prefer leaving the zoning at 1-5 du/acre. Anything less would mean a financial hardship in development based on the cost of sewer pumping stations necessary.
- The concern over senior space is maybe a little overblown. Senior independent buildings and assisted living (e.g., The Willows, Crita Shores, etc.) are having difficulty getting residents. There is presently no shortage of senior facilities and rooms remain unoccupied.
- Ron Ross' inclusion into Alternative 2 UGA? No! In the last comprehensive plan, it states the importance of keeping the lands along Waaga Way rural. Our scenic vista, natural drainage area of saturated soils and farmlands will be forever changed. Why would you insist it remain as it presently is *before*, and now under pressure, change it to be included in Alternative 2? Steele Creek cannot stand more development. Please don't put this area under more strain. Please take it out.
- Great, fantastic; thank you for zoning parks. This is a good plan.
- After walking from South Kingston Road (where Olympic Resources will enter) to Ferry and from 272<sup>nd</sup> to Ferry, I find it quicker via PUD trail to go to Ferry from 272<sup>nd</sup>. The driving distance is the same. But if the idea is to encourage public transportation (Ferry) and fewer autos used (walking), then allowing the UGA to move north makes a lot of sense. Move Kingston UGA to north to take advantage of existing trail(s). Allowing higher density here would fulfill better transportation systems.
- I appreciate the flexibility I see in the mixed-use zoning for downtown Kingston, especially the living areas over businesses and the fact that a building can be all condo until the business climate improves.

# Chapter 3. South Kitsap Draft Plan Open House

Location: Givens Community Center, Port Orchard

Date: September 7, 2006

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Meeting Participants: 64

## 3.1. Introduction

Kitsap County Commissioner, Patty Lent, welcomed meeting participants, thanked them for their involvement and encouraged comments on Volume I: Draft Comprehensive Plan Policy, Volume II: Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and Volume III: Proposed Regulation documents.

Jones & Stokes consultant and meeting facilitator, Melinda Posner, then asked meeting attendees how they heard about the meeting and highlighted the purpose of the open house was to introduce the draft planning documents, and gather community feedback on the three alternatives analyzed in the documents. She explained the meeting format and reviewed the ground rules. She also described the public hearing opportunities later in September.

Kitsap County Department of Community Development Special Projects Manager, Eric Baker, provided a brief recap of the May 2006 Alternatives Workshops; described the process for developing the alternatives and draft documents; gave an overview of key issues and features of the draft documents; and reviewed the upcoming steps in the Plan Update process.

## 3.2. Question and Answer Session

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

Q = Question; A = Answer; C = Comment

Q How much of the 100,000 [new population] are located in South Kitsap?

A Roughly, 15,000 for South Kitsap; 8,000 Central Kitsap; 7,000 Silverdale; 2,000 East Bremerton; 2,000 West Bremerton; 3,000 (plus 3,000 for Poulsbo city); and 3,000 Kingston [See Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for more information.]

Q If an area is not indicated on the map, is it covered by the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations?

A Yes, both urban and rural areas are covered.

Q What about Bainbridge Island? They aren't shown. They have ferry service that we'd like to have.

- A Bainbridge Island does have an allocation. The city figures the allocation first, and then the county provides input. Cities take the lead under the Growth Management Act.
- Q At Planning Commission last week, we saw a table of costs for public facilities. Can you share that?
- A Transportation was 29 to 80 million in revenue and 300 million in cost [cost is roughly for Alternative 2; see DEIS for more information]. How will the county make up the deficit – a key question for decision-makers.
- Q Stormwater and sewer costs?
- A That is more difficult to quantify because we are not sure where that infrastructure will be located. It is easier to quantify roadways. The cost of stormwater is usually borne by new development and stormwater fees. [The Draft Plan identifies a 6-year cost/financing plan for stormwater in the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)]
- Q What is the stormwater cost?
- A Currently, the county does not have 20-year costs [The Draft Plan identifies a 6-year cost/financing plan for stormwater in the CFP.]. Stormwater is the same as sewer.
- Q The Health Department and Karcher Creek sewer has that information.
- C We will need state agency for more than 3,500 gallons.
- Q Are developers responsible for sewer lift station costs?
- A Yes, they are responsible for their share.
- Q Is there a deficit of water rights?
- A It is part of the Capital Facilities Plan. Alternative 2 has adequate water/mitigation. Alternative 3 has some short falls.
- C An example of alternative sewer is located on Farmer Dell Road.
- A There is a pilot project that involves a series of pre-existing lots that drain to another field.
- Q Do Alternatives 2 and 3 commercial require sewer?
- A Generally, yes, because septic is not preferred.
- Q Does Alternative 3 have a better chance for sewer due to commercial?
- A It depends on topography and other factors. Alternatives 2 and 3 are fairly equal regarding sewer. Other factors such as population differentiate them.
- Q What do the squares on the SKIA map signify? 20-acre parcels? Most of South Kitsap consists of 20-acre parcels.

- A Yes.
- Q What about the Rural Wooded designation and future Urban Growth Boundary?
- A Eric explained Rural Wooded Incentive Program (RWIP). A portion would be developed and a portion would be retained as forest land and open space. The UGAs would be intensified before expanding them further. A balance would be sought between expansion and intensification.
- C Don't destroy South Kitsap with large parcels.
- Q Broadband isn't available in South Kitsap. Will the Comprehensive Plan make it easier to obtain broadband?
- A The Comprehensive Plan allows the county to coordinate with the Public Utilities District and cities to move toward some of these goals.
- Q Is the population accommodation in UGAs 5% less than what was allocated and can be accommodated per the land capacity targets?
- A Land capacity estimates are planning level estimates; also reasonable measures can help; also Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) is at minimum, but there is a range. Cushion helps.
- Q Have you gotten together with city planners to resolve differences? Areas designated at 4 du/acre different than high density plans of cities?
- A Eric outlined methods of coordination: Poulsbo/interlocal; Bainbridge Island/coordination; Port Orchard/joint-planning sub-area plan; Bremerton/future UGAMAs and association; have been discussed and staff encourages comment.
- Q For sewer technology, the county should look at Yelm's example. Have you been there?
- A Eric indicated he had not, though he has reviewed the associated documents.
- Q Is the county working to help Public Utilities Districts? The state should offer credit when water is put back into the aquifer.
- A The County is working on a water reuse plan and looking at conservation and water reuse for our water systems.
- Q Regarding South Kitsap Alternatives 1, 2 and 3. Why is Alternative 1 so different?
- A Alternative 1 is significantly short in housing and population. Alternatives 2 and 3 come closer, especially Alternative 2 with population. Alternative 1 equals the baseline [No Action].
- Q Please comment on typical reasonable measures and forcing growth into Urban Growth Areas.

A We look at density goals and actual creation. If different, then you ask ‘why’? One example is pre-planning; remove it and have true minimum density. Other examples include greater building heights and increased densities.

Q What is a negative reasonable measure?

A Some may find removal of pre-planning a concern. Some may find RWIP may be positive or negative. An example (which is not in the Comprehensive Plan) is differential investment in urban and rural areas.

Q Why are buffers the same in rural and urban areas?

A Buffers do impact development, but certain codes also produce some flexibility with regulations.

C We have greater wetland replacement requirements than before.

A There are higher mitigation ratios.

### 3.3. Draft Comprehensive Plan Alternative Element Stations

#### 3.3.1. Station 1: Land Use

The following represents flip chart comments recorded at the Land Use station:

- Alternative 3 for Port Orchard/South Kitsap sub area, include Anderson Hill Road area as urban to help clean-up housing with newer homes at higher density
- Additional industrial to provide more jobs to area along Old Clifton Road; expands Port Orchard industrial park
- Encourage urban growth in downtown Bremerton

#### 3.3.2. Station 2: Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems

The following represents flip chart comments recorded at the Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems station:

- Keep Hood Canal as pristine as possible; less septic tanks
- Fully fund Mosquito Fleet Trail

#### 3.3.3. Station 3: Economic Development/Housing

The following represents flip chart comments recorded at the Economic Development/Housing station:

- Discourage ugly and cheap house and apartments (design guidelines), but what about mobile and modular housing?

### 3.3.4. Station 4: Utilities/Transportation/Capital Facilities

The following represents flip chart comments recorded at the Utilities/Transportation/Capital Facilities station:

- If ferries don't happen, improve Kitsap Transit bus routes, especially around Gorst
- Bridge Sinclair Inlet, Hwy 16 to Hwy 3
- Bridge Illahee to Bainbridge Island
- Eliminate Hwy 3 squeeze at SR 304
- Bridge Key Port
- Allow Olalla-Winslow maglev
- Talk with all cities to coordinate road improvement plans

### 3.4. Comment Cards

Open house participants were encouraged to submit comments via the comment cards available at the meeting, a written letter or email message. The following comment were submitted at the open house:

- Multi-use of Givens Community Center is not working; too noisy
- Can you schedule your meetings for a location where noise pollution is not a problem? Obviously the loud exercise class goes on until 7pm, so having that noise blast into the meeting room while Mr. Baker is speaking is horrible. Kitsap Transit uses Harper Church for meeting. Think about it.
- Will there be a vote by the public before any growth management?
- Thanks for all our hard and exceptional work
- I fear for major development (NASCAR?) on the only dry-land road off this "island."

## Chapter 4. Central Kitsap Draft Plan Open House

Location: Kitsap County Fairgrounds, Bremerton

Date: September 14, 2006

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Meeting Participants: 61

### 4.1. Introduction

Kitsap County Commissioner, Chris Endressen on behalf of Commissioner Jan Angel, welcomed meeting participants, thanked them for their involvement and encouraged comments on Volume I: Draft Comprehensive Plan Policy, Volume II: Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and Volume III: Proposed Regulation documents.

Jones & Stokes consultant and meeting facilitator, Melinda Posner, then asked meeting attendees how they heard about the meeting and highlighted the purpose of the open house was to introduce the draft planning documents, and gather community feedback on the three alternatives analyzed in the documents. She explained the meeting format and reviewed the ground rules. She also described the public hearing opportunities later in September.

Kitsap County Department of Community Development Special Projects Manager, Eric Baker, provided a brief recap of the May 2006 Alternatives Workshops; described the process for developing the alternatives and draft documents; gave an overview of key issues and features of the draft documents; and reviewed the upcoming steps in the Plan Update process.

### 4.2. Question and Answer Session

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

Q Is there a wildlife corridor between the two Urban Growth Areas?

A Barker Creek corridor is proposed as a rural corridor in Alternative 2 between Silverdale and Central.

Q Can property owners still build there?

A Yes, at rural densities.

Q 100,000 persons? What are the demographics, e.g., seniors?

A Expect that most will live in single-family homes; age ranges from 35 to 50 years old; but it’s a blend of young and old.

- Q Keyport area; rural protection 1 du/10 acres; lots are smaller there; can they build?
- A Yes. They can build on legally created lots even if its nonconforming.
- Q Barker Creek as natural barrier. Is Central Kitsap its own Urban Growth Area? Can it be made independent?
- A Yes. Central Kitsap is its own Urban Growth Area. Through the 10-year, not all population will be accommodated, but rather the remaining population would be assigned through a UGAMA and/or distributed to another unincorporated urban area. The proposed Barker Creek rural corridor provides a de-facto jurisdictional boundary between the future city of Silverdale and city of Bremerton.
- Q Comprehensive Plan chapters; sub area vs. community area? What is the difference? Is there a hierarchy?
- A Incorporation is possible for some UGAs; most UGAs have sub area plans; need to be consistent with Comprehensive Plan and zoning; same for community plans once adopted; goals and policies are equal.
- Q Regarding demographics; 30-50; baby boomers are aging; how involved will county get?
- A The County has to provide opportunities for senior housing, e.g., commercial areas. Plan promotes additional area for higher density.
- Q Is there a proposal for 9-lot short plat without environmental review?
- A Draft Environmental Impact Statement analyzed up front what would be need for future SEPA, including 9-lot short plat exemption; still need critical areas and stormwater requirements.
- Q Pine Road area is on septic—are there plans for sewer given growth? Also road improvements?
- A Yes. Sewer will be necessary in 20-year horizon. See the transportation display station for road plans.
- Q Is attention given to fire services?
- A Account for public services in land capacity. Also work with districts.
- Q How are Urban Growth Areas assigned citizens' groups? What about Central Kitsap?
- A Silverdale looked at potential of incorporation. We could set up a group in Central Kitsap; talk with Board of County Commissioners. We'll be talking with City of Bremerton and citizens about services, etc.
- Q Does the parks zone include all county parks? Will plan address more parks for new population?

- A Parks zone address current parks. The parks plan addresses additional parks, including dog parks. Need to look at funding.
- Q Sub area plans consolidated; lost some specificity. How can we stay in touch?
- A Sub area plans will stay around as references. Please comment if you think particular language has been omitted.
- Q What is category for senior housing in Comprehensive Plan and code?
- A Apartments, congregate care. Looking at commercial and multi-family zones, 10-30 du/acre. Also looking at raising heights and densities from 18/24 to 30.
- Q Barker Creek. Why pull back since they meet now? Why not Urban Restricted with Critical Areas Ordinance?
- A The idea of corridor from citizen input is shown in Alternative 2, and Urban Restricted in Alternatives 1 and 3. Environmental analysis looks at both ideas.
- Q Current rural designation includes Urban Reserve, 1-du/20 acres. Using some Urban Reserve land. Are we going to replace it?
- A The 10-year is not removing all Urban Reserve lands. Urban Reserve was intended for larger tracts so it's not divided into relatively smaller lots. Have several options to direct growth. Don't want to look only at Urban Reserve. Also Urban Reserve downzones 1-du/10 acres.
- Q Sewers on Hwy 303. Property owners paid. Treatment plant is not enough. Now mixed-use. Will there be enough capacity?
- A Yes. The Central Kitsap Treatment Wastewater Facility has capacity to treat wastewater to 2025. Please see the Capital Facilities Plan analysis.
- Q TDR equals rural to urban. What about Urban Restricted for TDR (sending area, more densities)?
- A Urban Restricted in Urban Growth Areas are where we need to provide sewer. In that scenario, it would create pockets of no development within an urban area and would not be able to get latecomer's fees.
- Q Alternative methods of sewer to help aquifers. Why keep referring to sewer lines?
- A Alternative sewer types encouraged in 10-year. Still the exception, not the norm. We are encouraging all options of wastewater treatment.
- Q Reading about developments in downtown Bremerton; they are good examples. Then you see new development in Silverdale. Is it not as controlled?
- A Think office/medical. Required to meet county landscape and development standards. Silverdale doesn't have design guidelines now, but looking at guidelines now.

C Also retail. Interested in office zone?

A Commercial zones allow offices. Need to focus on office uses in the future.

## 4.3. Draft Comprehensive Plan Alternative Element Stations

### 4.3.1. Station 1: Land Use

The following represents flip chart comments recorded at the Land Use station:

- No Urban Growth Area should include Central Valley. It should remain rural per 200 petitions.
- No support for any Urban Restricted beyond natural barrier of Highway 303
- Last time I saw Alternative 2 for Central Kitsap, the parcels north of SR 303 were not included. That is the way it should remain!
- Why overlap of one parcel (Royal Valley) in Silverdale and Central Kitsap Urban Growth Areas?
- Illahee Community Plan should be included in the three alternatives for Central Kitsap. Why the difference?
- Dyes Inlet Pres. Council correspondence
- Zoning in center of Illahee forest should be same as surrounding zoning. The 13 double-wides on that property should be designated as non-conforming.
- Tax account 232501-002-2005 should be mixed use or HTC to be consistent throughout property and to be used at highest and best use. Currently only a small area is zoned neighborhood commercial. Comment to be emailed to planning.

### 4.3.2. Station 2: Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems

The following represents flip chart comments recorded at the Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems station:

- No North Perry wells identified on the map
- No protection for North Perry aquifers
- Need stronger code enforcement and fines
- Create wildlife corridors (lower density zoning) near Illahee S.P.
- Shoreline designation (rural) should have an Urban Restricted zoning, e.g., Third to University Point in Illahee)

- ‘Fall 2004 Planning by Watershed’ was the call for people to come get involved with the South and Central Kitsap sub area plan. ‘Alternative Futures for Watershed’ was then aborted, killed, and forgotten. This must stop. Get back on track with Planning by Watershed.

### 4.3.3. Station 3: Economic Development/Housing

No flip chart comments were recorded at this station.

### 4.3.4. Station 4: Utilities/Transportation/Capital Facilities

The following represents flip chart comments recorded at the Rural and Resource Lands/Natural Systems station, but relate to Station 4:

- Current transportation models do not reflect narrow county road with minimum shoulders; all county roads treated the same.

## 4.4. Comment Cards

Open house participants were encouraged to submit comments via the comment cards available at the meeting, a written letter or email message. The following comment were submitted at the open house:

- Central Valley should remain rural. Royal Valley is constrained by numerous streams, hydric soils, geo-hazards, as well as wildlife conservation areas that are Category 1. The neighborhood has expressed by petitions, etc., that it desires to remain rural in its entirety. Although we were allocated approximately the same population as many other UGAs, we were not allowed time to evaluate our UGA through the CAC.
- As a 30-year resident of Central Valley, my concern is that the valley remains rural, low density for as long as possible. I applaud the hard work by DCD, citizen committees, and others to develop a carefully thought out plan for future development.
- Alternative 2: county recommendation to downzone entire Barker Creek corridor to rural is to be applauded! The CAC recommendation was the same initially, then was unfairly changed at a meeting where there was not a quorum.
- Park zoning is an excellent idea.
- Not a fair process by which Ross development was included in Alternative 2. Sewer is not available. Major wetlands and streams are in that area. A political/singular landowner request such as this vs. the major/multiple number of residents in Central Valley opposing this is unconscionable!
- Central Valley, north of Waaga Way, should remain a rural area.
- Coordinate with Bremerton for UGA plan and boundaries

- I strongly oppose having NASCAR track in this county for a number of reasons. I was not involved in any official surveys.
- Zoning: an “agricultural” zone for ranches and farms and perpetual protection for parks.
- Why isn’t North Perry water system on water systems map? Several other water facilities are not included on the water systems map. Is there a plan to develop a consolidated, accurate water systems map? There should be.
- In mixed-use zone, don’t require the minimum if someone is only able to do one unit. Encourage the mixed-use, like the fact that we’re moving in that direction, not ready for it to be required.
- Proposed regulations (page 6-7), transfer of development rights (Chapter 6). On the ‘Land Use’ map (21.08.110. C.), county needs to make it clear that this is the Comprehensive Plan map. Either here or in definitions, and make it consistent throughout the plan.
- What is a transfer of development credit certificate? It should be well defined. Do you need it if it goes on the deed? Having another piece of paper makes it confusing; property owners don’t know what to do with it.
- You guys and gals do a great job.
- I oppose the speedway in Bremerton. My vote is no!
- I felt that Mr. Eric Baker was very well informed and that he is doing an excellent piece of work on a large and difficult project.
- I emphatically disagree with the inclusion of the Ron Ross/Royal Valley, LLC property being included in the Alternative #2 UGA! The property is obviously disconnected (north of Waaga Way) from the balance of the UGA. The property is an aquifer recharge area, contains several salmon streams and is currently zoned for one home per five acres and should remain so! I am one of a large number of Paulson Road/Central Valley Road residents who wish to remain as un-crowded as possible and do not want to subsidize more growth!