

ATTACHMENT A
KITSAP COUNTY 10-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS AND BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS APPROVAL FOR PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
URBAN GROWTH AREA SIZING AND COMPOSITION

Below is a summary of the Planning Commission recommendations and Board of Commissioner Approval on the sizing and composition of Kitsap County's Urban Growth Areas (UGAs). The table addresses general issues regarding UGA sizing and then each UGA specifically.

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Minimum Density for Urban Low and Urban Cluster Zones (Reduction from 5 to 4 Dwelling Units Per Acre)	Recommended	Same	Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) decisions have ruled that 4 dwelling units per acre is an urban density for Kitsap County. Citizen groups have lobbied for residential densities lower than 5 dwelling units per acre to maintain neighborhood character. Four dwelling units per acre addresses GMA requirements and these community desires.	Same	Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) decisions have ruled that 4 dwelling units per acre is an urban density for Kitsap County. Urban Low and Urban Cluster still allow a range of densities (4-9) and do not restrict development to the lower end. Citizen comments during the sub-area planning processes have requested densities consistent with existing development patterns when appropriate. Four dwelling units per acre helps address these public requests.
Mixed Use Minimum Densities (10 Versus 4 Dwelling Units Per Acre)	Maintain 10 dwelling unit per acre minimum density.	Same	Public comment has included testimony that 10 dwelling units per acre may not allow small developers on small lots to include residential development in their projects due to higher development costs. However, the intent of the mixed use zone is to encourage higher density development to provide additional housing types and maximize infrastructure improvements. Lowering the density removes the zones value for these purposes and as a reasonable measure.	Same	The mixed use zone is intended to provide additional multi-family housing options for Kitsap County. Lowering the minimum density to that of a single-family zone would limit the zone's ability to provide these options and its usefulness as a reasonable measure.

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Population Banking	Bank undistributed population within the Central Kitsap, East Bremerton and West Bremerton UGAs to be resolved through UGAMA discussions with the City of Bremerton in 2007/2008	Same	<p>The land capacity for the proposed UGA boundaries is unable to accommodate all the projected population countywide, but most notably in three UGAs. Accommodating the proposed population allocations for the Central Kitsap, East Bremerton and West Bremerton has been difficult. Opportunities for upzoning and expansion to accommodate this population are limited due to critical area constraints and existing development patterns.</p> <p>Countywide Planning Policies call for the association of UGAs adjacent to cities and the development of Urban Growth Area Management Agreements (UGAMAs) for these areas. As all three UGAs abut the City of Bremerton, the remaining population can be sensibly designated through an UGAMA process or redistributed to other urban areas within the County.</p>	Same	<p>Close coordination with the City of Bremerton is important to properly allocate population within these UGAs. With the development of UGAMAs for these areas, issues such as population distribution, development regulations, revenue sharing and maintenance of community facilities can be addressed. The County and cities have received a grant from Community Trade and Economic Development to assist the development of these agreements over the next two years.</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Overage of Designated Commercial Land (Over 200 acres)	<p>Removal of Commercial zoning from the following areas from Alt 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove Neighborhood Commercial extension on Mile Hill Dr./Pull back to existing UGA boundary (90 acres) Remove additional agricultural properties near the corner of Glenwood and Sidney from UGA (9 acres) Convert Highway Tourist Commercial expansions along Bethel Road south of Sedgwick Road to Mixed Use (100 acres) Convert Neighborhood Commercial along the Anderson Hill Road (Silverdale) to Mixed Use (13 acres) 	<p>Removal of Commercial zoning from the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove additional agricultural properties near the corner of Glenwood and Sidney from UGA (9 acres) Convert Highway Tourist Commercial expansions along Bethel Road south of Sedgwick Road to Mixed Use (100 acres) Convert Neighborhood Commercial along the Anderson Hill Road (Silverdale) to Mixed Use (13 acres) 	<p>Alternative 2 currently contains a 200 gross acre overage of land designated commercial. Reductions are necessary to help balance the employment projections and land capacity for the countywide total.</p> <p>The County needs properly zoned land for future employment and shopping opportunities. The remaining commercial land and remaining overage is necessary for this purpose.</p> <p>The Planning Commission did not recommend removing the Mile Hill Dr. Neighborhood Commercial extension due to the need to recognize existing commercial activities in the area, possible sewer extensions from the Manchester LAMIRD and to provide support for economic activities for Manchester.</p>	<p>Removal of Commercial zoning from the following areas from Alt 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove Neighborhood Commercial extension on Mile Hill Dr./Pull back to existing UGA boundary (90 acres) Remove additional agricultural properties near the corner of Glenwood and Sidney from UGA (9 acres) Convert Highway Tourist Commercial expansions along Bethel Road south of Sedgwick Road to Mixed Use (100 acres) Convert Neighborhood Commercial along the Anderson Hill Road (Silverdale) to Mixed Use (13 acres) 	<p>The decision to designate commercial lands countywide was based upon public processes that when combined yielded an overage of commercial land. The decision on which designations to remove were based upon the properties' inappropriateness for commercial development, surrounding zoning and development patterns and/or infrastructure availability.</p>
Kingston UGA	Alternative 2	Same	<p>The Plan has addressed the remanded issues from the CPSGMHB on the Kingston Sub-Area Plan. With these issues addressed and the reduction from 5 to 4 dwelling units an acre for Urban Low and Urban Cluster (see above), the size and composition of Alternative 2 is within 2% of the population projections for the area.</p>	Same	<p>The Plan has addressed the remanded issues from the CPSGMHB on the Kingston Sub-Area Plan. With these issues addressed and the reduction from 5 to 4 dwelling units an acre for Urban Low and Urban Cluster (see above), the size and composition of Alternative 2 is within 2% of the population projections for the area.</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Poulsbo UGA	Alternative 2	Same	Alternative 2 is consistent with the future plans for the City of Poulsbo and is within 2% of the population projections for the area.	Alternative 1 (see comments)	<p>The BOCC approved Alternative 2 subject to concurrence by the City of Poulsbo.</p> <p>The City of Poulsbo at their November 8, 2006 council meeting did NOT concur with Alternative 2 and recommended Alternative 1.</p> <p>Consistent with the BOCC decision, the preferred alternative for this UGA will be based upon Alternative 1 with all proposed expansions/alterations addressed with the City of Poulsbo during their 2007 Comprehensive Plan amendment process.</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Silverdale UGA	<p>Alternative 2 w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert Urban Low on Dickey Road to Industrial • Convert Urban Low east of Schold Farm to Urban Restricted • Convert Neighborhood Commercial on Anderson Hill Road to Mixed Use 	Same	<p>All properties were reclassification requests that were recommended for approval by the Silverdale Citizens Advisory Committee.</p> <p>In alternative two, the Dickey Road parcels is zoned Urban Low, but is surrounded on three sides by Industrial zoning. As has been seen in North Kitsap, maintaining compatibility between industrial and residential uses can be difficult when abutting on only one side, let alone three.</p> <p>In alternative two, the Schold Farm parcel is zoned Urban Low, but is surrounded on three sides by Urban Restricted zoning and by a roadway on the fourth. This property's proximity to critical areas as well as the surrounding zoning makes Urban Low zoning inappropriate for the property.</p> <p>The Anderson Hill Road Neighborhood Commercial properties should be converted to Mixed Use to address the countywide overage of commercial designated land and to maintain a consistent land use pattern.</p>	Same	<p>The Dickey Road Urban Low property would create possible incompatible land uses in the future as it is bordered on three sides by Industrial zoning. The properties should remain Industrial.</p> <p>The Schold Farm Urban Low property is inconsistent with surrounding zoning, (Urban Restricted) and is in close proximity to a large wetland and stream system. Urban Restricted is the appropriate urban designation for the property.</p> <p>The properties along Anderson Hill Road are surrounded by those zoned mixed use. To ensure a coordinated development pattern for the new mixed use zone in this area, these properties should also have mixed use zoning.</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Barker Creek Corridor	<p>No recommendation on inclusion/exclusion from UGA</p> <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a clear separator between urban areas. • Allows low-density development near critical areas. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area does have sewer availability. • Provides a de-facto boundary of rural zoning between Silverdale and Bremerton 	Exclude from UGA as shown in Alternative 2	<p>The purposes of the inclusion/exclusion of this area from the UGAs are two-fold; environmental protection and determining future jurisdiction (incorporation/annexation).</p> <p>The Silverdale CAC has not provided a clear preference, first voting to exclude from the UGA at one meeting, then voting to include in the UGA at another meeting.</p> <p>The Planning Commission recommended the removal of the Barker Creek corridor from the UGA to provide an urban separator between the future City of Silverdale and the City of Bremerton consistent with the requests of many property owners and a community group.</p>	Exclude from UGA as shown in Alternative 2	Barker Creek provides a clear delineation between the future City of Silverdale and the Central Kitsap/Bremerton area. Rural zoning for this area may also provide enhanced critical area protection. Properties such as the mobile home park are not affected by the change in zoning as their use, as existing, is protected as a non-conforming use.

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Central Kitsap UGA	<p>Alternative 2 w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove Urban Restricted north of Waaga Way Convert Mixed Use and Urban Low between Perry and Trenton Avenues, north of Sylvan Way to Urban Restricted Convert certain properties along the St. Hwy. 303 corridor to Highway Tourist Commercial from Mixed Use 	Same	<p>Includes significant upzoning of the St. Hwy. 303 corridor as appropriate. Implements mixed use zoning (reasonable measures).</p> <p>The City of Bremerton has objected to the expansion of the CK UGA north of Waaga Way. As the most likely jurisdiction to annex this area in the future, the City's goals should be acknowledged.</p> <p>Significant critical areas are located on the northeast corner of Sylvan and Perry Avenues. These properties may not be appropriate for higher-intensity development that comes with mixed use zoning and may be better suited for lower-density development consistent with Urban Restricted.</p> <p>Additionally, certain properties along the St. Hwy. 303 corridor were zoned mixed use while the properties surrounding them were zoned HTC Staff recommends returning these properties to HTC to better coordinate with adjacent properties.</p> <p>As the capacity of the proposed UGA will not meet its population allocation, population banking will be necessary.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove Urban Restricted north of Waaga Way Convert Mixed Use and Urban Low between Perry and Trenton Avenues, north of Sylvan Way to Urban Restricted Convert certain properties along the St. Hwy. 303 corridor to Highway Tourist Commercial from Mixed Use Convert Rolling Hills Golf Course to Urban Reserve Convert Fir Drive area to Urban Restricted Convert Sunset Drive area to Urban Restricted 	<p>The properties north of Waaga Way are significantly constrained by critical areas and are agricultural in character. The proposed Urban Restricted zoning would provide little population capacity and located on the perimeter of the urban growth area would create Growth Management Act concerns. This property may be further addressed during UGAMA discussions with the City of Bremerton in 2007/2008.</p> <p>The properties along St. Hwy. 303 should be consistent with their surrounding zoning when possible. Splitting zoning (HTC and Mixed Use) in existing developments or areas is not desirable.</p> <p>Properties countywide, and especially in important watersheds such as Illahee Creek, should be further protected by Urban Restricted zoning when appropriate. The Sunset Avenue and Fir Drive areas are critical area constrained and should be zoned Urban Restricted. Due to the unknown future of the Rolling Hills Golf Course, these properties should remain Urban Reserve to be resolved by the UGAMA discussions with the City of Bremerton in 2007/2008.</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Royal Valley Site-Specific	Maintain as Rural Residential. Exclude from UGA.	Same	The City of Bremerton has objected to the expansion of the CK UGA north of Waaga Way. As the most likely jurisdiction to annex this area in the future, the City's goals should be acknowledged.	Same Site-Specific Request (2004) is denied.	The properties north of Waaga Way are significantly constrained by critical areas and are agricultural in character. The proposed Urban Restricted zoning would provide little population capacity and located on the perimeter of the urban growth area would create growth management act concerns. This property may be further addressed during UGAMA discussions with the City of Bremerton in 2007/2008.
East Bremerton UGA	Alternative 2	Same	Alternative 2 provides opportunities for higher densities and mixed use development (reasonable measures). These measures do not accommodate all the projected population and will require population banking (see above).	Same	Potential upzoning opportunities have been designated within the UGA to increase population capacity. But, even with the appropriate upzones, the total allocation cannot be addressed. The remaining allocation shall be addressed during UGAMA discussion with the City of Bremerton in 2007/2008.
West Bremerton UGA	Alternative 2	Same	Alternative 2 provides opportunities for higher densities and mixed use development (reasonable measures). These measures do not accommodate all the projected population and will require population banking (see above).	Same	Potential upzoning opportunities have been designated within the UGA to increase population capacity. But, even with the appropriate upzones and expansions, the total allocation cannot be addressed. The remaining allocation shall be addressed during UGAMA discussion with the City of Bremerton in 2007/2008.
Gorst UGA	Alternative 2 w/ additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include additional Urban Restricted and Urban Low land between W. Belfair Valley Road and St. Hwy 3 	Same	Alternative 2 with minor revisions most closely meets the population projections for the UGA. Areas to be included are appropriate for urban densities.	Same	Alternative 2 meets the population allocation for the UGA and provides opportunities for the future redevelopment of mineral resource and industrial activities in the area.

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) UGA	Alternative 2	Same	Alternative 2 includes no additional Industrial or Business Center zoning. New employment is spread out to other areas of South and Central Kitsap. Contains Industrial Multi-Purpose Recreational Area (IMPRA) designation and Urban Holding Area.	Same	Alternative 2 provides for future economic opportunities with the IMPRA designation while establishing a clear framework (development agreement, master plan and EIS) for the environmental review and capital facilities planning necessary for the use as proposed. (See Record for more discussion).
GWS/Overton Reclassification Request	Designate as IMPRA within the SKIA UGA boundary	Same	<p>IMPRA designation and the Urban Holding Area zone establish a clear framework for the approval of future emerging economic opportunities such as a speedway or large-scale industrial complex or other unique employment uses in this area.</p> <p>Full environmental review and capital facilities planning will be required based upon the actual use proposed rather than a more general zone. The costs of such review and planning would be bourn by the applicant rather than the County.</p> <p>A future development agreement and master plan will be required before any urban uses would be allowed. These processes will include full public participation and approval by the Board of Commissioners.</p>	Same	<p>The land use reclassification request to be designated IMPRA rather than the requested Business Center and Commercial.</p> <p>The IMPRA designation establishes a clear framework (development agreement, master plan and EIS) for the environmental review and capital facilities planning necessary for the use as proposed. (See Record for more discussion).</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
McCormick/ULID #6 UGA	Alternative 2	Same	Alternative 2 provides adequate land (within 1% of target) to meet the population projections for the UGA. No expansion is necessary.	Same	Alternative 2 provides for the population projected for this area. Due to master plan requirements, sewer connection issues and existing development agreements for transportation and parks fees, future expansions of this UGA should be in large areas of coordinated ownership.

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA	<p>Alternative 2 w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute unallocated population to the “centers” designated by the Sub-Area Plan. • Remove Neighborhood Commercial extension on Mile Hill Dr. Pull back to existing UGA boundary • Remove additional agricultural properties near the corner of Glenwood and Sidney from UGA • Convert Highway Tourist Commercial expansions along Bethel Road, south of Sedgwick Road, to Mixed Use 	<p>Alternative 2 w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute unallocated population to the “centers” designated by the Sub-Area Plan. • Remove additional agricultural properties near the corner of Glenwood and Sidney from UGA • Convert Highway Tourist Commercial expansions along Bethel Road, south of Sedgwick Road, to Mixed Use (100 acres) • Several reclassification requests (see planning Commission map). These requests have been analyzed in the DEIS. <p>Neighborhood Commercial along Mile Hill Drive remains in UGA</p>	<p>The Sub-Area Plan encourages higher density development within the designated centers in the UGA. The Plan contains goals and policies to accomplish this. To maintain consistency with the goals and policies and acknowledging the potential success of this strategy, the remaining population should be allocated to these centers. Additionally, the conversion of the southern end of the Bethel Road corridor from Highway tourist Commercial to Mixed-Use furthers this purpose.</p> <p>Several site-specific requests have merit to provide expansion for existing businesses and to acknowledge the existence of others.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute unallocated population to the “centers” designated by the Sub-Area Plan. • Remove Neighborhood Commercial extension on Mile Hill Dr. Pull back to existing UGA boundary • Remove additional agricultural properties near the corner of Glenwood and Sidney from UGA • Convert Highway Tourist Commercial expansions along Bethel Road, south of Sedgwick Road, to Mixed Use • Several reclassification requests (see attached map). • Remove requested properties around the Beach Drive/Mountain View Road area from the UGA and maintain as Rural Residential. 	<p>Commercial properties should be carefully designated based upon appropriateness for commercial development, surrounding zoning and development patterns and/or infrastructure availability. The properties removed from the UGA (Mile Hill Drive extension, the agricultural properties near the corner of Glenwood and Sidney Roads and the several land use reclassification requests) were reviewed based upon these criteria.</p> <p>Mixed use zoning provides for a combination of commercial and multi-family residential uses that would provide additional housing and community opportunities for the Bethel Road area.</p> <p>Due to significant critical area constraints located on the properties near Beach Drive and Mountain View Road and their limited development potential at urban densities, these properties are better suited for rural designations.</p> <p>The South Kitsap/Port Orchard Sub-Area Plan provides a framework for the further development of centers within the UGA. These centers located on key points of the transportation system are encouraged to develop at higher densities. It is appropriate for any remaining population to be designated to these centers to reflect these policies.</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Rural Wooded Incentive Program (RWIP)	Defer to 2007/2008	Defer to 2008	<p>Testimony at the public hearings regarding this program was largely negative from both large property owners and the other stakeholders</p> <p>Environmental Review has been conducted on the Rural Wooded Incentive Program and assumed one third of rural growth could occur in these properties over 20 years. Results of 2007 Buildable Lands Report (BLR) will help quantify urban rural split issues. With this added information, deferral to 2008 may allow further discussions to resolve issues between property owners and the other stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>Approve w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board of Commissioners will determine if additional phases will be released for use by the program. 	<p>The Rural Wooded Incentive Program provides bonus density for the maintenance of long-term forestry and open space. As a pilot program of only 5,000 acres, the program as revised can be used to assess its successes and failures with future revisions to the code made appropriately.</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Transfer of Development Rights	<p>Recommended w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required only for Site-Specific and rezone requests (remove requirement for height increases). 	<p>Recommended w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required only for Site-Specific and rezone requests (remove requirement for height increases). • Rural properties who have sold a development right may be allowed to restore the right by purchasing one from another rural property. • Include language stating if property that has sold a development right is included in a UGA through a Comprehensive or Sub-Area planning effort, the development right will be restored for urban development. 	<p>TDRs provide an additional alternative to rural development that allows rural property owners to see financial benefit from their property while furthering the County's UGA density goals (reasonable measure).</p> <p>An increased structure height is another important step towards increasing densities within the UGAs. Requiring TDRs for such increased heights may reduce the chances of this higher-density development by increasing the costs.</p> <p>The TDR program is recommended with the provision for rural properties to recapture their sold development right if purchased from another rural property. Such a purchase would not increase their density beyond that allowed by their zone.</p>	<p>Approved w/ revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required only for Site-Specific and rezone requests (remove requirement for height increases). • Rural properties who have sold a development right may be allowed to restore the right by purchasing one from another rural property. • Include language stating if property that has sold a development right is included in a UGA through a Comprehensive or Sub-Area planning effort, the development right will be restored for urban development. • The BOCC, during approval of their annual docketing resolution, will determine if TDRs are required for specific sub-area plan UGA expansions or redesignations. 	<p>The transfer of development rights program can provide opportunities for rural property owners to see economic value for their properties in a manner other than through rural development. The sale of these development rights to urban property owners will help increase densities in urban areas where public facilities are available.</p> <p>By requiring the purchase of development rights for any site-specific or rezone request, a market will be created to fuel this program while not creating a large burden on urban development.</p> <p>Due to some of the unknown market-driven components of this program (cost and availability of rights), future revisions may be necessary.</p>

	Department Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation	Planning Commission Comments	Board of Commissioners Approval	Board of Commissioners Comments
Urban Restricted (UR) Density Range and Calculation	<p>Density range of 1-5 dwelling units per acre.</p> <p>Density calculated based upon the gross acreage of the project minus critical areas and their buffers.</p>	<p>Same</p>	<p>Historically, the density range for the Urban Restricted zone was calculated at 1-5 dwelling units per acre with the low number based upon net acreage and the high based on gross acreage. For example, a 20-acre property with all but 5 acres constrained by critical areas could develop between 5 (net) and 100 (gross) dwelling units.</p> <p>The language of the Comprehensive Plan and County Code contradicted this interpretation. These documents indicate that the density for each project was to be based upon the property's constraints taking into account critical area impacts. This indicates that both the low and high numbers should be based upon net acreage after the removal of critical areas. Using the previous 20-acre example, the range of allowed dwelling units would be between 5 and 25 rather than 5 and 100.</p> <p>The proposed language clarifies the intent of the Urban Restricted zone and the means of calculating its density.</p>	<p>Approved w/revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density range of 1-5 dwelling units per acre. • Density calculated based upon the gross acreage of the project minus critical areas. 	<p>The revised code language for Urban Restricted maintains the intent of the zone (to provide greater critical area protection through reduced densities). By removing only critical areas from the calculations (rather than buffers, stormwater ponds and other features as well), development can be facilitated at appropriate levels.</p>